U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 87—PART 5

JUNE 3, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1941
(PAGES 4651 TO 5806)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
STATES OF AMERICA

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MAR 12 '42

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, May 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, once more a new day lies before us with its lessons to be learned, its problems to be solved, and, ere it wings its way, we beseech Thee to pardon our unrighteousness and to cleanse us from our sins. Make us, each one, to realize as we enter upon our tasks, if we would have the needful strength for their completion, that we must have pure hearts; that our thinking must be straight if Thy purposes for us and for our Nation are to be made manifest.

May we never quench the glow of young ideals by selfish pride or craft, nor blight the bloom of faith by the frost of unbelief; but help us by our sympathy to cheer the suffering, by our wholesome sense of the worth and joy of life to freshen all who droop in sadness or despair. Save us from the deadly poison of class pride, lest we bruise the rightful self-respect of any man by a contemptuous attitude or a selfish unconcern.

And, as we yield our help ungrudgingly to fellow men, help us all to yield ourselves to the service of our country, and to consecrate thereto, with the fullest measure of devotion, all that we are and hope to be. Do Thou enable us to overthrow the tyranny of lustful power, that there may be established among the nations of the world, justice, mercy, and truth. Grant this in our dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, June 2, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1642. An act granting to regular employees of the District of Columbia not paid on an annual or monthly basis the same benefits with respect to holiday leave with pay as are enjoyed by similar employees of the Federal Government;

H. R. 2688. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 4687. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, decorations, and presents as have been tendered them by foreign governments;

H. R. 4823. An act providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat;

H. R. 4826. An act to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4849. An act to provide for regulating, inspecting, cleaning, and, when necessary, disinfecting railway cars, other vehicles, and other materials entering the United States from Mexico;

H. R. 4887. An act to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for performance of Coast Guard duties; and

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain lands to the State of West Virginia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 578. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to release certain interests in certain land which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J.; and

S. 1311. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PERSONAL GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of surplus personal property of the United States to certain schools conducting vocational or defense training courses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress of the United States a bill known as the Arkansas Valley Authority bill; and

"Whereas there is a necessity for the developing of the State of Missouri in the mining industry and also for the curtailment of the damaging flood waters that have brought about the rapid erosion of soils in the last 50 years; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill is necessary at this time for the carrying out and boosting of a national-defense program: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the National Congress be asked, petitioned, and memorialized to pass said bill at its earliest convenience."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 47

"Relative to memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to aid in furthering the development of Highway 20

"Whereas there extends westward from United States Highway No. 40, at Emigrant Gap, Nevada County, a road known as State Highway 20; and

"Whereas this lateral is considered by many to be a military life line and passes through Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Lake, and Mendocino Counties, linking the Sierras with the sea; and

"Whereas many residents of the counties of Nevada, Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Lake, and Mendocino have formed a Highway Twenty Association for the purpose of furthering the military and the commercial development of this vital avenue of transport and travel; and

"Whereas many members of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California have had occasion to travel and to view sections of this highway and to learn of some of the problems involved in the adequate development of this highway for national defense and for public travel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to make a survey and to study the possibilities of the development of Highway 20 and to

take such steps in the development of the highway as such survey and study shall justify; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of Subsidiary No. 1, Master Barbers of Illinois, Chicago, Ill., favoring the amendment of title I of the Social Security Act, so as to make a minimum of $30 per month available, as a matter of right, to every retired citizen 60 years of age or older, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Hillsboro, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Valley Center, Kans., remonstrating against the use of American ships for convoy purposes through war zones and also against the sending of American soldiers to fight on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. BURTON:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio; to the table.

"Resolution relative to the construction of the first concrete paving

"Whereas 50 years ago an enterprising citizen of the city of Bellefontaine, Ohio, conceived the idea of building concrete roads and experimented with the proposition and constructed in the city of Bellefontaine the first concrete paving of a public street in the history of the world, which street is still in use in the city of Bellefontaine and has stood the test of time and traffic for half a century; and

"Whereas from this initial use of concrete has developed the building of concrete highways throughout the entire Nation and the world, making the use of the highways more safe and speedy for traffic; and

"Whereas this original street construction has been studied by engineers not only of the State but of the Nation and the world in general and has met with the approval of all who have examined and tested this construction; and

"Whereas the use of concrete in this initial attempt marks the transition of highway construction from cobblestones to concrete and has developed our wonderful system of State and National highways; and

"Whereas the city of Bellefontaine, Ohio, under the supervision of the junior chamber of commerce of that city, is celebrating the golden jubilee of the first use of concrete for street and highway construction on the 13th day of June 1941, to which the officials of the State, the members of the senate and the house of representatives, and the citizens of Ohio are most cordially invited: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the ninety-fourth general assembly*, That we extend our congratulations to the junior chamber of commerce and the citizens of the city of Bellefontaine, Ohio, and extend our best wishes for the success of their celebration of this advance in the methods of street and highway construction."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. Res. 79. Resolution requesting the Tariff Commission to investigate the effect upon the red-cedar shingle industry in the United States of importations of red-cedar shingles from Canada (submitted by Mr. BONE on February 24, 1941); with an amendment.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 633. A bill to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 367);

H. R. 148. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896; without amendment (Rept. No. 368); and

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 369).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. BARKLEY), from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 35 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1581. A bill for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1582. A bill for the relief of J. C. Lemon; and

S. 1583. A bill for the relief of Louis McCoy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1584. A bill to increase the amount authorized by the act of July 11, 1940, for the construction of a building for the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1585. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia;

S. 1586. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept for the United States Naval Academy such gifts and bequests as he may see fit;

S. 1587. A bill to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 1588. A bill authorizing the appointment of Richard A. Bevernick to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Regular Navy, for engineering duty only;

S. 1589. A bill to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty; and

S. 1590. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Comm'ttee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1591. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1592. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, to extend retirement to certain employees of certain Indian schools; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1593. A bill to exempt from taxation certain hospital property situated in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Johns; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1642. An act granting to regular employees of the District of Columbia not paid on an annual or monthly basis the same benefits with respect to holiday leave with pay as are enjoyed by similar employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 2688. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; and

H. R. 4826. An act to amend section 8 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to preserve the rights of authors during the present emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 4687. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, decorations, and presents as have been tendered them by foreign governments; and

H. R. 4823. An act providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4849. An act to provide for regulating, inspecting, cleaning and, when necessary, disinfecting railway cars, other vehicles, and other materials entering the United States from Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4887. An act to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for performance of Coast Guard duties; and

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain lands to the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce.

PREVENTION OF WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator WHEELER at Indianapolis on May 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY ON NATIONAL UNITY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio ad-

dress on the subject of national unity delivered by Senator CONNALLY on June 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRNES AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF WOFFORD COLLEGE

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator BYRNES at the commencement exercises of Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C., on June 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

IDEOLOGIES FOR EXPORT—ARTICLE BY STUART CHASE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Progressive of Saturday, May 31, 1941, by Stuart Chase entitled "Ideologies for Export," which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA HAS A CHOICE—ARTICLE BY ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, printed in the Progressive of Saturday, May 31, 1941, under the headline "America has a choice," which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending business before the Senate is Senate bill 937, the so-called sugar bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no motive in wanting a quorum call, but, if the Senator wishes one called, I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Guffey	Reynolds
Aiken	Gurney	Rosier
Ball	Hayden	Russell
Bankhead	Herring	Schwartz
Barbour	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smathers
Brooks	Houston	Smith
Brown	Hughes	Stewart
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Tobey
Byrnes	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	White
Ellender	Norris	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gillette	Overton	
Green	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONVOYS AND STRIKES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when President Roosevelt spoke over the radio last week the entire Nation was listening, curious to know whether or not he was going to recommend steps which, if carried out, might take this Nation into active war against the enemies of Britain. The all-important question then was, Will the President ask the Nation to change existing laws so as to permit the Navy to convoy merchant vessels to the British Isles?

Some time before that the President had said that "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war." However, when members of his Cabinet strongly advocated the use of our Navy to convoy goods destined for Great Britain, it seemed in the face of these utterances from the President's official family that he himself might advocate such measures in his fireside chat.

It is not my intention today to favor or oppose convoys. I have mentioned this subject only to show the state of mind of the country last week, to show how, in many minds, we were on the very verge of war itself.

I have mentioned the convoy issue simply to call attention by way of contrast to two domestic issues—the labor situation and the tremendous waste, both in war and ordinary expenditures, of our National Government.

Let me say at the outset that I believe that the great mass of people in the industrial establishments of this Nation are just as patriotic, as willing to sacrifice in hours of national emergency, as are any other class of our population. This goes for employers, too, as well as for employees.

The sons of those employed in our industrial establishments make up many hundreds of thousands of the men who have already been drafted and have commenced their service at $21 a month in the training camps of this country.

My concern is that the Federal Government has exercised its power to take these men from their homes, and quite often from employment at very high wages, to serve for a year in Army camps, and then the same Government refuses to discipline others of our population who are engaged in producing the arms and supplies needed to equip our fighting men so that they may be in position to protect the lives of our people and the Government and institutions of the United States. Yet this is exactly what is happening today. In the face of strike after strike, strike after strike, the Federal Government seems to sit supinely by and allow valuable time to be wasted, to allow valuable munitions to remain unmade, to allow valuable and needed equipment to remain unproduced, and consequently not to reach either our own soldiers now in camps or the British, who are in dire need of it, and to whom we are pledged to accord this help.

We have pledged this country to furnish Britain this equipment, provided she comes here and gets it. We have appropriated billions of dollars, which for the most part labor itself must pay in taxes, in order to pay for the guns and the tanks, the planes, and the shells which Britain needs. These commitments are formal ones. These commitments are in the laws of the United States today. Yet there have been repeated strikes in our airplane plants, repeated strikes in our shipbuilding plants, and repeated strikes in other industries engaged in the manufacture of war materials, with apparently little or no concern for these stoppages of production on the part of the Government of the United States.

Now, mark me well, if there had been no strikes, many more planes, many more tanks, many more antiaircraft guns would not only have been produced but would even now be in the British Isles, or in Greece, or in Africa, where they are so badly needed. Mark me well—indeed, I venture to say that if there had been no strikes, more actual equipment would have reached Britain under the present arrangements, even with ship sinkings in the Atlantic, than would have reached her, taking into consideration the prevailing strikes, even though we had convoyed such material as we did produce.

In other words, it is reasonable to assume that more equipment would have reached Britain with no strikes, even with more ship sinkings than have taken place, than that which actually has reached Britain, cut down as our production has been by strikes and work stoppages, even though we might have managed to convoy all this material overseas.

So, Mr. President, if "convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," and the sole purpose of convoys is to get the equipment to Great Britain, it seems to me that the deficiency in equipment arriving in Britain because of ship sinkings could be completely overcome through the medium of producing more equipment here, and we could take this step without involving this country in war, as, according to the President, convoying would do.

When we are told by the President that this is the gravest hour in our history—that if Britain falls we shall be next on the list—that if Britain falls planes will leave Africa for South America and thence fly to the United States to bomb our cities—and in spite of all these utterances we see this complacency

on the part of the Government in the face of stoppages, delays, and obstructions in our defense production, it is difficult to take seriously the warnings of a possible war being brought to our country. Certainly, if the words of the President have any factual foundation, it seems to me that action on the home front is vital if we are to survive as a Nation; and that action has not been forthcoming.

I want to add that, in my judgment, the great masses of the American working men and their employers are in complete sympathy with the sentiments I am expressing. It is their sons and brothers who are the soldiers and sailors in our armed forces, who, if war comes, must do the actual fighting and dying. Hundreds of thousands of these men have been called out and have been in service for several months; and the needed equipment which they must learn to handle, maneuver, and fight with has not been supplied to them. Yet the Government has actually done little or nothing to speed up the production of the supplies which not only Britain needs, but which we, too, need to defend ourselves.

Then, too, ever since 1931, and even before the present emergency, the national Government has been spending each and every year billions of dollars that it did not have, to that extent putting a burden on future generations to pay the debts incurred by this generation. The average yearly deficit of the National Government for each year since 1930 up until the present emergency has been $2,800,000,000. During the 10 years ending June 30, 1940, the Federal Government spent $28,000,000,000 more than it took in. It has passed that debt on to future generations. It has been unwilling to cut materially its expenditures, and it has been equally unwilling to raise all, or a substantial part, of these deficits by increased taxation. In the present emergency it has let contract after contract without competitive bidding, and without the usual surety and other bonds given for faithful performance, and so forth.

The cost of many of the projects it has undertaken has run to twice the amount originally agreed upon. The national debt is going up and up and up. No one knows how long the war will last, but already a $100,000,000,000 debt is in sight, and a hundred billion dollars is more than all the men, women, and children in America earn in a single year; even if they gave every penny of their earnings to the Federal Government, the debt would not be liquidated. There is no doubt in my mind that the Federal Government can lop off anywhere from five hundred million to a billion dollars in unnecessary peacetime expenditures at this time. To the extent that it effects reductions in the annual cost of the Government, to that extent it can lessen the burden of taxation on the masses of the people, either present or eventual taxation.

Certainly, in the face of continued deficits, now almost finishing the eleventh year, and a national debt that is already pointing toward the $100,000,000,000 mark, good administration would dictate that every unnecessary Federal expense be eliminated forthwith.

Mr. President, I have supported every measure which the President has recommended in this emergency, and, indeed, some which he did not recommend, and upon which he was silent, such as the Draft Act.

I have remained silent, too, about some things, not saying a single word that might be construed as criticism in these grave hours of the world's history, hoping, always hoping, that leadership would be assured and that action, which is vital to the safety of this Nation, would be taken by the President. I now call on him, in the name of the American people, in the name particularly of the mothers and fathers whose sons are in the training camps, in the name of the taxpayers of this country, in the name of dying British men, women, and children who nightly are being crushed beneath bombed dwellings, to give us some leadership in the solution of the difficulties between capital and labor, which will prevent stoppages in production of essential war materials; I ask it in the name of the vast majority of workingmen themselves, but, more than that, I ask it in the name of all the people of the United States.

Hand in hand with that, I ask the President, in the name of all the people of this country, to save our financial front, too; for not only during this war, but in its sad aftermath, there will be a tremendous financial strain placed upon the Government of this country. To spend hundreds of millions of dollars now in luxurious peacetime undertakings which can be eliminated without serious hardship is to jeopardize the future of this country very dangerously—a danger which is only less great than that which we would suffer were we a defeated nation in a world war.

We must remember that we not only have to defend ourselves against defeat in a possible war, but no less we must save this Government from defeat at the hands of a coalition of depression, unemployment, and world economic disorder after the war is over.

I feel sure that if the President will take the leadership in finding a means to end these disputes between capital and labor, so that production may go on, and in effecting economies of not less than five hundred million to a billion dollars annually in the nondefense activities of our Government, all the people of this Nation, including labor itself, will support him in that undertaking. I know that the Congress of the United States will do so, as it has done in the past through all this emergency.

Until these things are accomplished—the ending of strikes in defense plants, and the elimination of all nonessential expenditures by our Government—talk of convoys and other measures calculated to carry us into actual war are out of place.

Until we, as a nation, have done all we can do short of war to aid Britain, it is not logical to consider steps which mean actual participation in war by this country.

SUGAR QUOTAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 937) to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I had hoped that in the discussion of the pending measure, the Adams-O'Mahoney amendment to the Sugar Act of 1937, we might hear from the opponents of the bill. So far no speech has been made in opposition. A few remarks have been made by the acting chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators who are opposed to the measure. I expected the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is opposed to the bill, to speak, but he desires that I proceed with my remarks on the bill before he speaks, and in deference to him I am doing so. I wish to assure the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia that I do not intend to take more than 20 to 25 minutes in the discussion of the bill, so that there will be ample time for them before the hour of 2 o'clock, when the Senate is to vote upon the measure.

I wish to impress upon Senators first that this measure in no way changes the intent of existing law. In 1937, when we enacted the Sugar Act, we had before us the question of what was to be done with the deficit in the Philippine quota, if any appeared. What we were talking about at that time was the so-called dutiable portion of the Philippine quota. Roughly speaking, at the present time the Philippine Commonwealth may ship into the United States free of duty approximately 850,000 long tons of sugar. For many years they have had the right to ship in a larger amount of sugar than that, but upon much of that excess the full duty was to be paid.

It was assumed, in the discussions before the Finance Committee and before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in 1937, that it was probable that the Philippine producers would not ship into the United States some 60,000 to 75,000 tons of dutiable sugar which had to be shipped in over our tariff wall. The present situation is such that it is practically impossible for the Philippine producers to ship in any sugar over that tariff wall, and I think it is fair to say that none will be shipped in.

In addition to that, because of a rise in freight rates of over 400 percent, from $8 a ton to, according to the latest quotation which I received this morning, $35 a ton, and because of the shortage of ships, it is estimated that the Philippine Commonwealth, the Philippine producers, will be short from 100,000 to 300,000 tons of sugar in their shipments into the United States.

Based upon that condition, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wyoming, after consultation with several of us who represent sugar-producing States, decided to ask that the Philippine deficit should be turned over to American producers. That means the domestic beet producers, the domestic cane producers, the Hawaiian producers, the Puerto Rican producers, and the producers in the Virgin Islands. In other words, the producers of all continental United States and the Territories of the United States in these offshore islands.

I stated before the Finance Committee at the hearing that there was no question in the mind of any of us who han-

dled that bill, or any of us in the conference—and I happened to be one of the conferees—as to what was intended by the provisions which we wrote into the 1937 law, namely, that they related to dutiable sugar. I wish to confirm that by reading a letter from the then Secretary of Agriculture, the distinguished gentleman who presides over this Chamber. On April 8, 1937, he wrote to the House Committee on Agriculture as follows:

An additional measure for increased diversification of the foreign market for exports is contained in the proposed provisions under which any deficit of full-duty sugars—

He was not talking about the nondutiable sugar, but any deficit of full-duty sugar—

including a Philippine deficit of such sugars—

That is the full-duty sugar—

would be allotted among the countries supplying such sugar—

Meaning by that, as shown from the context, foreign countries—

in proportion to their present quotas.

On April 13 the then Secretary of Agriculture wrote to the Committee on Agriculture of the House as follows:

In order to increase the full-duty quotas without disturbing the basis of the existing quota allocations, the draft of a bill presented by the Secretary of Agriculture proposed that any part of the full-duty share of its quota not utilized by the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands be reallocated on a pro rata basis to full-duty countries.

There was no one on the House Committee on Agriculture or the Finance Committee of the Senate who had in contemplation such a situation as that the Philippine Islands would be unable to ship in their full quota of nonduty sugar. All we had in contemplation, all the Secretary of Agriculture had in contemplation, was the full-duty sugar. Therefore when the Adams-O'Mahoney bill came before the Finance Committee, after a very full discussion—and I think I am privileged to quote what was said in open session there—it was suggested by the acting chairman that perhaps the fair thing to do would be to allot the deficit which the Philippine Commonwealth is unable to supply among all producers, not only the domestic, not only the Territorial producers, as I will call them, those of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, but also among foreign countries, and it was suggested that we present such a plan to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture. I then pointed out that if we did what was suggested by the acting chairman the amount of sugar which foreign countries would get, principally Peru and Santo Domingo, which are practically the only countries involved in this controversy, would be even less than they are getting at the present time, and that the fair thing to do would be to turn over to the foreign countries an amount substantially equivalent to the difference between the amount of dutiable and nondutiable sugar coming from the Philippine Islands, which has averaged over a 4-year period about 73,000 tons, or less.

I therefore proposed an amendment to the Finance Committee that we allot to the foreign countries the first 75,000 tons, and that whatever the Philippine deficit was above 75,000 tons be allotted to the domestic producers. I do not think there was anyone on the Finance Committee, as my colleague, Mr. VANDENBERG, stated the other day, who doubted that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State would agree to that proposition. I was instructed, along with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], to write a letter to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of Agriculture suggesting what the Finance Committee had tentatively proposed as a compromise, and, I think, without due consideration, without a full understanding on the part of the men at the head of those Departments, the proposal was rejected.

I wish to repeat what that proposal was. It was that, as a practical proposition, we would give to Peru and Santo Domingo the first 75,000 tons of the Philippine deficit, which is larger than the average amount of sugar they have received over the past 4 years. That whatever there was by way of deficit over 75,000 tons should go to supply the deficiency in the American producers' quotas.

I here call attention to the fact that there has been a decrease of between 17 and 18 percent in the acreage allotted to the American beet farmer in 1940 over 1939. That means that the producers in California, in Nevada, in Wyoming, in Colorado, in Nebraska, in Michigan, in Ohio, in Indiana, in Wisconsin, and in all the other States that have produced sugar beets, are forced to take a cut of 18 percent in their acreage for this year when we will have a probable deficit of from 200,000 to 300,000 tons of sugar in the total production of all countries, including Cuba and the Philippines, within the American sugar-producing system.

I thought my proposition made to the Finance Committee was more liberal to foreign countries than that which the acting chairman of the committee had suggested as a compromise. I thought when we gave to the Secretary of State, who in a certain sense represents the views of the producers in the foreign countries—and I mean that in no invidious sense, because I recognize, of course, the reciprocity trade agreements which are fundamentally affected by this situation—I thought, when we gave more than the foreign producers had any right to expect, that we were going a long way with the American sugar market which, after all, we ourselves own and should control.

Now what is the situation that brings about the extraordinary drop in Philippine production? The Philippine production, the nondutiable quota, is in round figures 850,000 long tons, or 925,000 short tons. Because of the approaching independence of the Philippine Islands, due to the Tydings Act which was passed by the Senate under the guidance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, there will be a gradually declining Philippine nondutiable quota. On January 1 of 1940 it dropped from approximately 1,000,000 short tons to 925,000 short tons. As it is expressed in the statute in long tons, that would be 850,000 tons. In addition to that, a gradually increasing export duty is imposed upon the nondutiable sugar by the Government of the Philippine Islands. In 1941 the export tax is 5 percent of the American tariff, which is $1.875 per hundred.

For 1942 it is 10 percent of the tariff; for 1943, 15 percent of the tariff; for 1944, 20 percent of the tariff; for 1945, 25 percent of the tariff; and for 1946, when the Tydings Act goes into full effect and the Philippine Islands are totally detached from connection with the United States by any ties of governmental relationship, it goes to the full 100 percent of the American tariff, or $1.875 per hundred pounds of sugar.

Of course, that situation will mean that gradually the Philippine nondutiable quota will decline, and that the amount that the Philippine Islands may ship into the United States, unless there is an extraordinary rise in price, will gradually decline.

But, Mr. President, there are two other factors. The principal one is the freight rate. The rate on sugar from the Philippine Islands to the United States has increased from $6.75 a ton to $35 a ton, an increase of between five and six times. That is equivalent to an additional heavy tariff, because it must be paid by the purchaser or the producer of the sugar.

Likewise the shortage of ships has been tremendous. I have before me the report of the Tariff Commission, which was submitted at the request of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee [Mr. HARRISON], showing the decline in the shipping facilities available for carrying sugar from the Philippine Islands to the United States.

From January through August of 1939 between 56,000 and 95,000 tons of sugar a month were shipped from the Philippine Islands to the United States. In October, and since that time, it has declined to approximately 7,000 tons a month. This shortage may become serious in the United States. All of us can recall the days immediately following the World War. Because American production had been forced down, the price of sugar rose. We were controlled by foreign producers. American production had been forced down by an inadequate tariff protection. I have the figures before me. The retail price of sugar jumped from 8 cents in 1916 to 10 cents in 1917, 11 cents in 1919, and 19 cents a pound in 1920. Assertions have been made on the floor of the Senate that at times the price reached 26 cents a pound. Due to the fact that we had neglected our domestic production, the cost to the American consumer was tremendous.

Mr. President, I think it is vital at this time that we should encourage domestic production. How are we to get sugar from Peru or Santo Domingo? Reliable market reports state that at the present time their stocks of sugar are pretty well committed to the British Empire. Why? It is much easier for the British to get sugar from Santo Domingo in the Caribbean Sea than it is to get it from Java, which involves a much longer and more perilous haul. It is easier for the British to get sugar from Peru through

the Panama Canal than it is to make the long run from the Dutch East Indies, where the supply may be cut off at any time by action on the part of the Japanese Nation. In the interest of Britain, which produces very little sugar within the British Isles, it seems to me that we ought to leave to Britain the stocks which may exist in Santo Domingo and Peru.

Mr. President, there is another factor. The freight rate on sugar, even from Cuba, has increased from $2.80 a ton to $10 a ton; from Santo Domingo, from $2.60 a ton to $8.40 a ton; and from Peru, from $4.75 a ton to $15 a ton.

It is said that we should release ships from coastwise service in the United States to carry war materials to Britain, in accordance with our adopted policy. If we want ships in order to carry on the policy upon which we have embarked, it seems to me that we ought to do everything possible to encourage domestic production so that ships may be freed from the sugar trade. A tremendous number of ships are so used. In the Philippine carrying trade, from January to October 1940 there were 873 sailings from the Philippine Islands to the United States. There were 193 American ships, 267 Japanese vessels, 150 British, 97 Dutch, 90 Norwegian, and 76 from other countries.

Mr. President, if there is a shortage of ships—and we all know that there is—would we not be benefiting the present situation and alleviating the conditions about which we complain if ships were released from the obligation of carrying at least a part of the sugar from Cuba, the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, Peru, and Santo Domingo?

Of course, we shall have to use a large amount of sugar from outside the United States. Only about 29 percent of our consumption requirements is produced within the limits of the United States. Therefore it seems to me that to the limit of our capacity it would be wise for us to encourage domestic production within continental United States, knowing that we shall have to take full quotas from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in order to supply our needs.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to summarize this simple bill. The bill carries into effect the original purpose of the then Secretary of Agriculture, expressed in his letters to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the intent of the Agriculture Committee of the House, the intent of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the intent of the entire Congress itself when it enacted the Sugar Act of 1937. The bill provides that 75,000 tons of sugar production—all that anybody at that time had in contemplation as the Philippine deficit—shall be allotted to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State for use in connection with our foreign trade. Because of the extraordinary and unforeseen conditions, by reason of the great increase in freight rates and the shortage of bottoms on the Pacific and on the Atlantic, the deficit may amount to as much as 300,000 tons of sugar, which is a tremendous amount of sugar. The entire consumptive demand of the United States is slightly less than 7,000,000 tons.

I say that by this bill we are merely putting into effect the original intent of the Sugar Act of 1937. The enactment of this bill, with the amendments which the Finance Committee recommended, will in nowise interfere with the trade agreements or with the arrangements which the Secretary of State has made, and, I hope, will continue to make under the reciprocal trade agreements.

I desire to read a very moderate statement from the report of the Tariff Commission upon this bill.

> While it may be held that these undertakings on the part of the United States—

That is, to give the Philippine deficit to foreign countries—

> do not constitute an obligation to continue to redistribute any and every deficit in the Philippine quota solely to full-duty countries, it can hardly be disputed that to exclude these countries entirely from participating in such additional allotments would be contrary to the spirit of the international sugar agreement.

That, Mr. President, was the basis upon which I proposed to the Finance Committee the 75,000-ton compromise, and that was the reason why it was adopted. Seventy-five thousand tons is more than these countries, in 1937 or at any other time, had any right to expect. Under this amendment we will give them that 75,000 tons. With that amendment to the bill I believe, Mr. President, that every Senator who is a warm friend and advocate of the reciprocal trade agreements can be satisfied that the Government of the United States and the Congress of the United States are performing their full duty and their full obligation under the reciprocal trade agreements to these nations in South America.

I am pleading today that this tremendous cut of 18 percent—almost a fifth—in American acreage for 1941 over 1940 be made up to the American farmers by allotting to them and to the island possessions of the United States our offshore areas, the tremendous probable deficit in the Philippine quota. By so doing we shall be making a little progress toward becoming more self-sufficient in meeting our sugar needs; we shall be making some progress in the effort to prevent our people being at the mercy of foreign producers. Our national economy will be protected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under the agreement the time expires at 2 o'clock, as I recall. The Senator from Georgia will make the main argument on this side of the question. I do not desire to transgress on his opportunity thoroughly to explain the attitude of the committee.

Mr. President, those of us who are opposing the pending bill are not out of sympathy with the sugar producers of the United States. If we had been, we would not have voted for the bill which the sugar interests presented and asked the Congress to enact. I do not know when that bill was passed, but it went into operation in 1937; did it not?

Mr. BROWN. It was passed in 1936.

Mr. CONNALLY. The sugar producers of the United States came forward and said, "We want the Jones-Costigan Act. It will help the sugar producers." That was in 1934. Those of us who do not produce sugar but who eat sugar voted for it. Now, the same sugar interests that wanted that act are coming back and asking us to change it and make it still more generous than it heretofore has been.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one possible correction?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. There is a variation between the Jones-Costigan Act and the Sugar Act of 1937. What we are asking is to go back part way to the Jones-Costigan Act. The Jones-Costigan Act provided that Philippine deficit should be divided proportionately among all sugar-producing areas. That was a fair provision. The 1937 act varied the Jones-Costigan Act. In other words, there were some who asked to have the Jones-Costigan Act modified. Now we are asking to go back part of the way—not all the way—to the Jones-Costigan Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the Jones-Costigan Act was sponsored by the sugar interests. I assume that the act of 1937 was sponsored by the same interests, or it would not have passed this body; and, knowing how well organized the sugar-producing interests are, I cannot conceive that the act of 1937 ever would have gotten in the front door of the Senate if the sugar interests had not sponsored it.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I may say that both acts were no more based upon the wishes, desires, and sponsorship of the sugar interests than they were based upon the desires and sponsorship of the consumers' interests. If the Senator will recall, the President of the United States brought up both bills by a letter addressed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, in which letter he called attention to the chaos in the sugar industry and the necessity for legislation. I should say that the sponsorship was administration sponsorship, and not that of any particular interest.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be the case, I hope the Senator will stay with the administration's attitude.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I realize that legislation in the United States for many years has had the effect of creating enhanced prices for our domestic products. I realize that, and I am not out of sympathy with the movement. I am perfectly willing that the American consumer shall pay more for American sugar than for sugar coming from other countries. But, Mr. President, there is a limit beyond which in fairness to the consumer we should not go; there is a limit beyond which we should not go in fairness to the other nations of the hemisphere with whom we deal and with whom our economic interests ought to be encouraged and built up, rather than discouraged and torn down.

What is the attitude with respect to the manner in which this legislation has operated to the advantage of the sugar producer? In the first place, the sugar

producer gets the benefit of a tariff, of $37.50 a ton—$37.50 a ton—and one-half a cent excise tax—if I am in error I want to be corrected—on every pound of full-duty sugar that comes into the United States; and the countries which Senators say would be benefited by the existing law instead of by this amendment, the full-duty countries, when they bring in a pound of sugar must first walk up to the Treasury and put down $37.50 a ton, and then, on top of that, half a cent a pound, before that sugar can get in here to compete with either our beet sugar or our cane sugar. If that statement is not true, I should like to have it denied. Is not that helping the sugar people of the United States? Yet it has been said upon this floor that the purpose in opposing this bill was to destroy—was to destroy—the domestic sugar producer. Is that fair? Is that a fair statement of the facts?

Now, let us see what is the price received by the domestic producer. I quote these figures from the Department of Agriculture. I said I was willing for domestic sugar consumers to pay more for American sugar than for foreign sugar. I am. Under the existing law the price of refined sugar in the export market is 2 cents a pound. If one is a Britisher or anybody else, and wants to buy some sugar in the export market, he can get it for 2 cents a pound. What do we pay in the United States? Four and ninety-five one-hundredths cents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield, but I want Senators to be as tolerant with me as they can, because I desire to leave as much time as possible for the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to interrupt the Senator to say that the argument which he is now making seems to me to overlook the fundamental fact that the 2-cent sugar of which he speaks is possible only because of the very distressed condition in the entire sugar industry throughout the world, to correct which the administration in 1933 joined forces with those who represented the sugar-producing areas of the United States and those who represented the refining interests of the United States to stabilize the industry. No proper comparison can be made between the distress world price and the price which the Senator has quoted in the United States.

The correct comparison, as I see it, is between the prices to the domestic consumers existing under the Sugar Control Act and the prices which were charged before that act went into effect. Under the tariff system, before the quota system was adopted, and under the conditions that existed in the last World War, the prices which were paid by the consumer were uniformly higher than under the present act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Let us see what the Senator's contention is. The Senator from Wyoming contends that the cheap foreign price has been caused by war. Very well; granted as to the countries that would get this extra quota. They are cursed by the conditions of war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not make that suggestion. The distress price existed long before the war. The war will cause the world price to go up, and my prediction is that, unless the bill which the Senator from Colorado and I have introduced is passed, the consumers of the United States will probably pay a very much higher price than they are now paying. The distress price to which I have referred was the price which was brought about by too much production in the world, and the denial of the proposal made in this bill will have the effect, in my opinion, of increasing the price to the American consumer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator that my understanding has been that because of the lack of transportation the European market for South and Central American sugar has greatly deteriorated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator quoted a price of 2 cents a pound in Great Britain.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say "in Great Britain," I said "in the export market."

Mr. ADAMS. I was going to ask whether or not one can buy refined sugar in the export market at 2 cents?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not in Britain, of course.

Mr. ADAMS. Can he buy sugar in the export market of the United States for 2 cents?

Mr. CONNALLY. As I said on yesterday, the memorandum on which that statement appeared was given to me by a sugar expert of the Department of Agriculture. I have got to take his statement; I do not know whether it is true; but he is here, and I should be glad to call him in and put him under oath, if that could be done under the rules, and see just what he does say. But he gave me the figures in his own handwriting.

Price for refined sugar for export 2 cents per pound; price of the same sugar under the sugar program 4.95 cents.

Mr. ADAMS. The fact is that the retail price of sugar is higher in almost every country in the world than it is in the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that; but it is not the retail price that the producer gets, and we are talking about the producer. Of course in foreign countries they have all sorts of government controls and monopolies and things of that kind which make sugar cost more than it does here, probably, just as in the case of tobacco they have government monopolies and government restrictions which make the consumers in those countries pay more. But we are not talking about that; we are talking about the price paid the producer. The producer in America gets 4.95 cents a pound for sugar which in the export market selis for 2 cents. I think the Government has done pretty well by the sugar producer by providing a system under which he can do that.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, because I yielded to the Senator from Wyoming and to the Senator from Colorado. Then I shall yield to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Texas seems to imply——

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean "to imply," if I did; I want to state the facts as I know them; but I am not an expert on sugar, and I want to be corrected if I am in error.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator does not get the full import of my question, and I have to make a statement in connection with it. He implies that since the Jones-Costigan Act, which went into effect in 1934, and the act of 1937, the American producer has been getting more for his sugar than before the Sugar Act went into effect. The fact, I will say to the Senator, is that the average retail price of sugar for the last 6 years under the two sugar acts has been 5.46 cents a pound. For the period 5 years previous to that time it was 5½ cents a pound, or a little higher; for the 5-year period before that it never fell below 6 cents, or 6¼ cents; for the 5-year period before that it never fell below 7 cents a pound. So the Senator cannot say, without being successfully contradicted, that the price has been raised by the Jones-Costigan Act and the act of 1937. The price has been cut rather than raised.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to make any positive statement and I ask Senators to correct me if I am in error; I am not a sugar expert; all I know about sugar is that it is sweet; I am really very much embarrassed in undertaking to discuss the question here with Senators who sleep with sugar and live with sugar, and I want to be corrected when I am wrong; I do not want anything to go into the RECORD from my lips that is not true. But the facts are that under this legislation, which was sponsored by the sugar interests, the sugar producers have done exceedingly well.

Now, what are the facts? It should be remembered that the sugar producers, the beet growers—I am talking about sugar beets now—unlike other agricultural producers, received parity or near parity returns in every year of the sugar program since 1934, and that the sugar-beet producers are protected against competition of foreign sugars, other than those of Cuba, by a tariff, a tax on such sugars equivalent to over 200 percent. How much protection do they want? They are receiving 200 percent; the refiners have that advantage; and the sugar producers, claiming that they are not being treated fairly, have been receiving parity or near parity when other agricultural producers have not received parity. Are we discriminating against the sugar producers?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator speaks of parity. Of course parity in agricultural crops has been worked out on the basis of the period from 1909 to 1914, which, as to most crops, was the period of high agricultural prices. It so happens, however, that in the case of sugar that period was a period of low prices. So, when we speak of parity, the parity

of that period was not even the average sugar price.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Now, let us see what the sugar factories in the beet States are doing; let us see how they are suffering; and let us see how the sugar producers in the sugar-producing States are suffering. Let us see what has happened to them under the sugar program.

Under the sugar program the sugar-beet processors have averaged about 9 percent on net worth as compared with losses of 4 and 5 percent in the years preceding the program. Under the program they have been making 9 percent on their capital investment, as against a loss of 4 and 5 percent before the program was adopted; and yet it is said that we are trying to destroy the sugar-beet industry. In one year, 1937, their net income averaged as much as 12.64 percent. There is, therefore, no need to prejudice our Latin-American relations and our badly needed export markets by the passage of this bill.

What has caused the introduction of this bill? Under the Sugar Act the Philippine Islands have a certain quota. By reason of the lack of shipping and high shipping costs it is anticipated that the Philippines will not fill their quota; and this bill is to give the Philippine quota to the domestic producers. That may be a temporary condition. That may be a temporary state of affairs. Would it do the sugar producers any good in the long view to allow them for 1 year or perhaps even 2 years to plant a larger quota, and then, when normal conditions return, have to reduce those quotas and put them out of business? Then we would have a cry here to the effect that we were discriminating against the sugar producer by cutting down his acreage when the bill was supposed to be of benefit to the sugar producer.

Mr. President, it seems to me that from the consumer's standpoint we are doing mighty well by the domestic sugar producers. The Treasury is interested in this matter to some extent. On every ton of full-duty sugar the Treasury gets $47.50, and the foreign producer gets $25. The countries from which this sugar is expected to come—Peru, Santo Domingo, and Haiti—are all full-duty countries; and on every ton of sugar that comes from those countries the Government gets $47.50, not for itself but largely for the benefit of the domestic producer, while the foreign producer of that sugar gets only $25 a ton. Is there not some national interest in this program?

But, Mr. President, in addition to those considerations there are other aspects of this question which give concern to the administration. The Secretary of State is opposed to this bill. The Secretary of Agriculture, who administers the Sugar Act and who has been very sympathetic with the sugar program and who has been endeavoring to do what he could for the sugar producers, is against the bill; and, as I have said, the Secretary of State is against the bill. It has aspects that are more significant than just a cent and a half on a pound of sugar. It has repercussions that affect the political and institutional life of the Western Hemisphere. Under the act of 1937, in the event the Philippine quota should decline, the Secretary of Agriculture is instructed to prorate that quota around among all the quota countries and areas. If I am in error in that statement, I should like to be corrected. That is my understanding.

Mr. ADAMS. Except Cuba.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; except Cuba. Cuba has a special relationship to the United States, and it does not pay the full tariff duty; but, other than Cuba, the Philippine quota, if not filled, is to be prorated by the Secretary of Agriculture to other sugar-producing areas.

Why should that arrangement be changed? That was contemplated when the act passed. The Senators who are here now advocating this new bill knew that that provision was in the earlier bill when they voted for it. They knew that provision was in their bill when they asked the rest of us who do not produce any sugar to vote for it. To pass this bill now would be to say to Santo Domingo and Peru and Haiti, "Because of this temporary condition caused by the war, because the Philippines do not fill their entire quota, we are going to take away from you whatever anticipated quota you might get, except for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan about the 75,000 tons."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senator realizes that 75,000 tons is all that anybody in 1937, when we passed the present law, had any idea would be brought into the United States. Not only was that the idea of the committees and of the Congress, but it was the written statement of the then Secretary of Agriculture that they were talking about the deficit in the so-called dutiable sugar.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not prepared to dispute that statement, and I thank the Senator for putting it into the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that that is the whole question. The Senator talks about prices, and so on and so forth. There is no fight about prices here. There is no complaint about the Sugar Act. We are talking about an entirely different situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator still wants to get the high price for sugar, but he also wants to be able to plant more sugar. Of course, after all, that is an item of price.

The Secretary of Agriculture is not for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. He points out, in a letter to the Senator from Michigan which is incorporated in the report of the committee, that the so-called amendment does not substantially improve the legislation. This is what he says in one paragraph:

Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937 provides for allotment to foreign countries other than Cuba of any deficit in the quota of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands. On April 11, 1941, this Department announced that pursuant to this provision of the act reallotment of a deficit of 73,232 short tons, raw value, in the Philippine sugar quota had been made to foreign countries other than Cuba. Although, in accordance with the last paragraph of section 202 of the act, a number of countries are listed in the announcement, the final reallocation resulting from the operation of section 204 (b) of the act gives the major portion of this quota to a few countries, chief among which are Peru and the Dominican Republic.

The amendment which you have now submitted—

This letter is addressed to the Senator from Michigan—

does not disturb the allotment of April 11, 1941, but would provide that practically no further allotment be made to these countries and that any further deficit in Philippine quota supplies be allotted to the domestic areas.

The administration has, on a number of occasions, expressed its views on modification of this provision of the act. In a letter by this Department to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of May 23, 1940, it was pointed out that—

"Sugars purchased by the United States from full-duty countries are subject to an import duty of 1.875 cents per pound and an excise tax of 0.50 cent per pound. Consequently, while the American producer, with benefit payments under the sugar program included, received on the average during the 1937–39 period about $74 per ton of raw sugar marketed with no net payment to the Treasury, the foreign producer paying full duty received, on the average, only $25 per ton, and the Federal Treasury received a revenue on such sugars of approximately $47.50 per ton."

Mr. President, I cannot take any more of the time of the Senate.

I ask to have incorporated in my remarks, as a part thereof, the letters to the acting chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] setting forth certain data in connection with this problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
Acting Chairman, Finance Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I have received from Senator BROWN and Senator JOHNSON a copy of a committee print of May 10, 1941, of a revised draft of S. 937, a bill to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937, with the request that I furnish your committee with a report thereon.

I submitted a report to your committee on the original bill under date of May 7, 1941. The original bill provided that any deficiency in the Philippine sugar quota should be allotted to domestic sugar areas, rather than to foreign countries other than Cuba, as is now provided in the Sugar Act of 1937. The revised draft of the bill provides, in effect that not more than 75,000 short tons of any deficiency in the Philippine quota may be allotted to foreign countries other than Cuba and that any deficiency in excess of 75,000 tons shall be allotted to domestic areas.

Since the sugar quotas provided for in the Sugar Act of 1937 will expire on December 31, 1941, the proposed amendment would be effective only during the present year unless action were taken by Congress to extend the Sugar Act. The question of extending the act is not involved in the present bill, and I do not understand the committee's request as including this subject.

On April 11, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture reallotted to foreign countries other than Cuba a deficiency in the Philippine quota of 73,232 tons, in accordance with the present provisions of the Sugar Act, this amount being equal to the present dutiable portion of the Philippine quota. The principal effect of the 75,000-ton limitation in the revised draft of the bill would therefore be to prevent these countries (primarily the

other American republics) from participating in any further deficiency which might be found in the Philippine quota this year. Under the revised draft, any deficiency in excess of 75,000 tons would be allotted to the major sources of our sugar supplies except Cuba, which would be excluded from sharing in such a deficiency.

As I pointed out in my letter of May 7, these countries are suffering severely from the restriction of their European markets for sugar and other products as a result of the war. Furthermore, such sugars must bear the burden of an import duty in the United States of 1.875 cents per pound and an excise tax of 0.5 cent per pound, a total charge which is equivalent to more than 200 percent ad valorem. It would appear that legislation excluding these American republics from participation in any further deficiency would establish an undesirable embargo feature in the act.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I feel that substantially the same objections apply to the revised draft as apply to the original bill, and I recommend that it be not enacted.

I understand that the committee desires to consider the revised draft of S. 937 on Friday, May 16, and has requested that the views of the Department be submitted prior to the committee's meeting. In view of this request, it has not been possible to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 15, 1941.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: This will acknowledge the letter of May 10, 1941, which you and Senator JOHNSON sent to the Secretary enclosing a proposed amendment to S. 937, a bill to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937. A report on S. 937 to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee was made by this Department on April 25, 1941.

Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937 provides for allotment to foreign countries other than Cuba of any deficit in the quota of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands. On April 11, 1941, this Department announced that pursuant to this provision of the act reallotment of a deficit of 73,232 short tons, raw value, in the Philippine sugar quota had been made to foreign countries other than Cuba. Although in accordance with the last paragraph of section 202 of the act, a number of countries are listed in the announcement, the final reallocation resulting from the operation of section 204 (b) of the act gives the major portion of this quota to a few countries, chief among which are Peru and the Dominican Republic.

The amendment which you have now submitted does not disturb the allotment of April 11, 1941, but would provide that practically no further allotment be made to these countries and that any future deficit in Philippine quota supplies be allotted to the domestic areas.

The administration has, on a number of occasions, expressed its views on modification of this provision of the act. In a letter by this Department to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of May 23, 1940, it was pointed out that—

"Sugars purchased by the United States from full-duty countries are subject to an import duty of 1.875 cents per pound and an excise tax of 0.50 cent per pound. Consequently, while the American producer, with benefit payments under the sugar program included, received on the average during the 1937-39 period about $74 per ton of raw sugar marketed with no net payment to the Treasury, the foreign producer paying full duty received, on the average, only $25 per ton, and the Federal Treasury received a revenue on such sugars of approximately $47.50 per ton."

In our report of April 25, 1941, on S. 937, the Department stated:

"It is the established policy of this administration to develop and improve our trade with other American republics and under present world conditions the need for encouraging such trade is greater than ever. The proposed legislation raises important questions of hemispheric trade and unity, which primarily concern the Department of State."

In his letter on S. 937 to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, dated May 7, 1941, the Secretary of State pointed out that the enactment of the bill would "repudiate the policy of hemispheric defense and the economic cooperation which the American republics agreed upon at the Habana conference less than a year ago."

The proposed amendment to section 204 (a) of the act appears to be inconsistent with the general policy outlined in the President's letter of April 11, 1940, on sugar legislation to the Honorable Marvin Jones, then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. In this letter, the President objected to several legislative proposals which, if enacted, would have injured the economic status of American republics, to which, as he pointed out, we must look in increasing degree for enlarged outlets for the products of our own labor, land, and factories.

Although the proposed amendment to S. 937 differs from the bill, S. 937, in giving recognition to the reallotment of the Philippine deficit already made by this Department on April 11, 1941, pursuant to existing provisions in the Sugar Act, we trust that you will recognize that the previously stated objections of this administration to a major revision of the public policy embodied by the Congress in 1937 in section 204 of the Sugar Act apply to the proposed amendment and that the Department is, therefore, unable to recommend its enactment.

Since we have been informed by Mr. F. M. Johnston, clerk of the Senate Finance Committee, that the committee desires to have our report on the bill prior to its meeting on May 15, 1941, we have not had an opportunity to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD, *Secretary.*

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield; but I hope the Senator will be brief in his question, because I want to give the Senator from Georgia time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator now to agree and state that the allocation of deficit sugars to the foreign countries other than Cuba, including the Dominican Republic and Peru, has covered heretofore all those countries have been able to send into the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; I have not contended that. I assume they have been selling in Europe all the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it is the Senator's belief that a larger amount of sugar should be brought in from those countries than experience has shown could be brought in?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it could have been brought in except for the fact that they found a market in Europe. The position of the Senator from Texas is that because of the war and the lack of shipping, these countries are not able to have that European outlet, and that consequently the United States should not take advantage of that situation by a reverse influence caused by the war, whereby we cannot get sugar from the Philippines, and say that we will keep the opportunity all ourselves, rather than allow these countries, which have been expecting to furnish those quotas, to supply a little larger quota than normally.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it is the position of the Senator from Texas that these foreign countries other than Cuba should now be permitted to market in the United States as much sugar as they can, which they are unable to market abroad, in European countries, because of the war?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator did not make that contention. The Senator made the contention that what is already the law, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in the event of a deficit in the Philippines, to distribute that deficit around among all the sugar-producing areas except Cuba, should be maintained, and that we should not take advantage of this temporary condition to penalize, as it were, these little South American countries.

Let us take Peru, for instance. Peru is not going to send us much sugar, in any event; but we do not want to create the impression in Peru that the United States is so selfish and so narrow that we will amend the law—a law which was supposed to be permanent—taking advantage of a temporary condition in the Philippines to give our producers a larger quota than that which they would receive under the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I now to understand the Senator to contend that Peru, the country which the Senator just named, will not in any event send in more sugar than it has previously sent in?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know about that. I suppose it will send all it can.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What does the Senator's talk about penalizing these countries mean, then?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator wants to know, here we have a law on the books, for which the Senator voted, which I assume the Senator supported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; I did.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the present law. You want to change that in the middle of the stream. You want to say to these countries, "We intended to treat you this way, but we see a chance to bypass you. The war is on; the Philippines cannot get the sugar over here. We see a chance, because of the war, of the Philippine quota not being filled, and, therefore, we are going to give you the bypass; we are going to grab the opportunity ourselves, and we are not going to keep our agreement, the agreement which we had in the law." That is what the Senator would say.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are not attempting to change the law in the middle of the stream, but in the middle of the deluge. When this law was passed, as the Senator from Michigan has very clearly pointed out, there was no contemplation on the part of anyone that a European war would ensue.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When we were legislating about deficits, we had in mind, as the Secretary of Agriculture clearly sets forth, a particular kind of deficit; namely, that deficit arising from the failure of the Philippines to send in sugar on which a duty had to be paid. We are dealing here with the duty-free sugar now. Because of conditions which no one contemplated when the act of 1937 was passed, there is likely to be a substantial deficit in the duty-free sugar from the Philippines.

The position which the proponents of the bill take is simply this, that in these unusual conditions we should take advantage of the full opportunity of domestic producers, rather than run the risk of not being able to get that amount of sugar, except at very high prices, from foreign countries other than Cuba.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no trouble about getting plenty of sugar. The Secretary of Agriculture points out that, if there is a shortage of sugar, under the law the Secretary has methods of reallocating the whole quota system.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Secretary has no method of providing shipping which does not exist, as has been pointed out by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. We could reallocate it here, if there were really a shortage of sugar. That is not the question. The question is one of taking advantage of this temporary situation to feather the nest of a particular group of producers, and to enrich them, producers with whom I am in entire sympathy generally. I supported the various sugar measures, not because I represented a sugar State, but because I wanted to be fair with the sugar producers of the United States. Those representing the sugar States told us then that they wanted those measures passed in order to stabilize the domestic production. They wanted to know about how much they could plant and about how much they could produce every year, and they wanted to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make those allocations so that they could look forward to what they could expect. They did not say they wanted high profits, no. They wanted to "stabilize the industry." Now that we have it stabilized, the war comes along, and the Philippines cannot send sugar to the United States, they want to unstabilize it because they think they can get a little more sugar and a little more profit in the producers' pockets.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield, but when I yield, I am through, because I do not wish to take the time of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is quite correct as to the purpose of the act being to stabilize, but the way the situation has been stabilized has been by cutting the beet-sugar producers from 1,030,000 acres to 820,000 acres. That is the way it has been stabilized. They have been cutting the beet-sugar producers down, and that is one of the things about which they are complaining.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to cut the beet-sugar men down. I voted for the present law. I thought the sugar men knew what they were talking about when they came here with a bill which they sat up nights sweating over, and of which they had blueprints showing how it was going to stabilize, was going to fix up the sugar people. Now they say, "We had a bill to stabilize, but now somebody has unstabilized it." Then they come back and say that does not do. "It does not give us quite enough acreage and not enough profit, so we want the act of 1937." Most of us being of a complaisant turn of mind, and wanting to help the sugar producers, said, "Sure, we will vote for the Sugar Act of 1937." Now, when the war comes along, they hear about the Philippines being out of boats and not being able to get the sugar to the United States, and they say, "Boys, this act needs amending. We intended to stabilize it, but it has just not stabilized it on our side, in our favor, and we are going to frame up here now and get that Philippine quota, and say to these little South American countries, 'We want you to wave the flag down there, and holler loud for Western Hemisphere defense. We want you to stand by Uncle Sam, and he is going to stand by you. But while you are looking toward Europe, we are going to take this little quota of sugar from you and put it in the west somewhere.'"

Mr. President, is that fair? I am in sympathy with the sugar people. I voted for the sugar measures; but here is the administration, through the Secretary of State, saying that this bill should not be passed because it would have an unfavorable effect upon our foreign relations with the countries to the south of us. Here is the Secretary of Agriculture, the man who administers the act, saying that the bill should not be passed. He points out the benefits the law has conferred upon the sugar producers. Here are the consumers of America paying 4.95 cents a pound for domestic sugar, when they could go out into the export market and get it for 2 cents a pound. Have we treated them right? Has not the consumer done a little bit? Has not he regulated his gastric processes to the domestic situation by paying 4.95 cents a pound for sugar when he could get sugar in the foreign market at a lower price?

Then there is the Treasury over here. It has a good many leaks in it, a good many places where it is busted loose, and the money is running out. It receives $47.50 a ton on every ton of sugar that comes in from full-duty countries, and yet Senators are saying, "For God's sake, do not let that money received on foreign sugar go into the Treasury." Because of this extra Philippine quota, the consumer pays 4.95 cents a pound instead of 2 cents a pound.

I want Senators to know that I am not hostile to the Senators who are advocating this measure. But these Senators ought to know, if they do not know it, that the bill will never get through the House of Representatives. I congratulate them, however, on their enthusiasm; I congratulate them on the bitter battle they have waged for this sugar measure, even though it will not pass the House. Their record is clear.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator would not want to leave the impression that the House Committee on Agriculture had not acted favorably upon this bill? A similar bill was reported out by the House committee by a vote of 14 to 7.

Mr. CONNALLY. When?

Mr. BROWN. Within the last 10 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Without the Brown amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not authorized, of course, to speak for the House.

Mr. BROWN. The House itself has not passed upon that measure, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I understand. I do not intend to speak for the House, but my information is that this bill does not have a chance in the House. I may be in error about that.

Mr. BROWN. I think the House Committee on Agriculture would be a better authority on that matter than the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, it is. It is a much better authority on many things. But there are other authorities than the House Committee on Agriculture. The House has a set of rules somewhat more complex than the rules of the Senate, which allow the Committee on Rules to supervise what is to come up. In the House there is a leader who is to say what the Rules Committee is to consider. Over the leader there is the Speaker, who has something to say concerning what the leader shall submit. And over the Speaker, on every Monday morning, there is somebody else who has something to say with respect to what the Speaker may do. So in order for the bill to pass the House it will have to thread its way through this labyrinthine maze, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, who was formerly a Member of the House, and who knows that. He smiles at me, but I can see the knowledge in his eyes that what I say is true.

Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senate for having taken so much of its time, and I wish to apologize to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] because he is to make the real argument on this side of the measure.

Let me ask in conclusion: Why do we have a Finance Committee? The bill was sent to the Finance Committee. The Senate told the members of that committee to examine the facts. The committee examined the facts. It held hearings and brought witnesses before it to testify. The committee had before it the sugar representatives from the Department of Agriculture who administer this law. It had before it representatives from the State Department. Others interested in the subject appeared before the committee. The committee had before it Senators who advocated the bill. After the most painstaking and careful investigation by the Finance Committee it reported this bill adversely, and I want to say that it is some task to report a bill from the Finance Committee adversely when the committee has on it as members such Senators as the Senator from Michi-

gan [Mr. BROWN], with his persuasive logic and his eloquent voice to resist adverse action by the committee; when it has the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], with his earnestness and shrewdness; when it has as a member the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who with his forensic powers stands there arguing for the bill. Other prominent Senators who are interested in sugar are members of the Finance Committee. In the face of all those influences the Senate Finance Committee reported that this bill ought not to be passed, because it, in a way, breaks up the system of handling sugar under existing law, but principally because it unnecessarily and uselessly tends to offend the South and Central American countries from which we have been getting some of this full-duty sugar, and to which we have heretofore allocated quotas. If I am in error I want Senators to correct me.

Mr. President, I have tried to be fair in this debate. I am in deep sympathy with the sugar producers, and I want to be fair. I have no selfish interest in the matter, but I do believe that this is not time to pass legislation of this character, which is bound to react unfavorably on our relations with the republics to the south. It cannot improve those relations. It is bound to injure those relations. In the face of the position taken by the Secretary of State and by the Secretary of Agriculture I cannot give my consent to support this bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the pending bill. I feel I should do so in view of the statements made heretofore in the debate. In the first place, the bill does not come to the Senate with the favorable recommendation of the Finance Committee. It comes to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do not pass. That recommendation was made by a majority of the committee. The committee had every sympathy with the sugar-producing States. On the committee were highly influential Senators from States which would be actually and directly affected by the proposed legislation.

The report of the committee was adverse. The report of the Department of Agriculture on the bill was adverse. The Department recommended that the bill do not pass for reasons set out in its report. The report of the Secretary of State was adverse upon this bill, the Secretary of State recommending specifically that the bill do not pass. Not only is that true, but I desire the Senate to understand, especially in view of the statement made by my very good friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] that when the committee first considered the bill in executive session, in an effort to be of help to the producers of sugar in the sugar-producing States, and, if possible, to bring in a bill on which the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State might possibly agree, some suggested amendments were proposed to the bill. As acting chairman of the committee, in the absence of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I designated the Senators directly interested in the bill, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], as a committee to visit the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State; in other words, to take this matter up with the administration, which has definitely a stake in the matter.

The result was an amendment which appears here illogically as an amendment by the committee. The amendment was really made by the proponents of the bill, acquiescing, at least, for the purpose of perfecting the bill.

Perfected, or amended, as it was, the Secretary of Agriculture still insisted upon his objections to the bill. The Secretary of State still insisted upon his objections to the bill. The committee then proceeded to consider the matter. The majority of the committee thought such legislation to be unwise at this time, and reported adversely upon the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator believe that if and when the Philippines obtain their freedom, there will be a different question, and the committee may then be more sympathetic?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, indeed. I shall reach that point in a moment.

The committee did not believe, and does not now believe, that the bill would be of any real, substantial benefit to the beet-sugar producers or the cane-sugar producers. Neither of the Senators from Florida is present; but, so far as Florida is concerned, the bill would freeze the cane-sugar producers of Florida in an unenviable position. But, be that as it may, the committee did not believe that the bill would be of the slightest real benefit to the producers of cane or beet sugar in the United States.

Why? Because the period for planting sugarcane in the United States for this year has already passed. The period for planting sugar beets will have passed long before the Secretary of Agriculture can estimate the deficit which will or may occur in the Philippine quota, because that deficit cannot be estimated until September or October of the present year.

I know very well that the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has insisted that while no additional beets or cane can be planted this year in the United States or in any of the areas forming a part of our insular possesions, the marketing quota may be increased even at the very end of the year, and that if the United States producers are given the advantage of an increased marketing quota they will be able to dispose of some of the surplus which has overshadowed the market.

On the one hand, we are admonished by the proponents of the measure that there is to be a shortage of sugar, with resulting high prices; and, on the other hand, the proponents of the bill tell us that the only real benefit is the possibility of consuming, through increased marketing quotas, some of the surplus now on hand. There will not be any shortage of sugar. There cannot be any shortage of sugar. Under the law the Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the duty of increasing marketing quotas to take care of prices in the United States, so there will be no shortage of sugar. I am not quoting literally the language of the law, but that is its effect.

What about the Philippine quota? I stress this point because we are entitled to analyze this measure to see why it is here, and to see whether we are justified in doing what the proponents of the bill ask us to do under the facts as they exist.

In the first place, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Philippine quota has already been received in the United States or is on board ship, or is booked for shipment, with the exception of 125,000 long tons. We talk about a great surplus. There will not be any great surplus. The Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States is committed in writing as to the exact amount of sugar shipped, en route, and booked. Only 125,000 tons remain in the Philippine Islands not booked for shipment. It is an undeniable fact that 45 percent of the entire Philippine quota has always moved to this country between May and October. Roughly two-thirds of the nondutiable Philippine quota has already been received in the United States or is on ships en route to the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr ADAMS. What is the date of the letter from the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines? I have before me a statement from the United States Department of Agriculture which shows that as of May 7 there had been received 397,465 tons, and that the balance remaining was 585,198 tons. Of course, bookings are very uncertain. Can the Senator tell us whether the information from the Resident Commissioner is later than the date to which I have referred?

Mr. GEORGE. The letter from the Resident Commissioner is dated May 15, 1941.

Mr. President, I do not want to take all my time upon this point, although it is an important point. The statement of the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines is borne out by reports from other official sources. The Resident Commissioner says:

> In connection with the consideration of S. 937, now before your committee, may I invite attention to the following radiogram which I received from the Philippine Government in relation to the question as to whether or not the Philippines will be able to fill its duty-free sugar quota this year:
>
> "Referring your radiogram May 5, 125,000 long tons of centrifugal sugar quota still unbooked, but according information from shipping companies sufficient bottoms will be available carry above quantity across, although impossible determine how much this space will be used for other cargo. Difficult estimate visible shipping facilities, as agents in some cases are reluctant make bookings more than 1 to 2 months in advance, although they are confident of continuation regular services barring unexpected turn war situation."
>
> The above information indicates that only 15 percent of our centrifugal sugar quota is still to be booked for shipment. In past years approximately 45 percent of our quota is shipped during the 6-month period May to October.

In view of the relatively small quantity, 125,000 tons unbooked for, it is reasonable to expect that our quota of 850,000 long tons for this year will be filled.

Mr. President, why is it necessary to upset the provision in the law and the basic policy upon which we have carried on our intercourse with our neighbors to the south? The bill would do the producers of this country no good this year. If the bill were the law this minute, the increased allotment which might be made under the terms of the bill would not go to the producers. It would not increase by one-tenth of an acre the plantings of the beet-sugar producers in any State or of the cane-sugar producers in any State. The law itself must be extended in December or it expires. Why, then, disturb basic relationships which are strong enough at least to persuade the Secretary of Agriculture to advise against the bill and to persuade the Secretary of State to recommend against its passage? They so recommended not only once but after the amendment which has been put into the bill had been offered and after the matter again was submitted to the same Secretaries of State and Agriculture they still adhered to their recommendations and said they could not recommend the passage of this bill.

When the present law is extended in December, or when a new sugar act is written in December, if considerations of equity or justice should indicate the necessity for changing the allotments to the domestic, insular, and foreign producers, who have furnished a part of the American market, then the readjustment may properly be made. If it is made in good faith, none of the consequences feared by the Secretary of State and by the Secretary of Agriculture will follow.

Now let me remind the Senate that it is not a question of giving away everything we have in order to satisfy our neighbors to the south; but it has been scarcely a year since the Habana conference, in which we pledged cooperation with those neighbors. We pledged economic cooperation—not merely political cooperation, not merely defense cooperation—but in express language we pledged economic cooperation. Do this thing, which will do our domestic producers no good whatsoever, which might increase the sales of some of the large sugar refineries in the United States slightly, if at all—do this thing, and throughout Central America and South America the propagandists who are unfriendly—I am not speaking of war, but who are unfriendly to the trade and commerce of this Nation—will spread the story. Actions speak much louder than words. Actions speak much louder than declarations; and that is true of action by the Senate, though the House never concurred in it, repudiating economic cooperation, the very kind of cooperation which was textually in the law of this Nation at the very moment the United States and the countries south of us entered into the convention of Habana, and agreed not merely to hemispheric defense, but to economic cooperation. This bill proposes to repeal the very cooperation which is vital to the economy of our neighbors to the south and which already was in our law at the very moment our delegates set their hands to that convention.

The passage of the bill would be an act which would speak louder than our words. It would be an act that would speak louder than any mere declaration we might make, and it would be an important act. If war never comes to this hemisphere, and if we never need to stand together in military cooperation with our neighbors north and south, certainly we face an economic and commercial condition hitherto without its exact counterpart in our history, and we want to carry on our commerce with the people to the south.

Mr. President, I have not time to discuss the bill in detail, but I desire to say that it proposes to write out of the law a section inserted in 1937, which expressly provides for the reallocation of any deficit in the Philippine quota. Now our friends tell us that it never was contemplated that there would be any real deficit in the Philippine quota. They say to us that it was anticipated that the deficit would be only a slight one, or the usual one, and would not be an extraordinary one, and they make that statement in the face of the fact that already at that time there was in effect the Philippine Independence Act, which annually reduced the amount of sugar that could come in from the Philippines. But we are told that this is an extraordinary situation, created by war, and they say, "We did not contemplate that there would be any large deficit in the Philippine sugar quota."

In other words, now we are asked—and I know that my good friends who introduce this bill do not want to put the Senate of the United States in this light—now we are asked to say to Central American and South American countries, "Oh, yes; we said you could participate. We are giving you less than 1 percent of the American market. We are giving you a mere token quota; but if the Philippines do not fill their quota, you can have it." That was the substantial hope they had, and I know our friends do not want the Congress of the United States now to be put in the light of saying, "We were making a promise to you which we did not intend to perform. That promise was not intended to stand good if there happened to be a real deficit in the Philippine quota. We will take it all back if there is really something for you to have."

Under this bill we shall be doing nothing for Cuba. Up until 1930, Cuba was sending not over 3,000,000 tons of sugar into the United States. Even in 1933 she was sending in 1,806,000 tons, in round numbers. In 1937, after the passage of the act, she sent us 2,089,000 tons; but in 1939 and 1940 she was sending less than 2,000,000 tons, although as early as 1925 she was sending nearly 4,000,000 tons.

We have arrested the expansion of sugar production in Cuba by inducing them to stop expansion. We have tried to arrest the expansion of sugar production in other Central and South American producing countries; and we ourselves voluntarily said, "We will limit our own expansion in the United States, in consideration of benefit payments which our producers will get"—payments which our producers have received.

Now, it is said there has been a great reduction in the acreage of the beet-sugar producers and that in 1941 there has been such a reduction. Under the Sugar Act the only reduction in acreage occurred in 1 year, due to three successive big crops. During the average 6 years preceding the sugar program, that is, from 1928 to 1933, the average acreage planted in beets in the United States was much less than it is at the present time. During the average of the 5 years since the program was in effect the average acreage was less than the acreage for this particular year.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. May I ask the Senator where he gets those figures? They are inaccurate.

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator is mistaken. I will put the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMS. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. They are authentic figures. They are official. I said the average acreage.

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. GEORGE. The average acreage for the 5 years. The average for the period under the Sugar Act was only 815,000 acres. Under the 1941 allocation it is 820,000 acres.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, there is not time to enter into a discussion of what are the correct figures; but I say the Senator's figures are inaccurate, regardless of where he got them.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sorry the Senator takes that position.

Mr. ADAMS. Because the average will exceed 980,000 acres for that 5-year period.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that I may have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the figures to which I have referred and other figures which I will not have time to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Increase in acreage and average returns of Louisiana sugarcane producers under sugar program

	Acreage	Average income per ton	Parity	Average farm value
Average 6 years preceding sugar program (1928–33)	177,000	3.42	4.92	$8,593,000
Average 6 years of sugar program (1934–39)	242,000	3.90	4.62	18,296,000

NOTE.—Unlike the some 60,000 independent beet growers, who have received parity or near parity returns, the mainland cane area where the bulk of the production is by large plantation company farms, although enjoying a largely increased total income, do not receive parity returns under the Sugar Act because payments are based on the recoverable sugar in the cane or beets. Under the Jones-Costigan Act they received parity.

Increase in acreage and average returns of mainland sugar-beet producers under sugar program

	Thousands of acres	Average income per ton	Farm value in thousands of dollars
Average, 1909–14	485	$5.50	26,697
Average 5 years preceding sugar program (1929–33)	785	6.09	54,219
Average 6 years following sugar program (1934–39)	818	6.78	62,867
1940 (estimated)	916	7.00	85,344

NOTE.—The 1941 acreage allotment of 820,000 acres, with respect to which payments will be made, represents a curtailment from 1940 but is in excess of the average of the years preceding the sugar program.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD a table showing that the following quantities of sugar have been reallotted to full-duty countries under section 204 (a) of the Sugar Act as the result of the deficiency in the Philippine quota: 1937, 86,805 tons, running on down to 1941, with a total of 73,232 tons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

	Tons
1937	86,805
1938	53,883
1939	59,111
1940	None.
1941	73,232

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. The bill was reported from the Finance Committee adversely, but it contains committee amendments. I presume that the first vote will be upon the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is as the Chair understands it.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, further debate under the unanimous-consent agreement is precluded, and the clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum myself; but, before a quorum is called, in order to clear the situation, I ask that the amendments offered by the proponents of the bill, which appear technically as committee amendments, be agreed to, so that the vote will come squarely on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which appear in the bill as committee amendments be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

The amendments of the Committee on Finance are as follows:

On page 2, line 14, after the word "shall", to strike out "revise" and insert "increase"; in line 15, after the word "areas", to strike out "by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to such domestic areas on the basis of the prorations of the quota then in effect for such domestic areas", and insert "and for foreign countries other than Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar, on the basis of the prorations of the quotas then in effect for such domestic areas and foreign countries, equal to the deficit so determined, as follows: (1) To such foreign countries, an amount not in excess of 75,000 short tons, and (2) to such domestic areas, the remainder, if any, of the amount of such deficit in excess of 75,000 short tons"; and on page 3, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(a)" and insert "(b)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall, as he deems necessary during the calendar year, determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, will be unable to market the quota for such area. If the Secretary finds that any domestic area or Cuba will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall revise the quotas for the domestic areas and Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to the other such areas, on the basis of the quotas then in effect. Any portion of such sugar which the Secretary determines cannot be supplied by domestic areas and Cuba shall be prorated to foreign countries other than Cuba on the basis of the prorations of the quota then in effect for such foreign countries. If the Secretary finds that the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall increase the quota for domestic sugar-producing areas and for foreign countries other than Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar, on the basis of the prorations of the quotas then in effect for such domestic areas and foreign countries, equal to the deficit so determined, as follows: (1) To such foreign countries, an amount not in excess of 75,000 short tons, and (2) to such domestic areas, the remainder, if any, of the amount of such deficit in excess of 75,000 short tons: *Provided, however,* That the quota for any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba or other foreign countries, shall not be reduced by reason of any determination made pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) If, on the 1st day of September in any calendar year, any part or all of the proration to any foreign country of the quota in effect on the 1st day of July in the same calendar year for foreign countries other than Cuba has not been filled, the Secretary may revise the proration of such quota among such foreign countries, by prorating an amount of sugar equal to such unfilled proration to all other such foreign countries which have filled their prorations of such quota by such date, on the basis of the prorations then in effect."

Mr. GEORGE. Now, I suggest the absence of a quorum or the Senator from Colorado may renew his request for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Barbour	Bulow
Aiken	Bone	Bunker
Ball	Brooks	Burton
Bankhead	Brown	Byrd
Byrnes	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Caraway	Kilgore	Smathers
Chavez	La Follette	Smith
Clark, Idaho	Lee	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Danaher	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Davis	McFarland	Tobey
Ellender	McNary	Truman
George	Maloney	Tunnell
Gillette	Mead	Tydings
Green	Murdock	Vandenberg
Guffey	Murray	Van Nuys
Gurney	Norris	Wallgren
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Herring	Overton	Wheeler
Hill	Radcliffe	White
Holman	Reynolds	Wiley
Hughes	Rosier	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. MCNARY, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The demand for the yeas and nays is sufficiently seconded, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY (when Mr. HOUSTON's name was called). My colleague, Mr. HOUSTON, is necessarily absent.

Mr. AIKEN (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER]. If present, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and I am advised the Senator from Arkansas, if present, would vote "nay." The Senator from North Dakota is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Mississippi were present, he would vote "nay"; and if the Senator from Kansas were present, he would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARBOUR (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and allow my vote to stand. If the Senator from Nebraska were present, he would vote "yea"; and, if the Senator from Kentucky were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator in-

cost. We are

coal. It is of local and

from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea," and that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "nay."

I am further requested to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

I also announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay"; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON]. I am advised that the Senator from Texas, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—45

Adams	Caraway	Johnson, Calif.
Aiken	Chavez	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Clark, Idaho	La Follette
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	McCarran
Bone	Danaher	McFarland
Brooks	Ellender	McNary
Brown	Gillette	Maloney
Bulow	Gurney	Murdock
Bunker	Hayden	Murray
Burton	Herring	Norris
Capper	Holman	O'Mahoney
Overton	Taft	Wallgren
Reynolds	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Schwartz	Vandenberg	Wiley
Stewart	Van Nuys	Willis

NAYS—26

Barbour	Hughes	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Lodge	Tobey
Connally	Lucas	Truman
Davis	Mead	Tunnell
George	Radcliffe	Tydings
Green	Rosier	Walsh
Guffey	Russell	White
Hill	Smathers	

NOT VOTING—25

Andrews	Downey	Nye
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Barkley	Harrison	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hatch	Spencer
Brewster	Houston	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Langer	Wagner
Butler	Lee	
Chandler	McKellar	

So the bill (S. 937) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4590, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arizona is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in brief explanation, let me say that, as is disclosed by the report, the bill carries $185,119,000, of which some $8,000,000 represents the increase recommended by the Senate committee; but the total appropriation is $1,376,000 under the Budget estimate.

The appropriation provided by the bill exceeds that of last year by $29,569,000, but an examination will disclose that that is due almost entirely to increased appropriations for the development of hydroelectric power. The ordinary running expenses of the Department have not been increased, in fact, in some instances they have been reduced, but an acute shortage of power necessary for the national defense was developed in the intermountain and Pacific coast region, and for that reason it will be found that the appropriations carried in the bill for the Bonneville project, for the Grand Coulee project, and for the Central Valley project, and others of that type, have been increased. That is the reason why the appropriation in the bill is larger than it was last year.

The only other important feature of the bill I should like to mention at this time is the transfer from the reclamation fund to the general fund of the Treasury of some seven projects. That is a matter which has been discussed for a considerable period of time, in fact, Representative TAYLOR, of Colorado, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and I took the matter up last fall with the authorities, and it was agreed that on the face of it the transfer had to be made. These projects were begun with public-works funds, and more than $40,000,000 has been expended upon them. The income derived by the reclamation fund is less than $8,000,000 a year. It will cost in excess of $90,000,000 to finish the projects, and it seemed that at that rate the construction work would be dragged out for a long time. We were assured by the Budget that next year this transfer would be made. The committee deemed it proper to make it now, and that is the reason for taking these sums of money from one place in the bill and putting them in another.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does that mean that none of the projects listed on page 6 of the report are new appropriations, starting new projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; there are no new projects.

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are all projects which were initiated by P. W. A., so that the P. W. A. committed us to this $90,000,000 program by its initial payments on the projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what happened. The President adopted these projects and made allotments from Public Works funds sufficient to complete them—that is, if it would take 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years, whatever it was. Later, because of the slowness in putting men to work, since it takes time to plan and to advertise, it became evident that the work would not accomplish the purpose sought by the act—namely, to provide employment for the unemployed. In the meantime the Works Progress Administration expanded very materially, and ran out of money. So the allotments which were

made to these projects beyond 1 year were all withdrawn, and the money transferred to the W. P. A., which necessitated bringing the projects back to Congress in order that they might be continued. Congress has been appropriating for them, in varying amounts, during the past few years; but they were all initiated with Public Works money. The commitments were made in that way.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So that we confront the contemplation that relief funds were used—I do not mean to speak invidiously, I am merely speaking of the procedure—relief funds were used virtually to a net result which was equivalent to a decision by Congress to proceed with this list of projects?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the fact.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Precisely, for example, like the way, let us say, the Florida ship canal was started, by a relief fund diversion of $5,000,000, and if we had wanted to proceed with it, we would have had to appropriate subsequently?

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress would have had to appropriate for that purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator know whether there is any other large, lurking, lingering commitment of any kindred nature?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not, so far as the Interior Department is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Petroleum Conservation Division", on page 6, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$240,000" and insert "$255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bituminous Coal Division", on page 7, line 11, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$3,029,000" and insert "$3,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil and moisture conservation operations", on page 8, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,125,000" and insert "$1,178,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", on page 9, line 19, after the word "operations", to insert a comma and "production of alumina from low grade bauxite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research", and on page 11, line 16, after the word "operations", to insert a comma and "production of alumina from low grade bauxite, and managanese beneficiation pilot plants and research."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration", on page 13, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "$22,858,000" and insert "$22,988,500."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, in justification of the $130,000 increase, I should like to explain that the purpose is to provide ways and means to establish broader permanent markets for Bonneville-Grand Coulee power through the utilization of the latent unused resources of the Pacific Northwest, largely submetallurgical minerals occurring in complex structures. This objective will not only provide enlarged permanent regional employment but can be made into a national asset by developing commercial domestic sources of strategic and critical minerals. There is nothing new or untried in the proposal. Norway, for example, has conditions similar to those of the Pacific Northwest, namely, abundant low-cost hydro power, large timber resources, and deposits of subgrade minerals. Through activities similar to my proposal, such hydro power has been put to work in new electric processes, developing the subgrade materials into high-class finished products. The Ontario Hydro, the Swiss services, and the T. V. A. have also used such methods with outstanding success.

This expenditure in no way will duplicate work of existing agencies. We have a number of Federal agencies working on some phase of this over-all problem, but unfortunately we have no agency that can coordinate this work so as to devise the formula for coupling these resources into a workable utilization. The method of procedure outlined in the report sets out nonduplicating functions for this fund.

The marketing of Bonneville power in such a way as to encourage the widest possible diversified use of the Columbia River power, and at the same time provide a full return to the Federal Treasury, is the major policy provision of the Bonneville Act approved August 20, 1937. Section 9 (b) of the act authorizes expenditures for facilities and services that may be necessary to carry out the policies established by Congress. The Accounting Office, I understand, has passed on this type of expenditure, and has ruled substantially that any reasonable expenditures for providing wider markets is authorized by the act of August 20, 1937.

My proposal will provide a nonduplicating temporary base for widening the market for the power in such a way as to build up the region and at the same time create national sources of strategic materials which we have been importing from regions now blockaded. Such a development must come through private efforts, and before these efforts are initiated we need to demonstrate that they are commercially feasible. This, in brief form, is my objective in suggesting the $130,000 appropriation.

Mr. President, I have prepared a more detailed statement setting forth the purposes for which this appropriation has been requested, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATION FOR MARKETING WORK BY THE BONNEVILLE ADMINISTRATION

Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects need more technical and expert guidance in respect to industrial use than any other power projects in the Nation. This is because they have been developed in a section of the country where the electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries were practically unknown.

Another factor of moment is that private industry had up until recently developed relatively little of this type of manufacturing. The western seaboard is desperately in need of a stronger economic front. To make it strong we should have a number of essential industries established there. When private industry is reluctant to pioneer in a new field the Government should cooperate in getting all possible data together in order to encourage such developments.

In a war emergency, the value of these developments on the west coast must be patent to any one. If there should be military operations on the Pacific or in the Orient, the necessity for large supplies of war goods being made available on the Pacific seaboard of the United States is apparent. Such a war operation would immediately result in restricted or closed commerce through Panama Canal, and a terrific congestion of the transcontinental railways. If reasonable foresight were indulged, and as many of these war necessities as practical were produced on the west coast, it would add tremendously to the safety of the American people, and also make possible very important economies in getting our necessary equipment available for use.

A peacetime consideration is also worthy of your study. In competing with Europe for delivery of certain products in the oriental market, sailing distances of ships from points of production to points of consumption is an important cost factor. If we undertake to supply the Orient with American products from our Eastern or Gulf seaboard, the sailing distance is almost as great as that from Europe to the Orient. On the other hand, if we developed some certain industries along the Pacific seaboard capable of competing in the oriental market, our sailing distances would be all to the American advantage.

The extra fund authorized by the Senate Appropriations Committee was specifically intended to equip the Bonneville Administration office with more technical help which could study and aid in translating to private industry the economics of operating in the Pacific Northwest. When appearing before Government departments here in respect to the operation of an industry using Bonneville-Grand Coulee power I often have been confronted with the rejoinder that the data presented was not prepared by recognized technicians in that line. This appropriation is to equip the Bonneville Administration with sufficient funds to employ on short-time jobs for specific industrial studies outstanding national technicians whose signatures on reports would carry great weight with Government officials and leaders in private industry. Such studies might not require over 2 weeks to a month in each case. They should be directed by the Bonneville Marketing Administration with respect to the most urgent problems at hand.

Some of the issues which I had in mind for such able technical study are as follows:

1. A careful and exhaustive investigation as to the cost of making charcoal from our enormous wood waste. It is estimated that we have from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 cords of wood waste in Oregon and Washington annually. Certain industries could be developed in the Pacific Northwest for the benefit of the Nation as a whole through securing charcoal at a proper cost. Some expert could be picked by the Marketing Division of the Bonneville Administration for a thorough and complete study of this subject covering all known methods for economic production.

If charcoal could be produced at the right cost from this great volume of wood waste, the Pacific Northwest could engage in the high grade carbon-steel industry in competition with Sweden and other countries.

Charcoal is also desired in the carbide industry if available at the right cost. We are short of good coking coal. It is of local and

national importance that real technicians and engineers prove some method whereby we can convert some of our wasting woods into commercial charcoal.

2. Reduction of a greater quantity of zinc by the electrolytic process is a certain possibility in the Pacific Northwest today. The Nation needs more zinc. Existing zinc reduction companies want the ore producers to ship to distant points. The producer has to pay the cost of shipment. The question whether we can get a sufficiently increased production of zinc not now being utilized in reduction plants to warrant an electrolytic zinc plant in the Columbia River area is before us.

If the Bonneville Administration have the funds to employ a competent engineer and his time is devoted for a limited period to the zinc question, I believe that the picture could be changed quickly and the Nation would be relieved through increased production of zinc ores at a lower cost in our Northwest area.

3. Silica deposits of sufficient purity to be attractive in the ferro-silicon and the glass industries, is urged upon us daily. The limited technical staff of the Bonneville Administration cannot cover this field adequately. Were some expert employed for a short time, working closely with the local authorities, I am satisfied that silica of sufficient purity could be found in commercial volume.

4. Lime of the purity desired in calcium carbide and for fluxing in furnaces at a low cost is constantly being urged by industries locating in the Northwest. An expert assigned to the task of studying this problem could doubtless bring out an answer within a short time to the benefit of the whole industrial program in that region.

5. The question of mining and treating our lower grade chromite and manganese ores is now before the Nation with great force Imported ores are going higher in price and ship tonnage for their deliveries is becoming very scarce. The sources of such imported ores are becoming more and more restricted because of war conditions and acquisitions by other countries. A study of simple concentration methods in areas where these ores occur in this country should be conducted at once in order to bring the product up to shipping grade. Whether this treatment is by gravity concentration or the flotation method or other means is something that only experts can determine and this should be done quickly.

It is known that there is adequate tonnage of low-grade chromite and manganese ores in the West, if experts will but find the way of making them commercially available.

The Bureau of Mines has done considerable work in this direction, but someone connected with the Bonneville Administration, hired for this purpose and working more intensively in the Northwest area, could undoubtedly expedite the program in a way to benefit the whole Nation.

6. We have on the Oregon beaches, sand which carries chromite, magnetite, zircon, ilmenite, etc. The Bureau of Mines is now drilling on certain benches of the Oregon coast behind the seashore sands in order to determine the quantity of chromite which may be carried therein.

A separation process for saving either one or all of these minerals and metals is next in order. If the Bonneville Marketing Division had authority to employ an able expert to work with the Bureau of Mines, the State department of geology and mineral industries, and other agencies, great help could be rendered.

7. New processes are constantly being offered by private individuals for the handling of some of lower-grade ores and minerals. If the Bonneville Administration were authorized to employ experts of national standing to check on some of these processes, working closely with the Bureau of Mines, it would be very helpful.

8. Office of Production Management officials have been discussing the possibility of a substantial explosives plant west of the Rocky Mountains; and some special consideration has been given to a Columbia River location. The materials necessary for economic and efficient manufacture of explosives should be studied by some engineer whose name would be accepted by the Army, Navy, and Office of Production Management as a dependable authority. Such engineering services have been performed for other explosive developments in different parts of the country. If the Bonneville Administration had authority to put such an engineer on the job for a short time, and this expert were given data that had been gathered, undoubtedly he could present a report that would have great value in the national-defense program and determine whether or not a location in the Columbia River area is economically sound.

9. In the sale of power so far by the Bonneville administrator, relatively light pay rolls have been secured. Production of the primary metals and chemicals as a rule has been the order of the day. It is very important from the Pacific Northwest viewpoint to have the subject of fabricating and remanufacturing on a substantial scale given intensive study. In this manner we could begin securing heavier pay rolls and balance the industrial situation more satisfactorily.

The Bonneville administrator should have the funds for the employment of experts in these various lines, each of which would probably be a short-time job. The employment of economists and planners is not effective in getting industries located in a new territory or in developing new methods of utilizing available facilities and raw materials. Factual studies by recognized technicians dealing with the practical problems encountered by industry are needed rather than abstract theories.

There are many instances which indicate the value and necessity of having funds available for outstanding expert services. We have appropriated the money for increased operations with this kind of work in mind. I hope that the administrator will follow this plan of procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands", on page 14, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$2,600" and in line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$159,400" and insert "$160,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office—General Expenses", on page 17, line 14, after the word "lands", to strike out "$154,560" and insert "including not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs", on page 20, line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$564,090" and insert "$585,370."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Expenses", on page 20, line 18, after the word "available", to strike out "$45,500" and insert "$49,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 8, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$255,340" and insert "$270,340."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$74,540", and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Indian lands," on page 24, after line 14, to insert:

Purchase of land, Mescalero Indians New Mexico (tribal funds): For the purchase of land, or interest therein and improvements thereon for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation of New Mexico, $14,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for said Indians: *Provided further*, That no expenditure shall be made hereunder without the consent of the Mescalero tribal business committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 24, to insert:

Payment of judgment in the case of *Luis M. Sanchez et al.* v. *United States* (tribal funds): There is hereby appropriated from the tribal funds of the Indians of the Isleta Pueblo, N. Mex., so much as may be necessary to satisfy the judgment obtained by the plaintiff in the suit entitled "*Luis M. Sanchez et al.* v. *The United States* (No 135, civil)," in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico: *Provided*, That title to the land and improvements thereon involved in said suit shall be vested in the United States in trust for the pueblo of Isleta: *Provided further*, That use of the money for such purpose shall receive the approval of the governing authorities of the pueblo as required in section 5 of the act of May 1, 1933 (48 Stat. 108).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 25, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$85,000" and insert "$130,000, to be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial assistance and advancement", on page 30, line 15, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$698,600" and insert "$710,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 22, after "(49 Stat. 1967)", to strike out "$246,800" and insert "$250,000", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$22,500" and insert "$25,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$16,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Development of water supply", on page 35, line 5, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$110,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 5, to insert:

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS WEEDS

For the control of noxious weeds on Indian reservations, $100,000, which shall be used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in such amounts as may be needed for sponsors' contributions in cooperation with the noxious-weed-control program of the Work Projects Administration.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage", on page 43, line 22, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$560,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 1, after the name "Colorado", to strike out "Consolidated Ute" and insert "Southern Ute."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, after the name "Wind River", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 15, after the words "In all", to strike out "$1,617,950" and insert "$1,907,950."

The amendment was agreed to.

THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at the close of business last week, on May 31, there had been no improvement in the strike situation throughout the country as affecting vital defense requirements, notwithstanding the speech made by the President on Tuesday, May 27.

I have obtained from the War Department a report to the effect that at the close of business on May 31, 34 strikes were in existence on contracts for the War Department alone, with 40 strikes reported by the Navy Department, making 74 strikes in Army and Navy contracts, but not including strikes in connection with construction of merchant ships under the Maritime Commission.

Although a number of these strikes have been in existence over 30 days, only three, as of May 31, had been certified by Madam Perkins, as Secretary of Labor, to the Mediation Board for mediation.

In addition to the strikes reported on War Department contracts, the War Department reports 21 threatened strikes, some being of the most serious character and involving very large contracts for military equipment.

This is a total, Mr. President, of 74 reported strikes in defense industries and 21 threatened strikes, making 95 actual and threatened strikes. This number has not been reduced since the declaration made by the President of the United States last week.

These figures, as I have said, include only the contracts made by the Navy Department and the War Department, and do not include contracts made by the Maritime Commission, information on which is not today available.

The strikes in the shipyards on the west coast, affecting $500,000,000 worth of ship contracts, still continue. In his press conference following his speech on May 27, the President said he proposed to continue the present method of mediation in an effort to make this plan work. I submit, Mr. President, that there should be no further delay in dealing firmly and sternly with this great menace to our national security and this interference with our aid to England in her imminent peril.

Significant of the disastrous effect that these continuing strikes have had on our defense program, the Navy Department has given me information showing that strikes in naval contracts alone have lost to national defense approximately 2,000,000 man-days of work, and this time lost would be sufficient to build 8 to 10 submarines, 6 to 8 destroyers, or 2 battle cruisers.

These figures include only the Navy Department interruptions and not those in contracts for the War Department, where a majority of important strikes up to this time have occurred.

If the President intends to act, the time to act is now. Already the delay in our defense program may well be disastrous to England, and it is an equal menace to our own security. Let Miss Perkins either be removed, or take away from the Labor Department completely the right to certify strikes. Give the Mediation Board the power to enforce its own decisions, and then let the President of the United States state in clear and unequivocal language that the safety and security of this Nation will not permit interruptions by strikes in our defense program, and that all issues between capital and labor must be arbitrated without stoppage of work by either.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks reports furnished to me by the War Department and by the Navy Department, giving in detail the number of strikes existing on Saturday, May 31.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, May 31, 1941.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Strikes on naval defense contracts.

There are listed below strikes pending during the week ending May 31, 1941, in plants having naval defense contracts. More complete information may be obtained from the Shore Establishments Division, room 2026, branch 812, where information as to discrepancies noticed, or as to urgency of contracts in the plants listed, should be sent.

Man-days lost on national-defense work in plants at which naval defense contracts have been involved, have accumulated to date to a total between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000. These figures may be compared with the facts that this time lost would be sufficient to build 8 to 10 submarines, or 6 to 8 destroyers, or 2 cruisers.

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.: Began March 19, 1941. Status: This strike is preventing placement of Navy Department orders for urgently needed potash. Referred to Mediation Board April 23.

Armstrong Cork Co., Braintree, Mass.: Began May 16, 1941; settled May 27, 1941. Status: 300 men involved.

Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engine Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 21, 1941. Status: 75 men involved. A. F. of L. jurisdictional row over installation of machinery in plant extensions. Some hope of settlement next week.

Carborundum Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Began May 26, 1941. Status: 3,000 men involved. Men returned to work May 28 on promise of certification to National Defense Mediation Board to determine union bargaining agency.

Curtis Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began May 7, 1941. Status: 350 men involved. Machinery on naval defense contracts shipped except spare parts. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board.

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.: Began May 7, 1941. Status: 750 men involved. Issue is union recognition. Efforts being made to obtain shipment of completed material.

Fedders Mfg. Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: Began May 22, 1941. Status: Naval defense contracts for refrigerator and evaporator equipment. Principal issue wages, which may be arbitrated.

Gould Battery Co., Depew, N. Y.: Began May 9, 1941; ended May 19, 1941. Status: Union reorganization under C. I. O. involved. Employees returned to work May 19 pending arbitration of grievances.

Graver Tank Co., Catasauqua, Pa.: Began April 26, 1941. Ended May 15, 1941. Status: About 3 weeks' delay on naval contract for buoys.

C. G. Hussey Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: Began May 20, 1941. Status: Seven hundred men involved. A. F. of L. strike after election row over jurisdiction with independent union. Efforts being made to obtain delivery of urgently required material.

Lumber Mills, Tacoma, Wash.: Began May 10, 1941. Status: Situation active with National Defense Mediation Board.

Marlin Rockwell Co., Plainville, Conn.: Began May 28, 1941. Status: Not ascertained.

Monsanto Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 16, 1941. Status: Nine hundred men involved. Union vote on new wage proposal expected May 28.

Phoenix Iron Works, Phoenixville, Pa.: Began May 14, 1941. Status: Strike for union recognition. Finished materials being shipped.

San Francisco Shipyards, San Francisco, Calif.: Began March 31, 1941. Status: Two thousand union members involved. Violation of Stabilization Conference agreement. Increasing numbers of unions, other than machinists, returning to work.

Superior Lime & Hydrate Co., Bessemer, Ala.: Began April 9, 1941. Status: Thirty-seven men involved. Plant shut down. One source of supply of lime and limestone for steel manufacture.

Sivyer Steel Casting Co., Chicago, Ill.: Began May 23, 1941. Status: 254 men involved. Congress of Industrial Organizations strike over closed shop. Subcontractor for castings, principally for General Electric Co., Fort Wayne, and Sullivan Machinery Co., Michigan City, Ind. Conciliator present. Negotiations under way.

Trumbull Electric Co., San Francisco, Calif.: Began May 14, 1941. Status: Jurisdictional row between American Federation of Labor machinists and American Federation of Labor electrical workers. The latter have been chosen as bargaining agency. Full production resumed May 19, 1941.

Vulcan Proofing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Began May 6, 1941; ended May 26, 1941. Status: 375 men involved. Settled and production resumed May 26.

Listed below are companies in which strikes are pending but information relative to naval-defense contracts not yet available:

American Hide & Leather Co., Lowell, Mass., May 27, 1941.

Apollo Steel Co., Apollo, Pa., May 19, 1941.

Atlantic Metal Products Co., Long Island City, N. Y., May 22, 1941.

Belcher Lumber Co., Powderly, Ala., May 8, 1941.

Cleveland Brass Co., Cleveland, Ohio, May 27, 1941.

Dixie Firebrick Co., Kimberly, Ala., May 14, 1941.

Federal Enameling & Stamping Co., McKees Rock, Pa., May 8, 1941.

Griess-Pfleger Tanning Co., Waukegan, Ill., April 16, 1941.

Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va., May 23, 1941.

Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, Minn., May 22, 1941.

National Carloading Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 14, 1941.

Refrigeration & Air Conditioning Contractors Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 14, 1941.

Reilly Tar & Products Co., New Jersey Meadows, N. J., May 6, 1941.

Rock Island Sash & Door Co., Rock Island, Ill., May 8, 1941.

Sawyer Foundry & Machine Co., Oswego, N. Y., May 8, 1941.

Shampaine Co., St. Louis, Mo., May 20, 1941.

Southern Pacific Steamship Co., New York City, May 22, 1941.

Titan Valve & Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, May 20, 1941.

Wilson Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J., May 14, 1941.

Woodstock Flag Co., Birmingham, Ala., May 2, 1941.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
LABOR SECTION,
June 2, 1941.

Subject: Strikes and labor disputes affecting War Department procurement.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of War.

Saturday, May 31, 1941; number of strikes, 34.

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.:

Strike: March 19, 1941, of 1,000 mine, mill, and smelter workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board, April 23, 1941. Commissioner Malcom continuing negotiations at Board's request.

Interest: Borax and boric acid for Kimball Glass Co. and Corning Glass Works. Medical Corps' contracts behind schedule.

Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 950 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Ward assigned. Progress made in negotiations.

Interest: Supplying hot-rolled steel to Motor Generator Co. for Ordnance contracts and sheet steel for A. B. C. Steel Equipment Co. for Quartermaster Corps cabinets.

Arrow Tool & Reamer Co., Detroit, Mich.:

Strike: May 1, 1941, of 60 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: Agreement expected at conference to be held June 2, 1941.

Interest: Cutting tools for Springfield Armory and Watervliet Arsenal not immediately important.

Black Hosiery Mills, York, Pa.:

Strike: April 11, 1941, of 100 (C. I. O.).

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: National Labor Relations Board election ordered—no date set. Company shipping all Army goods in their own trucks without hindrance.

Interest: Socks for Quartermaster Corps. Some shipments have been made.

Cleveland Brass Co., Cleveland, Ohio:

Strike: 150 diecasters (C. I. O.)

Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Harris on case May 27, 1941. Possibility of joint meeting June 2.

Interest: Indirect source of supply for ordnance.

Continental Can Co., Jersey City, N. J.:

Strike: April 4, 1941, of 600 A. F. of L. and independent workers.

Issues: Jurisdictional.

Status: Office of Production Management Labor Consultant Blumberg on the case. Negotiations have broken down May 28, 1941.

Interest: $98,667 contract for combat gas-mask canisters for chemical warfare. It is impracticable to locate an alternate source of supply at this time.

Crescent Tool Co., Jamestown, N. Y.:

Strike: May 12, 1941, of 500 machinists (A. F. of L.)

Issues: Alleged discriminatory discharge of one union employee.

Status: Commissioner Goldsmith on case. Deadlock in negotiations.

Interest: Pliers and wrenches for Air Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Signal Corps.

Curtis Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: April 8, 1941, of 300 S. W. O. C. (C. I. O.)

Issues: Wages, vacations with pay, signed agreement.

Status: Certified to N. D. M. B. May 3, 1941. Meeting held May 26, 1941.

Interest: Portable air compressors and car washers for use by Diamond T for Quartermaster Corps—emergency stock from Holabird exhausted. Diamond T assembly line will be forced to shut down. Hoists for General Steel Castings Co. for Canadian contracts used in production of tank-top hulls. General Steel Castings unsuccessful so far in locating alternate source for these hoists. (Three thousand clutch discs for Spicer removed May 26, 1941.)

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.:

Strike: May 7, 1941, of 750 U. A. W. (C. I. O. and A. F. of L.).

Issues: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner and Office of Production Management labor consultant on case. N. L. R. B. election to be held around June 12, 1941.

Interest: Steel screens for Lake City Ordnance Plant—urgently needed. Also supplies machine-tool plants at Springfield and Windsor in Vermont, and Fort Ethan Allen and Plattsburg Barracks.

Eagle Iron Works, St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 28 A. F. of L. Iron Workers shopmen.

Issues: Closed shop.

Status: Unauthorized strike. Case has been before N. L. R. B. for some time on charge company fails to observe their agreement with union.

Interest: Manufacturers of structural steel used in the sulphuric acid concentration building at Weldon Springs Ordnance Plant, Missouri.

Griess-Pfleger Tanning Co., Waukegan, Ill.:

Strike: April 16, 1941, of 600 leather workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Holmes on case. Deadlock continues.

Interest: Leather to five companies having Quartermaster Corps shoe contracts.

Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va.:

Strike: May 22, 1941, of electricians (A. F. of L.). About 100 still out.

Issues: Wage increases.

Status: Engineers returned to work May 27, 1941; electricians gradually returning. Meeting May 28, 1941, in Washington; situation favorable.

Interest: Construction of explosives plant.

C. G. Hussey & Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Strike: May 20, 1941, of 700 A. F. of L. and Independent Copper Workers.

Issues: Union recognition and grievances.

Status: Commissioner Moffitt assigned. National Labor Relations Board election to be held June 2, 1941.

Interest: Copper. Seventy-five percent of material manufactured is for defense facilities.

LaFayette Worsted & Spinning Co., Woonsocket, R. I.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 315 Independent Textile Workers.

Issues: Contract terms.

Status: Commissioner Weinstock on case; all points agreed on but closed shop; meetings continuing.

Interest: Subcontractor manufacturing yarns for Princeton Worsted Mills and for Verdun Manufacturing Co., both having Quartermaster Corps contracts for cloth.

Louisville Tin & Stove Co., Louisville, Ky.:

Strike: May 21, 1941, of 225 A. F. of L. workers.

Issues: Wages and closed shop.

Status: Meetings to be held first of next week.

Interest: Quartermaster Corps miscellaneous cooking equipment.

Lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest area, State of Washington:

Strikes: May 18, 1941, May 10, 1941, and May 16, 1941, of about 20,000 Woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and contract terms.

Status: Tide Water Boom Operators, Tacoma, Wash., union reported as willing to move defense material; Twin District Council, Seattle, Wash., certified to N. D. M. B. on May 9, 1941. Negotiations are continuing; Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills, Raymond, Wash., no details.

Interest: Lumber.

NOTE.—It has not been ascertained whether or not there are other companies involved in this strike.

Madison Woolen Co., Madison, Maine:

Strike: May 12, 1941, of 410 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Contract terms.

Status: Company asking for 5-year agreement; conferences to begin the end of the week.

Interest: Subcontractor for suiting cloth on large Quartermaster Corps contracts.

Maisel Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 33 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner went on case May 17, 1941. No reports.

Interest: Quartermaster Corps contract for 65,000 pillows.

Marlin Rockwell Corporation, Plainville, Conn.:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 1,000 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and bargaining agent.

Status: Commissioner conducting joint conferences.

Interest: This company is one of the largest manufacturers of ball and roller bearings in the country. Priority rating A-1-a.

Metals Disintegrating Co., Elizabeth, N. J.:

Strike: May 28, 1941, of 65 United Mine Workers of America (C. I O.).

Issue: Determination of bargaining agency.

Status: Commissioner assigned. Meetings being arranged.

Interest: Alloys for defense.

New Jersey Galvanizing Co., Newark, N. J.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 35 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: Strike called May 23, 1941. No details.

Interest: Holding up iron frames necessary to complete Fort Monmouth project.

Phoenixville Iron Works, Phoenixville, Pa.:

Strike: May 14, 1941, of 1,000 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Union recognition and wages.

Status: Meeting was held May 27, 1941, or May 28, 1941. Reports that approximately 900 have signed petition to return to work if sufficient protection were received.

Interest: Structural steel. Supplies material for St. George Bridge in Delaware being built by Army engineers at cost of $1,350,000. Watervliet Arsenal contract with J. C. Moyer & Co. for structural steel and craneways being delayed; Phoenixville is subcontractor for Moyer.

Reliance Manufacturing Co., Michigan City, Columbus, and Washington, Ind.:

Strike: April 28, 1941, of 1,200 Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (C. I. O.) and United Garment Workers (A. F. of L.).

Issue: Union status.

Status: Commissioner Cofer holding conferences. No details of progress.

Interest: 100,000 pairs cotton drawers for Quartermaster Corps at Michigan City plant; 90,000 cotton duck trousers at Columbus plant.

Seneca Wire & Manufacturing Co., Fostoria, Ohio:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 600 C. I. O.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Commissioner Harris assigned. Attempting to arrange conference for June 3, 1941.

Interest: This company supplies Standard Products Co. with wire for 155 mm.

Shampaine Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 20, 1941, of 131 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issue: New contract.

Status: Commissioner on case. Meetings continuing.

Interest: Manufactures hospital equipment for Medical Corps.

Sivyer Steel Casting Co., Chicago, Ill.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 250 United Auto Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, closed shop, and vacations.

Status: Commissioner holding conferences; next one for June 4, 1941. Attempts being made to remove castings for gun carriages to the Milwaukee plant.

Interest: Castings for International Harvester for limber and gun carriages, 155-mm. high-speed adapters. Harvester deliveries will be delayed proportionate to the length of this strike (critical). Castings for Allis-Chalmers who make crawler tractors for Ordnance. Important subcontractor for Navy. Delaying production of trailers at Athey Truss Wheel Co.

Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.:

Strike: May 28, 1941, of 360 International Ladies Garment Workers (A. F. of L.). This report has not been verified.

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner Deal assigned.

Interest: Undershirts and drawers for Quartermaster Corp. Deliveries up to schedule.

Superior Structural Steel, St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 24, 1941, of 40 American Federation of Labor iron workers.

Issues: Closed shop and signed contract.

Status: Strike report received May 27. Commissioner White assigned.

Interest: Structural steel for St. Louis Ordnance plant and for Western Cartridge Co.

Wilson-Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.:

Strike: May 15, 1941, of 1,200 bookbinders at the two plants (C. I. O.).

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: Commissioner Scheck on the case since May 26, 1941.

Interest: Subcontractor for Quartermaster Corps manufacturing posting trays, stands, and guides for use in laundries at 37 camps, posts, and stations.

OTHER STRIKES NOT INCLUDED IN TODAY'S FIGURES

Antrim Iron Co., Maincelona, Mich.:

Strike May 29, 1941, of 450 United Mine Workers Association (C. I. O.). Company manufactures methanol for Navy and 90 percent of defense production of pig iron. C. I. O. says man was discharged for union activities.

Atlantic Metal Products, Long Island City, N. Y.:

Strike May 28, 1941, of 160 A. F. of L. and C. I. O. Company manufacturing steel doors and bucks for various Army and Navy construction jobs. C. I. O. attempting to organize and force election. Decision pending before the National Labor Relations Board.

California packers and canners:

Strikes May 8 and May 9, 1941, of A. F. of L. packers and canners in California. Delaying shipments of foodstuffs ordered by Quartermasters Corps. Not considered serious at this time.

San Francisco shipyards, San Francisco, Calif.:

Strike of A. F. of L. machinists in San Francisco shipyards, May 12, 1941, has tied up Navy production to a very great extent. Enterprise Foundry, which supplies engines for water and power at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., has been forced to cease production on these engines because of lack of materials usually obtained from these plants now on strike with the shipyards.

Sawyer Foundry & Machine Co., Oswego, N. Y.:

Strike May 8, 1941, of 31 machinists and molders (A. F. of L.): Commissioner O'Connor assigned May 29. Strike is a result of management's attitude in denying them the right guaranteed under the National Labor Relations Act.

NEW STRIKES REPORTED MAY 31, 1941

Metals Distintegrating Co., Elizabeth, N. J.

CASES WHERE MEN RETURNED TO WORK MAY 31, 1941

Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph, Mo.

CASES NOT TO BE REPORTED INDIVIDUALLY

Tide Water Boom Operators.
Twin District Council.
Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills.

NOTE.—These three cases will be carried under the heading of "Lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest area."

MOST IMMEDIATE DANGER (THREATENED STRIKES)

American Brass, Waterbury, Conn.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts amounting to $7,000,000; manufactures brass for Frankford Arsenal for small arms ammunition; also major suppliers of raw and finished brass products. Strike vote taken May 28, 1941. Negotiations deadlocked on wages.

Bendix Aviation Corporation, South Bend, Ind., manufactures aviation carburetor parts for Air Corps: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 7, 1941. Negotiations proceeding before the Board. Quartermaster Corps reports a slow-down which has cut production of constant velocity type joints from 600 to 200 a day has been instigated by shop stewards. Agreement ratified May 31, 1941.

Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts Wage controversy—strike vote taken May 29, 1941, with threat of immediate deadline. Commissioner Dewey on case.

Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.: Manufactures magnesium; leading plant in the country of this critical item; strike threatens on issue of union recognition: National Labor Relations Board started hearings May 26, 1941; election to be held some time in June.

Electric Storage Battery Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: Prime and subcontracts for Signal Corps and Air. Strike is threatening. Conference continuing. Company is adamant on union shop; is offering 5-cent increase.

North American Aviation Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., manufactures trainers and bombers for Air Corps and British. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 22, 1941. Strike threat postponed; United Automobile Workers of America (C. I. O.) canceled strike deadline for June 4 but left with its negotiating committee the power to call a walk-out at a future date.

Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.: Manufactures pistons and rings for Air Corps, Ordnance, and Quartermaster Corps. Strike vote taken; no date set. Negotiations are deadlocked on wages and union shop. Proposal to have a neutral party audit company records has been rejected by union.

Soft coal: John L. Lewis threatens to call out 300 000 to 400,000 soft-coal miners again unless satisfactory wage agreement with southern operators is obtained. National Defense Mediation Board, handling case since May 23, reports mediation efforts have collapsed, and they are preparing to make public their findings and recommendations.

OTHER SERIOUS THREATS

Aluminum Co. of America, Cleveland, Ohio (5 plants): Aluminum for Ordnance and Air Corps. Union seeking wage increase. Strike vote taken in favor of strike. Commissioner Broderick assigned on the 26th.

American Aluminum Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Aluminum metal for Air Corps. Awaiting outcome of N. L. R. B. election held April 30, 1941.

American Bobbinet Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: Manufacturing mosquito netting for Quartermaster Corps. Wage controversy. Strike is threatened for Monday, June 2, 1941.

Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engineering Co., St. Louis, Mo. Prime contractor for ordnance, manufacturing Diesel-driven generating units. Strike not affecting Ordnance Department at this time but Navy contracts are seriously affected. Dispute is over the installation of machinery in a new plant. Commissioner White has advised that the carpenters are willing to do the work in question on a 50–50 basis with the machinists; however, a complete agreement is not yet in sight.

E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y. Prime contractor for ordnance for presses and small arms ammunition machinery ($10,000,000) for Lake City, Denver, and St. Louis ordnance plants; Navy and British also have contracts. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 22, 1941; strike threatened for this morning (May 28, 1941) postponed indefinitely. Negotiations to continue before the Board in an effort to settle new minimum wage rate dispute.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill. Prime contractor for Quartermaster Corps and Air Corps, for tractors and graders. Strike vote taken authorizing committee to call strike whenever it sees fit. Progress made at joint meeting May 26, 1941. Wage issues still unsettled. Special Commissioner Haas on the case.

Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif.: Large and important contractor for Air Corps, Navy, England, Netherlands, and Canada. Negotiating new contract and terms run parallel with those being asked at North American Aviation. A. F. of L. machinists are involved here. C. I. O. at North American. May 29, 1941, management refused to grant any form of union shop (is considering granting check-off of union dues). Grievance procedure and seniority agreed upon. Counterproposal to be presented at meeting on June 2. Both sides anxious to settle.

Cudahy Packing Co., Norfolk, Va.: Strike threatened for May 29, 1941; union asked for Conciliation Service to withhold action until June 2 until commissioner could be assigned. Commissioner Walsh assigned.

Electro Metallurgical Co., Alloy, W. Va.: Supplies steel companies with ferro-manganese, manufactures 75 percent of total tonnage of alloys for the entire country. N. L. R. B. dismissed A. F. of L. petition for hearings to contest the C. I. O. victory at recent election.

Gager Lime Co., Sherwood, Tenn.: Important source of supply for lime to large defense contractors, also Wolf Creek ordnance plant, Milan, Tenn. Strike threatening within the next few days.

Pittsburgh drivers: Threatened strike by International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen. This local controls 1,500 truck drivers in the Pittsburgh area. Strike will tie up deliveries from freight terminals as well as deliveries between mills in the Pittsburgh area; this area is about 90 percent production. Commissioner Moffett assigned May 27, 1941. (Late information indicates that a strike was called June 2, 1941.)

Reynolds Metal Products Co., Louisville, Ky.: Manufactures $4,000,000 worth of Army and Navy contracts. May 29, 1941, workers voted 95 percent to strike. Negotiations are still in progress but have about reached the breaking point.

Western Cartridge, St. Louis, Mo.: Supplies cartridges to Frankford Arsenal; dispute centers in the powder mill involving 400 chemical workers (A. F. of L.). Since union won National Labor Relations Board election and further trouble does not seem imminent, this case will no longer be followed.

Cases settled: Bendix Corporation, South Bend, Ind.; North American Aviation Corporation, Inglewood, Calif.

W. H. SADLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army,
Chief, Labor Section.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in response to my telegram to Miss Perkins with respect to the machinists' strike in the shipyards in the San Francisco Bay area, I have received from her the following letter:

MAY 26, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have your telegram of today with regard to the strike of machinists in the shipyards in the San Francisco Bay area. In that telegram you inquire why this stoppage of work has not been referred to the Defense Mediation Board.

Perhaps you are not familiar with the entire background of this stoppage of work, and I will therefore take the liberty of repeating it.

Several months ago the Office of Production Management set up what was known as a Ship Stabilization Committee. On this committee there were representatives of the Office of Production Management, representatives of the Navy Department, of the Maritime Commission, as well as representatives of the labor and the employers in the west coast shipbuilding industry. This committee, after several weeks of work, negotiated and agreed upon a master agreement for wages and working conditions for the entire industry on the west coast. This agreement was ratified by all parties, including the metal trades department (A. F. of L.) of the bay area. The machinists are full members along with many other craft unions in the metal trades department. The rules of the metal trades department call for the acceptance of decisions by majority vote by all of the member unions. In the case of the Stabilization Committee's master agreement all but one of the craft unions in the metal trades department voted in favor of it, and hence it was carried by a large majority. The machinists are the one union who voted against it, but under the terms of their membership in the metal trades department they were bound by the majority vote of that department.

This master agreement not only carries provision for wages and working conditions in all of the crafts, but has a no-strike and no-lock-out clause. The stoppage of work by the machinists in the shipyards of the bay area has therefore been considered to be in violation of this agreement.

The Government departments involved have called upon the A. F. of L. to enforce its contract upon this striking member. Mr. John Frey has gone to the coast for this purpose. Mr. Hillman of the Office of Production Management sent his special representative to the coast and expressly requested the Department of Labor not to attempt any conciliation or not to refer the case to the Defense Mediation Board, as that would weaken the effort of the Office of Production Management and the metal trades department to enforce the contract. In other words, their position is that this is no strike for the adjustment of a grievance, but is a deliberate violation of a contract only recently entered into, and that the Office of Production Management expects that those now not working will shortly return to work.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

This strike has brought about for a number of days stoppage of work involving the construction of ships valued at $500,000,000, and the situation as outlined by Madam Perkins makes it imperative, I think, that such conditions not be tolerated, but that firm action be taken to control this menace to our essential defense efforts.

To add further to the general confusion, Madam Perkins has now appointed a committee of three to recommend to her what strikes should be certified to the National Defense Mediation Board. This simply adds more red tape and additional complexities to a method that has already fallen down of its own ineptness.

Nothing could be more absurd and ridiculous than the machinery that is now operating to attempt to settle the strikes. First, a committee of three recommends to Madam Perkins what strikes should be certified to the National Mediation Board. Madam Perkins then reviews the recommendations of this committee of three, and approves or disapproves. Then, if she approves, she certifies to the National Mediation Board, and this Board has no power to act or to enforce its decisions, except that of persuasion.

Is it any wonder that little progress is being made to control these strikes?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks letters written by Madam Perkins, as well as an announcement, in which an explanation is made of the order issued by her appointing this committee of three to give advice to Madam Perkins as to what labor disputes should be certified.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 29, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing you copies of the letters of appointment to the committee to which you refer in your letter of May 28, also copy of the public announcement of the appointment of that committee. No other orders were issued.

Yours respectfully,

FRANCES PERKINS.

[Enclosures.]

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 27, 1941.

Mr. MAXWELL BRANDWEN,
Office of Production Management,
New Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRANDWEN: I have appointed you as a member of a committee, having one member each from the National Defense Mediation Board, the Office of Production Management, and the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, the committee to advise me effectively with regard to the selection of labor disputes deemed suitable for reference by certification to the National Defense Mediation Board.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 27, 1941.

The Honorable CLARENCE DYKSTRA,
Chairman, National Defense
Mediation Board,
New Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DYKSTRA: I have appointed you as a member of a committee, having one member each from the National Defense Mediation Board, the Office of Production Management, and the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, the committee to advise me effectively with regard to the selection of labor disputes deemed suitable for reference by certification to the National Defense Mediation Board.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

A three-man committee to keep in touch with industrial disputes in defense industries and to select, after consideration, the cases for certification to the National Defense Mediation Board will be appointed by Secretary of Labor Perkins, she announced today (Monday).

The committee will be made up of John R. Steelman, of the Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor, Clarence A. Dykstra, of the Defense Mediation Board, and Maxwell Brandwen, of the Office of Production Management.

"Now that we have gained some experience in the most effective operation of the Defense Mediation Board in industrial disputes that interfere with the defense program I believe that such a method will assure the handling of each dispute in the most effective way and at the most favorable time," Secretary Perkins said.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of today, entitled "Mr. Roosevelt Can Stop Strikes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 3, 1941]

MR. ROOSEVELT CAN STOP STRIKES

Within the last week the question of labor in defense has been brought appreciably nearer to downright treatment. Mr. Roosevelt, in his last broadcast, spoke more plainly than ever before against stoppages. Later, the American Federation of Labor called for exhaustion of all means of conciliation before the ordering of a strike. Still later, a small rank-and-file group of the C. I. O. declared war on subversive strike leaders.

This is a gain in comparison with the attitude which has generally prevailed in Wash-

ington and in labor circles. For months those who have urged self-discipline upon labor have been regarded with suspicion. What though they also urged sacrifice upon others. What though they stood for severe taxation of industry and of the well-to-do classes. What though they stood for subordination of private production in industry to production for defense. No matter. When they spoke of labor's duties, they were treated as enemies of social gains. Only a short time ago Mrs. Roosevelt, who wields large influence in Washington and in the country, spoke condoningly of strikes.

But, though there is a gain within the last week over that attitude, the question of labor in defense is not settled. Strikes continue in industries which vitally affect production for defense. These strikes reduce production for the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission. Other strikes are threatened, some of them against plants owned by the Government itself. The daily loss in man-hours is very heavy at a time when the administration itself says that not an hour can be wasted in aiding Britain and in arming ourselves.

Leadership against this condition, leadership which will translate the words spoken within the last week into action, rests in the hands of one man. That man is Mr. Roosevelt. This leadership rests in his hands because he is the President. It also rests in his hands because he is the idol of labor in this country and has far more influence over the masses of the workers than Mr. Lewis or Mr. Green. Mr. Roosevelt can bring the labor situation under control by doing three things:

First. He can use his official power and his personal power with labor to drive disloyal and subversive men out of positions of influence among industrial workers. A line must be drawn between tolerance and weakness. Communists are entitled to their civil rights. If they wish to appear in the open and to speak or write in support of their convictions, they should be permitted to do so. Fair discussion will dispose of their arguments. But they must not be permitted to conceal their identities, to conceal their policies, to conceal their objects, and, in a cloak of lies, to incite trouble and disorder in the defense industries of the land. To permit them to continue the manufacture of strikes is not tolerance. It is fumbling, muddle-headed weakness.

Second. Mr. Roosevelt can use his official power to introduce common sense into the heads of a considerable number of his subordinates. His administration embraces a large element of pseudo intellectuals who arrived in Washington with their heads full of such slogans as "Production for use, and not for profit." They, too, are entitled to their opinions and their civil rights. But it has always been doubtful that men and women of such views are the best of servants in an administration which professes faith in private enterprise. Today many of them argue that the country is not worth saving if "social gains" must be curtailed. Mr. Roosevelt should make all his subordinates realize that nothing is more important than the Nation's safety.

Third. He can use his personal leadership to array the vast majority of patriotic workers against subversive and shirking elements; against abuse of this national emergency to force any change in labor relationships by way of strikes or lock-outs; against reckless demands from the best-paid labor ever on this earth for wage increases that will embarrass the Government in its financing and will set off the inflationary spiral. This patriotic majority of labor is sending its sons into the Army camps and is standing ready to bear its share of taxation. It can be made the most powerful of all correctives of labor evils if Mr. Roosevelt will assert his moral leadership.

The United States cannot afford to trifle with the question of labor at this stage in its history, and in the world's history.

Every day that passes sees Britain forced farther back toward her own island. There is grave danger that in a matter of months, even weeks, Britain will be stripped of her outlying posts and will have nothing left save her island, where she will stand with her back to the wall before the concentrated might of Nazi Germany. In such a period, the United States cannot trifle with the question of labor in production for aid to Britain, and for defense. We cannot excuse strikes, nor can we seek to prevent them by uniformly paying higher wages on demand. For that device will surely invite more and more threats of strikes, will surely cause more and more industrial disorder, while on the financial side it will head us straight into the fool's paradise of ever-rising costs and ever-rising prices, with inflation and destruction as the inevitable end.

Mr. Roosevelt should use the powers which are in his hands. He knows that industry is being brought under discipline. He knows that in procurement of materials, industry is being subjected to priorities in favor of production for defense—as it should be. He knows that in distribution and sales, industry is being subjected step by step to price ceilings—as it should be. He knows that in the pending tax bill industry is being subjected to an enormous increase in its tax payments—as it should be. He must know that all these and similar sacrifices may be unavailing if strikes continue and are permitted to grow in number and in their effects upon production. He has described, none more movingly, the peril in which this Nation lives. He must know that this peril is brought closer to the people by every strike.

Let Mr. Roosevelt act. Let him root out the subversive elements in labor. Let him beat common sense into the heads of the pseudo intellectuals in his own administration. Let him array the great mass of patriotic workers against production-killing disorders. The power is in Mr. Roosevelt's hands. Let Mr. Roosevelt use it.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration", on page 57, line 18, after the word "provisions", to strike out "$2,611,320" and insert "$2,615,720."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 24, after the word "and", to strike out "rural"; in line 25, after the name "United States", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,300,000"; on page 58, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$65,000"; and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$60,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 9, to insert:

Idaho: Northern Idaho (Coeur d'Alene), $2,000, for the construction of a church.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 20, after the figures "$400", to insert "Seminole: The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $7,787 from tribal funds of the Seminole Indians, Oklahoma, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, for reconstruction of a community house, and continued available until June 30, 1941, by the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until expended;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, after the name "Klamath", to strike out "$95,760" and insert "$113,760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 13, after the name "Washington", to insert "Colville, $5,480", and in line 16, after the words "in all", to strike out "$13,300" and insert "$18,780."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 17, after the name "Keshena", to strike out "$77,900" and insert "$83,100", and on page 61, line 5, after the words "Indian Affairs", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $5,200 shall be available for the compensation and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys employed by the tribe under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$463,060" and insert "$493,740."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 10, to insert:

Shoshone Indians, Wyoming (tribal funds): Pursuant to authority contained in section 3 (c) of the act of Congress, approved July 27, 1939 (53 Stat. 1128), there is hereby made available until expended the balance remaining in the Shoshone judgment fund for the purposes and under the conditions set forth in said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 9, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of attorney, Red Lake Indians, Minnesota (tribal funds): For compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $10,000, payable from any funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians, and the amount herein appropriated shall be available for compensation earned and expenses incurred during the period covered by said contract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 19, after the words "Indian Affairs", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 7, to insert:

Per capita payment to members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma (tribal funds): The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from any available funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma, to make immediately therefrom a payment of not to exceed $20 to each member of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Tribes living on the date of the approval of this act,

which payment shall be credited to the individual account of each Indian to be expended in accordance with the individual Indian money regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads and bridges", on page 67, line 7, before the words "to be", to strike out "$2,100,000" and insert "2,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction and repair", on page 67, line 22, after the figures "$12,000", to insert "hospital and quarters, $250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 68, to insert:

Carson, Nev.: General repairs and improvements, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 9, to insert:

Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma: Dormitory facilities and quarters, Jones Academy, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 21, after the figures "$20,000", to insert "Dormitory facilities and quarters (Fort Sill School), $75,000; Dormitory facilities and quarters (Riverside School), $75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 8, after the word "plant", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 20, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,277,000" and insert "$1,877,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 73, line 22, after the word "service", to strike out "$5,000 for photographing and making photographic prints" and insert "$7,500 for disseminating useful information, photographing and making photographic prints, and completing and distributing material, including recordings"; and on page 74, line 3, after the word "offices" and the semicolon, to insert: "for the establishment, in addition to the main office in the District of Columbia, of a branch of that office in Denver, Colo., with appropriations herein made to be available therefor, the costs and expenses thereof to be accounted for as though said branch office were in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 13, to strike out:

Gila project, Arizona, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 14, to strike out:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 15, to insert:

Paonia project, Colorado, $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 17, to strike out:

Boise project, Idaho, Arrowrock division (formerly Twin Springs Dam and Snake River pumping plant), $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 21, to increase the appropriation for the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, from $500,000 to $1,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 81, line 22, after "$1,500,000" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That such part of the storage capacity of the Cascade Reservoir, and the costs thereof, shall be reserved for other irrigation or power developments in and adjacent to the Boise project, as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to increase the appropriation for the Sun River project, Montana, from $50,000 to $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to increase the appropriation for the Carlsbad project, New Mexico, from $50,000 to $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 82, to strike out:

Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 1, to strike out:

Lugert Altus project, Oklahoma, $350,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 3, to increase the appropriation for the Deschutes project, Oregon, from $400,000 to $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 4, to increase the appropriation for Owyhee project, Oregon, from $100,000 to $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 5, to increase the appropriation for the Klamath project, Oregon-California, from $200,000 to $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 6, to strike out:

Provo River project, Utah, $1,250,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 8, after the name "Washington", to strike out "Rosa division, $500,000;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 19, to increase the appropriation for the Kendrick project, Wyoming, from $65,000 to $265,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 19, to insert:

Riverton project, Wyoming, $100,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 22, after the word "division", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$350,000", and in line 23, after the word "division", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$57,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$150,000", and in line 16, after the word "field", to strike out "$725,000" and insert "$575,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 17, to reduce the total appropriation for construction, from reclamation fund, from $10,145,000 to $6,437,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 5, after the numerals "1942", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That $25,000 of any unobligated balances of allotments under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1935, available to the Bureau of Reclamation may be transferred to the Vale project, Oregon (Official Project 05-9) for expenditure in the same manner as appropriations contained in this act for the construction of reclamation projects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 12, to reduce the total appropriation, from reclamation fund, from $11,079,600 to $7,371,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam Fund", on page 86, line 2, after the words "building and", to strike out "grounds and" and insert "grounds", and in line 3, after the word "hospital", to insert "and (3) recreation grounds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Fund, Construction", on page 87, line 22, after the word "for", to insert "general investigations and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 8, to reduce the appropriation for Bullshead project, Arizona-Nevada, from $5,000,000 to $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 12, to insert:

Gila project, Arizona, $500,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 16, to reduce the appropriation for the Central Valley project, California, from $34,750,000 to $31,750,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 88, line 17, after the figure "$31,750,000" and before the

semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That in addition to contracting hereunder in the manner authorized by section 12 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, the Bureau of Reclamation is authorized to obligate the United States by entering into contracts in connection with this project for the procurement of materials and supplies for power transmission lines, the total obligations under such contracts not to exceed $10,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in that connection, I wish to explain that the money which is stricken from the appropriation was to go into the transmission lines, which will cost a total of about $10,000,000. The contract authorization is made with the distinct understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will confer with the Office of Production Management, and if the copper and other materials necessary for building the lines can be obtained without interfering with the national defense, the contracts may be let; otherwise not.

The same matter will come up a little later in connection with contract authorizations for the Fort Peck project and certain other projects. In all these cases the idea is that there must be the closest coordination between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Production Management, so that no work will be undertaken if it interferes with naticnal defense. On the other hand, it may be very essential to national defense to build transmission lines in order to provide power for war industries on the Pacific coast; but the two agencies are to work together.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice in the bill that some of the appropriations have been stricken out and placed in other parts of the bill. For instance, on page 81, line 14, the item for the Gila project in Arizona, $500,000, is stricken out and transferred to page 88, line 13.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator probably was not present when I explained that matter at the opening of my remarks. The projects which are transferred are seven in number. They were begun with public-works funds; $40,000,000 has been expended upon them already. It will cost more than $90,000,000 to complete them. It is estimated that the amount of money in the reclamation fund will never be more than $7,000,000 a year. There would be unconscionable delay and excessive overhead if the projects were carried on through the reclamation fund. Everyone agrees that in order to take care of the projects they should be handled just as the Bonneville project, the Grand Coulee project, and the Central Valley project have been handled, from the general funds of the Treasury. That is the reason why the transfer is being made. Also, as I mentioned a moment ago, by direction of the committee we placed in the bill, subject to agreement by the Senate, contract authorizations to carry on the work after conferring with the Office of Production Management to see that anything done does not interfere with national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment on page 88, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 17, to insert:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $3,000,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 20, to insert:

Boise project, Idaho, Anderson ranch (formerly Twin Springs Dam and Snake River pumping plant), $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 22, to insert:

Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 23, to insert:

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 24, to insert:

Provo River project, Utah, $1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 3, after the word "works", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$11,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 19, to insert:

Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 20, to insert:

General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$220,000", and in line 13, after the word "field", to strike out "$695,000" and insert "$845,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 14, to increase the total appropriation, general fund construction under the Bureau of Reclamation, from $54,555,000 to $60,505,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 24, before the words "to be", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 10, to insert:

Protection of project works: For the purpose of providing protective devices such as floodlights, gates, and barricades for the protection against sabotage and other depredations of any and all dams, powerhouses, and other structures and works whatsoever, heretofore or hereafter constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, which in the opinion of the Secretary require such protection, $50,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the committee, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 92, line 18, after the word "available" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, enter into agreements with other Federal agencies or with States, counties, irrigation, construction, or reclamation districts or other political subdivisions or water users' associations for the protection of any such works and for reimbursement from this appropriation for amounts expended by them in furnishing protection for any such works.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the item in the bill on page 91, entitled "Valley Gravity Canal and Storage Project, Texas." I desire to express my great gratification to the Senator from Arizona and to the Committee on Appropriations for carrying this item in this measure. It is a very worthy one, and it is entirely consistent with our national policy with reference to flood control, irrigation, and the cultivation of our relations with the Republic of Mexico. I understand that at the proper time the Senator from Arizona will offer the text of an amendment to this particular section; but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the inclusion of this item and to say that the Member of the House from that district, Hon. MILTON H. WEST, has been diligent in advocating and pushing this project, and I am very happy to know that it has been included in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we might as well perfect this amendment now. When we had hearings on the bill it was disclosed that certain features of the construction were international in character; and the engineers who represent the State Department in this work and those representing the Bureau of Reclamation agreed that of the amount appropriated—not increasing the amount, but that of the amount appropriated—$250,000 should be devoted by allocation by the President to the International Boundary Commission for continuing investigations, and so on. I ask for the immediate consideration of the amendment, and that will dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 92, line 10, after the words "set forth" it is proposed to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That of said sum, $250,000 shall, upon approval by the President of an allocation therefor, be available to the Secretary of State (acting through the American Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico) for continuing the investigations authorized by such act of August 19, 1935: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State, with the approval of the President, shall designate the features of the project which he deems international in character, and shall direct such changes in the general project plan as he deems advisable with respect to such features; and the features so designated shall be built, after consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation as to general design, by the American section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, and shall be operated and maintained by said Commission insofar as their operation and maintenance in such manner is, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, necessary because of their international character. The construction, operation, and maintenance of such project shall be pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, except as hereinbefore provided and except that—

"(1) In addition to the nonreimbursable allocation to flood control or navigation which may be made by the Secretary of the Interior under section 9 (b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, the President, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, shall allocate such part of the total estimated cost of the project as he deems proper to the protection of American interests from drought hazards resulting from the uncontrolled and unregulated flow of the international portion of the Rio Grande below Old Fort Quitman, Tex. Provisions of law applicable with respect to allocations to flood control under section 9 (b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the foregoing provisions, be applicable in like manner with respect to any allocation made under this subparagraph; and

"(2) All revenues received by the United States in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. LODGE. May I ask what is the import of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. In reply to the Senator's question let me say that the dams go entirely across the Rio Grande, for the purpose of diverting into the United States water for irrigation purposes. That is a reclamation feature. But being international in character and partly in another country, certain features of the dam would be international, and those would have to be managed by the Department of State. In other words, we are trying to segregate the functions of the Interior Department in the supplying of water to the United States from the functions of the State Department in operating this structure, working in connection with Mexico; and this $250,000 item is allocated for that purpose. The International Boundary Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation have agreed upon this arrangement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think the language offered by the Senator from Arizona is possibly the best solution for this particular situation. Particularly on account of its location on the boundary and adjacent to the Rio Grande, ever since I have been in the Senate Texas constantly has been distressed about the situation of that stream, on account of its international character. There never has been a treaty between the United States and Mexico which has provided for any division or allocation of the waters of the Rio Grande. On the Texas side, irrigation for general agricultural purposes and particularly for citrus fruits has been developed to a very high state, and far in advance of irrigation on the Mexican side of the river. There being no treaty respecting the division of these waters, the great Rio Grande Valley is under constant threat and under constant danger of Mexico's diverting waters either from the stream itself or from the tributaries which largely lie in Mexico, damming up those tributaries and practically drying up the water supply by which this great valley is nourished and sustained. It is sustained solely by irrigation.

If adopted, this item in the bill will be the beginning of a policy which, I think, will obviate that very great danger. Of course, in arguing with Mexico about the division of the waters on the Rio Grande, her respecting the status quo on our side, and not beginning to divert waters above our source of supply and drying it up, she always brings up the subject of the Colorado River in California and what we are going to do about this; and, of course, among Senators residing in that area, we do not always find a great deal of sympathy toward anything like using one as an argument against the other.

I do think the Senator from Arizona has been very fine and splendid about this particular item. Of course, the structures in the nature of dams would have to be under the direction of the International Boundary Commission, because that is a joint commission set up by the United States and Mexico to handle the rectification of the river and the fixing and determining of the permanent boundary between the United States and Mexico. So that portion of the expenditures very properly would fall under the International Boundary Commission, whereas the water, once within the United States, would be administered under the reclamation laws which, generally speaking, cover irrigation projects in the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this has been a most aggravating problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just one moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. My former colleague, Senator Sheppard, and I have had to have constant contact with the Department of State with regard to the Rio Grande River in general; and some years ago we were very fortunate in securing an allocation of P. W. A. money for the construction of some flood-control works along the river. They were administered by the International Boundary Commission — very capably administered, I thought, and very satisfactorily. So, such portions of this work which may be committed to the jurisdiction of the International Boundary Commission will receive not only fine engineering abilities but splendid administrative abilities in handling the project.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Am I correct in understanding that this appropriation and the provision which the Senator offers will in nowise impair or interfere with the compact entered into between Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado as to the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, that is a positive assurance that has been given to us.

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I understand. May I add a word to what the Senator from Texas has said? The State that my colleague and I represent has been confronted with the problem that in order to seek an adjudication to the controversies on the Rio Grande, Mexico wanted to insist that there should be a collateral and coexisting adjudication of the problem concerning the waters of the Colorado River. It happens that Colorado is the source of the principal waters both of the Rio Grande and of the Colorado River, and we have a very deep interest in seeing that there be no allocation of the waters of the one river to settle controversies with respect to the other.

So, I am glad to have that assurance, which is in accordance with my understanding.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I say to the Senator from Colorado that of course adoption of the amendment would not affect the supply of water which Colorado and New Mexico would get, because we cannot do anything with this water until it gets down to Texas; and this arrangement applies only south of Old Fort Quitman, which is considerably below the Colorado River and south of El Paso, where the canyons end.

So this whole project is far south of El Paso; and while we do not want to interfere with any of the water that Colorado and New Mexico get, we do not want to be required to pump any of it back to Colorado or New Mexico.

Mr. ADAMS. Not even a little of it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, it costs us a lot to pump.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, referring to page 88 of the bill, and especially the item in line 8 having to do with the Bullshead project, Arizona and Nevada, I have had printed, and there is lying on the table, an amendment which

I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate at this time. The amendment reads as follows:

"*Provided*, That 7½ percent of the gross proceeds derived each year from the sale of electric energy generated at such project shall be paid promptly after the end of such year to the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes and as a part of the costs of operation of such project, such payments to be equally divided between such States."

Mr. President, I did not offer that amendment in the committee, nor do I urge it at this time, because of a rather peculiar situation with reference to the construction of what is to be known on the Bullshead Dam on the Colorado River, but I wish to serve notice now—and I do so in behalf of myself, and, I believe, I may say in behalf of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], that we do not by not offering the amendment at this time abandon either the principle or the policy or the language of the amendment.

The Colorado River is the boundary line dividing the States of Arizona and Nevada at this particular place, and, as at Boulder Dam, the waters of the Colorado River affect both States. When Boulder Dam was constructed it was constructed by a special act of Congress, and provision was made in the course of the legislation that the States of Arizona and Nevada should receive a pro rata of the net income from Boulder Dam. That has since been crystallized into a further law which was enacted about a year and a half ago. Contracts carrying out the policy of that legislation have been formulated and concluded during the past week.

The same principle that applied to Boulder Dam, which is also between the States of Arizona and Nevada, applies and will apply, as we will contend, to the Bullshead Dam, which will extend between the States of Arizona and Nevada. What is more, there is legislative precedent, and precedent in practice, for the States of Arizona and Nevada receiving a proper allowance and consideration from the revenues derived from the Bullshead Dam when it is in operation. There is legislative precedent in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, under which dams were constructed in that region, for that legislation was based on the principle that from the revenues derived payments should be made to the respective States, and respective communities, and the respective counties in the States in lieu of taxation.

The same principle will apply and does apply now, and should apply when Bullshead Dam is constructed, to the States of Arizona and Nevada and to the municipalities and counties of those respective States.

I merely rise at this time to say that neither Arizona nor Nevada, by not proposing or offering the amendment at this time, abandons any right it may have, but that we will, at the proper time, insist on legislation carrying out the conditions and provisions found in the amendment which I had printed and which I am not offering to the pending bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Nevada has made the statement he has made. The matter to which he refers is very important to our two States and it involves a very vital principle. As he states, it has been recognized in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority Act that payments should be made to the States in lieu of taxes. The same recognition is contained in the Boulder Canyon Project Act. In this instance we will, undoubtedly, probe the matter to the very bottom and see exactly what can be done. It is not necessary, however, to do it now, because, as a matter of fact, there will be no revenue from this project within 3 or 4 years. So, ample time will be afforded to go into it very thoroughly, and then we will be able to advise the Senate as to what sound conclusion should be reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Geological Survey", on page 93, line 11, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$160,000" and insert "$185,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 16, before the words "of which", to strike out "$975,000" and insert "Alaska, and Puerto Rico, including office equipment for use in the District of Columbia, stationery, and printing and binding, $1,962,500"; in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$300,000"; and on page 94, line 3, after the word "municipalities", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not less than one-half of this appropriation shall be devoted to mapping in strategic areas in accordance with priorities to be determined by the Secretary of War;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 20, to increase the appropriation for salaries and expenses, United States Geological Survey, from $3,911,400 to $4,923,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Salaries and general expenses", on page 101, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$232,000" and insert "$262,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 11, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$456,880" and insert "$466,880", and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$275,500", and insert "$276,940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, after line 14, to strike out:

The unexpended balance of $2,000,000 made available to the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, from the appropriation "War Department, Expediting Production" contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, for manganese beneficiation and investigations is hereby continued available until June 30, 19[illegible].

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, after line 20, to insert:

Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite: For all expenses necessary to the conduct of investigations and research on processes for production of alumina from siliceous bauxites, including all necessary laboratory research; maintenance and operation of small subcommercial plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; construction and equipment of a building to house testing and subcommercial plant units; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building and plant units; purchase of supplies and equipment; travel expenses; purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriters, adding and computing machines, professional and scientific books and publications; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for protection of employees engaged in their work, $85,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at this point I desire to offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 108, line 24, after the word "bauxite", it is proposed to insert "and alunite."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Also in line 21, on the same page, after the word "bauxite", and before the colon, I move to insert the words "and alunite."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to, and, without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, to make the bill conform to that amendment, I move that on page 9, line 20, after the word "bauxite", the words "and alunite" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the committee amendment beginning on page 9, line 19, was agreed to will be reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, on page 11, line 16, after the word "bauxite", I move to insert the words "and alunite."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the committee amendment beginning in line 16, page 11, was agreed to is reconsidered. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I understand, what the Senator seeks to do is to have this investigation include two sources of aluminum.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. One is low-grade bauxite, and the other is alunite?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the process of extraction from those two sources materially different?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the processes are very similar. I may state that, as I understood the junior Senator from Oregon, it is his purpose in offering his amendment to furnish additional use for powers being developed on the Columbia River.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. In a recent conversation with Mr. Reynolds, of the Reynolds Metals Co., who is erecting a plant at the Bonneville Dam, he informed me that he is very much interested in alunite as a source of aluminum. In many of the Western States there are abundant deposits of alunite. The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey have spent a great deal of time in their surveys of alunite and the extent of the deposits in many of the Western States. In the State of Utah the Western Cartridge Co. has expended over a million dollars in research and in the development of a process which makes commercially feasible the extraction of alumina from alunite. At another plant at Marysvale, Utah, on which has been expended close to a quarter of a million dollars, there has been developed another process for the extraction of alumina from alunite.

In my opinion, if the Bureau of Mines are permitted to include, by the adoption of my amendment, research into alunite, about all that is left for them to do is to check over the processes on which so much money has already been expended by private sources; and, once their approval is had, I am certain that we shall have an additional domestic source for the production of aluminum.

I am sure the Bureau of Mines would have absolutely no objection to this amendment; in fact, I am confident they would welcome it, so that the scope of their investigation may include what I consider at least the second most important source of aluminum in the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the tremendous demand that exists and will continue to exist for aluminum in aircraft production, it seems to me every step that can be taken to increase aluminum production should be taken. I have no objection to accepting the amendments, and I will take them to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 110, line 16, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines from $4,537,470 to $4,662,470.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 119, line 17, after the word "work", to strike out "$358,425" and insert "$374,575."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 4, after the name "New York", to insert "in the fiscal year 1943", and in line 6, after the word "year", to strike out "1941" and insert "1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 14, after the name "Montana", to insert "and including not to exceed $25,000 for the construction of the museum authorized by the act of Congress approved on August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1337)", and in line 20, after the word "Monument", to strike out "$424,025" and insert "$449,025."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 4, after the word "Memorial", to strike out "Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 125, line 4, after the word "which", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 11, after the figures "$20,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any person who prescribes or collects any visitation fee on account of any person visiting the shrine in the District of Columbia known as the "House Where Lincoln Died" or who shall have entered into any contract with any concessionnaire under which such concessionnaire is permitted to charge any fee from any person on account of visiting such shrine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 5, to insert:

Travel Bureau: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to encourage travel in the United States and for other purposes", approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 773–774), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses, including expenses incident to participation by the Travel Bureau in international expositions and conferences dealing with travel; printing and binding; books, newspapers, and periodicals, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 21, to insert:

Recreational resources of Denison Dam and Reservoir project, Texas and Oklahoma: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the making of a survey, investigation, and plan for the utilization of the recreational resources of the Denison Dam Reservoir in accordance with the act approved June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894), $27,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128 line 24, after the word "employees", to strike out "$410,000" and insert "$430,000, of which $20,000 shall be available for the construction and equipment of a structure, West Potomac Park, to be used as a first-aid station, Park Police lodge, maintenance and comfort station."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 130, line 6, before the word "including", to strike out "$1,055,230" and insert "$1,069,555."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 20, after the word "stations", to strike out "$476,475" and insert "$545,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out $186,940" and insert "$196,940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, after line 21, to insert:

Alaska crab investigation: For all necessary expenses of the Fish and Wildlife Service in continuing and completing a technical, economic, and biological investigation of the king crab fishery off the coast of Alaska, locating the areas of abundance, and carrying on experiments to develop improved methods of taking and canning king crabs, including the charter of vessels without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the appointment of employees without regard to the civil service and classification laws, $25,000, and not to exceed $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this heading in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940, is hereby reappropriated and added to this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 17, after the word "structures", to strike out "$233,800" and insert "$255,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 6, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "$849,300" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 4, to increase the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Fish and Wildlife Service, from $5,291,175 to $5,582,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration", on page 139, line 6, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, line 9, after the words "Wildlife Service", to strike out "$7,719,175" and insert "$8,582,200", and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$919,120" and insert "$933,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territo-

ries—Territory of Alaska", on page 142, line 23, after "(48 U. S. C. 321a–321c),", to strike out "$634,500" and insert "$684,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, after line 3, to strike out:

No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be paid to Dr. Ruth Gruber.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Equatorial and South Sea Islands", on page 149, line 24, after the name "Bureau of Mines", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I desire to offer a series of amendments.

I send the first amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, on behalf of the committee, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after the word "Columbia," it is proposed to insert:

including a special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements, at a salary of not to exceed $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The next amendment is on page 25, line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 18, after the word "Provided," it is proposed to insert:

That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations, and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land, not exceeding a total of $600,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created: *Provided further*.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator in charge of the bill if, in the adoption of this amendment, it was not the sense of the committee that, pursuant to statements made before the committee by the Indian Office, the lands known as the Dewar Ranch in Elko County should be considered for purchase.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the distinct understanding in the committee; inasmuch as that was the sole remaining tract of land in white ownership which had not been acquired, the family was completely surrounded by Indian families, and there was no school there for the children to attend except an Indian school. Undoubtedly, under one of these contractual authorizations, an appraisal of the property may be made and a settlement arrived at.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that connection, I desire to say to the Senate that a very peculiar condition was created by the Indian Office in the acquisition of certain lands in this locality, which is known as the South Fork in Elko County, Nev., where the Indian Office purchased lands surrounding a white farmer who had been on this ground all his life, and his father before him, leaving him occupying what might be called in homely terms an island completely surrounded by Indians, so that his irrigating ditches and his fences were used jointly by Indians in the acquisition and the occupancy of the new lands purchased by the Indian Office for the Indian settlers. The school to which his children formerly had gone, and where they were accustomed to meet the children of their neighbors, was no longer attended by white children but by Indian children. To my mind, the condition deserved immediate consideration, and I drew it to the attention of the Indian Office on a number of occasions.

On February 10, 1941—this year—I called the attention of the Indian Office to the deplorable and unhappy condition which prevailed there, unhappy for the Indians and for the white family as well. The Acting Assistant Commissioner replied to my letter by his letter of February 10, in which he said:

There are no funds now available which could be used for the purchase of Mr. Dewar's land. It is, therefore, not possible at this time for this Office to consider the purchase of the land in question or the acceptance of an option covering the same. It may be added, however, that if in the future additional funds are made available for the acquisition of lands, Mr. Dewar's land will receive consideration along with other lands desired for the Indian purchase.

I desire to say, in furtherance of that suggestion, that, in my judgment, there can be no land anywhere more desirable for acquisition for the Indians, and justice would be wrought by its purchase, for the Indians would have a solid body of land on which to live, and would not have a white settler right in their midst.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment was read so hastily that I did not grasp all its details. Does it authorize the incurring of obligations up to $600,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. It proposes to do exactly what we did last year, and what we have done every year. The authorization under what is known as the Wheeler-Howard Act is that $2,000,000 a year may be spent for the acquisition of lands for Indians. Congress has never appropriated that amount. I think the largest amount appropriated in one year was about a million dollars. The amount now recommended is that which the committee deemed to be justifiable in view of the fact that there are many Indians throughout the United States who need care.

Mr. LODGE. Is there a Budget estimate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there is no Budget estimate. There never has been. But there is authority of law for an appropriation to the extent of $2,000,000 a year. We are appropriating to the extent of $600,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 19, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to insert the words "or this contract authorization."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer a further amendment on page 34, line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 4, after the word "binding", it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to insert the following:

Provided, That interest or other charges heretofore or hereafter collected on loans shall be credited to said revolving fund and shall be available for the purposes of this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer an amendment on page 44, line 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, after line 26, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

In aid of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Okla. and Kans., authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1571), as amended, for the control of floods in the Verdigris River Valley, the Osage Tribal Council be, and it hereby is, authorized, upon payment of just compensation therefor, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States of America such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said Hulah Dam and Reservoir project. Construction of said project may be undertaken when the amount of money to be paid to the Osage Tribe as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized has been agreed upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Osage Tribal Council. The amount agreed upon as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of appropriations made for flood control, general, to the Secretary of the Interior for disbursement in the manner provided by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, for the disbursement of royalties received from the leasing of minerals owned by the Osage Tribe.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a proposal which the Senate has twice passed in the form of a bill, and has included it in appropriation bills, but we never have been able to get the House to agree to it. The sum and substance of it is that, under the flood-control act, a reservoir is to be built on certain lands belonging to the Osage Tribe of Indians. The War Department does not want to build the reservoir and have someone possess the right to come along and drill an oil well on the reservoir. In order that

the Secretary of the Interior may give good title to the land, it is necessary to enact this provision. I have a letter from the Secretary of War urging the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that there be included in the RECORD at this point the correspondence of the Secretary of War endorsing the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 20, 1941.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Indian Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Reference is made to your letter of March 14, 1941, requesting the views of this Department concerning Senate bill No. 1115, "In aid of the construction of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project, Oklahoma."

The purpose of Senate bill No. 1115 is to authorize the Osage Tribal Council, upon payment of just compensation therefor and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by act of Congress approved June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Oklahoma and Texas, as authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, as amended, for the control of floods in the Verdigris River Valley.

Section 2 of the bill provides that construction of the project may be undertaken when the amount of compensation has been agreed upon while section 3 of the bill provides the manner in which the money to be paid as just compensation shall be disbursed.

This Department understands that legislation as proposed by S. 1115 is necessary and has deferred execution of the project until such legislation has been enacted. Accordingly, favorable consideration of the bill by Congress is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment on page 90, after line 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 90, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

In addition to the sums appropriated under the caption "General fund, construction," the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into contracts for construction work on the following-named projects and in not to exceed the following sums, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof:

Gila project, Arizona, $500,000;

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $1,500,000;

Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, $500,000;

Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $1,550,000;

Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,150,000;

Provo River project, Utah, $1,150,000;

Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,100,000;

In all, $7,450,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I have before explained to the Senate, this, like all the other contract authorizations under the reclamation fund, is made with the idea and the distinct understanding that the Commissioner of Reclamation will consult with the Office of Production Management, and unless a clearance is obtained for whatever materials such as steel, or anything else, as may be necessary for any transmission line or dynamo, the contract will not be let. If, on the other hand, he gets a clearance and a proper priority from the Office of Production Management that there will be no interference with national defense, then the work may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The same explanation applies to the next amendment I am about to offer, carrying half a million dollars, with respect to Fort Peck.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

Fort Peck project, Montana: For the purposes of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 18, 1936, entitled "An act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Peck project for navigation, and for other purposes" (52 Stat. 403), the Bureau of Reclamation may enter into contracts for the procurement of materials and supplies and for the purchase of the necessary interest in lands, the total of the obligations under such contracts not to exceed $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer an amendment on page 115, line 24, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 115, line 24, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and insert the following:

Provided, That employees of the Mammoth Cave Operating Committee who have had not less than 2 years' service with that committee at the time of the approval of this act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be employed by the National Park Service, in the administration, protection, and development of said national park.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 123, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

Hereafter appropriations made for the National Park Service shall be available for any expenses incident to the preparation and recording of title evidence covering lands to be donated to the United States for administration by the National Park Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. If anyone should donate land free, this amendment would provide for making the deed and recording it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 123, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

Hereafter fees incident to admission to the national parks and monuments and other areas in the national-park system, charged and collected with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be exempt from all Federal tax on admissions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is required in order to do away with duplicate bookkeeping. If a fee of 50 cents is collected and it is necessary to deduct a 5-cent tax, it is necessary to keep two sets of books.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 124, line 16, after the name "Columbia", it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of $3,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligation so created.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is in the same language we adopted last year.

Mr. LODGE To what does it relate?

Mr. HAYDEN. It relates to road construction in the national parks. We are doing this year what we did last year, giving a contractual authorization to construct these roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer another amendment, on page 125, line 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 125, line 19, after the word "Congress" and before the period, it is proposed to insert:

: *Provided further,* That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of $6,000,000 of which $2,000,000 shall be for the Natchez-Trace Parkway and shall be allotted and expended ratably between the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee according to mileage of said parkway in each respecive State, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and main-

tenance of the Blue Ridge, Natchez-Trace, and George Washington Memorial Parkways shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligation so created.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 138, line 24, after the figure "1941," it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to insert:

Provided, That hereafter all such migratory bird hunting stamps not sold at the end of the fiscal year for which issued shall be turned over to the philatelic agency and therein placed on sale until disposed of or until the Congress otherwise provides: *Provided further*, That such stamps shall be usable as migratory-bird hunting stamps only during the fiscal year for which issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the last amendment I offer relates to the State of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 150, after line 21, it is proposed to insert a new section, reading as follows:

SEC. 8. Hereafter jurisdiction or authority over any lands in the State of Arizona shall not be acquired by or transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, except by act of Congress. This provision shall not prevent exchanges of lands heretofore authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have had considerable difficulty with respect to the creation of national monuments and recreational areas without any consultation with interested citizens. For example, there were some very estimable gentlemen who decided that a certain area along the Mexican border contained a kind of cactus known as organpipe cactus. No one knew anything about it, but suddenly we woke up and found a large national monument embracing that area. It so happened that there were mining claims within the area, and the action taken would have prevented any future development at all.

I twice had passed through the Senate a bill to rectify the situation, but could not get anywhere with it at all, because there are certain persons in the United States who think that once a certain area of public domain has been set aside as a recreational area, or monument, or park, it becomes sacred, and no kind of industrial development should take place in it. I have had other experiences of that kind, and I think that in the future it would be better for those interested to come to Congress, and I am sure Congress will deal justly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not have any objection to any amendment the Senator wishes to propose in regard to the State of Arizona, and I am very much impressed with the cogency of his reasoning, but why should this not apply to the whole United States instead of only to Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have had these peculiar circumstances to deal with, and I should like to have this action taken. If it works well, we may extend it later.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, let me ask the very able, persuasive, and sensible legislator in charge of the bill whether, if he is allowed to protect the State of Arizona at this time, he will lend his legislative skill at another time to protecting some of the other Western States?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator knows I am always cooperative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to change the section numbers, and make any clerical changes in the bill that are necessary to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to state at this time that I agree in what was said by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and by my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] in regard to the right of the States of Nevada and Arizona to ask for payments from the revenue derived by the Bullshead Dam, and we do not wish to be deemed as having waived the right to ask for it later on if, after an investigation, we think it of interest to our States to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4590) was passed.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider Senate bill 1050, Calendar No. 378.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1050) relating to the status of retired judges, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert new matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the bill is read for amendment, I should like to have an explanation of it. I may desire to have the bill read in full.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to explain the bill. Its purpose is to fix the status of retired judges, to fix their duties, and provide when they may act and the conditions of their action.

The bill as originally drawn was clarified in a conference between the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, six presiding circuit judges, as I recall, the administrator of the judicial circuit, and a representative of the Department of Justice, and the suggested amendments were in conformity with that agreement.

In brief, under existing law a retired district judge has the power to sit when he desires and feels able to sit within his district. Senate bill 1050 provides a limitation. A retired judge may sit when he desires, and when he feels that he is able to sit, but the designation of the time and place in which he sits is made by the justice having jurisdiction over the circuit, and the presiding judge of the circuit court of the circuit in which the district is located, or the circuit counsel. In other words, he is not permitted simply to go around and interfere in courts as he desires, but his service must be designated, and his permission to serve must, of course, be secured.

This provision applies both to existing retired judges and those who may be retired in the future, both by reason of age and by reason of ill health.

Another provision carries into effect what has been for years the ruling of the Department of Justice on the status of the so-called roving judges, district judges who have jurisdiction over more than one district. The Department of Justice had always ruled that they held no seniority in a district with reference to the making of appointments of court officials.

In the conference it was agreed that in order to make them the equal of all other district judges, the fair thing to do, would be to allow them to obtain seniority in the district of their residence, because otherwise, if they were allowed to obtain seniority over all districts in which they might have personal jurisdiction, that would be setting up a sort of a superior type of district judge who might have seniority and appointing power over an entire State in courts where he held no terms, over which he did not preside, but who could appoint officials for other judges in those courts. That provision was included.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. At that point, on the matter of seniority, it has seemed to me that the provisions of the present statutes with regard to allowing the senior judge in any district to make appointments may work out very unfairly, in view of the growth of the Federal judiciary. For instance, suppose a district now has three judges where originally it had only one. Why should the senior judge make the appointments in that district as against a majority of the judges?

Mr. KILGORE. He would not under this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand he would not under this bill, but this bill does not change the provisions as to seniority, does it?

Mr. KILGORE. No. This bill does not change the provisions with respect to seniority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This bill, as I understand it—and I have had an opportunity to examine it only very briefly—freezes the present system. For

instance, in a State such as mine, where in one district there are two judges, in another district two judges, and where there is one of the so-called roving judges who has jurisdiction over the whole State, and whose time is evenly divided between the two districts, it seems to me it would be more equitable and fair in every way if a majority of the judges in any district, including the roving judge for his divided time, should have a right to cast their votes in the matter of making appointments, rather than to allow simply the matter of seniority of commission to determine the whole matter, as the present law provides.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Missouri is wrong with respect to his interpretation of the present law. The majority of the judges do appoint officials when a majority can be obtained, but when there is a tie vote the senior judge decides the tie. In such case, in other words, the senior judge has the sole appointing power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will agree, I am sure, that a judge who is only for a portion of the time assigned to a district, as is the case in my own State, who may put in half his time in that district, who may handle only one-fifth of the docket in that district, is not entitled to a vote. Is not that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. No, sir; I think the Senator is incorrect about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is my understanding of the present law.

Mr. KILGORE. At least it is the opinion of the Department of Justice; that when there are a multiplicity of judges, the majority rules, but when they cannot agree, then the senior judge has the right to make the appointment. If that situation continues the roving judge would eventually become the senior judge in all the districts, and in my State, we having only two judges, if there is a split vote, the roving judge becomes the sole authority for both districts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to see the roving judge become the senior judge in all districts, but I think that the roving judge, who in many cases handles a great deal of the business in a district, is entitled to a vote, which I do not understand to be the practice under the present law.

Mr. KILGORE. The present law provides that when the judges cannot agree the senior judge shall make the appointment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the terms of the bill the roving judge would have seniority in the district in which he resides.

Mr. KILGORE. He would attain his seniority in the district in which he resides, but would not become the senior judge in any other district.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is what I mean. He could become the senior judge in the district in which he resides.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. But under the terms of the bill he could not become the senior judge all over the State.

Mr. KILGORE. Or in all the districts in which he holds jurisdiction.

My interpretation of the law is that if the judges cannot agree the senior judge takes the matter completely out of their hands. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent a judge from becoming the senior judge in more than one district. I think it is true that judges having more than one district under their jurisdiction are invariably found in States in which there is only one other district judge. That is a recent outgrowth, and I think not a healthy outgrowth, of the judicial system. According to the information which I have been able to gather, in each of the districts which has a partial or roving judge there is only one other judge in the district who could participate in the selection of the officials.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is mistaken when he says that such is invariably the case. At least he is mistaken so far as my own State is concerned, because we have two districts in Missouri, each with two district judges. In addition we have a roving district judge. I believe in roving justices, because I think such a plan gives greater flexibility to the judicial system. At times there may be more business to attend to in the eastern district of Missouri than in the western district, and at other times more in the western district than in the eastern district. I use my own State merely as an example. The reason why we have a roving judge in Missouri is that we could not obtain an additional judge for each district, which we should have had. I believe in the flexibility of the system. The matter of judicial appointments is relatively a minor one; but it seems to me that the judge who spends half his time in one district and half in another is entitled to at least half a vote in the determination of appointments.

Mr. KILGORE. If there are two judges in each district, and a roving judge for two districts, the roving judge could not transact much more than about one-sixth of the business of each district.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He transacts precisely one-fifth of the business in each district: By agreement between the judges of the two districts the roving judge transacts precisely 20 percent of the business in each district. Each other judge assigned to the district transacts 40 percent of the business in his own district. The result is a precisely even division in the efforts of the roving judge and the other judges.

Mr. KILGORE. The bill does not provide that the roving judge shall not have a right to participate in the matter of appointments. It merely limits his seniority to the district of his residence, and makes of him a judge junior to the senior judge in the district in which he does not reside. He participates in the conferences, and so forth, as he has always done. The bill affects the matter of appointments only in case the judges cannot agree on an appointment. A judge may become the senior judge only in the district in which he resides, and only in that district may he take over exclusive powers when the judges cannot agree.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Am I correct in understanding that from the standpoint of appointments and other administrative functions the judge who has retired occupies the position of a junior judge at all times?

Mr. KILGORE. A junior judge at all times.

Mr. ADAMS. Why should a judge who has retired, and who is subject only to such service as he sees fit to render, be put on an equality with the active judges in those matters?

Mr. KILGORE. Under existing law he still has that right. The bill does not attempt to take that right away from him.

Mr. ADAMS. I am asking the Senator what he thinks about it.

Mr. KILGORE. Frankly, I do not think he should participate; but that matter could not be dealt with in the pending bill.

Mr. ADAMS. It seems to me we are being very good to the retired judges in the matter of salary and otherwise; and that they ought not, by rendering a very small fraction of service in most instances, to become active participants in the organization of the courts.

Mr. KILGORE. With respect to retired judges, we were assured by the various circuit judges that without the activities of the retired judges it would be impossible to keep up with their dockets. The retired judges are of tremendous help, even when they give only 25 or 50 percent of their time. The circuit judges were very insistent upon the utmost consideration being given retired judges, but it was thought that their activities should be limited so that they may sit only at times and places designated by the proper authorities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia whether or not the substitute proposed by the Judiciary Committee has the approval of the Judicial Council.

Mr. KILGORE. Six presiding judges from six circuits were present and discussed the amendment. The bill as presented here has the approval of all the judges we could get before the committee. I believe six circuits were represented. It also has the approval of the representative of the Attorney General's Office and of what we call the court proctor, or administrator of judicial affairs. Letters are on file to that effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With regard to what the Senator from West Virginia has said about the services of retired judges, I agree wholeheartedly with him, from my own personal observation of the business in our own circuit. We had three retired judges in the circuit, two in Missouri. One of them has recently died, and the other two have now become more or less incapacitated. They attended their offices just as regularly after

they retire as before, and were as available for service, within the limits of their physical ability, as they had been when they were in active service. They rendered just as good service to the Government, although they took less work on themselves. The death of Judge Faris and the fact that Judge Van Valkenburgh is now more or less incapacitated have necessitated the creation of two additional judges in that circuit within the past year, simply because the services of the retired judges were no longer available. I think that when we can obtain the services of able and distinguished men who have given their lives to the Federal judiciary, and who have become more or less unable to render full-time service, the Government ought to avail itself of such service as they can render. Most of the retired judges are willing to render all the service possible within the limits of their physical ability.

Mr. KILGORE. They are not only willing, but anxious to do so. I know one judge in my circuit who devotes approximately 60 percent of his time to the work. That is as much as he is physically able to do.

Recurring to the committee amendment, while it purports to be a substitute for the bill, it merely embodies the amendments which were agreed upon in a committee hearing at which there were present representatives of the judiciary, including the presiding justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the administrator of judicial affairs, and the representative of the Attorney General's office, all of whom agreed on the amendments contained in the committee amendments and were of the opinion that such a measure would make the system flexible and embody in the law what they thought should be the law, making legislative enactment take the place of administrative orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That section 260 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 375), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC 260. When any judge of any court of the United States, appointed to hold his office during good behavior, resigns his office after having held a commission or commissions as judge of any such court or courts at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years, he shall, during the residue of his natural life, receive the salary which is payable at the time of his resignation for the office that he held at the time of his resignation. But, instead of resigning, any judge other than a Justice of the Supreme Court, who is qualified to resign under the foregoing provisions, may retire, upon the salary of which he is then in receipt, from regular active service on the bench, and the President shall thereupon be authorized to appoint a successor; but a judge so retiring may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake or he may be called upon either by the presiding judge or senior judge of any other such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as such retired judge may be willing to undertake. Any judge who has heretofore retired, or who hereafter retires, under the provisions of this section, may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided.

"In the event any circuit judge, or district judge, having so held a commission or commissions at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise, and having attained the age of 70 years as aforesaid, shall nevertheless remain in office, and not resign or retire as aforesaid, the President, if he finds any such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of mental or physical disability of permanent character, may, when necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional circuit judge of the circuit or district judge of the district to which such disabled judge belongs. Any judge who has heretofore retired or who hereafter retires voluntarily under the provisions of this section, or whose mental or physical condition caused the President to appoint an additional judge, shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the remaining judges of said court, who shall, in the order of the seniority of their respective commissions, exercise such powers and perform such duties as by law may be incident to seniority. In districts where there may be more than one district judge, if the judges or a majority of them cannot agree upon the appointment of officials of the court, to be appointed by such judges, then the senior judge shall have the power to make such appointments: *Provided*, That in determining the seniority of district judges in any State for the purpose of exercising the power of appointing officials of the court, any district judge whose jurisdiction extends over more than one district shall be held and treated as if junior in commission to the other district judges in such State, in all districts except the district of his residence.

"Upon the death, resignation, or retirement of any circuit or district judge, so entitled to resign, following the appointment of any additional judge as provided in this section, the vacancy caused by such death, resignation, or retirement of the said judge so entitled to resign shall not be filled."

SEC. 2. The act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1204; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 375b), entitled "An act to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior," is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Any Justice of the Supreme Court who retires or who has retired under the provisions of this act may nevertheless be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties, in any judicial circuit, including those of a circuit justice in such circuit, as such retired Justice may be willing to undertake; a circuit or district judge so retiring or retired may nevertheless be called upon by the senior circuit judge or circuit council of that circuit and be by such senior circuit judge or such circuit council authorized to perform such judicial duties in such circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake, or he may be called upon by the Chief Justice and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in any other circuit as such retired judge may be willing to undertake; and any judge of any other court of the United States so retiring or retired may be called upon by the presiding judge or senior judge of such court and be by him authorized to perform such judicial duties in such court as he may be willing to undertake. Any such judge so retiring or retired may perform judicial duties only when so called and authorized as herein provided."

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the District of Columbia shall be considered as a judicial circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1050) was passed.

RETIREMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, today Chief Justice Hughes accepts retirement. Chief Justice Hughes is one of the wisest, noblest, and most highly respected men of a half century of public life. Always he has maintained dignity, balance, integrity, and a desire to serve the American people.

I vividly recall an experience years ago, when I was Secretary of Labor, in regard to the immigration law, which was then new and under fire. Mr. Justice Hughes was asked by one of the attorneys of the Labor Department how he regarded the law. He said, "What is the law?" It was read to him, and Mr. Justice Hughes said, "Follow the law." During all these years that has been the consuming, unifying purpose of the life and activities of this great man. He has been faithfully following the law.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry doctors to be assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy; and sundry officers for promotion, and several citizens for appointment as officers, in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Luther Harr, of Pennsylvania, to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel; and

Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1946 (reappointment).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Bright to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Simon H. Rifkind to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the two nominees in North Dakota, Fred A. Sommars and Earl T. Atha. The Senator from North Dakota desires that they be passed over. I therefore ask that they be passed over and that the other nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the calendar.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE—WALTER L. MILLER

Mr. GEORGE. Before taking up for consideration the treaty on the calendar, I submit a unanimous-consent request, with this preface: Yesterday, when the nomination of Walter L. Miller to be collector of internal revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania was confirmed, and after the request that we immediately notify the President had been granted, for reasons which were communicated to me I asked that immediate notification be withheld in the case of the collector for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania. That reason having been removed, Mr. President, I now ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Walter L. Miller to be collector of internal revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, and also of all other nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTOCOL CONCERNING FOREIGN COMPANIES IN THE COUNTRIES OF AMERICA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. A protocol concerning recognition of the juridical personality of foreign companies in the countries of America, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union on June 25, 1936, and was signed for the United States on June 23, 1939.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know whether the able Senator is asking for consideration at this time; but I suggest that it go over until another meeting.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to ask for the consideration of the treaty at this time, because the Senator who had previously raised the question is now satisfied about it.

Mr. McNARY. I think there is another unsatisfied Senator. I suggest that it go over for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that we may dispose of it. I desire to get rid of it.

Mr. McNARY. Let us take it up on Thursday.

Mr. GEORGE. We shall probably not have a quorum present on Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. I would not suggest the absence of a quorum at that time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall defer to the wishes of the Senator from Oregon. However, I had previously given notice that I would ask to proceed with the consideration of the treaty; and Senators who desire to object certainly ought to be on hand. I hope the Senator will consent.

Mr. McNARY. I shall not object further after today.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, Mr. President. I will consent to allowing the matter to go over until Thursday; but I shall expect to take it up on Thursday, because there is a particular reason why it should be disposed of.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, June 5, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3 (legislative day, May 26), 1941:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

John Bright to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Simon H. Rifkind to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

POSTMASTERS

TEXAS

Ralph B. Martin, Camden.
Shelley G. Tarkington, Jr., Cuero.
James E. Heaton, Cushing.
David P. Slaughter, Howe.
Helen C. Wallace, Kyle.
John H. Watson, McDade.
Allen Tolbert, Midland.
Benjamin E. Ramsey, Newton.
Una B. Walker, Pecan Gap.
William C. Wallis, Richardson.
Wade H. Taylor, Seminary Hill.
Sallie V. McAdams, Stratford.
Farris A. Brown, Talco.
Harold D. House, Three Rivers.
Floyd K. Rose, Tomball.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our blessed Father in heaven, that back of this world house, back of our joys and afflictions, back of our hopes and disappointments, back of our infirmities and tendencies, back of our perplexities and problems, back of the universe itself, is a good God of infinite mercy and power. We pray Thee to accept our praise and gratitude, beseeching Thee not to be too impatient with us. Thou art our strength and our refuge for weariness and the joy of work well done this is the comfort of living, to know that we are safe in our Father's hands. Let us not doubt the Divine Will, which keeps this troubled world steadfast and sure, feeling the touch of Thy spirit in our hearts and hearing Thy voice saying: "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." Bless the Congress with those living virtues which cannot die—faith, hope, and charity—thus defeating doubt, subduing fear, and destroying hate. Make us strong in our convictions and determined in our endeavors to fulfill all our obligations to our homes and country, and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) entitled "An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 991) entitled "An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty."

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES FOR THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3368), authorizing expenditures for the office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to rec-

ommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

JAMES A. O'LEARY,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Managers on the part of the House.
LISTER HILL,
FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368), authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended and agreed upon in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment:

Among the purposes for which expenditures are authorized by the bill is the "collection and distribution of information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress, administrative officials, and the public." The Senate amendment would have barred, as a part of this authority, the distribution of films or radio scripts or radio transcriptions. The Senate has receded from its amendment leaving the bill in its entirety in the form as passed by the House.

JAMES A. O'LEARY,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. For a question.

Mr. RICH. When the Senate put in this bill over there the provision regulating the dissemination of information over the radio, what was the object of the House striking that out?

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that in order to expedite consideration of the bill in the Senate, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] stated at the time the amendment was offered he would agree to take the amendment to conference. It was taken to conference and it developed in conference that if the amendment stayed in, this information organization would not have been permitted to even send a copy of a radio address to somebody that might be calling for it. I might add they do not at any time produce films.

Mr. RICH. It would have stopped this administration propaganda that is going out all over the country, and it seems to me that would have been a mighty fine thing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not think it would because they only distribute what other departments and agencies prepare.

Mr. RICH. They have an opportunity to put out any propaganda that they wish and it seems to me it would be a mighty fine thing for the country, it would have been a mighty fine thing for the Congress, and it would have been a saving to the taxpayers so far as this useless propaganda is concerned that puts the New Deal into the mouths of the American people and compels them to swallow it whether they like it or not.

Mr. COCHRAN. As has been stated time and again there is no desire on the part of those in charge to go beyond the duties they have performed in the past and let it be said, as shown by the hearings, they assemble the bad as well as the good, criticisms as well as praise. In this way they are able to keep the President as well as all Government agencies informed.

Let me repeat further what I said when the bill was under consideration in the House. The President asks for this authorization, stating the added duties imposed upon him by the Congress make such an organization necessary. The President never denies Congress funds we say we need to conduct our business, why should we deny the President funds to properly carry out the obligations we impose upon him?

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The point is passed for reserving the right to object.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I was on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The right to object has passed. There was no objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that the statement be read in lieu of the report. The gentleman from Missouri called up the conference report, and he has control of the time on the floor. If the gentleman from Missouri desires to yield, he may do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN rose.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a member of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any opportunity to object?

The SPEAKER. Not now.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is along the same line that Raymond Clapper said the other day. If we cannot say anything here, all right. We may have an opportunity at some other time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same observation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we also insert our remarks?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 36, noes 39.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] objects to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that there is not a quorum present, and I insist upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and also heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] make the point of order.

Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 130, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—176

Allen, La.	Harris, Va.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Barden	Hart	Pierce
Barnes	Harter	Pittenger
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Plauché
Beckworth	Hendricks	Poage
Beiter	Hill, Wash.	Priest
Bland	Hook	Ramsay
Bloom	Houston	Ramspeck
Boehne	Hunter	Rankin, Miss.
Boggs	Imhoff	Richards
Boland	Izac	Rivers
Bonner	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Jacobsen	Rogers, Okla.
Brown, Ga.	Johnson, Luther A.	Russell
Bryson	Johnson, W. Va.	Sabath
Buckler, Minn.	Kee	Sacks
Burgin	Kefauver	Sanders
Capozzoli	Kelley, Pa.	Satterfield
Cartwright	Kelly, Ill.	Schaefer, Ill.
Chapman	Kennedy, Martin, J.	Schulte
Clark	Keogh	Scrugham
Cochran	Kilday	Shanley
Coffee, Wash.	Kirwan	Sheppard
Connery	Kleberg	Sikes
Cooper	Kocialkowski	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Koppleмann	Smith, Wash.
Cox	Kramer	Smith, W. Va.
Cravens	Lanham	Snyder
Cullen	Lesinski	South
D'Alesandro	Lewis	Sparkman
Davis, Tenn.	Ludlow	Spence
Dickstein	Lynch	Steagall
Dingell	McCormack	Sullivan
Doughton	McIntyre	Sumners, Tex.
Downs	McKeough	Sutphin
Doxey	McLaughlin	Tarver
Drewry	McMillan	Tenerowicz
Duncan	Maciora	Terry
Durham	Mahon	Thom
Edelstein	Mansfield	Thomas, Tex.
Edmiston	Marcantonio	Thomason
Eliot, Mass.	May	Traynor
Ellis	Merritt	Vincent, Ky.
Fitzpatrick	Meyer, Md.	Vinson, Ga.
Flannagan	Mills, Ark.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Mills, La.	Walter
Forand	Monroney	Ward
Ford, Miss.	Nelson	Weaver
Ford, Thomas F.	Norrell	West
Fulmer	O'Connor	Whelchel
Gehrmann	O'Neal	Whittington
Gore	Pace	Wickersham
Gossett	Patman	Williams
Grant, Ala.	Patrick	Woodrum, Va.
Green	Patton	Worley
Gregory	Pearson	Wright
Haines	Peterson, Fla.	Young
Hare	Peterson, Ga.	Zimmerman
Harrington		
Harris, Ark.		

NAYS—130

Allen, Ill.	Chiperfield	Elston
Anderson, Calif.	Clason	Engel
Andrews	Clevenger	Faddis
Angell	Coffee, Nebr.	Fellows
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Fenton
Bender	Copeland	Fish
Bennett	Crawford	Ford, Leland M.
Bishop	Crowther	Gale
Bolles	Cunningham	Gamble
Bolton	Curtis	Gathings
Brown, Ohio	Day	Gearhart
Burdick	Dewey	Gerlach
Butler	Ditter	Gilchrist
Canfield	Dondero	Gillie
Carlson	Douglas	Graham
Carter	Dworshak	Guyer, Kans.
Case, S. Dak.	Eaton	Gwynne

Hall, Edwin Arthur	McLean	Sauthoff
	Maas	Shafer, Mich.
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Short
	Mason	Simpson
Halleck	Michener	Smith, Maine
Hancock	Moser	Smith, Ohio
Harness	Mott	Springer
Hess	Mundt	Stearns, N. H.
Hill, Colo.	Murray	Stefan
Hoffman	Oliver	Stevenson
Holmes	Paddock	Sumner, Ill.
Hope	Pheiffer, William T.	Taber
Hull		Talle
Jenkins, Ohio	Ploeser	Thomas, N. J.
Jensen	Powers	Tibbott
Johns	Rankin, Mont.	Tinkham
Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.	Treadway
Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Jones	Rees, Kans.	Wasielewski
Jonkman	Rich	Welch
Kean	Rizley	Wheat
Keefe	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wigglesworth
Kunkel		Wilson
Lambertson	Robertson, Va	Wolcott
Landis	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
LeCompte	Rolph	Woodruff, Mich.
McGregor	Rutherford	

NOT VOTING—125

Andersen, H. Carl	Domengeaux	Murdock
	Eberharter	Myers, Pa.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Elliott, Calif.	Nichols
	Englebright	Norton
Andresen, August H.	Fitzgerald	O'Brien, Mich.
	Flaherty	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arnold	Flannery	O'Day
Baldwin	Gavagan	O'Hara
Barry	Geyer, Calif.	O'Leary
Bates, Mass.	Gibson	Osmers
Baumhart	Gifford	O'Toole
Beam	Granger	Plumley
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Rabaut
Blackney	Hartley	Randolph
Boren	Healey	Robsion, Ky.
Boykin	Heffernan	Rockefeller
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Hinshaw	Romjue
Buck	Hobbs	Sasscer
Buckley, N. Y.	Holbrock	Scanlon
Bulwinkle	Howell	Schuetz
Burch	Jarman	Scott
Byrne	Jarrett	Secrest
Camp	Jenks, N. H.	Shannon
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Sheridan
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, Conn.
Casey, Mass.		Smith, Pa.
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Somers, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Kennedy, Michael J.	Starnes, Ala.
Claypool		Stratton
Cluett	Kerr	Sweeney
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Taylor
Collins	Kinzer	Thill
Colmer	Knutson	Tolan
Cooley	Larrabee	Vreeland
Costello	Lea	Wadsworth
Creal	Leavy	Weiss
Crosser	McArdle	Wene
Culkin	McGehee	White
Davis, Ohio	McGranery	Winter
Delaney	Maciejewski	Wolverton, N. J.
Dies	Magnuson	Youngdahl
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	
Disney	Mitchell	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murdock for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Fitzgerald for, with Mr. Vreeland against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey against.

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Culkin against.

Mr. Beam for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Jarrett against.

Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Thill against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Jennings against.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Burch for, with Mr. Dirksen against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Smith of Connecticut for, with Mr. Rockefeller against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Creal for, with Mr. Kinzer against.

Mr. Buck for, with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky against.

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Winter against.

Mr. Bulwinkle for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Cluett against.

Mr. Cole of Maryland for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. H. Carl Anderson against.

Mr. Tolan for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Larrabee for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Holbrock for, with Mr. Knutson, against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Somers of New York for, with Mr. Youngdahl against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Stratton against.

Mr. Claypool for, with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire against.

Mr. Schulte for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

General pairs:

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Englebright.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Scanlon.

Mr. Arnold with Mr. Granger.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Elliott of California.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Anderson of New Mexico.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Davis of Ohio with Mr. Flaherty.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Secrest.

Mr. Wene with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. McArdle.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Shannon.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Domengeaux.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, WILLIAMS, SPENCE, WOLCOTT, and CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps giving some information which was requested by the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriations, but which arrived too late for inclusion in the RECORD yesterday, regarding the work done by the corps in 1940. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein this letter.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, will that cause the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps to be reduced from the amount that is now in the bill?

Mr. TARVER. I believe the statements made in the letter in regard to the accomplishments of the corps, if they are studied carefully by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will cause him to regard this work far more highly than he has evidently done in the past.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman believes it is necessary to continue the Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees on the Government pay roll rather than put them back in industry?

Mr. TARVER. I am very earnestly hopeful that the Congress will eventually decide to make this a permanent organization; and may I say to the gentleman that I hope we will have his cooperation.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman would agree that this administration will never be able to get the people back to work, if you do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there was disclosed on the floor of this House yesterday as remarkable and astounding information as it has ever been my privilege to hear. It happens that at least $250,000,000 has been wasted in construction of various phases of our defense program. At the same time, there are 1,500,000 of the finest young men that ever offered their services to their country now in military training working for $21 a month. In view of the fact that labor is averaging at least five times that amount in wages, and considering there are tremendous waste and profiteering of all kinds going on right under our noses, I am today introducing in the House a bill which calls for the doubling of the base pay for all enlisted men from $21 to $42 per month. The bill is brief, and I take this opportunity to read it to you:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective on the 1st day of the month following the month in which this act is enacted, the first sentence of section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is amended to read as follows: "The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army and the Marine Corps shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $126; enlisted men of the second grade, $84; enlisted men of the third grade, $72; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $60;

enlisted men of the fifth grade, $54; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $48; enlisted men of the seventh grade, $42, except that the monthly base pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade whose inefficiency or other unfitness has been determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall be $30."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Wednesday, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that means after the legislative program is disposed of?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. That is always understood.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been transmitted to the Congress an important communication from Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, involving the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office over the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has been referred to the Committe on Military Affairs. I consider this matter of such vital importance that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks so that there may be printed in the RECORD the letter and the decision of the Comptroller General. I have consulted the Joint Committee on Printing and they have procured from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing the document. It is in excess of the amount allowed for printing extraneous matter and will cost $270.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object—and I do not propose to object—I should like to know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a member of the Committee on Printing, approves of this expenditure; and if so, with apologies I use his question, Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I answer that question of the gentleman from Missouri by saying that the gentleman who made the request is interested in having the new Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, go over the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. We all have respect for Mr. Warren. We believe he is trying to do a good job. He is trying to interpret the law as he sees proper. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] wanted him to get that job, and so did I. He is a man well qualified for the place. He will give this country proper administration of legislation. It seems fitting that if he is allowed to go over the accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he will not let those fellows squander millions and millions of dollars. It will be a fine investment to spend this $270 to have this letter inserted in the RECORD so that every Member of Congress can see what Lindsay Warren wants to do. He is going to keep the New Deal from squandering, we hope.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has dug himself a verbal storm cellar in which to escape the logic of his own argument, instead of exercising his prerogatives as a Member of the House, I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] if it is not a fact that this report merely suggests a clarification of the law touching these reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Instead of making a great mountain out of a molehill, the whole matter could have been disposed of without exposing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to the charge of extravagance. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT SPACE IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement entitled "What the Automobile Means to America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FRUIT GROWERS AND THE TEAMSTERS' UNION

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter this morning from a farmer residing in my congressional district. This farmer lives, by the tens of thousands, in every rural district in the United States. This is what he says:

We have been selling our apples at the Union Produce Terminal in Detroit, and were informed this morning by a representative of the union that we (the owners) would have to join the teamsters' union or we would not be allowed to haul our own produce, or haul away our empty crates; $25 to join, and $2 per month dues.

I believe you are acquainted with the situation, and know what the fruit growers are up against. It has been a struggle to make ends meet for the past several years.

Please advise me if this condition is going to be allowed to exist. Is this the kind of democracy we are going all out to defend and maintain?

I am a World War veteran, treasurer of Novi Township, and have been growing fruit on this place for the past 30 years.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE R. SIMMONS.

If government, local, State, or national, will not protect the American farmer in his efforts to sell the products of his own labor from that kind of racketeering, then the time is not far distant when he will be forced to unite and invoke the age-old rule that self-preservation is the first law of nature. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial appearing in a New Jersey newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some remarks of the former Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from County Judge Kolb to Mr. William H. Moore, Area Director of the N. Y. A., at Russellville, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which I introduced yesterday creating a Department of Air.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. BENNETT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from the Los Angeles Examiner on Harry Bridges, admitting falsifying application for citizenship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I do this to direct the attention of the House to the fact that Harry Bridges is now facing one of the most relentless, dynamite-packed, evidence-backed cross-examinations that has ever been heard in the city of San Francisco. Harry Bridges admitted that he had under oath lied in his citizenship application. Also he admitted that he had accepted the Communist Party's support and that he had given the Communist Party aid. He admitted that he had taken sailors to Communist meetings. He admitted that time and again he had gone to the Communist headquarters, and gotten information and pamphlets and that he had hired men for 50 cents a day. I am very glad to say that I think Harry Bridges is being given a real trial in San Francisco, and it is so different from the one that he received before.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the N. Y. A. program and its administration in Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from General McClintic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address delivered by Fred Wilson before the Greenbriar College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF THE TREASURY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it was amusing a few moments ago to hear a few of the new dealers wanting to know where we are going to get the $250 to publish in the RECORD something that the Congress ought to know. Let me call their attention to the fact that the Treasury statement of May 28th shows that we are now $4,845,587,000 in the red. There are none of the new dealers who know where they are going to get a nickel of that or what it is all about, but they are now going to tax the people three and a half billion dollars more, and bring in a tax bill that will make the people of the country shudder. The people will have to bow to heavy taxation and yet they are spending from three to four billion dollars more than they will get in revenues this year. It seems to me that they ought to have some consideration for the welfare of this Nation, and ought not to wreck it financially for that is what they have been doing for 8 long years. For 8 long years they have been hum-bugging and hornswoggling the people of this country so that they do not know what it is all about or where they are going, or how they are going to pay their way. We could have a big navy, a big army, and a big air force, but if you have no sound financial policy you are wrecked. That is what is happening. Why do you do it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

CAPT. JAMES ROOSEVELT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the Consent Calendar yesterday I called attention to a photograph of Capt. James Roosevelt, of the Marine Corps, showing him with a bespangled chest wearing several decorations, and asked members of the Naval Committee if they knew where he had received these decorations, but they were unable to enlighten me.

My curiosity aroused, I inquired of the Marine Corps and was informed that in May 1936, when acting as the President's aide, he was awarded the diploma of the National Order of the Southern Cross of Brazil, and in May of 1938 the Order of the Military Merit, first class, white badge, Dominican Republic, and in March of 1938 the order of the Crown of Belgium.

The Constitution of the United States provides that—

> No person holding an office of profit or trust shall, without the consent of Congress, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign state.

On further search I found that in Private Act No. 55, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved April 24, 1937, he was listed among other officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps "to accept such medals, orders, and decorations as have been tendered them." This would cover the Brazilian decoration, but I can find no authority for his wearing the others.

THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me proper that we should pause in our legislative deliberations sufficiently to give recognition to a local event, national in character, to which reference is made on the front pages of all the newspapers today, namely, the resignation of the Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes. I am sure we all regret that consideration for his health and age makes it necessary for the Chief Justice to lay aside the robe of his high office, which he has worn with such dignity, such honor, and such credit. No man in public life is more respected than he. His record has been one of unselfish public service, and he has left an indelible imprint upon the sands of time. The Government is losing a grand official, and, as a layman, not having legal knowledge, I am glad to have this opportunity to express this word of comment upon his resignation. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter I received relative to the increased cost of living.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a resolution of the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a speech I made over the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by me at the Academy of Music on the subject I Am An American Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, before Camp Nordland at Andover, N. J., was opened, I called the attention of this Congress to the menace of nazi-ism and fascism in this country. Since it was established I have called attention to the camp at least a half a dozen times, and have described in detail the subversive activities carried on there. I am very proud to say that on May 13 I called the especial attention of this Congress to the opportunities for sabotage which the members of Camp Nordland have and what they might attempt to do to interfere with our defense program. The number of "accidents" we have been having in New Jersey factories seem to substantiate my warnings. I therefore want to congratulate the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, David T. Wilentz, who found some way to close that filthy Nazi camp. I hope it stays closed for good. I hope that other States where such camps are located will find some method, as did the attorney general of New Jersey, to close these camps. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio broadcast I made on Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the very near future on account of the illness of my mother.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE COMMANDER WALTER JONES

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed of the death of Lt. Comdr. Walter Jones, United States Navy, who, I understand, was killed in Ireland yesterday while flying a United States naval plane. I have very little information as to how his death occurred, and so far have not been able to obtain any details from the Navy Department. Commander Jones originally came from my district. That partially explains my interest in obtaining details as to his death. I desire to know, too, and I think the Members of Congress should know, why Commander Jones was in Ireland and what type of duty he was performing there. His death raises the question of whether our neutrality patrol has been extended to the British Isles. Why are United States Navy planes flying over Ireland? I shall ask the Navy Department to answer these questions. I think the people of America should be told the truth. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short newspaper article from the Kokomo Daily Tribune of Kokomo, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 of the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter which I received from Mr. Thomas Lamont, of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rural electrification and to enclose a copy of a bill I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the fact that today is the anniversary of the birthday of one of our greatest Americans, Jefferson Davis, the president of the Confederacy. [Applause.]

Jefferson Davis is one of the few men who ever administered the oath of office to Abraham Lincoln. He swore Mr. Lincoln in as a captain in the Black Hawk War.

I wonder what kind of conversation we would hear today if we could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where they have taken their places in the silent halls of death, and could hear Lincoln and Davis, Jefferson and Washington discussing world affairs as they exist today. There is one thing on which I am sure they would all agree, and that is on the fundamental policy laid down by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on the Confederate flag.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

THE UNIONS AND THE FARMERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] called attention to the fact that in the city of Detroit the unions are requiring farmers to pay $25 when they bring to market the food to feed the people. In my district a farmer going into Chicago has to pay a fee of $50 and on top of that $5 a month. If the majority party would devise a scheme to curb the labor racketeers and to work out a plan to extend the good neighbor policy so it would operate between hungry city folks and farmers we would surely appreciate it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day on which the Private Calendar is in order. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MARY W. OSTERHAUS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 181, granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Osterhaus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary W. Osterhaus, widow of Hugo Osterhaus, late rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INEZ CLAIR BANDHOLTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 341, granting an increase of pension to Inez Clair Bandholtz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan will explain the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, it cannot be explained.

Mr. SCHULTE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, objection cannot be reserved. It requires two objections to strike a bill from the calendar.

Is there further objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. But one objection has been made. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Inez Clair Bandholtz, widow of Harry Hill Bandholtz, late major general, retired, United Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA R. ETTNER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 376, granting a pension to Bertha R. Ettner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Bertha R. Ettner, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Ettner, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. BOTNER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 474, granting a pension to John N. Botner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John H. Botner, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the word "Company" and insert "Troop L, Seventh Regiment; Troop."

Line 7, after the word "Regiment;" insert "and Troop F, Fifth Regiment,".

Line 9, strike out "$50" and insert "$15."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSALIE C. HOOD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 492, granting an increase of pension to Rosalie C. Hood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rosalie C. Hood, widow of John Hood, late rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH PAINTER MENOHER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 902, granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Painter Menoher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth Painter Menoher, widow of Charles T. Menoher, major general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE SHARP GRANT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1493, granting an increase of pension to Florence Sharp Grant.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in view of the distinguished service rendered his country by Vice Admiral Albert Weston Grant, late of the United States Navy, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Florence Sharp Grant, widow of Vice Admiral Albert Weston Grant, and pay her a pension at the rate of $10^ per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NELLIE J. MERRIMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2190, granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. Merriman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nellie J. Merriman, widow of Truman A. Merriman, late lieutenant colonel, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $75 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTRICEY K. BURDEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2563, granting a pension to Artricey K. Burden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Artricey K. Burden, widow of James Burden, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$30" and insert "$20", and at the end of the bill insert the following: "and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL WISE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2787, granting an increase of pension to Ethel Wise.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ethel Wise, widow of Brig. Gen. Frederick May Wise, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $200 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$200" and insert "$100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELAIDE WESTOVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3358, granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Westover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Adelaide Westover, widow of Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover, late of the United States Army Air Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE W. PITTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 241, for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jesse W. Pitts, of Round Lake, N. Y., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for injuries received when struck by wreckage from a United States Army airplane when it collided with another United States Army airplane and crashed at Round Lake, N. Y., on August 9, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,953.20."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GILBERT E. AND HELEN JACKSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 647, for the relief of Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, individually, and as the natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gilbert E. Jackson the sum of $175, such sum representing the amount necessary to repair the car of Gilbert E. Jackson, which was damaged by collision with a Government vehicle on or about December 24, 1937; and to Helen Jackson the sum of $7,878 for personal injuries sustained in said collision; and to Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, as the natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor, the sum of $2,743 for personal injuries sustained by Edwin Jackson in said collision.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 6, after "$175", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "to Helen Jackson, the sum of $2,500, and to Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, as natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor, the sum of $1,500 The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them on December 24, 1937, at Portland, Oreg., when the car in which they were traveling was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. E. FLODING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1551, for the relief of W. E. Floding Co.

Mr. HALLECK and Mr. HANCOCK objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

EMILY BARLOW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1576, for the relief of Emily Barlow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emily Barlow, of El Paso, Tex., the sum of $2,000, for injury incurred as the result of an accident caused by a collision between a passenger car in which she was riding and an Army truck operated by an employee of the United States Government.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 6, after the word "of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$1,230 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained through the negligence of an employee of the War Department while driving an Army truck on February 16, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY McCUTCHEON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1702, for the relief of Mary McCutcheon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Mary McCutcheon, postmaster at Schulter, Okla., in the sum of $870.69, due the United States on account of loss of postal funds resulting from the failure of the First National Bank of Schulter, Okla., and the Miners National Bank of Henryetta, Okla.: *Provided*, That the said postmaster shall assign to the United States any and all claims she may have to dividends arising from the liquidation of said banks.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Postmaster General" and insert "Comptroller General of the United States."

In line 5, strike out "account" and insert "accounts."

In line 7, after "funds", insert "and Treasury savings funds."

Page 2, line 2, after "banks", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. SCHAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1746, for the relief of Charles J. Schay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000 to Charles J. Schay, of Little Rock, Ark., in full settlement and satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses and permanent personal injuries sustained as a result of being struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck at Eleventh and Main Streets, Little Rock, on September 29, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, in line 5, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,200."

In line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED WEYBRET, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1852, for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred Weybret, Jr., Soledad, Calif., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Fred Weybret, Jr., for damages on account of injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with an automobile operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps on February 3, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "of", strike out "$2,500" and the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$1,500; to Fred Weybret, Sr., of Soledad, Calif., the sum of $226.50; to Walter McHenry, of Oakland, Calif., the sum of $5,000; to Jessie McHenry, of Oakland, Calif., the sum of $1,274.29; to Earle P. Schouten, of San Rafael, Calif., the sum of $3,000; to Allan D. Cameron, of San Rafael, Calif., the sum of $2,500; to the General Exchange Insurance Corporation, of California, the sum of $617.50; and to the State Compensation Insurance Fund, of California, the sum of $382.10. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages sustained February 3, 1939, as the result of a collision between the car driven by Earle P. Schouten and a car operated on official business for the Civilian Conservation Corps, near Vacaville, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fred Weybert, Jr., and others."

WADE H. ERWIN AND VONNIE ERWIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2010, for the relief of Wade H Erwin and Vonnie Erwin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Works Progress Administration and/or out of any other money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wade H. Erwin, of Strawberry, Ark., the sum of $162 50; and to Vonnie Erwin, of Strawberry, Ark., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained by them in the collision of an automobile, owned and operated by them, and an automobile truck owned and negligently operated by the Works Progress Administration, near the town of Charlotte, Independence County, Ark., on November 26, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact or collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Treasury", strike out the remainder of line 5, all of line 6, and the words "out of any other money in the Treasury" in line 7.

In line 10, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,250."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "their" and insert "all."

In line 4, strike out "owned and negligently" and after "by" insert "an employee of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN S. SMALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2182, for the relief of John S Small.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John S. Small, of Waynesboro, Pa., the sum of $459.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses for personal injuries to his minor daughter, Patricia Ann, sustained when struck by a rock from a blast on a Work Projects Administration project, on September 26, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$459.50", and insert "$1,459.50."

In line 7, after "States" strike out "for expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM CROMER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2382, for the relief of William Cromer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Cromer, of Newberry, S. C., the sum of $1,000, the same being in full satisfaction and settlement of any claim he may have against the United States Government on account of bodily injuries sustained as a result of the negligent and reckless operation of a motor-truck by an employee of the Works Progress Administration, acting within the scope of his employment, on or about September 17, 1938.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, in line 7, strike out "any claim he may have" and insert "all claims."

In line 9, strike out "bodily" and insert "property damages and personal."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE P. CRAWFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2427, for the relief of George P. Crawford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George P. Crawford, of Bolivar, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said George P. Crawford on account of the death of George P. Crawford, Jr., his minor son, who died from injuries received on May 13, 1939, when he was struck at Bolivar, Tenn., by a truck of the Civilian Conservation Corps operated at the time of such accident under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, in line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,647.50."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLIAM BUTAK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2894, for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement against the Government, the sums of $228 to Mrs. William Butak, $228 to Dorothy Clyde, $228 to Mrs. Albert Westcott, $240 to Mrs. Albert Meyer, $240 to Florence Johnson, $228 to Marie Grill, $228 to Mrs. Leo Maloney, $240 to Marian McDonald, $222 to Mrs. Edward Beier, $126 to Mrs. E. L. Bly, $234 to Mrs. Lucien Miller, $228 to Lois Kehnl, $234 to Reka Berg, $234 to Mrs. Ollis Klicker, $222 to Wilma Vogler, and $228 to Mary Chisholm, for services rendered in the capacity of registered nurses at St. Josephs Hospital, Chippewa Falls, Wis., by direction of the Civil Works Administration during the months of December 1933 and January 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAYNARD GOSS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2917, for the relief of Maynard Goss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1155, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maynard Goss the sum of $650.25, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident in which his car was struck by a car driven by an employee of the Farm Security Administration who was acting in the scope of his employment on July 3, 1939, near Mulhall, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment, on behalf of the Committee on Claims.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Page 1, in line 5, before the name "Maynard Goss", insert "Mr. and Mrs."

Page 1, in line 6, strike out "$650.25" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,285.60."

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is to make the Senate bill conform with the House bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss."

A similar House bill (H. R. 2917) was laid on the table.

CARL SWANSON ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3180, for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson.

Mr. GORE and Mr. SCHULTE objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES H. WRIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3233, for the relief of Charles H. Wright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles H. Wright, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement and satisfaction for all damages sustained by him on account of personal injuries received by him on August 15, 1940, when the car which he was driving collided with a truck driven by Jack Murlett, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, said collision being entirely the fault of the Work Projects Administration employee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000", insert in lieu thereof "$2,000, and to William Francis Agard, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $2,000,".

Page 1, line 7, strike out "and satisfaction for all damages sustained by him on account of", insert in lieu thereof "of all claims against the United States for."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "him", insert in lieu thereof "them."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "he was driving", insert in lieu thereof "they were riding."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "said collision being entirely the fault of the Work Projects Administration employee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard."

EQUITABLE INSURANCE ALLIANCE, THE FIDELITY & GUARANTY FIRE CORPORATION, AND THE HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3523, for the relief of the Equitable Insurance Alliance, the Fidelity & Guaranty Fire Insurance Corporation, and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Equitable Insurance Alliance, Providence, R. I., the sum of $1,192.50; to the Fidelity & Guaranty Fire Corporation, Baltimore, Md., the sum of $79.17; and to the Hartford Fire Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., the sum of $15.83. The payment of such amounts shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of payments made by such companies on account of liability incurred under contracts of insurance when a United States naval airplane crashed, on December 5, 1938, into the residence garage owned by Commander H S. Kendall, United States Navy, 850 J Avenue, Coronado, Calif., the insured under such contracts.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LILLIAN KORKEMAS AND ROSE GRAZIOLI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3551, for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lillian Korkemas, of Troy, N. Y., the sum of $3,000, and to Rose Grazioli, of Troy, N. Y., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages, and for pain and suffering resulting from personal injuries sustained on April 7, 1940, in the city of Troy, N. Y., when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck in the service of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$800."

Lines 7 and 8, strike out "$2,500. The payment of such sums shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "$248."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED SPENCER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3774, for the relief of Fred Spencer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred Spencer the sum of $10,916.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Fred Spencer on account of injuries and damages sustained by him on August 3, 1938, by reason of an automobile collision due to the negligence of an operator of a Government automobile: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$10,916.66" insert in lieu thereof "$6,337.56."

Line 8, strike out the following "by the said Fred Spencer on account of injuries and damages sustained by him on August 3, 1938, by reason of an automobile collision due to the negligence of an operator of a Government automobile" and insert in lieu thereof

"for personal injuries sustained on August 3, 1938, when the car in which he was riding was struck by a truck in the service of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLINTON WARD AND ESTER WARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4430, for the relief of Mrs. Clinton Ward and Ester Ward.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clinton Ward, of Bainbridge, Ga., the sum of $5,000, and Miss Ester Ward, of Bainbridge, Ga., the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for injuries sustained January 28, 1938, when the windshield of the car in which they were passengers was struck by a piece of wood hurled by a Works Progress Administration worker on project No. 65-34-2614 on Donalsonville, Seminole County, Ga.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the sign and figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000".

Line 7, strike out the sign and figures "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250".

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERETT A. ALDEN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4433) for the relief of Everett A. Alden, Robert Bruce, Edgar C. Faris, Jr., Kathryn W. Ross, Charles L. Rust, and Frederick C. Wright.

Mr. GORE and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. FELIX BELANGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger.

Mr. SCHULTE and Mr. HALLECK objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MONROE SHORT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 317) for the relief of Monroe Short.

Mr. GORE and Mr. SCHULTE objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE H. CROW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 498) for the relief of George H. Crow.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. HALLECK objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

HARRY J. WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 529) for the relief of Harry J. Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry J. Williams, of West Townsend, Mass., the sum of $87.30, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for the value of certain tools owned by him which were lost when the office building of the Civilian Conservation Corps camp at South Lee, Mass., was destroyed by a fire on February 23, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. J. B. EDGAR, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 596) for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. B. Edgar, Jr., of Memphis, Tenn., a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, the sum of $555.51 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement to him of expenses incurred as a result of medical treatment and hospitalization for disability incurred in line of duty in the United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) for the relief of certain United States Commissioners.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government of the United States, the sum of $231 to David J. Meyerhardt, United States Commissioner at Atlanta, Ga.; the sum of $57 to C. Wayne Clampitt, United States Commissioner at Tucson, Ariz.; the sum of $39 to Ray K. Bannister, United States Commissioner at El Reno, Okla.; the sum of $219 to Malcolm McNaughton, United States Commissioner at Leavenworth, Kans.; and the sum of $159 to Reginald H. Carter, Jr., United States Commissioner at New Orleans, La., for fees due them which were disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States because they followed instructions erroneously issued by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ARTHUR EDGAR SCROGGIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 681) for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of Arthur Edgar Scroggin, of Robbinsdale, Minn.; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act, by or on behalf of the said Arthur Edgar Scroggin, for compensation or other benefits under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for disability due to injuries alleged to have been sustained by him on May 2, 1931, in the performance of his duties as an employee at the Veterans' Administration Facility in Minneapolis, Minn.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. T. EARL RODGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 829) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One objection is heard.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers, of Huntington, W. Va., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of their daughter, Allura Jean Rodgers, who was instantly killed by a United States mail truck, driven by F. F Miller, substitute carrier, in front of her home at Twentieth Street, Huntington, W Va., on December 2, 1939: *Provided*, That no part

of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. FUREY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 911) for the relief of William J. Furey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William J. Furey, of Somerville, Mass., the sum of $1,000, in full and final settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by him as the result of the ramming by the United States Navy tug *Powhatan* of the Rendel lighter on which he was working, near Pier 44, Hoosac Docks, navy yard, Boston, on August 22, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ROBERT B. AYERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 931, for the relief of Robert B. Ayers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert B. Ayers, of Avalon, Livingston County, Mo., the sum of $1,534.46, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for medical and hospital bills incurred in connection with personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when the two-horse team (drawing a wagon with a hay rack attached) which he was driving at the time was struck by a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, the same being United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck No. 11, license No. T451-4171, attached to Camp BF-2, located at Swan Lake Refuge, Sumner, Livingston County, Mo., and at that time under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture, on the highway designated as "J" 1¾ miles southwest of Bedford, Mo., on July 8, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD GAMMON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1022, for the relief of Richard Gammon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard Gammon, of Cedartown, Ga., the sum of $108.65, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incident to official travel during period of employment as field agent, Railroad Retirement Board: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE JANES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1064, for the relief of Caroline Janes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caroline Janes, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $702, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered as a result of an accident involving an Army truck, at Wickliffe, Ohio, on September 14, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR A. SCHIPKE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1076, for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke.

Mr. GORE and Mr. SCHULTE objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1077, for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann.

Mr. BARDEN and Mr. GORE objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MARTHA PACE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 439, granting a pension to Martha Pace.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws the name of Martha Pace, widow of Abner Pace, late of Troop A, Second United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORA ARLENA BALLARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 477, granting a pension to Cora Arlena Ballard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cora Arlena Ballard, widow of Taylor N. Ballard, late of the One Hundred and Eighteenth Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$30" and insert "$26".

Page 1, line 9, after the word "month", insert: "and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 65 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. VICTOR GONDOS, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1994, granting a pension to Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears only one objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr., late of the Five Hundred and Tenth Regiment United States Coast

Artillery, plans and training officer, regimental staff, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert "United States Coast Artillery Corps Reserve."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. SHANKLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2063, granting an increase of pension to William H. Shanklin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Shanklin, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", insert "Headquarters Battery and Combat Train, First Battalion, and Battery F, Eleventh Regiment United States Field Artillery, and."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "C" and insert "G."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$50" and insert "$18.75", and strike out in lines 1 and 2 the words "in lieu of that he is now receiving."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a renewal of pension to William H. Shanklin."

GEORGE M. LOUIE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3308, for the relief of George M. Louie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws the temporary admission to the United States of George M. Louie is hereby declared a record of permanent admission as of the date he last temporarily entered continental United States, to wit, October 13, 1938.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO P. MASTRILLI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1656, for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Francesco P. Mastrilli, of Utica, N. Y., and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act, or on false statements or admission of false statements in connection with any application for registry as an alien. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have been, at Norfolk, Va., on June 8, 1925, lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and any subsequent entry of such alien into the United States shall be deemed to have been lawful.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATEO CASTELLVI ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2616, for the relief of Mateo Castellvi (Bartolomé), his wife Pilar Casal de Castellvi, his sister Carolina Castellvi (Bartolomé), his son John Castellvi (Casal), and his daughter Pilar Castellvi (Casal).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN and Mr. SCHULTE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS, CIVIL WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4860, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Ella E. Terryll, widow of John C. Terryll, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Birdie L. Santee, widow of Joseph W. Santee, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara B. Mathews, former widow of George M. Bascom, late of Companies K and E, Seventh Regiment Indiana Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella L. Patterson, widow of Levi H. Patterson, late a sergeant major, One Hundred and Ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John William Marshall, helpless and dependent son of William T. Marshall, late of Company B, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harry A. Croft, helpless and dependent son of John L. Croft, late a private, Company E, and a second lieutenant, Company F, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Cavalry, and a second lieutenant, Company M, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Martha J. Blacketer, widow of George H. Blacketer, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Claude Stine, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Stine, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Illinois Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elmer E. Wilson, helpless and dependent son of Joseph S. Wilson, late a commissary sergeant, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harry C. B. Frets, helpless and dependent son of George Frets, late of Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice G. Townsend, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph G. Townsend, late a lieutenant colonel, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hiram Russell Griffith, helpless and dependent son of Jacob C. Griffith, late of Captain Griffith's Independent Company, Pennsylvania Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary E. Miller, widow of John H. Miller, late of Company F, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. Doll, widow of Abraham Doll, late of Company L, First Regiment Ohio Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edith M. Link, widow of Martin Link, late a first lieutenant Companies A and C, Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lulu May Craig, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas C. Craig, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Illinois Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lydia Louise Enslow, widow of George Enslow, late of Company G, Ninety-seventh Regiment, and Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment, Illinois Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Rebecca Fields, widow of David Fields, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Adelaide V. de Rael y Salazar, widow of Rafael Rael y Salazar, late of Company B, First Regiment New Mexico Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK AND PAULINA RUBLEIN AND MRS. ETHEL BOWERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 853, for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein, and Mrs. Ethel Bowers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE and Mr. BARDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MAJ. HAROLD SORENSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 583, for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $313.02 to Maj. Harold Sorenson, of Bismarck, N. Dak., formerly the United States property and disbursing officer for North Dakota, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid by him in the settlement of certain charges made against his accounts by reason of disallowances in his accounts for the month of August 1932, such disallowances representing overpayments of mileage allowances to certain members of the North Dakota National Guard for travel from their home stations to Devils Lake, N. Dak., and return, for the purpose of participating in field training of the National Guard during the period June 11, 1932, to June 25 1932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAUDE W. LASALLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1040, for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle, and the Dauterive Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,830.50 to Claude W. LaSalle, of Jeanerette, La., and the sum of $169.50 to the Dauterive Hospital, New Iberia, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Claude W. LaSalle, and for medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of a collision when he was struck while on foot by United States Coast Guard truck No. 1616, said collision occurring on May 22, 1939, about 3 miles east of New Iberia, La., on United States Highway No. 90: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDNA LA BLANCHE GILLETTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 257, for the relief of Edna La Blanche Gillette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edna La Blanche Gillette, Scotia, N. Y., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Edna La Blanche Gillette on June 15, 1940, when she fell into the cellar of a United States Government building in Rotterdam, N. Y., while attending a field day held under the auspices of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$5,000," insert in lieu thereof "$2,305.50."

At the end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS E. FORBES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1142, for the relief of Gladys E. Forbes, attorney in fact for the heirs of George P. Eddy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys E. Forbes, of Santa Maria, Calif., the sum of $1,760. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of losses sustained by Gladys E. Forbes, attorney in fact for the heirs of George P. Eddy, due to loss of time, effort, and improvements made in an effort to patent homestead entry 16200, a 160-acre tract of land located in Los Padres National Forest, Calif., in SW¼ sec. 23, T. 7 N., R. 29 W., San Bernardino meridian, said loss being caused by no fault of the patentee, said George P. Eddy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of the language after the enactment clause down to the word "*Provided*" in page 2, line 4. Insert in lieu thereof:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury, on certification by the Secretary of the Interior, be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs of George P. Eddy, deceased, a sum determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be the fair and reasonable value of all improvements, and the labor involved therein, not in excess of $1,760, placed by George P. Eddy upon the SW¼ sec. 23, T. 7 N., R. 29 W., San Bernardino meridian, 160 acres, located in the Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California, prior to December 28, 1905, the date of the cancelation of homestead entry 014375, San Francisco series, erroneously allowed December 10, 1897."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy."

ROBERT EDWARD LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1359, for the relief of Robert Edward Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,266.75 to Robert Edward Lee, of Rockmart, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States because of personal injuries, including the value of lost time and hospital and physicians' bills, incurred in a collision with a Government automobile assigned to the National Park Service and operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps near Chipley, Ga., on August 8, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "United States" strike out the balance of line 7, all of line 8 and line 9 down to and including the word "incurred" and insert the following: "for personal injuries and expenses sustained."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON ATKISON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1649, for the relief of Vernon Atkison.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Vernon Atkison, a minor, of Greenville, S. C., the sum of $1,150, in full

settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries received by the said Vernon Atkison and property damage to his bicycle when such bicycle was struck on Paris Mountain Road near Greenville, S. C., on the morning of December 30, 1937, by a truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. HERFURTH, JR., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2650, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. Herfurth, Jr., Inc.

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. SCHULTE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LEWIS JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2753, for the relief of Lewis Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lewis Jones, of Ben Hur, Ark., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an automobile accident in the city of Little Rock, Ark., on August 13, 1931, while he was a Federal prisoner in the custody of, and riding in the car driven by, a prohibition agent of the Department of Justice: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,510."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESS W. HARMON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2960, for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jess W. Harmon, the sum of $4,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for permanent personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident in which his car was struck by a truck driven by an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps who was acting in the scope of his employment on July 7, 1939, near Muskogee, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. H. MARTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2934, for the relief of L. H. Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to L. H. Martin, of Clay County, N. C., the sum of $5,000 as full compensation for injuries sustained by the said L. H. Martin on or about July 19, 1938, at a point about 1½ miles west of Topton, N. C., on United States Highway No. 19, when he was hit, while riding on a State highway truck, and injured by an ambulance belonging to the Civilian Conservation Corps stationed at Camp N. C. F. 24, Robbinsville, N. C., and driven by Julian Harrell, enrollee of said corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$3,284.50 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when the truck in which he was riding collided with an ambulance operated by the Civilian Conservation Corps, near Topton, N. C., on July 19, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. O. B. OLSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3247, for the relief of Mrs. O. B. Olson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. O. B. Olson, the sum of $175, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of damages sustained on October 1, 1937, as a result of a fall on the driveway of the customs inspection station at Noyes, Minn.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "Mrs. O. B. Olson", insert "of Chicago, Ill."

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS A. SCHWAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3802, for the relief of Louis A. Schwan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis A. Schwan, of Evansville, Ind., the sum of $642. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage by fire to his orchard caused by the negligence of Work Projects Administration workers.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$642" and insert "$1,284."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "workers" and insert the following: "employees, on December 7, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. KIMBALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 189, for the relief of William F. Kimball.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William F. Kimball, Mud Butte, S. Dak., the sum of $1,885.74. Such sum represents the amount paid to the United States by the said William F. Kimball as part of the purchase price of a tract of land on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, N. Dak., and as interest on the unpaid portion of such purchase price, less the sum of $166.99 which was refunded to the said William F. Kimball on March 24, 1933. The sale

of such land was canceled on February 20, 1929, on account of the failure of the said William F. Kimball to complete the payment of the purchase price.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, starting with "$1,885.74", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$1,208.01 in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Said sum represents the amount paid as part of the purchase price of a tract of land on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, N. Dak., and the sale of such land being canceled on February 20, 1929: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RINZO TAKATA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 732, for the relief of Rinzo Takata.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rinzo Takata, the sum of $6,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States on account of the death of Yasu Takata, wife of said Rinzo Takata, when she was struck and killed by a United States Army truck in Honolulu, T. H., on February 2, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the sum of $6,000" and insert "of Honolulu, T. H., the sum of $2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD E. WAREHEIM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1532, for the relief of Bernard E. Wareheim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard E. Wareheim the sum of $833.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages sustained as result of collision between the claimant's automobile and an ambulance which was attached to the Civilian Conservation Corps, No. 239, Camp S-54, Butler, N. J., which collision occurred on October 2, 1935, at about 5 o'clock p. m., at intersection of Mount Pleasant Avenue and Prospect Avenue, West Orange, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Wareheim" and insert "Warehime."

In line 8, strike out "property damages."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime."

MRS. H. C. BIVINS, HENRIETTA BIVINS, AND IRVIN TATUM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1548, for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. H. C. Bivins, of Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Ellaville, Ga., the sum of $1,743.25, for personal injuries and property damages suffered, and to Henrietta Bivins, of Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Ellaville, Ga., the sum of $105 for personal injuries and property damages suffered, and to Irvin Tatum, of Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Ellaville, Ga., the sum of $350, for personal injuries and property damages suffered, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States, sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck being used in connection with the Soil Conservation Service in hauling supplies from Quartermaster District B, Civilian Conservation Corps, to commanding officer, Company 4450, Civilian Conservation Corps, Wewahitchka, Fla., on the Americus-Ellaville public highway, same being Georgia State Highway No. 3, about 3 miles northeast of Americus, Ga., on March 2, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, in line 7, strike out "for personal injuries and property damages suffered, and."

In line 9, strike out "for personal injuries and property damages suffered."

Page 2, in line 3, strike out "suffered" and after the word "full" strike out "satisfaction of their" and insert "settlement of all."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM SANDLASS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1743, for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William Sandlass the amount, not in excess of $6,278.72, determined by him to be the actual expense to such estate of moving certain buildings owned by it from the right-by-way required by the Government in connection with the widening of the road leading to the military reservation at Sandy Hook, N. J. In determining such expense the Secretary shall include the cost of all demolition, moving of buildings, excavation, construction, reinforcing, wiring, plumbing, and painting necessary to put such buildings as nearly as possible in as good condition in their new location as they were prior to such moving.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, in line 6, strike out "determined by him to be the" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

Page 2, in line 1, after "Jersey.", strike out the remainder of line 1 and all of lines 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND W. REED AND ROSE REED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2212, for the relief of Raymond W. Reed and Rose Reed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond W. Reed, of Trenton, Tex., the sum of $5,000, and to the wife of Raymond W. Reed, Rose Reed, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, property damages, medical and other expenses arising out

of an accident on January 6, 1939, which occurred on United States Highway No. 69, approximately 2½ miles north of Canadian, Okla., involving an automobile driven by an inspector of the Bituminous Coal Commission, W. E. Beaty, while on official business.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, in line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,089."

Page 2, in line 3, strike out "W. E. Beaty, while."

In line 4, after "business", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASCADE INVESTMENT CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2861, for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cascade Investment Co., of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $139.45. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by such company as a result of the damages to a truck owned by said company, while said truck was being used on Works Progress Administration project No. 505, at Camp Clatsop, Oreg., during the year 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, in line 6, strike out "$139.45" and insert "$78.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. E. BUZBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2888, for the relief of H. E. Buzby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. E. Buzby, of Fairbanks, Alaska, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck on a public highway near Fairbanks, Alaska, on May 2, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, in line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTOMATIC TEMPERATURE CONTROL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3121, for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,624.32 to the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa. Such sum represents the additional cost to the company above the contract price on account of work in complying with Coast Guard contract TCG 27927, dated October 9, 1937. Payment under this act shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such additional cost.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTON WAYTASHEK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3607, for the relief of Anton Waytashek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anton Waytashek of Pierz, Minn., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Anton Waytashek against the United States arising out of the loss of an eye by Gerald Waytashek, his minor son, due to the explosion on October 13, 1940, of a cartridge which had been left in a field near the Waytashek home during Army maneuvers in the summer of 1940 and later found by the said Gerald Waytashek's older brother

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500."

At the end of the bill, add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. W. A. BATCHELOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3801, for the relief of W. A. Batchelor and wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. A. Batchelor, of Overton, Tex., the sum of $3,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. A. Batchelor and of his wife, Mrs. W. A. Batchelor, against the United States arising out of a collision on December 24, 1938, on United States Highway No. 80, about 5½ miles west of Minden, La., between a car in which they were passengers and a truck owned by the Department of Agriculture. Such collision resulted in personal injuries to the said W. A. Batchelor and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor and in the damage and loss of personal property of the said W. A. Batchelor and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, beginning with the initial "W.", strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof: "Mr. and Mrs. W. Batchelor, of Overton, Tex., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and property damage sustained in a collision on December 24, 1938, near Minden, La., when the automobile in which they were passengers was struck by a truck owned by the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor."

TONY CIRONE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4045, for the relief of Tony Cirone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Tony Cirone the sum of $124.80, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages to a truck belonging to the said Tony Cirone while the same was being used on a project of the Work Projects Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Lines 5 and 6, strike out "the sum of $124.80" and insert in lieu thereof "of Trinidad, Colo., the sum of $100."

Line 9, strike out "Work Projects Administration" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Works Progress Administration on August 31, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW WICHMANN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4414, for the relief of Andrew Wichmann.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Andrew Wichmann, Lemay, Mo., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Robert Wichmann, a minor, on August 7, 1938, as the result of personal injuries sustained on July 21, 1938, by the said Robert Wichmann, by falling into an unguarded excavation being operated by the Work Projects Administration, project No. O. P. No. 465-55-2-338: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000."

Line 11, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. S. JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4556, for the relief of L. S. Jones.

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400 to L. S. Jones, rural free delivery route No. 4, Meridian, Miss., to reimburse him for damages to a motor vehicle belonging to him which was rendered practically worthless as the result of a gun battle between special agents of the Department of Justice, aided by local peace officers, and two malefactors, James Earlie Holland and Armand Clay Davis, on April 16, 1939, near Lauderdale, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAY BELLAMY VEIRS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4459, to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period from September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, are hereby validated, and the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Commander R. S. Robertson, Supply Corps, United States Navy, with the sum of $1,488.63, which sum represents the difference between payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Veirs during the aforesaid period and the monthly benefits allowed veterans having no dependents while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1070; 38 U. S. C., Supp. V., sec. 706b).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARVY A. LOTHMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 212, for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Arvy A. Lothman, assistant meteorologist, United States Weather Bureau, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $600, in full settlement of claim for loss and damage to household effects by fire and water while said household effects were being transported from San Francisco to Boston in March 1939, via the steamship *Texan* of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., in consequence of change of station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIZZIE SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4359, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the patent in fee No. 1010067 issued to Lizzie Smith under date of December 15, 1927, covering her allotment of land on the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont., described as follows: West half of section 17, township 31 north; east half southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 34 and the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 27, township 28 north, all in range 53 east, Montana meridian in Montana, containing 380 acres, and to issue to her a trust patent in lieu thereof covering the same land to be held in trust for her sole use and benefit or, in case of her decease, for the sole use and benefit of her lawful heirs and devisees for the same period under the same conditions as other trust patents are held on that reservation as extended by the last proclamation of the President relating to the said reservation: *Provided*, That any valid encumbrances now resting against any of the said land shall not in any manner be affected by the provisions of this act, but any of such land so encumbered, if still owned by the allottee, heirs, or devisees, shall, when such encumbrances have been removed, become subject to the provisions of this act as fully and to the same extent as if such land were now unencumbered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN STENCIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 191) for the relief of Franklin Stencil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Franklin Stencil, Cayuga, N. Dak., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Franklin Stencil against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on March 4, 1940, when an automobile owned and driven by him was struck on South Dakota State

Highway No. 25, near Britton, S. Dak., by a truck in the service of the Work Projects Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and the remainder of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, on page 1, and lines 1 and 2, on page 2, and insert: "$400 for personal injuries and property damages, to Domonic Stencil, Cayuga, N. Dak., the sum of $5,000 on account of the death of his wife, Rose Stencil. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained when the car in which they were riding was struck by a truck in the service of the Work Projects Administration on March 4, 1940, near Britton, S. Dak.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Franklin Stencil and Domonic Stencil."

LAURA McSTAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1855) for the relief of Laura McStay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laura McStay, of Monterey, Calif., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Laura McStay for damages on account of injuries sustained by her when a stone from a blast set off by Work Projects Administration employees working on the Monterey Presidio Grounds, Monterey, Calif., came down on the top of her passing car on April 26, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert "$2,500", and in line 8, page 1, strike out "by the said Laura McStay."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we were to stop at this point and I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understood that we agreed to stop after Calendar No. 285, H. R. 2434, was called.

Mr. HANCOCK. Very well, I have no objection to that.

MARGARET S. HOLTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of Margaret S. Holton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret S. Holton, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising from the death of Mary Schramm Alexander, the mother of the said Margaret S. Holton, who died on May 18, 1939, as a result of being struck by a truck driven by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Holton" and insert "Holten", and in line 6, page 1, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500"; and in line 9, strike out "Holton" and insert "Holten."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Margaret S. Holten."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, that is as far as we intended to go today. I move that further proceedings of the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PUNISHING WILLFUL OBSTRUCTION OF RECRUITING

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4868) to amend section 3 of title 1 of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of title 1 of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 219), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies and whoever, when the United States is at war, or during a national emergency declared by the President to exist, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand the gentleman from Georgia is going to offer an amendment to this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which I shall offer which I understand is satisfactory to the minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the other members of the minority, and it has been accepted by me, the author of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What will this amendment do?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is to strike out on page 2, line 3, the words "or during a national emergency declared by the President to exist" and in line 7, to insert the following: "And whenever the United States is at war or during the national emergency declared by the President to exist on September 8, 1939." The gentleman from New York prepared the amendment and I understand there is no objection to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That confines it entirely to recruiting of members of the naval forces?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. The amendment was submitted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary that reported the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And in the event that this amendment should be changed in the Senate, would the gentleman insist on the House version in conference?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This is a bill which came up on the Consent Calendar yesterday. Some question was raised as to the extent of the application of the bill. The bill is now brought up again with the understanding that the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, will propose an amendment which will satisfactorily meet the question raised on yesterday. The Committee on the Judiciary passed on the original bill and I reported the bill for the committee.

Mr. SABATH. What does it do?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This bill as amended by the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, amends the existing law so as to set up a penalty for interference with enlistments in the

Navy during the period of the emergency. It extends the present law, which provides a penalty for interference with enlistments in the Navy only during wartime.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday several Members expressed some dissatisfaction with the way it was worded. Since that time with the proposed amendment, those who objected to it yesterday are completely satisfied and have no objection to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I might explain for the RECORD that while the Committee on the Judiciary has not had an opportunity to reconsider this bill in the light of the amendment, I have spoken to many members of that committee on both the majority and minority side, and I feel that it has the unanimous accord of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 2, after the comma following the word "war," in lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "or during a national emergency declared by the President to exist," and strike out the word "or" in line ', and insert after the word "states," in line 7 the following words "and whoever, when the United States is at war or during the national emergency declared by the President to exist on September 8, 1939."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. SABATH. Mr Speaker, I call up House Resolution 223 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the appropriations and language providing for the National Youth Administration and the appropriations and language for all items specifically earmarked for national defense for such year

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. This is a privileged resolution. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] desire any time on the rule?

Mr. MICHENER. I would like to make a short statement.

Mr. SABATH. Very well. I will yield later on.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is required because the committee having in charge this appropriation bill was informed that points of order would be raised. Naturally points of order against many of the defense provisions in this bill would be sustained, because the committee having this bill in charge has included in the bill many provisions that are not authorized by law. Those provisions, all defense items, amount to about $181,000,000; but the committee came to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary that this legislation should be considered and that these defense items included in the bill should not be eliminated by any points of order. Consequently the Rules Committee came to the rescue of the Appropriations Committee and granted a rule waiving points of order that would be raised against the defense provisions in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. As soon as I explain the provisions.

For the information of the House the report shows on page 3 all the items that are being made in order by the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee does not look with a great deal of favor on committees bringing in bills, especially calling for appropriations where no authority has been heretofore granted. Not only does the Rules Committee look with disfavor upon the granting of rules of that kind, but the Rules Committee also feels—and I might as well be candid with the House—that henceforth any and all committees that come in for a rule will have to show a clean bill. What I mean is, not come before the Rules Committee and say, "We will amend the bill when it reaches the floor if a rule is granted." The committee feels that such rules should not be granted and will not be granted in the future. But in this instance we felt that it was for national defense and that the committee having charge of this appropriation bill had carefully examined the need of each and every provision in the bill.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House, going over each and every item in the bill, but as I say, the total amounts to about $181,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania may ask "Where are you going to get the money?" I feel that the Government will be able to get the money for these needy national defense items provided in the bill. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman forecast one question that I would ask, naturally, but I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that he has never shown since he has been here any disposition to try to balance the Budget or even come approximately close to it.

Mr. SABATH. Well, what is the question?

Mr. RICH. The question is this: The Rules Committee comes in here with a special rule——

Mr. SABATH. What is the question, please?

Mr. RICH. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks it is the proper way to legislate for the Rules Committee, a committee of the House of Representatives, to come in here and grant a rule making these things permissible when they could be objected to because of the fact that they have never been permitted. The Rules Committee should not legislate for the rest of us. We should assume our responsibility. I say it is high time that Members of the House stopped giving that power to the President of the United States or to the Rules Committee. It is not right. It is a travesty on justice.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield any further for a speech. The gentleman makes so many of them every session that I think it is not necessary to take up the time of the House now. I refuse to yield any further, but I will answer the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman that the Rules Committee does not deprive anybody of the right to vote against the provisions in the bill. We merely make it possible that they can be considered in the House.

A point of order is a technical matter. We realize that and have called attention to it. I call the attention now of all the committees that henceforth we shall be very reluctant to grant rules to make in order on appropriation bills provisions that have not been authorized.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman admits by that very statement that this is wrong.

Mr. SABATH. In the gentleman's mind everything is wrong, but I believe he in wrong nearly every time he rises in his seat. The trouble is he likes to hear himself talk. He makes it appear that he is very serious, then turns around and laughs about it, but the laughs and the smiles do not appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He is speaking only for the RECORD so that the people at home or throughout the country may read what he has to say. But I do not blame him, I do not blame him. He is playing politics, he is criticizing the administration. I venture to say that notwithstanding his objections and his daily inquiries as to where you are going to get the money, he has voted for nearly every one of these appropriations and for nearly all of the expenditures here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He knows that is not true. He knows that is not true, yet he stands up there and makes a statement like that. He ought to be ashamed of himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. I have heard that statement on his part many times: "You ought to be ashamed of yourself." If anybody should be ashamed of himself I think it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania for making such rash statements. I will show many, many votes he cast for appropriation bills. The gentleman of course has a right to object and a right to vote against measures, and I believe in some of the instances he might have been right, because perhaps we have appropriated

frequently money that should not have been appropriated, and I feel the same way he does as to trying to bring about economy. I do not, however, talk about it so much, when it comes to the test I vote my convictions. But I am not going to, because of my great friendship for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, say that his votes do not always coincide with his statements, and I am not going to take up much of the time of the House. All I wish to say further is that I hope in the future the appropriations subcommittees will not include in their bills provisions calling for large sums of money that have not been authorized by the Congress. And this applies also to the other committees that come before the Committee on Rules for rules on bills that have not been completely agreed upon, promising that correcting amendments will be offered on the floor.

We have reluctantly agreed to this rule recognizing and realizing the need for the items included in this bill. In view of the fact that the majority of the committee, even the Members on the Republican side, voted to grant the rule I hope there will be no serious objection to passing the rule making in order these needed appropriations called for in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan and reserve the balance of my 30 minutes. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will yield some time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to whom I could not have yielded sufficient of my time for him to make a speech.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, never since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives have I heard such an apologetic statement as that just made by the gentleman from Illinois when he admitted that this legislation was wrong on the face of it. He said so over and over again, at least half a dozen times in his request that committees of the House not come to the Committee on Rules asking for a rule so that no one could make a point of order against legislation on appropriation bills. I never heard one so willingly admit the poor qualities of the legislation we are to be compelled to swallow.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman state to the House whether or not if he had the opportunity he would make the point of order against the item for the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RICH. Certainly, I would. Would not the gentleman?

Mr. COCHRAN. No, I would not.

Mr. RICH. We have rules supposed to govern the conduct of the House, and those rules prohibit legislation on appropriation bills, yet we have these things slipped into appropriation bills all the time. I am not going to have the House of Representatives here run on any such basis if I can prevent it. I have never been noted for trying to get around rules, and I am not two-faced enough to stand up here today and say I would not make the point of order. If I were two-faced I would not be wearing the one I am wearing now.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is qualifying his statement by saying he would make the point of order on procedural grounds; but would the gentleman make the point of order, if he had the opportunity, to destroy the National Youth Administration entirely? That is the question.

Mr. RICH. That would not destroy the National Youth Administration entirely.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman answers my question, I say it does.

Mr. RICH. It does not. If you are to give $181,000,000 to the National Youth Administration it should be done in such way as not to be subject to a point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is not answering my question. I asked the gentleman if he would make the point of order if he knew——

Mr. RICH. Yes; I would make the point of order; certainly I would.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman would?

Mr. RICH. Certainly I would. Do you want me to say it again? Yes; I would.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all I want to know.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that when we legislate in this manner we are going far afield from good legislation. We have been doing this for 8 years, ever since this administration came into power. It has been doing everything it could, either open and aboveboard or in an underhanded way, to accomplish its desires. That has been the record of the New Deal ever since I have known it. Of course, they have some nice fellows on that side of the aisle. I like them all, but they do things on the floor of the House here that they would not do if they did it on their own individual responsibilities, in other words, were not compelled to do it, because they are driven from the other end of the Avenue.

Whenever the other end of the Avenue cracks the whip up there you fellows get up and march down the aisle one by one just like Sunday-school scholars as if you are compelled to do it. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] a question? We take his advice and counsel, but when we as individual Members think he is wrong, and if he wanted us to do something that he thought was right, we have a right to express our own individual opinions; is that not a fact?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly it is.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think those Members on that side are able to express their own opinion when it comes to orders from the White House? Certainly he does not.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts go down the aisle together.

Mr. RICH. I go down the aisle with the gentleman from Missouri sometimes, but many times I cannot think of going down the aisle with him.

Now, what is the situation so far as this legislation is concerned? The Rules Committee comes in here and calls this a national emergency. Everything now is based on the national emergency. What are we coming to? You are saying that this is for a national emergency. You are making great appropriations. We give the President the power to do certain things under the national emergency, even to giving away our materials to foreign governments, if he sees fit. It does not seem right, it does not seem logical, and it does not seem sensible. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, has said some things that are not exactly correct. The able gentleman from Pennsylvania has said some things that are not quite accurate, and, after all, neither one has said a great deal in reference to the matter now pending before the House.

The Rules Committee has been severely castigated because of its conduct. The committee is an agency set up by the Congress, and reports rules to the House. Following the democratic processes, the House has the right to pass affirmatively or negatively on any matter submitted to the House by the Rules Committee.

The matter before the House at the moment is, Shall points of order be waived against certain items carried in an appropriation bill? The House has the right to say whether or not it wants to waive points of order against those items. If it does, it votes "yea." If it does not, it votes "nay." In the final analysis, therefore, it is the will of the House and not the will of the Rules Committee that is given expression by action of the House on a rule. In short, the Rules Committee makes it possible for the House to work its will concerning the matter at issue.

So far as this particular rule is concerned, the Rules Committee voted to report it to the House, but I am opposed, and so stated in the Rules Committee, to this constant repetition. For instance, this appropriation bill contains an appropriation for the National Youth Administration. Without discussing the merits of the items in the bill, I am opposed to the Appropriations Committee coming in here year after year asking the Congress to waive points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee can stop this procedure if it will.

I believe that the legislative committees of this House have a function to perform. They are not mere formalities. I believe that matters which should rightfully go before the legislative committees should go before those legislative committees and be considered by those committees, and the House given the opportunity to pass upon the policy reported from the proper legislative committee. Now, I do not know just who is to blame, but year after year the Appro-

priations Committee brings this same matter before the House in this form. It cannot justify that position and will not attempt to justify it under parliamentary procedure or under democratic procedure.

Occasionally, as in the instant case, we find an appropriation bill brought upon the floor which contains items that are presently necessary to the carrying on of the Government. No authority has ever been granted by the Congress for those items. It is necessary because of an emergency to move points of order. If you vote down this rule you will delay the appropriation for a day or two. I do not like this procedure. I do not think it ought to be done this way. This method of ignoring the legislative committee has become a habit and the Rules Committee is condemned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania when the Appropriations Committee of which he is a member is to blame.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have we not on many occasions sustained points of order as to these matters; the bill goes over to the Senate, the Senate reinstates the matter, then they are not subject to a point of order when it comes back? Does not the gentleman anticipate these matters will come back in the same manner if they are eliminated now?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but I do not think that is sufficient excuse to warrant changing the rules of the House. It is an excuse that is often made on the floor of the House. When an agricultural bill is being considered, some Member, who wants to get credit for getting something for agriculture, will say, "If we do not do this, the Senate is going to do it, and the Senators will get the credit."

The distinguished chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee applies that principle. He says, "I concede in substance that this method is wrong. I concede we should not do it this way." I am reading his mind. He has not used those words, but he will not challenge the words I am placing in his mouth. He says, "It is wrong to do it this way, but when the bill goes over to the Senate, the Senate will include these items, then the bill will go to a conference committee, and the House conferees will not have the courage to stand up and insist on the position of the House, but will yield to the conferees on the part of the Senate. The Senate will have its way, and in the end the same thing will be accomplished as is accomplished if points of order are waived as provided in this rule." This is not a case where the end justifies the means.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I imagine several other Members are in that same predicament. I personally am in favor of providing money to the N. Y. A. to carry on this training program that is necessary in defense. If I am in favor of that, then, of course, I should vote in favor of the rule; otherwise the appropriation might be knocked out by a point of order. Is that the right interpretation?

Mr. MICHENER. That is the correct situation. If you vote against the rule, then it will make it possible to strike from this bill the N. Y. A. appropriation. I speak of that agency in particular, because, as I recall, it was created in the first instance by Executive order without the authority of Congress. The Congress has never voted on whether or not there should be a National Youth Administration as now administered. As an emergency measure it was established by an Executive order. Then, after the agency was established and the work was in progress, the Committee on Appropriations was asked to furnish the money to carry on the activity of the agency.

When the matter was before the Committee on Rules a year ago on a request for the same kind of a rule, I insisted that this year the Committee on Appropriations refuse to bring in an appropriation unless the appropriation had been authorized according to the rules of the House. Yet here we find another year gone; no action by the legislative committee, and the Appropriations Committee again recommends an unauthorized appropriation and asks for a rule to violate the parliamentary procedure of the House. You will find the same thing happening next year unless something is done about it. Enough of this kind of conduct will destroy the usefulness of both the Appropriations and the Rules Committees.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania had the same purpose in mind as my friend from Michigan had in raising a question with reference to this procedure. While there may have been some facetiousness in connection with the colloquy between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was motivated by much the same spirit as my friend from Michigan in criticizing the matter. Is that a fair observation to make?

Mr. MICHENER. I can say it is fair as far as my motives are concerned. I assume the motives of the gentleman from Pennsylvania were similar to those prompting me.

Mr. DITTER. May I ask the gentleman a question now? I believe the gentleman expressed some doubt as to where the blame should be placed for the irregularity of the parliamentary procedure he is presently criticizing. Speaking for myself, and, of course, in a very humble way, I feel that the blame without question is squarely at the door of the administration and the leadership on the majority side. None of us on the minority side has any part at all in this procedure by which appropriations are made without any authorization. For myself I make that declaration. If the gentleman is uncertain as to where the blame is to be placed, I place it squarely at the doorstep of the majority.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has undoubtedly placed the baby on the right doorstep. He is possibly a little more outspoken than I am on some occasions. I did not want to get anything into this debate that might savor of politics or anything of that kind, regardless of provocation amounting to justification. However, the gentleman is undoubtedly 100 percent correct, and I concur 100 percent in everything he has said, and admire him for his courage in saying it.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman did not imply in any way that there was any partisan political purpose in my mind when I made that observation as to where the blame should be placed. My only purpose was to keep the record straight. Because of either the gentleman's graciousness or his usual suavity he failed to make a positive declaration, and I thought probably he would appreciate the contribution I might bring in connection with this question.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, no one would think for one moment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] ever thought in political terms. [Laughter and applause.]

You applaud that statement. Politics is the science of government, and I am sure that at times the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] does think in political terms; and thank God we have men in these days who dare stand up and fight and say the things they believe to be for the best interest of their country, even at the risk of being called partisans. As long as we have the two-party system, let us hope that there will ever be on the minority side of the aisle a militant, fair, and conservative—I use that word advisedly, not in connection with radicalism—a conservative minority party fulfilling its duty as a constitutional minority party.

Do you realize—if I may take a moment to call attention to the great English Parliament—that it always has a minority party, and this minority group in that Parliament has always been given a place of honor to the right of the speaker on the floor. The members of that minority are referred to as "His Majesty's most loyal opposition." You find on this side of the aisle today "His Majesty's most loyal opposition." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman mean by "His Majesty"? [Laughter.] Is the gentleman speaking about the gentleman who now sits in the White House? I hope not.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman and I are thinking along the same lines. Possibly, however, we express ourselves differently. Yes; I have reference to the President, and I speak sincerely. The gentleman from Pennsylvania might refer to Franklin I. Maybe my language is unfortunate, but it was my purpose to convey the thought that the Republican minority in the House has criticized and

expects to continue constructive and helpful criticism of all legislation presented to the Congress. We shall continue to support the President when we feel that the best interests of the country justify such support. By the same token, we shall oppose him when we think otherwise. In taking this position we are not politically partisan and want it distinctly understood that we are acting entirely as the President's most loyal opposition. Loyal to our country and to its institutions, but critical of anything that might destroy or impair the perpetuity of our country, its Constitution, and its traditions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I think in justice to the Appropriations Committee I ought to make a brief statement with regard to this resolution.

This is not a novel procedure. We have had, I believe, the N. Y. A. ever since 1935. This House never could have given consideration to any N. Y. A. appropriation except for the adoption of a rule of this character, and the fact that it has adopted such rules in the past has evidenced the desire on the part of the House to consider it.

The so-called defense items in the bill largely consist of appropriations proposed for the youth-training program. The Congress during the last session made two deficiency appropriations, aggregating $41,000,000, to the Office of Education for the purpose of instituting this program, neither of which could have been made had not points of order against the proposed appropriations been waived, and also appropriations for similar purposes to the N. Y. A.

The Appropriations Committee received, by transmission through the President's office, the estimates of the Budget for these activities, and in view of the action of the House in past sessions in considering items of a similar character and the fact that these items of appropriation merely propose to carry forward for another fiscal year what has heretofore been passed upon favorably by the House, we conceived it to be our duty to use such steps as might be possible to bring the appropriations in the bill to the floor of the House for its consideration. I may say that the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was consulted by me prior to the application for the rule with regard to the desirability of asking unanimous consent to waive points of order against these items and he expressed no objection whatever to that procedure. It was on account of some other threatened objection on the minority side, which, in my judgment, does not represent a very large proportion of the minority, that it was necessary to ask the Rules Committee for the submission of a rule. I do not think any lengthy discussion with regard to where the blame is, if there is any blame concerning the failure of Congress to legislatively authorize these objectives for which these appropriations are sought, is necessary. I certainly do not feel that any blame rests either on the Appropriations Committee or on the Committee on Rules. Whether any blame is attributable to inaction on the part of the legislative committees having jurisdiction, I would not undertake to say, but for my own part I would not like to vote at this time on the question of permanently authorizing the National Youth Administration.

It was set up as an emergency organization. I think it has performed a very useful purpose. I think it is performing a very useful purpose today, but until the period of the emergency has ended and we are able to evaluate its accomplishments and determine whether or not it ought to be made a permanent part of our governmental structure, I do not think the Congress ought to consider legislation proposing to make it a permanent organization, and therefore in my opinion the matter of appropriations for the National Youth Administration is more properly handled at this time as an emergency measure and under procedure such as is being followed in the House today rather than the way it would be handled if we insisted that the legislative committee having jurisdiction report authorization legislation to the House.

So far as these defense items are concerned, I think nobody wants to delay the training of the workers so urgently needed in defense industries and for which Congress has already made appropriations in the past until some legislative committee can thresh out the question of just what sort of legislation ought to be enacted to authorize these activities. This defense problem is an urgent one. It is one which we must deal with as quickly and as effectively as we can. This is one of the measures by which we are undertaking to deal with it and it is a measure which, in my judgment, receives the approval of at least 99 percent of the membership of the House, and if such a large proportion of the membership of the House wants to do a thing is there any harm in going to the Rules Committee and asking for a rule which will permit them to do it? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and others, it is up to the House to do as it may desire. The House can vote down the rule or it can vote for it, but this rule makes in order provisions in which we are all interested. I did not wish to read them all, but the rule provides for appropriations for vocational education and for many other things that each and every one of us, even the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], I know are interested in.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has stated that he is pleased that we have a two-party organization and he is pleased that we have a real fighting minority. To him and his colleagues I will say that I hope they will continue for many, many years to be in that fighting minority. [Applause.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. In connection with the gentleman's expression of the hope that the conservatives will be the minority party, let me quote Disraeli, who said, "The conservative party in power is an organized hypocrisy against the people." So I concur in the gentleman's wishes.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

JESS W. HARMON

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is passing a Senate bill in lieu of a House bill.

Mr. GORE. The situation is that on the Private Calendar we passed the bill, H. R. 2920, which is identical with the Senate bill. We stopped proceedings under the call of the calendar before we reached the Senate bill, which is also on the calendar. All that I am asking is that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Perhaps I do not understand. But I understood the gentleman to say that we already passed the bill.

Mr. GORE. We passed the House bill, which is identical with the Senate bill, which is a little further down on the calendar, and which I am asking now to be passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then there were two bills on the one calendar which were identical?

Mr. GORE. Yes; identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jess W. Harmon, the sum of $1,372.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for permanent personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident in which his car was struck by a truck driven by an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps who was acting in the scope of his employment on July 7, 1939, near Muskogee, Oklahoma: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, page 1, strike out "$1,372.20" and insert "$4,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings under which the bill H. R. 2920, of similar title, was passed, will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a petition in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. In the usual way?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, one by the insertion of an article from the New York Sun, and the other by the insertion of an article from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4926, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4926, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the order of yesterday general debate is closed, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, namely:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this in order to comment on this language:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

That is about the most foolish thing to have in a bill that ever was, because we all know that there is not any money in the Treasury that is not already appropriated. From the looks of things, we are not going to have anything in there that will not be appropriated; but I call attention to this bill. Secretary Morgenthau made the statement 3 or 4 weeks ago that we would have to cut down the regular appropriations of the Government by $1,000,000,000. According to the newspapers a couple of weeks ago, the Speaker of the House said he was going up to the White House for the purpose of determining how we were going to cut down the regular appropriations. That was good news to the public, that they were going to cut down something; but when you come back here on the floor of the House, neither the President nor the Secretary of the Treasury, nor the Speaker of the House, nor the majority leader, nor anyone on the majority side, paid the least attention to trying to cut down the regular appropriations. What do we find? This bill makes appropriations for the Department of Labor, for the Federal Security Agency, and related independent offices for the fiscal year 1942. You have appropriated in this bill $35,848,778 more than you appropriated for the same agencies a year ago. If that is not the most inconsistent thing I have ever heard about! Here this administration is talking one thing and doing something else. That is the same course that they have been following for the past 8 years. They have made this country almost a financial wreck. They have created the largest national debt in the history of the world. Since 1933 this administration has created a national debt in size twice over the debt at the highest peak it ever was after the World War.

The appropriations you are now making are going to be three or four times more than the amount of money you will get in. Then we get a lot of satisfaction in saying, "We are under the Budget estimate." That Budget officer who is appointed by the President of the United States has not been consistent in trying to cut down expenses since he has been in office. The only Budget officer that this administration had who tried to do a good job was Lewis Douglas, and he became so discouraged with the administration and the way they brought in appropriations, after the President said he would do a good job, that he resigned.

Now, there you have it in a nutshell. This administration will not cut down appropriations. There is nobody on this side of the House who wants to see them cut down, because they are not making any proposals to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Which side of the House?

Mr. RICH. The New Deal side. Anybody who knows anything about what has happened in the last 8 years knows what side I mean. The New Deal side of the House will not cut down appropriations. They do not know how to cut down appropriations. They never did balance the Budget and they never will balance the Budget. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in looking over this report, I see there is a reduction of over $31,000,000 plus as compared with the 1942 Budget estimate. I also find that the committee has taken it upon itself to reduce the National Youth Administration $10,000,000 and the Civilian Conservation Corps $23,000,000.

There has been a juggling of figures, so to speak—an increase in some appropriations and a decrease in others—until in the final recapitulation we find an actual reduction of $31,069,022.

I come from a great city. I have heard in the last few days some speeches with reference to the W. P. A., the National Youth Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps. True, it may be said they are the pets of the Members who come from the large cities.

Last Thursday the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made certain references to the administration of the Work Projects Administration in New York State, reading a letter, or part thereof, which the gentleman stated had been sent out. Of course, we all know the gentleman has been critical of W. P. A. from the outset, and on numerous occasions has assailed projects and officials in his own State. That, of course, is his right.

I have discussed the policy that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] referred to last week with Acting Administrator Hunter, and I am of the opinion the gentleman from New York has drawn inaccurate conclusions in this respect; in fact, it appears to me his argument demonstrates a total lack of understanding of the problems involved.

Section 15 (a) of the Emergency Relief Act for the fiscal year 1941 specifically provides that preference in employment by the W. P. A. shall be given on the basis of relative need. In other words, those persons who are in the greatest relative need are given employment before those in relatively lesser need. Mr. Hunter feels the action taken in New York State is exactly in accordance with this provision of the law.

The letter referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was intended to point out that since those in the greatest need had been provided for, there was now some opportunity to take care of those persons who were eligible for certification to the W. P. A., but for whom it was not possible to provide jobs while there were other persons in greater relative need.

In view of the law, I wish to point out that this action in no way constitutes a solicitation of trade or a relinquishing of a very strict standard of eligibility.

After a thorough review of the situation, the gentleman from New York referred to, I am convinced his reference to "racketeers" was unfair.

Mr. Chairman, I now take up the appropriation for the National Youth Administration. I say in all seriousness, I think one of the most dangerous elements we have to contend with in this country is the youth of the Nation. Young men and young women, graduates from colleges and universities, receive their diplomas and they come back home with an excellent education, ready to accept a job in industry; and for years past they could not find jobs, except the boy with a pick and shovel and the girl either at housework or a sewing machine.

Within the next few weeks hundreds of thousands of young men and women will graduate from high schools, colleges, and universities. They will be at once seeking employment.

When educated young people who will gather in meetings, dissatisfied because they cannot find employment, it is not the best for our Nation. Year after year I have seen young people come to Washington. I have seen them in groups, some of them extremely radical; some of them forgetting themselves to such an extent that they were even disrespectful to the President and his wife.

The National Youth Administration is helping to take care of that situation by placing young people to work. The Civilian Conservation Corps is likewise helping to take care of that situation. I say it is a mistake at this time, until we can find a way to place young people in industry, to cut these appropriations to the extent they have been reduced.

Some Members feel that because of the national-defense program we should practically eliminate the W. P. A. organization. Let me impress upon you that W. P. A. is taking care of the people who are termed "unemployables"; people who cannot secure work in private industry. People who are partly disabled or have reached the age where private industry will not employ them. Those advanced in years are not eligible for old-age assistance but they are turned away when they appear at the office of a corporation or a factory gate.

Let me show you a situation that exists in the big cities.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN In just a moment. Let me show you the situation in my home city, St. Louis. A Republican mayor of St. Louis making his first visit to the capitol of our State in support of legislation did so for what? To appeal to the legislature for $3,000,000 additional in the appropriation for direct relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the Committee would have no objection if the gentleman were addressing himself to a real amendment instead of a pro forma amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am addressing myself to the paragraph, Mr. Chairman, which refers to the appropriation for social security, to items in the bill under title II, social security.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will not object at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. The mayor asked the legislature for $3,000,000 additional to take care of direct relief in the city of St. Louis, and let me impress upon you right now that there is no Federal contribution for direct relief.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I know the gentleman from Missouri wants not only to be fair but also authentic and correct. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that W. P. A. was intended to take care of the employable unemployed. That is the program of the administration with reference to W. P. A., and the administrators of the program in times past all have carried out that idea, and the present Administrator under appointment acknowledges the same thing, that it is for the employable unemployed.

Mr. COCHRAN. We will call them the employable unemployed, but in the final analysis they are those that cannot find work in offices, or the factories will not accept and put to work, as well as those partly disabled.

Mr. DITTER. They do not fall in the classification of those to whom W. P. A. was supposed to afford work opportunity.

Mr. COCHRAN. It must be admitted that those who are employed on W. P. A. are certified as in need. If those people could secure employment in private industry where they could receive twice, three times, or four times as much as they are receiving on W. P. A. does anyone here mean to say they would not accept that employment?

I want to impress upon you that we are faced with a situation in the large cities of this country that we are going to be compelled to meet. We are spending now in St. Louis, with this $3,000,000 additional for direct relief, $9,000,000; that is the biennial allotment and, as I say, this is $9,000,000 of the money of the State of Missouri. Not one single cent is added by the United States Government. Direct relief is not in any way connected with Federal aid. I doubt if that will be sufficient but it is all the State revenues can afford.

Now as to the Civilian Conservation Corps. You are going to have plenty of trouble when you start to reduce the number of C. C. C. camps throughout the country. It is my view that the Civilian Conservation Corps can be made a very valuable adjunct to the national defense by providing for voluntary military training in the Civilian Conservation Corps. I do not mean compulsory military training, but let those boys who desire to have military training secure it in the Conservation Corps. You never saw young men in finer physical condition than the boys engaged in the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps. In the summertime as you drive along, stripped to the waist you find them nothing but one mass of muscle. Army officers will tell you that the big job they had during the period of the World War was not to teach the man how to shoulder a gun but to put him in physical condition so he could stand the gaff. These boys are in that physical condition, and those who desire to take military training should be given such training. In that way—God forbid that the day ever arrives but if it does arrive, when they are called they will be ready to respond, physically fit, and properly trained.

I cannot agree that this committee has done a good job even though it has reduced the appropriation $31,000,000, because of the fact that the largest amount has been taken from the appropriations which I feel should not have been reduced below the 1942 Budget estimate.

Now take the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, another office the big cities are interested in. The appropriation for the present fiscal year was $5,428,800, while the Budget estimate for the next fiscal year was $5,406,810. Here you find the committee recommending $4,697,700, which is $709,110 below the Budget estimate. This amount comes off of the appropriation set aside for salary. I wish someone would tell me how you can expect this agency to operate even on the basis that it is now operating with an appropriation reduced over $700,000. Only a few days ago a lengthy article appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, where charges were made that the law was not being properly enforced in the State of Missouri. I have not had time to investigate to determine whether those charges are correct, but the officials of the Wage and Hour Division did deny the charges. There has been a complaint that proper inspections have not been made; that conditions exist that should not be tolerated. Again I say I cannot comment upon the charges, but one thing I do know is that we were told, and we expected that when this law was passed limiting hours of labor as well as providing a minimum wage that several million unemployed would find work. If the law was enforced as Congress intended it should be—and it can be enforced if we give the administration a sufficient sum—then undoubtedly jobs will be provided for the unemployed, because the employer certainly would add to the number of employees rather than pay overtime to his present personnel. If we are going to pass laws we should be willing to provide proper appropriations to carry out the provisions of the acts we pass. In this instance I feel, as much as I want to save money in normal expenditures, that the reduction will be harmful rather than beneficial. I would like to see the amount restored to somewhere near the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. So long as we fail to give the Administrator proper personnel we would, by no means, be justified in criticizing the administration of the act if information came to us complaining of lack of enforcement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman from Missouri correctly, he said that one of the most dangerous elements in this country is the youth of the land. If this be true, the fault lies not with the young people but with the example we have set for them, the example we have given them during the last few years. It is planting time in Michigan. On the Clyde Swamp in Allegan County, farmers are doing their part, regardless of the wage-hour law, the N. L. R. A., or any other Federal law. Farmers were driving their tractors as late as 10 and 11 o'clock at night with the use of spotlights. In the morning as early as 5:30 o'clock, farmers and members of their families were down on their

knees in their fields weeding their crops, celery, cabbage, and similar market crops. They were putting in 12 to 14 to 16 hours a day. This, so city people may eat this winter.

I learned, too, from some of my friends at home that not only did the farmers have difficulty in getting in the crop and caring for it, because some of their sons were taken away to the camps, had been conscripted, but that when some of the older men went to seek work in those camps this administration followed a course which made it impossible for them to get jobs in those camps until they came across with their $57.50 for a work permit. Then I recall that a Senate committee disclosed that in one of these camps one of these organizations which pays no income tax, which makes no accounting for the funds it receives, had collected around $800,000 from poor men for the privilege of working in national defense.

Then this morning I listened to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] tell you that when the farmers of his district in Michigan wanted to market their apples in the city of Detroit they had to pay $25 in order to drive into that city; they were compelled to join an organization before they could furnish the food to the man who was charging that fee. Then I remembered that the farmers in my own district, the Hamilton Cooperative, which markets two or three carloads of eggs and a large amount of poultry each week in the city of Chicago, and other cities, to feed the workingmen of Chicago, and of other cities, had to pay a $50 membership fee before they could get into the city to furnish food to the people there who are hungry. They also had to pay $5 a month to those organizations before they could put their farm products on the market.

You talk about the youth of the land? When a young man grows up and he knows that he must work and he finds a job, then discovers he has to pay some organization which does not account for the money it collects, an organization which pays no taxes, which in some instances is controlled by Communists; when he discovers he has to pay another man and another organization for the privilege of purchasing the food that he must have to live, the privilege of earning the money to buy clothes and so forth, do you wonder he is sore? Do you wonder that he suspects there is something rotten in Washington? Are you surprised that he is dissatisfied and rebellious?

The gentleman from Missouri stated that some of the young people who came to Washington showed disrespect for the President of the United States. He might as well have said for the President's wife as well. But why should they not do that? Has not the President taught us in the last 8 years that no one need have any regard for the truth? Has he not made promise after promise to the people, promises which he has disregarded without flicking an eyelash? Has he not by his example shown the young people that neither truth nor honesty is respected in high places? Did not the President's wife go to the meeting of the Dies committee and take under her wing the Communists who threatened to overthrow our form of government or who are seeking the overthrow of our Government by force? Did she not go over there to the House caucus room and lend her moral support to the Communists when they were called to appear there and testify? She did. So why in God's name should anyone respect the First Lady of the land when she associates with and tries to protect the Communists, the enemies of our country? When she entertains them down at the White House, why should anyone respect her?

Is it not true that we have come now to such a situation that respect for truth and honesty no longer prevails? That respect for law and order do not abide in the Executive Mansion. If, as the gentleman said, some of our youth have no respect for the President or his wife the fault is not that of the young folk but is the direct and natural result of the acts of the occupants of the White House.

If, instead of deceiving the people, the President will tell them the truth; if he will keep the promises which he so solemnly and so repeatedly made in order to secure his own reelection; if the First Lady of the land will disassociate herself from the Communist, the subversive groups which have received her moral support; if she will show a little patriotism, a little thought for America first, the youth of the land will respect both the President and his wife.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have proceeded for 30 minutes so far and we have only read the enacting clause. I wish to serve notice at this time that the committee will object or make a point of order against any remarks, without regard to who may be addressing the committee, which are not addressed to the bill. It is necessary to do this if we are to make reasonable progress.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my remarks to the bill. In the committee print we find the Bureau of the Budget recommending an expenditure of $1,222,000,000 as compared with an appropriation in 1941 of $1,155,000,000. The amount recommended in the bill totals $1,191,000,000, or a decrease in the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget of $31,000,000. On that basis we are told that the committee recommends a decrease of $31,000,000. In truth, the appropriation for 1942 provides an increase of $35,000,000 over the appropriation for 1941.

In order to get a correct picture of this I repeat that the appropriation is $35,000,000 higher for 1942 than for 1941.

The Bureau of the Budget, the right arm of the President, is not very much concerned with what Secretary Morgenthau said when he asked for a billion-dollar decrease in nondefense appropriations for the next year. The Bureau of the Budget is the right hand and Mr. Morgenthau is the left hand, both a part of the administration. It is inconceivable to me that the President can place responsibility at the door of Congress when his own right hand and left hand fail to coordinate.

Nondefense expenditures provided in this appropriation bill represent the administration's wishes and from them we should expect recommendations consistent with the Secretary of the Treasury's statement that nondefense appropriations should be a billion dollars less. This is our opportunity to get a correct picture of the administration's sincerity in reducing expenditures. With each succeeding year the appropriations are higher because the Bureau of the Budget recommends that they be higher. For 1942 we have additional appropriations of $35,000,000 as compared with the current year 1941.

Sincerity and this administration are total strangers. The public is told that there should be a decrease of a billion dollars in nondefense appropriations. What has the administration done about it? We are confused here on the floor because we have nothing but confusion from the administration. It makes glowing statements regarding its policy, it sheds crocodile tears for the taxpayers on the one hand, but when we take them at their word and ask that they put it down in black and white, we find the administration has no regard for our intelligence. The committee points out how it reduced expenditures $31,000,000, but when you read the record you find it has increased the appropriations $35,000,000 over last year.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman really believe that the administration was serious when it made the recommendation to reduce the ordinary expenditures of the Government by a billion dollars?

Mr. BENDER. Of course, I do not, and the American people should not be fooled into believing that the administration was sincere when it made that statement. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it may serve a somewhat useful purpose, in view of the statements that have been made in reference to this bill up to date, that as one of the minority members of this subcommittee I say something about the bill. I do not believe anyone would accuse me of desiring to throw away the public purse, and I do not believe anyone would accuse the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], the other minority member of the subcommittee, of having any such purpose in mind. I am surprised that Members of the minority side would attempt to spread the gospel that there has been any attempt on the part of this committee to mislead anyone as to what this bill provides. The committee report states in plain language that the amount of this appropriation is some $35,000,000 more than the amount appropriated last year. That clearly is plain. If the gentlemen

who are so prolific in their talk on this and other bills would take the time to read the hearings and read this report, they would very soon find that as far as this particular appropriation bill is concerned our hands are tied in regard to most of the large items that are containe in the bill.

Will you kindly turn to page 2 of the recapitulation in the committee report and tell this Committee and the Congress how we are going to be able to change the necessary appropriations to carry out the provisions of title II, the Federal Security Agency? The Congress has already told us by legislative enactment what the program will be and this Committee has no course but to provide the funds necessary to take care of the activities.

You will find there that a large portion, over $600,000,000 as the report indicates, is carried in sums that are practically fixed in character by prior action of this Congress.

If you go further into the bill, read the report, and study the hearings, you will see that this committee by unanimous action, without any partisanship in the matter at all, worked assiduously day and night trying to accomplish cuts in this appropriation bill.

This appropriation bill contains appropriations for national defense of over $181,000,000, appropriations that came to us from the War and Navy Departments and the Office of Production Management, appropriations which they said were vital and necessary to national defense. Are the gentlemen who are criticizing the action of this committee going to be placed in the position of saying, "We shall deny the national defense the items that are so urgently necessary"?

These items came before our committee in supplemental appropriations. Although we reduced some of the items, we believed they were essential and necessary to national defense. There is $181,000,000 that has not heretofore been contained in this bill.

I believe that when you analyze this bill, without making speeches just thoughtlessly and heedlessly and becoming critical of your own membership on this committee, you will find that the committee has done a pretty good job on all of these items. It does not pay simply to stand up here and say, "Here is a challenge now to cut these appropriations in order to save $1,000,000,000."

I believe in the N. Y. A. and its activities. I believe in the proper administration of the C. C. C.

I direct my remarks to those that were made by the gentleman from Missouri, who apparently has not read the hearings and the testimony of Mr. McEntee, or he could not have made the statement he did make. This committee has offered you an appropriation for the C. C. C. based upon a supplementary estimate of the C. C. C., which was forced from them by action of the committee, reducing the amount by a very substantial sum. I think when we come to these items we will see that the committee has done a pretty good job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope that in the consideration of the bill we will not take a lot of time just making speeches denunciatory and critical of the committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I was in attendance on the hearings of the committee for weeks and weeks and weeks. I believe the members of the committee will say that neither the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] nor I are very prodigal in the expenditure of public funds, but there are some things that you cannot accomplish. I should like to see public expenditures reduced. I told you yesterday where you could reduce expenditures. I pointed out place after place where expenditures could be reduced, but I ask you again, can this Committee on Appropriations come in here with legislation on an appropriation bill to change the law the Congress has heretofore enacted? That is the duty of a legislative committee. That was my purpose in making the statement I did yesterday in connection with this bill. If you want to reduce expenditures, go to your legislative committee and amend the law to permit consolidation of activities, to permit the reduction of personnel. Then you will get some real reduction in expenditures. But I dislike this constant, carping criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, whose hands have been tied by legislative enactment heretofore.

I hope I am making myself clear in that respect. I should like to see the appropriations reduced in very material aspects, but the hands of the Committee on Appropriations are tied. We did reduce the appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division very materially. It is up to the Congress to determine whether that was a sane and sound procedure for us to adopt. We explained it. The chairman of the committee explained it yesterday to the mere handful who were here to listen to the report on this bill. Yet Members who were not here, who did not have the interest even to be here to hear the general debate on the bill, are now extremely critical of this Appropriations subcommittee.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I was here during the entire session yesterday and heard the gentleman's statement, and I commend him for it. I heard the other gentleman's statement, and I tried to interrogate him, but he refused to answer a question. But may I ask this question: Is it not possible to eliminate even legal departments by failing to appropriate money for them to carry on?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; it is possible even to eliminate legal departments, but I would suggest that the gentleman indicate in his remarks just exactly what legal departments he expects to eliminate. I would suggest that he offer amendments on the floor that are pertinent and directed to that subject so that we may know what he has in mind I have done the best I can as a member of this committee, and I know the other members have. It does not seem fair to take up time in critical comment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the Department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including the purchase of stationery, furniture, and repairs to the same, carpets, matting, oilcloths, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, laundry, not exceeding $1,400 for streetcar fares; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motorcycles and motortrucks; purchase (including exchange) of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; maintenance, operation, and repair of three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; commercial and labor-reporting services; newspaper clippings not to exceed $1,400, postage to foreign countries, telegraph and telephone service, typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, and, when authorized by the Secretary of Labor, dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, not exceeding $6,000; contract stenographic services; teletype service and tolls (not to exceed $1.100) and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses not included in the foregoing, $215,500.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 2, line 18, change the word "one" to "two"; and in line 19 change the word "vehicle" to "vehicles"; and in line 20, change the word "three" to "four."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this simply makes effective a Budget recommendation for the purchase of one additional automobile for the use of the Assistant Secretary of Labor. The committee has obtained additional information concerning the subject matter since the bill was written up and is now offering to restore the amount of the Budget estimate for this purpose.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 2, line 9, strike out "$850,000" and insert "$750,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that the paragraph to which it is offered has already been passed in the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOXEY). Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] desire to be heard?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I expect the Clerk to

read every word of this bill and not read as rapidly as he is reading in order that amendments may be offered at the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is being read by paragraphs and is subject to amendment by paragraphs. Of course, we have passed the paragraph referred to in the bill, and for that reason the point of order is well taken.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman had completed his statement.

Mr. BENDER. I think it is proper, if there is objection, that the bill be read word for word and not by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps we can remedy the situation by submitting a unanimous-consent request that the gentlemen be permitted to now offer the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing this bill now for 45 minutes. It took us over 40 minutes to get by the enacting clause. The Clerk read the bill in the usual manner and an amendment has been offered and adopted to a paragraph subsequent to the one to which the gentleman now proposes to offer an amendment. There appears to be no reason why he should have overlooked the matter of offering his amendment if he desired to do so, and in the interest of expedition in the handling of the bill in a reasonable manner, the committee is compelled to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 3, line 9, strike out "$215,500" and insert "$180,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in offering these amendments at the suggestion of the minority member of the committee—and I expect to offer many of them—I am acting, I am sure, in keeping with procedure in State and local political subdivisions everywhere. For example, when the city of Cleveland finds its income will not sustain its expenditures, there is an arbitrary cut in expenses in all departments. When the State of Ohio has that experience, they have to cut in all departments, and I believe that this Federal department can get along very well with less money and we will find that the work will be done just as well.

I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday discussing the duplication of inspectors and clerks. I do not find in my contacts with the departments here that anybody is overworked, and I am sure we can lop off some of these people and some of these expenses as we go along, and as we should. This is the time to act. I know there is too much conversation and too little performance. I have not burdened this body very much with talk. I had 2 minutes yesterday and I have had 5 today. I cannot be accused of taking up too much time, while some of the gentlemen now complaining consume considerable time. I intend to carry through and to offer these economy amendments, but I do not intend to make a 5-minute speech every time I do so.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think any Members of the House are more interested in bringing about reasonable economies than I am, but certainly if we undertake to effect economies we ought to go about it in an intelligent way. Just to say that an item of $215,500 should be cut by $35,500 without investigating the question of whether it is possible to carry on the necessary business of the Department of Labor with the reduced amount of appropriation for contingent expenses, which is proposed here, without investigation to determine what items of contingent expenses aggregating $35,500 might be left out without hampering or interfering unduly with the work of the Department of Labor, is not to my mind sensible economy.

If the gentleman knows the items of expense which have been proposed making up this total of $215,500 in the bill, and if he knows what items in this contingent expense might in his judgment be eliminated to the tune of $35,500, I yield to him at this time to give the information to the Committee; but if, as I suspect, he has not seen the justifications, and has not read them, and has no idea of what economies may be effected, but is simply making a grandstand play to indicate to the country that in some general way he is interested in economy, then I think the gentleman is wasting the time of the House and of the country, and that he ought not to proceed.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I care not what the gentleman may label it, whether it is a grandstand play or whatever it may be, I have a right as a Member of this House to offer amendments, and my good faith should not be challenged any more than should the gentleman's good faith.

Mr. TARVER. Then I ask the gentleman whether he read the justifications, and whether he knows the items which make up this total of $215,500.

Mr. BENDER. I know that we are talking about——

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I yield to the gentleman if he will answer the question. Has he read the justifications?

Mr. BENDER. I have read considerably more than the gentleman thinks.

Mr. TARVER. I mean the justifications for this item. Will the gentleman indicate to the Committee what items of contingent expenses aggregating $35,500 might be eliminated without interfering with the proper functions of the Department of Labor?

Mr. BENDER. I would not attempt to dot every "i" and cross every "t."

Mr. TARVER. Can the gentleman dot one "i" or cross one "t?"

Mr. BENDER. Oh, yes; I could, but the reading of the bill has been undertaken, and I have only 5 minutes. I will be glad to send for a copy of the Budget, if the gentleman will wait so that I could give the gentleman the information, and if I ask the gentleman I am sure he will give me the information.

Mr. TARVER. The trouble is that the gentleman did not have the information when he asked the House to cut down this appropriation, and now the gentleman thinks that he can get it in 5 minutes. He offers an amendment to cut down the appropriation by $35,500, without having any idea of what economy it would effect, without having any idea of what items ought to be eliminated.

Mr. BENDER. The only idea I have is to know that the President has said that it is up to the Congress to reduce the nondefense expenses, and the Secretary of the Treasury has asked for a billion dollars of decrease in those expenses. This is what we are undertaking.

Mr. TARVER. Why would not the gentleman offer to reduce the amount by $100,000 instead of $35,000?

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman chooses to amend my amendment, he has that right.

Mr. TARVER. There is just as much argument in favor of that as there is in favor of the amendment that the gentleman has offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Department of Labor, including all its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, $410,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 3, line 20, strike out "$410,000" and insert "$350,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Safety and Health Program (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to conduct a program of safety and health among employees engaged in national-defense industries, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $176,500.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 4, line 21, strike out "$176,500" and insert "$156,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioners of conciliation: To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor (5 U. S. C. 611) and to appoint commissioners

of conciliation, telegraph and telephone service, supplies for field offices, newspapers, books of reference, and periodicals; and not to exceed $67,520 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $444,300.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 5, line 14, strike out "$444,300" and insert "$244,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation in this title for traveling expenses shall be available, in an amount not to exceed $2,000, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two with reference to this study of post-defense problems. Will the gentleman tell us what is included in that item?

Mr. TARVER. In my presentation of the bill in general debate yesterday I undertook to enter into some discussion of that question. It involves the matter of trying to ascertain some plan or plans, map some program by which the anticipated deplorable unemployment situation which may be expected to follow the period of our national emergency may be handled so as to facilitate the reabsorption in industry of the millions of workers who will be released from the defense industries and the useful employment of the men in the selective service after the periods of their training shall have expired.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the objective is a very worthy one. I would like to ask this further question, however. The language is used in cooperation with the National Resources Planning Board. Will any part of these funds be used by the National Resources Planning Board?

Mr. TARVER. None of the funds appropriated in this bill will be used by that Board.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that we have a select committee of the House, known as the Tolan committee, to study this same problem, and that that committee is now functioning and has some 20 or 25 employees working on this problem?

Mr. TARVER. I do not understand it is the function of the Tolan committee to make studies of the type provided for in this item of appropriation. On the contrary, I understand the function of that committee is to be largely restricted to the investigation of what are usually referred to as migrant laborers, persons traveling about the country in search of employment, without any fixed place of abode. I do not understand that that committee is undertaking any type of study which would throw light upon this so-called post-defense industry problem.

Mr. CURTIS. I think if the gentleman investigates he will find that was the original Tolan resolution, a general study of migrants in the United States, but that the life of the committee was extended for 18 months to study the problem in connection with the national defense. I have no objection to this item in the bill, but I wonder whether the gentleman would care to state whether he thinks there is any duplication of the work that is being done.

Mr. TARVER. I had not been advised of the expansion of the functions of the Tolan committee beyond the purposes for which it was originally constituted, but even under the gentleman's statement as to what is provided for in the amendment of the original resolution, it seems to me that the work of the Tolan committee would be devoted to only a minor portion of the tremendous problem which is here involved. I feel sure that while the work of that committee has been very useful and very informative, it should merely supplement this work that is here proposed and not in any way be in duplication of this work or this work in duplication of the work of the Tolan committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the committee that the Department of Labor gather facts and figures only, or is the Department of Labor authorized to bring forth work programs or other solutions?

Mr. TARVER. I think the intention of the committee—at least I know it was the intention which I entertained—was that the Bureau of Labor Statistics should study every angle of this problem with a view to submitting to the Congress and to the country its best ideas as to how it might be ultimately solved.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I wonder if the gentleman could give us item by item a statement as to which are defense items and which are nondefense items?

Mr. TARVER. It would be possible, of course, to do that, but may I say to the gentleman that on page 3 of the report the national-defense items are all listed consecutively in a tabular statement. I am sure that table will furnish the gentleman the information he desires.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Study of Post-Defense Problems (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to conduct studies relative to problems connected with labor likely to arise upon the termination of the existing emergent conditions in connection with defense activities throughout the United States, in cooperation with the National Resources Planning Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations under the Department of Labor for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, $96,500: *Provided,* That not to exceed $15,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the employment on a part-time basis, of the services of experts without regard to the civil service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 7, strike out all of lines 9 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. BENDER. To put this study under the Secretary of Labor is questionable. The present Secretary of Labor may not be here when hostilities over yonder cease, and I do not know what value her information would be to us. I think this appropriation is a wholly unnecessary expenditure of money. About all it will do is to put a few more pop suckers on the pay roll with no one paying very much attention to what they said. I know that all Members receive as I do many Government publications every day, so many it would take them 100 years to read all of the Federal Government publications issued in the course of a year. As a rule most of these publications are filed in our bookcases or cabinets unread. The Members of Congress are not on an 8-hour day, they are on a 16-hour day, and we have not the time to absorb all of this data and information sent to us from the various bureaus. No one can tell what the future has in store. Ninety-six thousand dollars in the hands of Madam Perkins for this purpose is wholly unwarranted and unjustified.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe in connection with this item that the function to be performed by the Labor Department of gathering certain data and statistical information may be all right. I do believe, however, that so far as they are empowered to formulate a program it is somewhat of a duplication of what the Tolan committee have been authorized to do by this House; and I further am opposed to the Labor Department's writing the prescription for the economic ills of this country, because they have utterly failed so far.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, hold no brief for the Secretary of Labor although I have a higher regard for her than has been indicated by some of the Members who have spoken. The only question, it seems to me, to be here determined is whether or not an investigation of this character is desirable or necessary. If it is, then the investigation should be made by that agency of Government which is properly charged under the law with the duty of making it, and that organization is the Division of Labor Statistics. If the Congress has no confidence in the Department of Labor, if it has no confidence in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it should by statute law change the responsibility for the making of investigations in matters relating to labor so that they might be placed in some other agency in which it has greater con-

fidence. So long as the law is unchanged, however, and so long as these organizations, the Department of Labor, including the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are the proper governmental agencies for the making of these investigations, it seems to me that the making of the appropriation here involved ought not to be prejudiced by anybody's respect or lack of respect for the Secretary of Labor.

I believe it unnecessary to review the arguments which have been heretofore advanced on more than one occasion while this bill was under consideration, why in the opinion of the subcommittee it is indeed a very desirable and an appropriate investigation looking to at least an approach to the solution of this very great problem, and I certainly hope no Member of the House will vote against making the appropriation merely because he might not approve everything which has been done by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I recall reading where members of the joint committee on monopoly, or the T. N. E. C. Committee stated that the contribution of Dr. Lubin, head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was one of the outstanding contributions made to that committee during the many, many weeks they were in session. It is my understanding that Dr. Lubin is the gentleman who will compile this information to be used after the war. If that is correct you can be assured the job will be well done.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct; and if my own opinion may be considered by anybody as of any value, it is that Dr. Lubin is one of the most capable and efficient men we have in the whole Government service, in whose sincerity and ability we have every right to rely with the utmost confidence, knowing that any work he undertakes will be well administered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I would not want anything I said to be construed as indicating I do not favor the study being made. I do, and I believe the Labor Department can make a very definite contribution in submitting statistical information. I believe it is up to the Appropriations Committee, and I assume they have determined the amount they should have. What I object to is the Labor Department's writing the policy, because I think they are more interested in their pet reforms than in restoring a healthy economy in this country.

Mr. TARVER. The time to evaluate the work done by the Division of Labor Statistics under this appropriation would be after its plans or programs are submitted to the Congress for consideration. In the meantime I believe all the information along this line which is obtainable should be furnished for the information of the Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I believe the gentlemen on the other side who said the Tolan committee had gone into this matter were in error. The only part the Tolan committee is studying is the migrant labor which, of course, is a very infinitesimal part of the problem of what to do with labor and employment after the war is over. In addition to that, may I say to my friend that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has a resolution pending before the Labor Committee to set up a joint commission similar to the Temporary Economic Committee that Senator O'MAHONEY headed, to study this question. It might be helpful to have this appropriation for that reason.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Office of the Administrator, $127,500: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated the Administrator may expend not to exceed $2,500 for temporary employment of persons, by contract or otherwise, for special services determined necessary by the Administrator, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 13, line 23, strike out "$435,000" and insert "$380,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is approximately a 10-percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Chief Clerk's division, $251,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 13, line 24, strike out "$251,000" and insert "$226,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is another reduction of 10 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr BENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Office of the General Counsel, $600,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Strike out "$600,000" and insert "$540,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is approximately a 10-percent reduction.

The complaint has been made that too few Members are on the floor. I am inclined to believe that myself. Possibly if more were here we might vote other than we are voting.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. Chairman, I do not see much use in adopting any amendment or passing any bill right now. I have in my hand the bill S. 1579, to authorize the President of the United States to requisition certain property for the use of or disposition by the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the bill.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking against the amendment. I see no reason why we should adopt this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I must join in the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota. I gave notice some time ago that the committee would make points of order against any further remarks not addressed to the subject matter of the bill. The gentleman is clearly undertaking to discuss an entirely different piece of legislation. In the interest of expediting consideration of the bill and in an endeavor to be fair to everybody, not objecting in the case of one Member and not doing so in the case of another Member, I must join in the point of order which has been made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment it is to decrease the amount provided in this bill. Of course, it is my contention that if we are going to have national socialism we do not need any of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The item under consideration has to do with the office of the General Counsel, $600,000. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to adopt national socialism we do not need this $600,000 or any other amount. If we acquire all property in the United States, both tangible and intangible, we will have national socialism, and we will not need any appropriation.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman are not addressed to the question of how much money is needed for the Office of General Counsel, but is addressed to an entirely different piece of legislation which he is undertaking to discuss. I think the gentleman ought to be required to observe the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will observe the rules and proceed in order.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. This has to do with the elimination of some of the lawyers down there. It seems we have too many lawyers in the various departments.

Mr. HOOK. Of course, some of the lawyers that are supposed to be eliminated by this amendment would be able to interpret the question of acquisition or the question of what would be tangible or intangible property. These lawyers

might be able to determine what right or interest——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we might as well have the question decided now. If the Chair is going to permit the gentleman, against the repeated points of order, to speak out of order and concerning a subject matter which is not involved in the pending amendment, and if the gentleman may make some casual reference to the amendment and then proceed out of order, we might as well not make any points of order at all. The gentleman has several times been cautioned to confine his remarks to the amendment under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made reference to the General Counsel and the amount appropriated.

Mr. TARVER. The mere making of reference to the counsel and the amount appropriated in connection with the gentleman's argument on some extraneous piece of legislation does not make his remarks in order. The substance of his remarks must be addressed to the merits of the amendment proposed to reduce the appropriation for the Office of General Counsel, and not by any wide stretch of the imagination could it be held that anything he has said relates to the proper amount of that appropriation, although he did make reference to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must proceed in order or take his seat, under the rule.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I shall get time at another time to discuss fully and completely the subject to which I referred here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding (not appropriated for elsewhere) for the Federal Security Agency and all bureaus, boards, and constituent organizations thereof, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That any amounts transferred to this appropriation shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of the sections wherein such funds were appropriated.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 16, line 4, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$900,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is an item of $1,000,000 for printing. This amendment cuts down the printing costs by 10 percent, to $900,000. It seems that we have too much printing around here.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, subsistence, medical services, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses, burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital authorized to treat such patient, $153,414,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 17, beginning in line 23, strike out the entire paragraph down to and including page 18, line 8.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the country is in a very serious condition. We are facing expenses for defense totaling in the next year probably $22,000,000,000 or $23,000,000,000, according to the Budget figures. Why we should continue with an agency like the C. C. C. when they are unable to hold up their enrollment figures at all except by canvassing and soliciting for enrollments is something that is beyond the imagination of anyone who really wants to see things done right.

This is the time and this is the opportunity to save $153,000,000 that can be used for defense. We ought to get rid of this whole set-up. It is not anything that is helping the poor. It is something that is persuading men to go ahead with a program that is competing with defense industry for the labor that is needed to carry on. Everywhere the draft is being deferred against the boys on the farm, and everywhere it is being deferred against important men in key defense industries. Why should we at this time go on with maintaining a specially privileged class, when such an activity is not needed in any way, for relief or anything of that character?

I hope this amendment is adopted and that the House will set its face in favor of saving money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand it costs an average of approximately $1,200 to keep each boy in the C. C. C. camps. Does the gentleman have any figures on that?

Mr. TABER. It costs about $1,050 now. They did get up to $1,200, but it is now down to the other figure and, as I understand, there is a limitation in the bill as to the amount that may be spent. However, we are facing a situation as to whether or not we have the courage and the character to stand up and cut out at this time this tremendously expensive agency, which is doing nothing in comparison with the tremendous sums of money that are being spent on it.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Would the effect of the adoption of the gentleman's amendment be to deprive all of the young men in the C. C. C. camps of medical attention?

Mr. TABER. The effect of this amendment would be to wipe out the entire C. C. C. That is the object of it. They exist only because they go out and solicit trade, solicit boys to enroll in the C. C. C. The whole thing would be out if it were not for that. It is a tremendously wasteful, destructive force at the present time, and this Congress should get rid of it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House may find an opportunity to read in today's RECORD, when it becomes available tomorrow morning, the statement which I secured permission today to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, from the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, outlining the constructive work that has been accomplished by that corps during the last fiscal year, the construction of more than 100,000 miles of roads and truck trails, the construction of thousands of bridges, the building of lookout towers for use in fire cooperation work, and many other items of additions to real values in this country which it would be impossible for me at this time to detail.

The Director estimates the total addition to property values, values of Government-owned land and the values of other property upon which work has been done by the Civilian Conservation Corps, as aggregating for the fiscal year 1940 alone $220,000,000, and he supports his estimate by detailed statement of facts which, in my judgment, justify the conclusion he reaches.

However, it is not necessary, it is not even worth while that I or any other Member of the House should undertake to tell other Members of the House the value of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Each of us has his own opinion, each of us has had an opportunity to examine the work of that corps and has made up his own mind as to whether or not that work is worth while and deserves to be continued.

The subcommittee handling this bill seems to have been peculiarly unfortunate in that it has dissatisfied Members on both sides of the aisle, in the one case by having been too niggardly and in the other case by having been too liberal in endeavoring to make reasonable provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who addressed us a little while ago, took the committee to task rather severely for having brought about a reduction below Budget estimates in the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps of approximately $23,000,000.

Now the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in whose honesty and sincerity I have the utmost confidence, but with whom I most whole-heartedly disagree as to this item, desires to cut out the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps entirely. If you desire to do that, if from your knowledge of the corps and the work which it has been accomplishing you think it is a thing that should be entirely abandoned, you should, of course, support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I hope you will not only reject that amendment—and I am sure you will—but I trust that you will reject any amendment which may be offered by other Members proposing to increase the amount of this appropriation, because the subcommittee has gone into

the subject matter carefully and it has recommended an appropriation here which is estimated by the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps and his associates themselves to be sufficient to take care of the enrollee personnel which may be reasonably expected to be recruited during the next fiscal year, and we do not want to provide too much money, more money than can reasonably be used, and we do not want to provide so little it would be impossible to carry on an orderly program. So we have arrived, according to the estimates of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps himself, at an amount which we have included in the bill which ought to take care of all the enrollees who may reasonably be expected to enroll in the corps during the next fiscal year. It is not in our judgment good business to provide for more than might be recruited or might reasonably be expected to be recruited, and we do not think it would accord with the viewpoint of the majority of the membership of the House to provide for less.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to supplement what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said by expressing the hope that the amendment of my friend from New York will be defeated.

We all respect the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. His position is clear, absolutely honest, and we admire his courage. He states he is against the C. C. C. camps. I thoroughly respect the gentleman's views, although I am in disagreement with him. We all know the great work that has been done by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Respecting the views of the gentleman from New York as we do, on both sides of the aisle, those of us who differ with the gentleman should realize that his amendment presents a clear-cut issue. The issue based on the gentleman's motion is whether or not the C. C. C. shall be eliminated completely. From every angle, I think the C. C. C. has rendered a great service. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the chairman of the subcommittee, has very ably referred in a general way to the wonderful work done by this agency, and we are all familiar in a more particular manner with its work; and, without any further discussion, and again repeating my respect for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the fact he is against it and I am for it, the gentleman presents a clear-cut issue, and I hope the Committee will reject the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is generally assumed by the Members of the House that the C. C. C. benefits the young men, but the gentleman understands that there are about 25,000 veterans who cannot secure employment today, and they benefit as a result of the work of the C. C. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made an observation which enters into the picture very prominently and from a very important angle. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, any estimate of the value of the C. C. C. at this time should take into consideration the contribution that the corps has made and is currently making to the defense program.

During recent hearings on the War Department appropriation bill General Marshall, Chief of Staff, testified that the Army is receiving at least 25 percent of its cooks and bakers from the C. C. C. at the present time. Without them the new army would have been a badly fed army. He also referred to the contribution that the corps had made in men trained for the mechanical or motorized units of the Army.

Colonel Graham, an Army officer, also is quoted as saying that the boys who come from the corps into the service can be trained and made into efficient soldiers in 3 months' time, whereas the men who are recruited new require a year to make good soldiers.

The Civilian Conservation Corps is making a direct contribution to national defense, but a fair estimate of the returns for the expenditure of C. C. C. money would also take into consideration the contribution to the individual himself in improved health and in learning how to work and the contribution in works of a permanent character that the corps is constructing dams, roads, Government headquarters buildings, telephone lines, recreation grounds, and so forth.

And in addition to these things one would have to appraise the contribution to our natural resources through soil, water, and timber conservation. The value of the corps in preventing and combating forest fires, is apparent to those of us who live in mountainous country and know as a matter of personal knowledge the services of the corps in reducing, preventing, and combating forest fires. Many hundreds of millions of dollars of timber has been saved and preserved by the corps.

It is impossible to look at one phase of the activity of the corps and measure the entire cost of the corps against that single benefit. I hope that the amendment which would wipe out the corps entirely will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 5, noes 37.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 62]

Andersen, H. Carl	Ditter	Mitchell
Andresen, August H.	Douglas	Murdock
Arnold	Downs	Nichols
Baldwin	Durham	Norton
Bates, Mass.	Elliott, Calif.	O'Brien, Mich.
Baumhart	Faddis	O'Day
Beam	Fish	O'Hara
Blackney	Fitzgerald	O'Leary
Boren	Flaherty	O'Neal
Boykin	Flannery	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Gibson	Patton
Bradley, Pa.	Gifford	Rabaut
Brooks	Granger	Randolph
Buck	Grant, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gregory	Rockefeller
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rogers, Mass
Burch	Healey	Romjue
Burdick	Hébert	Sacks
Byrne	Heffernan	Satterfield
Camp	Heidinger	Sauthoff
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Scott
Cannon, Mo.	Hinshaw	Secrest
Celler	Hobbs	Shannon
Chenoweth	Holbrock	Sikes
Claypool	Hope	Simpson
Cluett	Howell	Smith, Conn.
Coffee, Wash.	Jarman	Smith, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Jarrett	Somers, N. Y.
Connery	Jenks, N. H.	Starnes, Ala.
Cooley	Jennings	Stratton
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sweeney
Courtney	Johnson, W. Va.	Taylor
Creal	Kilburn	Thill
Culkin	Kinzer	Tinkham
Cunningham	Knutson	Tolan
D'Alesandro	Larrabee	Vincent, Ky.
Davis, Ohio	McArdle	Wadsworth
Dies	McGehee	Weiss
Dirksen	Maciejewski	Winter
Disney	Magnuson	Youngdahl
	Mason	

The Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4926, and finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, when 310 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 49, noes 137.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries, departmental: For departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, $2,163,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 19, line 4, strike out "$2,163,000" and insert "$1,600,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not apply to persons who come under the C. C. C., that is, the people who are the beneficiaries as a result of the Civilian Conservation Corps, but it does apply to personal services of supervisors in the District of Columbia. There is a substantial cut in the amount of overhead expense. I would very readily turn the money over to the people who actually come in for benefits, but not for excess baggage in the offices here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses, departmental: For departmental expenses in the District of Columbia (other than for personal services), $577,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 19, line 7, strike out "$577,000" and insert "$409,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is a 10-percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For the Commissioner of Education and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $301,000.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 20, line 18, strike out "$301,000" and insert "$270,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this is approximately a 10-percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For carrying out the provisions of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education, and so forth," approved February 23, 1917, as amended by the act of October 6, 1917 (20 U. S. C. 15), and of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories," approved June 8, 1936 (49 Stat. 1488), $423,700: *Provided*, That $50,100 shall be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "Traveling expenses, Federal Security Agency," and $15,000 shall be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Federal Security Agency."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 23, line 19, strike out "$423,700" and insert "$380,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, another 10 percent reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Training for nurses (national defense): For the cost, including subsistence, but not including cash allowances to trainees, of refresher and postgraduate nursing courses, including courses in midwifery, provided by such agencies and hospitals and nursing schools in accordance with plans submitted by them and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, at hospitals with recognized schools of nursing, and, where necessary, in the case of postgraduate courses at other institutions, for approved persons who have been licensed to practice as registered nurses under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, $1,200,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: On page 48, line 14, after the word "refresher", insert "student nurse."

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to draw the attention of the committee to a matter of very grave importance to the Nation. The situation in our hospitals, in both civilian and military hospitals, is dependent upon nursing. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that in arranging for refresher courses and for postgraduate nursing courses nothing is done to increase the number of girls entering the field of nursing.

I would like to urge that the words "student nurse" be inserted in line 14. It simply means that we take cognition of the acutely serious problem that is before the country. It also involves many, many things that are of grave importance to you and to me and to all the boys in the service. We do not have enough students going into the training schools. This is partly due to the fact that training schools are at the bottom of their financial resources and so are unable to enlarge. Under present conditions it is necessary that we do something to train new nurses. Certainly we need them as much as we need engineers and technicians, and so forth.

In the testimony submitted to the committee it was very clearly brought out that there is an inadequate supply of nurses in the country even when the refresher courses have brought back into active nursing life some of those at present in other fields. Careful reading of the testimony shows that something should be done to increase the number of student nurses. I submit to the Committee the problem, and I ask that the amendment be considered favorably.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Would the gentlewoman mind telling the Committee just what she would cover by "student nurse"?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; I will be very happy to. A student nurse is a girl who is a graduate of a high school or of a college, for in a few schools the entrance requirement is that she has 4 years of college work; who goes into a school of nursing for training where she spends 3 years in fundamental, basic training in the skills of nursing.

Mr. HARE. Do I understand it means those who have already had 3 years?

Mrs. BOLTON. No. I mean girls who have had no training and who are coming fresh into the nursing field. It is those that we need most dramatically.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does this include undergraduates who have not completed their courses?

Mrs. BOLTON. It could readily do so.

Mr. WHITE. You provide facilities for undergraduates completing their courses?

Mrs. BOLTON. This could be done, just as it would make possible the enlargement of the school teaching staff so that more girls could be taken into already existing schools.

It does not mean new schools, it simply means help for the schools which are unable to take in more students. It will be of the greatest fundamental value in increasing the number of nurses in the country as the need for them grows.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am in favor of the gentlewoman's amendment. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would accept the amendment?

Mr. TARVER. Replying to the gentleman from Idaho I may say that I will explain the situation in a moment after the gentlewoman has completed her statement.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say then in conclusion that I am quite aware of the fact that the student-nurse program was not mentioned in the committee. I am also aware of the reasons for that, and it is because of these I have tendered this amendment. The need is very serious; as a matter of fact the testimony submitted to the committee contains most of the facts. They were not interpreted to you in the terms in which I am trying to interpret them. The basic problem of increasing the number of girls going into nursing was submitted to you only by inference. I am trying to bring it clearly before you. I made effort through members of the committee to discover when the matter was to be considered in committee, wanting to bring the facts before you; unfortunately I was not advised. Feeling it such an important matter, I have taken the liberty of submitting it to the Committee of the Whole.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, knowing of the deep interest of the gentlewoman in this subject matter and having full confidence in her knowledge of the problem concerning which she has addressed us it would be a pleasure if the committee could accede to the amendment offered by her, and they would accept it if it were not presented under conditions which make it impractical and in the judgment of the committee unwise that that action be taken.

As the gentlewoman from Ohio has stated, this subject matter was not presented to the committee for considera-

tion at all. Officials of the Public Health Service were not queried in regard to the advisability of instituting such a program.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not just now; I will later.

Nor has any evidence been presented as to the cost. It follows without question that if this change should be made in the language of the appropriation as proposed by the gentlewoman, additional funds would have to be provided in order to carry out the student-nurse-training program upon which she proposes to embark. The funds carried in the bill are sufficient, according to the estimate which we have examined and the testimony which was taken before the committee to take care of the training of these 6,000 nurses in postgraduate courses and some 600 nurses in special courses; and there is not in the item money to take care of the student-nurse-training program which she proposes to institute by the language of her amendment. If it should be undertaken the subject matter should at least receive the consideration of some committee of this House before an appropriation providing for it is passed by the House. The matter was never called to the attention of this subcommittee until a few moments ago, and if it should be undertaken then we ought to have some evidence from people in position to know as to how many trainees would be involved and what the cost of the program would be. So, it would appear to me, therefore, that it would accomplish nothing simply to add "student-nurse-training program" to the language of this appropriation without adding some money to take care of it. It is a subject matter which ought to have consideration, and we trust it will have consideration by the Senate committee after the bill has reached that body, but we certainly believe it would be unwise that the House should at this time upon this short notice and without committee investigation undertake to insert this student-nurse-training program in a provision which was intended for an entirely different course of training.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am not asking, Mr. Chairman, for any additional funds. I am asking more than anything else for the recognition of the student-nurse problem. There is very grave doubt as to whether the postgraduates will flock in in such numbers as doctors feel they will, and the funds available would do for a very small number of student nurses, and the recognition by this body of the need. That is all I am asking, I am not asking for any funds.

Mr. TARVER. May I state to the gentlewoman that the officials of the Public Health Service have shown to the satisfaction of the committee that there will be a need for the sum appropriated for the training in postgraduate and special courses. If the student nurse training program were inserted in the bill there would not be a cent of money to carry it out.

The gentlewoman, I assume, has no idea as to how many trainees might qualify under the program or as to how much money it would take. In other words, the logical sequence of the thing would be if the gentlewoman's amendment were adopted inserting the student nurse training program in the bill that a subsequent amendment be offered increasing the amount of the appropriation, and how much that amount should be is something none of us knows. Is the gentlewoman able to give us any idea on the cost of this program?

Mrs. BOLTON. I am exceedingly glad to do that. When the original bill was written, Mr. Chairman, it contained a very definite amount of money for this purpose. It was afterward cut down after a good deal of consultation between doctors and nurses to $1,250,000.

Mr. TARVER. What sum was originally proposed?

Mrs. BOLTON. Twelve million dollars, but that was cut down.

Mr. TARVER. Then the next amendment, logically, would be one increasing this item by $12,000,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. No; it would be an amendment asking for an additional $1,250,000 to finance the student nurse training program.

Mr. TARVER. I understand the gentlewoman to say that the program would cost $12,000,000?

Mrs. BOLTON. No; that was the first estimate. It was cut down after due consideration by both doctors and nurses.

Mr. TARVER. I think the discussion has shown the House that we cannot intelligently act upon the matter of determining how much, should we institute this program, we should appropriate to carry it out. Instead, it would be wiser to vote down the amendment and let the subject matter be investigated by the Senate committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be regrettable if our position here on the Democratic side was misunderstood. We are all in favor of encouraging the training of nurses by helping the nursing schools. Throughout this country there is a woeful lack of hospitals in which to train young people for the nursing profession. Last year the Senate passed a bill and sent it to the House, which provided a fund to establish the hospitals in communities that could not afford to build a hospital. Without hospitals you cannot having training schools. The House failed to act on the bill, and the conditions grow more serious.

We have a situation existing in my home city. The city officials of New York, our mayor included, have refused to appropriate the required money to properly carry on our institutions. Our private hospitals are suffering a big deficit each day in the actual cost to them for the care of city cases which the city officials send to the private hospitals and then refuse to appropriate the money to pay the receiving hospitals. When the elected officials in a great city like New York, headed by a mayor with four jobs, obstinately refuses to appropriate the money needed and insults citizens representing the private hospitals, what can you expect from the small towns in the way of hospitals and training schools?

We are all sympathetic to the proposal of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I am in favor of taking action here today so as to start training courses that will provide nurses in the near future. I am ready to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I sincerely hope that her amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to ask my colleague from Ohio certain questions. First, is it not possible, if this authorization to spend part of the money appropriated for student nurses is put in this bill, that part of the money, $1,200,000, will be spent for that purpose?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; very definitely.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentlewoman have any intention at this late hour of asking for an increase in this appropriation?

Mrs. BOLTON. No; I have not.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentlewoman tell the House when it was that she first called this to the attention of the members of this Appropriation Subcommittee?

Mrs. BOLTON. Some weeks ago. I was told by members of the nursing group, with which I have worked for 40 years, that the bill had gone to the Budget Bureau with an item in it covering student nursing; that the Budget Bureau had seen fit to run its pencil through the clause covering student nurses.

I asked to be told when this was coming up. My secretary was informed by the secretary of the committee that the Public Health matters had not been brought up. I therefore asked Members on this side of the House if they would let me know when those matters came before the committee so that I might appear. No information was given me, although I was in the city all the time. I deeply regret this because I know this is not the most fortunate way to bring anything before this body, and I do so reluctantly. But I think the committee should very definitely know the real problem that exists.

In the testimony that was submitted in committee it is shown very clearly that in the postgraduate classes, the refresher classes, do not meet the need as described by some 3,500 to 4,000 nurses.

Our nursing need will not be met by the refresher courses for the older married nurses. We have to get more girls

into training and I am sure, as the gentleman from Ohio has stated, some of the present appropriation would very happily be allocated by the Public Health Service for a small group demonstrating the need and the method.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Would not the effect of the gentlewoman's amendment be merely this: It would give somebody in authority in the health department the right to take all the trained nurses they could get and, if that is not sufficient, then they could tap this source, which would be supplied by the lady's amendment?

Mrs. BOLTON. I do not think so.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not what the gentleman said true? This does not compel them to train any student nurses. It means if they cannot get enough within this appropriation and they need other nurses, they can get student trainees, whereas without this amendment they could not?

Mrs. BOLTON. I beg the gentleman from Massachusetts' pardon for not understanding his question and thank the gentleman from Ohio for clarifying it for me. Indeed, I thank both of you for making this point clear.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What is the difference between a trainee and a student nurse?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I believe the gentleman will find that the language there merely refers to trainees as of all different types, but right after the comma he will find that the classes of trainees are defined, and unless the words "student nurse" are placed in there the appropriation will be limited to refresher or postgraduate courses for these older nurses, who may not be quite as plentiful as some seem to think they are. We have some fine older nurses, but if we should have another emergency we ought, at least to create the chance for the Government to have some student nurses for the ensuing year without spending more money. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in the light of the experience we had in the last war, when a great epidemic of flu created such devastation among the draftees, I believe we need a full corps of nurses. I am in sympathy with this amendment. We are marshaling a 2,000,000-man Army and we are certainly going to need nurses.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that there are thousands of girls who have taken 1 or 2 years of training but who have dropped out for financial reasons, or otherwise, who may be classified as undergraduates. I believe this amendment will make it possible for them to finish their training period. These girls will then be qualified to fill the need for nurses in our military and defense organizations. I believe this is a very constructive and good amendment, and I am for it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 107, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 1. Part-time youth work and student aid: To enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1942, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Agency, to engage in the following types of programs for assistance to needy young persons, $85,894,000, namely:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 56, line 25, strike out "$85,894,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$85,984,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely to correct a typographical error.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Georgia concluded with his statement on the committee amendment?

Mr. TARVER. I believe it is unnecessary to discuss the amendment further. The gentleman from New York really wishes to offer an amendment in the parliamentary situation that exists that will bring up another question.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am placed in the position that I must offer my amendment as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER as a substitute for the committee amendment: On page 56, in line 25, strike out "$85,894,000" and insert "$42,947,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have proposed in this amendment to cut this item squarely in two. I have done it in order that we may save money. The N. Y. A. is running boarding schools today where they take care of students free, and it costs them in my territory as high on an average as $92.50 a month, or over $1,000 a year apiece.

This activity is not necessary. This kind of business is not right. They are advertising all over the lot to get people to send their children in to these schools. I have seen all over my own territory all sorts of such advertisements in every newspaper. I have been advised of their advertising in New Hampshire papers for schools in Massachusetts. I have in my hand advertisements they are putting out in New Jersey for the N. Y. A. schools.

In my own territory there was a situation where this agency had a group in one community of 225 for over-age training, and of those only 55 would sign up with the board of education for the training they were supposed to have in the technical high school.

In view of the situation that prevails all over the country, it is time that we began to save some money. We are on the brink of a tax bill totaling $3,500,000,000. This Congress has not begun to save a dollar in spite of the warning and admonition of the Secretary of the Treasury that we should save $1,000,000,000.

This item as a whole has been boosted upward of $50,000,000 since the Budget was sent up here in January. Is it not time to stop? Is it not time to mind our responsibilities and cut down on some of these activities where we are wasting so much money? Is it not time that we stopped turning money over to Aubrey Williams to fool away? These activities will not train boys for defense industries. The way the agency is being operated, it is a liability. Let us vote to save some money and begin to operate in the right direction and prepare for national defense. If we are ever going to be ready to carry our load for national defense, we have to begin now. This would save $42,700,000. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations for the National Youth Administration for the present fiscal year, including the deficiency appropriations which have been made, aggregated approximately $157,000,000. The Budget estimates which were submitted for the consideration of our subcommittee for both the regular appropriations and for the national-defense items aggregated approximately $161,000,000, or about $4,000,000 more than was appropriated for the present fiscal year. From that amount, however, there was transferred through action of the subcommittee to the Office of Education to take care of the training of N. Y. A. workers in vocational education schools under the jurisdiction of State vocational education authorities, supervised by the Federal Office of Education, the sum of $10,000,000. A comparable sum of $7,500,000 was appropriated by the Congress for use by the Office of Education during the present fiscal year. The effect of this transfer, if it is approved by the Congress, will be to bring the amount of the National Youth Administration's appropriation for the next fiscal year to some four or five million dollars below what it has been for the present fiscal year.

Members, of course, will differ in their opinion as to the value of this program. No evidence was adduced before our subcommittee tending to show the abuses to which reference has been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I, of course, do not question for a moment his good faith in making the statements which he has made concerning conditions which obtain in his locality or in localities which have been under his observation. I can only say that insofar as the program has come under my observation its handling and its effects have, in my judgment, been commendable.

If there have been Members of the House who knew facts indicating the

misuse of the funds which had been appropriated to the N. Y. A. for the preesnt fiscal year, it certainly seems to me they should have come before our subcommittee and have given us the benefit of their knowledge on the subject.

We have had no evidence sustaining any idea that the N. Y. A. was advertising or making other efforts to secure the recruitment of youth for its program. On the contrary, the evidence before our committee showed, without contradiction, that the N. Y. A. now has a backlog of some 391,000 applications of youth eligible to participate in its program who are not able to participate therein because of the inability of N. Y. A. to enroll them. For the next fiscal year this program contemplates the affording of employment to youth on these work projects of N. Y. A. to the approximate number of 400,000. It includes, of course, the in-school program of assistance to needy high-school and college youth in efforts to complete their education. Altogether, taking into consideration the turn-overs that occur by reason of youth not being employed in the majority of instances for more than some 3 to 6 months, there will be, if this appropriation is approved, some 1,500,000 American youths who will receive the benefits of this appropriation during the next fiscal year.

In the judgment of our subcommittee it is exceedingly worthwhile to try to do something for these needy young people, and in the judgment of those who are in charge principally of our defense program the carrying on of the N. Y. A. work-center activities is materially contributing to the furnishing of trained industrial workers for national-defense industries, and there is no graver need existing in our defense program today, as we all know, than the need for additional trained employees who can participate in the manufacture of goods required in our national defense.

Of course, the effect of the transfer that the subcommittee has recommended in the bill is to reduce, by the amount of $10,000,000, the amount estimated by the Budget for the National Youth Administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. So in the opinion of some of the friends of N. Y. A. the committee has already made a very substantial cut. In the opinion of the committee it has not made a cut at all, but it has simply transferred funds which would have been available to the N. Y. A. to another youth training agency, the vocational educational schools, working under the supervision of the Office of Education, but it certainly seems to us that we have not dealt in either a too liberal manner with this organization or in a niggardly manner with it, but that the conclusions we have reached have been amply justified by the evidence which was adduced before us, and I certainly hope that Members will not vote to change those conclusions, either to increase or decrease the amount proposed to be made available, without familiarizing themselves with the evidence. It is impossible for me to enter into greater detail in the limited time I have available.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment. When the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and presented an unparalleled tax bill, calculated to raise an additional revenue of three and a half billion dollars, he told us in all seriousness and with great earnestness that the Congress could and should reduce the nondefense budget by $1,000,000,000, and when asked the items that he thought could with propriety be cut, he enumerated agricultural, C. C. C., N. Y. A., and work relief. The agricultural bill has gone beyond the control of the House. The Committee on Appropriations has brought out the relief bill in conformity with the Budget request. The committee has given us a bill that cuts C. C. C. I believe $23,000,000, and adds, including the office of Education, $60,000,000 to N. Y. A., so, instead of a billion-dollar saving in the items recommended to us by the Secretary of the Treasury, we have not saved one penny, but have added $37,000,000 to the total.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we have not added anything to the N. Y. A., but the amount for N. Y. A. is $4,000,000 less than for the present fiscal year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I was not talking about the present fiscal year. I was talking about the Budget recommended to us in January, and that is what the Secretary was talking about. That Budget called for $101,000,000 for N. Y. A., and after the suggestion was made that N. Y. A. should be cut, the President sent in a request for an additional $60,000,000, and the committee added every penny of that to the appropriation, if you include the $10,000,000 transferred to the Office of Education. The savings proposed here of a little more than $40,000,000 is a very small part of the recommended $1,000,000,000 saving, and so far as I am concerned, charged primarily with the responsibility of helping to frame for this House a new tax bill of unprecedented proportions, I feel that I should at least go on record in favor of some saving in nondefense items. I do not question the value of education.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am sorry I cannot yield. I do not care what the education is or where it is, I like to see it. Of course, when the N. Y. A. has a boarding school that costs $1,100 a year, per pupil, that is a rather expensive school. My point is this: We face the gravest crisis in all our history and we must keep our finances sound. We must tax and still tax, and I can give it to you as my personal opinion that the tax bill that we will bring in here in the next few weeks will by no means be the last tax bill. Let us show some little inclination for economy on this item, however meritorious it might be. Let us show some concern for the situation that confronts us, and let us show some realization of what we have to do and what we have to say to the taxpayers when we come under the burden of a new three-and-a-half-billion-dollar tax bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I cannot make some effort about closing debate. I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. Both the gentlemen who have spoken, the author of the amendment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] say that they are in favor of economy. I ask the attention of the gentleman from New York. He has talked about economy, and he sits here in this House and has supported the big appropriations to build big defense projects all over the United States. We are going to establish these great industrial plants, we are going to build defense airplanes and spend billions of dollars to construct plants, and where are we going to get the men to operate them, and I want to know where the trained mechanics are coming from. I want to know where the men to run the lathes are coming from. I want to know where the man who knows anything about skilled work is coming from if we do not provide some means of training these people. The gentleman from New York is going to save $40,000,000 by reducing the personnel that we propose to go into these plants and operate them. Today every industrialist and every superintendent of a plant is looking for trained, skilled men. We set up this National Youth Administration, a small project, entirely inadequate, to train these boys to take these rugged individuals, these boys who are not looking for white-collar jobs; these men who want to qualify to operate lathes and machines. I think instead of cutting this appropriation we should increase it if we are going to put into operation within any reasonable time at all these big defense industrial plants that we are building all over the country.

I wonder where the gentleman thinks we are going to get the men to build these airplanes that the War Department and the President is so insistent that we create. I am for an adequate appropriation for the National Youth Administration. It is the only plan of education we have today to train these boys who are willing to go into the shops and work on the lathes and machines, to provide the necessary equipment we are striving to get to implement the defense of this country.

I think every Member of this House, if he will give this appropriation a little

consideration, will be more in favor of raising the appropriation than reducing it. It is a matter of economy. It is a matter of utilizing the plants we have already authorized and appropriated money for. It would be a waste of money to build a plant that could not be properly equipped with experienced and trained personnel. The National Youth Administration offers an opportunity for an applicant to go to school and learn the simple principles of operating lathes and machines, or to operate the complicated machinery necessary to do this work. In reading the technical magazines describing the experience of Russia in trying to industrialize that country it is shown that there was great waste in putting inexperienced, uninformed people in charge, trying to operate these expensive, complicated machines.

Aubrey Williams is doing a magnificent work. He has an organization in every State. We are simply implementing that organization by appropriating enough money to permit him to do the thing that is intended, to train people to operate our defense industries.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER to the committee amendment: Strike out "$85,984,000" appearing in the committee amendment and insert "$61,773,800."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, that is necessarily a substitute for the substitute already offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and it seems to me is an amendment in the third degree, and is not permissible under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has offered it as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. TARVER. It is in effect a substitute for the committee amendment. There is already one substitute for the committee amendment pending. It seems to me, therefore, that this is a substitute for the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. What the gentleman says is true, as far as there being one substitute pending, but this is offered as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. TARVER. If the Chair thinks it is in order, I will not argue the question further.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, in the discussions of the National Youth Administration, nobody ever talks about anything but training and education. At the time this activity was launched, unquestionably it was done for the purpose of training and educating underprivileged youths. It was set up for the purpose of providing a training in useful fields that otherwise would not have been available to some of the finest youths of America.

My amendment does just this: It deducts approximately 25 percent from the total amount appropriated because of the duplication of the activities of this Administration with those of the W. P. A. Just look at subsections 1 and 2 of section (b):

Construction, improvement and repair of public buildings, grounds, parks, roads, bridges, and highways—

Almost identically the language employed in the W. P. A. law. Certainly this administration ought not be permitted to duplicate the activities already engaged in by an administration which, through years of experience, has gotten away from all of the waste, all of the inexperience and inefficiency which the W. P. A. has eliminated from its organization.

Today the W. P. A. is functioning smoothly in every State, particularly in my State of Pennsylvania. Those things that caused so much aggravation have been eliminated. At the head of the organization in Pennsylvania is a competent engineer, a graduate of the United States Military Academy. Under him are men of experience, men of ability. It certainly seems to me that if we are going to economize at any point at all we should do it here and now by taking out of this appropriation the funds used for activities that it was never intended the N. Y. A. should engage in.

The amount that they now expend for work that should be performed by the W. P. A. is $24,200,200. The adoption of this amendment will in no wise affect the program the N. Y. A. should be engaged in carrying on. It is a splendid program, and one that I heartily endorse, and have always enthusiastically supported, but we certainly are not training youths for something requiring any skill when we provide pick-and-shovel jobs for them. I am not certain that a man of the vision, integrity, and ability of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] is interested in securing funds for a program not in line with his objectives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I know the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia have said they wanted to cut nondefense items. The first point I want to make is that this is not cutting a nondefense item, that if there is anything that is basically important to national defense, it is that there should be young men trained to do the work of producing airplanes and other types of work that are the very basis of national defense in this day of modern machinery.

He also said we face a great crisis. We do. I asked for 20 minutes today. I have still got the 20 minutes. I wanted to make a speech about that grave crisis. The main thing I shall say is that I wondered whether the House of Representatives realizes just how grave that crisis is and just how they can meet it. I tell you the thing this Government has got to do is to convince the American people that they can look forward into the future after this period of struggle is over to a world in which democracy will point the way to the solution of the problems they have confronted all their lives and especially since 1929.

The only question I was asked on my last trip to my home district was this: Not how much taxes the people are going to have to pay. I was not asked whether the people were going to be asked to make sacrifices, or whether they were going to be drafted. The one thing I was asked most was: What is it going to be like after this is over? What are we going to come to? The one fear that was gripping their hearts was whether they were going to be plunged back into another period of unemployment and depression after their period of sacrifice was over. This is the question they all want answered.

I am in favor of saving money where it can be saved, but training youths to do things useful to the Nation in this crisis and to make a living for themselves after it is over certainly is not a thing that should be cut. Money should be saved where it can be. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has told the House in plain words how some of it could be saved. There are some big gobs of money that could be saved. Competitive bidding would, in my opinion, save millions. But for goodness sake, do not take it out of the hides of the poor boys of this country. Of course, we face a grave crisis, but if we are to meet it we have got to lean over backward to be fair—especially to our youth. We have got to make our young people know that America needs and wants and cannot get along without their talents and their abilities.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Considering the fact that the bill carries an increase for technical training under the Department of Labor, and the technical training being done under W. P. A. and C. C. C., does not the gentleman feel that having allowed nearly $43,000,000 in this bill, that ought to be enough for the training program?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will answer the gentleman this way: I am assuming that the committee on their testimony on this matter has submitted a figure to us based upon the number of people it is assumed the N. Y. A. can adequately give training to. If this be so, I certainly do not think the figure should be reduced. Am I correct in believing that that is the basis on which the committee submits its figure?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's statement is correct. I wish to say that the committee certainly had that in mind and has offered to the House a bill which, in its judgment, adequately provides for those things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I should like to find out if the committee has taken into consideration the fact that approximately 1,000,000 youths will graduate from high schools, colleges, and universities during the present month?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to answer if he cares to.

Mr. TARVER. I do not know that the committee had any particular evidence with reference to the exact number of youths who would graduate from schools and educational institutions this year. We took into consideration the evidence we had as to the number of youths in the country who need this program, the work program, and the in-school program. I referred a while ago to the fact that there is a backlog of 391,000 youths who are eligible for this program but who cannot be taken on because of lack of sufficient funds for the present fiscal year. We have a great volume of evidence, which it is impossible to detail here, showing an urgent need for the continuance of this program with reasonably adequate funds. We have not been extravagant in trying to provide for it. We have tried to be as economical as possible. Certainly every dollar we have reported here or recommended here is amply justified by the evidence.

Mr. HOOK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I believe the youth of America are entitled to just as much consideration as the wildlife conservation, and we have a great wildlife conservation program in America. I believe the youth of America are entitled to the training necessary to take them in as part of the national-defense program.

We have experienced in years past the situation in industry where there has been a shortage of trained youth, trained apprentices, where there has been a shortage of skilled labor. At one time all that the youth of America seemed to think about was a white-collar job. They wanted to go to school, graduate, and become professional men, feeling that manual labor, such as bricklaying, carpenter work, and things of that kind, was beneath their dignity. But as time went on and as the national youth program went into operation and they were taught to labor with their hands and become skilled mechanics to handle lathes and other machines, then it dawned upon the youth of America that they could become a vital moving part of the national-defense program.

Those youths are clamoring to go into the schools and to become a part of that program. They have been trained and they are now taking their part with a smile in the national-defense program. We should not therefore cut down this appropriation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, of course, no one is shocked or even surprised that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] should have offered the pending amendment to slash the appropriation for the National Youth Administration in half. Inasmuch as the gentleman has been against this great youth program from its inception and has opposed it vigorously from the very beginning, it is somewhat surprising that he is not sponsoring an amendment to eliminate the entire appropriation for the National Youth Administration.

You will recall that a year ago and the year before that the same distinguished gentleman was vigorous and vociferous in his opposition to the National Youth Administration, and judging from his attitude, evidently thought it altogether bad. Now, by offering to cut only some forty-odd millions or one-half from the annual appropriation for the National Youth Administration, the gentleman's attitude strongly indicates he feels that the program is now at least half good. It is to be hoped that our friend from New York when he receives further light and information will support the program in the future as vigorously as he has opposed it in the past. [Applause.]

But seriously, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentleman from New York does not expect his amendment to prevail at this time any more than he anticipated that his many amendments would prevail in years past, or any more than he expected to carry the amendment a few minutes ago to eliminate the entire Civilian Conservation Corps program, on which only a handful of faithful friends on his side of the aisle arose to give him their feeble support.

The burden of the argument of those who are supporting either the motion of the gentleman from New York or that of my good friend the distinguished and able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is that we have to cut somewhere and that that cut should come entirely on nondefense activities. I agree wholeheartedly with the first part of the statement—that is to say that Congress must cut and slash appropriations wherever it is possible to do so—but I do not agree that all of such reductions must be made in so-called nondefense activities. Moreover, I certainly do not agree that the National Youth Administration is a nondefense activity. The fact is that the N. Y. A., as is well known, has formulated and is carrying out a real practical national-defense program. It is feeding defense industry with thousands of young men who have had the much needed preliminary training which makes their services invaluable to industry during the present grave crisis.

It would not be good economy, good government, or sound business policy, and surely no thinking Members of Congress, irrespective of political affiliations, would vote at this time to cripple, if not practically destroy, the National Youth Administration and its splendid practical program for youth at a time when we are straining every effort to supply industry with capable young men.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who comes from the Old Dominion State of Virginia, reminds us that we must cut somewhere and must eliminate extravagance and save where it is possible to do so. I agree with his statement, but may I suggest that if there is an agency of government where the taxpayers are getting 100-percent service for every dollar expended that the National Youth Administration certainly can and does qualify as one of those agencies. [Applause.]

It may be that there are very few unemployed and needy youth in the great State of Virginia, that has now become a virtual arsenal of the Army and Navy, and where many defense industries are running day and night, but that situation does not obtain in the State of Oklahoma and many other Midwestern States that are not reaping a ripe harvest in the way of national-defense industries, but since the gentleman has talked about extravagance and since it is suggested that cuts should be made in all nondefense activities rather than anything that has the remotest connection with the Army and Navy, let me say, as one who has supported the defense program on all occasions and under all circumstances, that Congress would do well to scrutinize every defense item whether it be the Air Corps, the Navy, or the Army.

For example, at Army posts in the great old Commonwealth of Virginia, and of course that applies to some other sections, there have been provided hundreds of homes for army officers that cost from $15,000 to $16,000 each, and even noncommissioned officers are living in homes that Members of Congress would call a palatial residence as compared with the stuffy little apartments for which we pay outlandish prices in the Nation's Capital. Incidentally, another important defense bill will be here for consideration in a few days which will include hundreds of millions, even billions of dollars, and it is almost sacrilegious at this particular time to even question a single item that the generals and admirals have even hinted that they need, but the taxpayers have a right to demand that all of these national-defense items as well as nondefense items be scrutinized carefully and that no one take advantage of this emergency or be guilty of waste or extravagance.

Yes; I agree expenses of Government must be cut wherever possible, but why, may I ask, single out the youth of America? It would be tragic for this Congress to attempt such a thing. Since the opposition to the National Youth Administration talk of extravagance and say the committee must cut somewhere, I am sure that no Member of this House on either side of this aisle who knows the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling this bill, will charge him or his committee with being spendthrifts. If there is a real watchdog of the Treasury in this Congress, no one can qualify any better than can the gentleman from Georgia. The committee has already cut this item below the Budget estimate. A few moments ago you heard the chairman say that the evidence before the committee was to the effect that 391,000 eligible needy youths have been certified for the National Youth Administration, for whom no funds are available to assist. These worthy youths are begging, praying, and pleading for an opportunity to go to

school or learn a trade that will enable them to earn a decent living. They are begging for an oportunity to be given a chance to help themselves in this the richest land in all the world.

It is surprising to see the gentleman from Virginia join the gentleman from New York in saying in effect that we cannot afford to give youth this opportunity. Mr. Chairman, I say to you candidly it is my deliberate judgment that the Congress cannot afford to refuse to give youth every reasonable opportunity to help themselves. [Applause.]

A short while before the so-called Munich peace pact, I went all over and through Germany. Even then they were having their black-outs 3 nights a week and were preparing feverishly for the present death struggle. Of course, all who love liberty and freedom have a contempt for Hitler. We want none of his heartless, tyrannical rule in America; and yet I must confess I was surprised to find that in Germany there was no unemployed youth in that country ruled by a heartless dictator.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman made a statement that was very interesting, and I think, enlightening. Did the gentleman mean to say that we are building $15,000 and $16,000 homes for the officers of our Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I mean to say the Army has built hundreds of them.

Mr. SCHULTE. As high as $16,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; and higher. And no one dare question the Army for so doing. I might add that many such palatial homes are almost within a stone's throw of our National Capitol. But that, of course, comes under the category of national defense, and such outlandish, indefensible extravagance on the part of the Army must not be questioned. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 18, noes 93.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Missouri State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the New York State Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION BILL

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 1438, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order of the House, I have been allowed 30 minutes to address the House this afternoon following the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. In view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered this afternoon in Statuary Hall at the statue of Jefferson Davis on the life and character of Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE KEY TO THE MORALE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—THE MISSING FACTOR IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the "new order in Europe" which Hitler proclaims so loudly is not really new but very old. It is a throwback to the days of chiefs and Roman emperors, to the days of absolute reliance upon force as the instrument of government. But the German people believe it is new—and maybe some other peoples believe that too. And this is the serious thing for us.

And you can never successfully oppose a dynamic force and idea with a static one such as the preservation of this or that, however fine it may be.

We can successfully oppose the "new order in Europe" only if we have an "American New World" to offer as an alternative to it. That is what our people must believe we are building, that is what we must be about building, that is what we must start now to build. And our country and it alone of all the nations in the world has a chance to do this job. Upon our success will depend the whole future of mankind—his freedom and his hope.

Here is where some gentlemen miss the whole point as to what is necessary to build morale and national unity. They complain that what they choose to call "social reform" is getting in the way of national defense. That we must now forget such things and concentrate upon national defense. Of course, it depends somewhat on what they mean by social reform. Now is no time I agree to undertake certain types of experiments or to embark upon new programs based on increased or even sustained subsidies of one kind or another.

But things like the permanent solution of the unemployment problem, things like finding and putting into effect a program which will provide financial implementation of defense production and give us a sound and lasting answer to the problem of public debt—these are different matters. They are matters so central to the defense program itself, so essential to the morale of our people that to neglect them is to risk the whole future of our country. And will anyone be so blind as to suggest that the health of the people, the welfare of the people, the employment of all the people are not absolutely esesntial and basic to national strength.

It is spirit and heart and hope the American people need. I know Congress is not interested in the future but only in the immediate present desperate problem. But the thing that makes people willing to go to Army camps, to pay taxes—heavy and burdensome ones—to run risks, and, if need be, to suffer—the thing that spurs people to do these things with a will and a song in their hearts is hope—hope of a better tomorrow for themselves, maybe, but most of all for their children.

Here is the key to the success of our defense effort, gentlemen. Here is the

factor we have forgotten and neglected. What are we going to tell the people when they ask us why? Are we going to tell them simply "to defeat Hitler"? That is enough for you and me because we know what Hitlerism means. But it is not enough for Sam Jones, who farms out in Nebraska, or for Barney O'Neal, who works in a shop in Indianapolis. Sam and Barney want to know what kind of America they are going to leave for their kids.

And so I appeal for consideration of my resolution to create now an outstanding commission to work out a program for the prevention of depression and unemployment and the assurance of sustained full production when this critical period of defense spending comes to an end. I believe I shall get that consideration, gentlemen. I believe the resolution will be passed. I believe we are going to undertake our whole job, not just part of it.

WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE ASKING

On a recent trip I made to my district I found the people not complaining, but ready to sacrifice for defense of their country. But they asked me two questions. One was, "What kind of peace is going to follow this?" And the other was, "What kind of world will we face here in our American towns and cities when you stop spending all this money for defense, when the struggle in Europe is over; will there be millions unemployed again? Will we lose our jobs? Or will there be wisdom and vision enough to prevent this?"

THE REAL CONTEST

A world-wide contest is going on between two opposing philosophies of life and government. To win that contest we must achieve full production for national-defense purposes and we must demonstrate to our people now that we know how to maintain full production after the defense program is over.

We are confronted with competition of a controlled economic order in which finance is secondary to production and in which no financial obstacle is ever raised to a continuous and unlimited increase in production. Dorothy Thompson put it this way in a column published on June 17, 1940:

> The German economy is an economy of things and men; the Allied economy is an economy of symbols; money. The German economy recognizes that all wealth is in goods, particularly in capital goods, and that these are not created by money, which is only a medium of exchange, but by the application of labor to materials.
>
> The Allies had money but failed to produce goods. The Germans had no money, but did produce them.

WHERE WILL WE GET THE MONEY?

We have got to be prepared, if necessary, to devote as much as $20,000,000,000 a year to national defense for the next few years. I hope it will not be necessary but it is wrong to plan for anything less than that.

To say that such a rate of expenditure will break the present financial system is to state the obvious.

But it is certainly no less important for us to be prepared to sustain a full market in the United States for all the consumer goods we can readily produce when this thing is over.

One of three things is going to happen: (1) Either we will fail to compete successfully in production with the totalitarians; or (2) we will in the course of the next few years face a choice between real inflation on the one hand and an insupportable debt burden on the other; or (3) we will make our financial system conform to the needs of the times in which we live.

Only the third of these alternatives can make America safe.

We have got to have a system of money, credit, and public finance which will free us once for all of fear of inflation, deflation, or bankruptcy, and which will make us free to produce every bit we can produce, because we will know that as production increases our financial system will bring into circulation, without increase in public debt, a corresponding increase in the means of paying for and exchanging that increased flow of goods and wealth.

If I did not believe the very safety of America depended upon our taking hold of this principle, I would not talk about it so much.

We have got to and we can pay for defense and for other needs of America out of increased production and our national bookkeeping has got to be made to accord with this principle.

WHEN A "PUBLIC DEBT" SHOULD NOT BE A DEBT

Twenty-two billion dollars of our present public debt has been contracted by bond sales to banks—by paying private institutions to create money for the Government. This is wrong. It is a practice that should not continue. Whenever new money is to be created it should always be the Government that does it.

And our new bonds will work the same way unless we look out. For as long as banks can immediately use them as collateral for Federal Reserve notes or credit they can lend against such bonds and use blue-sky credit created on their books to make the loans.

And when this is over these bonds will fall again into hands of the few and there will be a drive to deflate the money supply and increase buying power of interest. This we must provide against with every means at our command.

THERE MUST BE NO DEFLATION

There should be no such deflation when the defense period is over.

Whatever happens now or in the immediate future there must be no deflation such as followed the World War.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT SETS FORTH BASIC PROBLEM

And what of the future?

Here is what the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee had to say about it:

> Technology will continue to increase labor productivity, displace skilled occupations and reduce unit labor costs. In the absence of effective offsetting forces, economic and social distress may be expected to accumulate.
>
> The existence of a large amount of long-term unemployment indicates a lack of balance between labor-displacing effects and the compensatory forces presumed to be inherent in our economic system. Estimates of unemployment at the beginning of 1940 range from 8,500,000 (National Industrial Conference Board) to nearly 12,000,000 (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
>
> Among benefits promised by economic theory to offset the evils of the machine are lower prices, higher wages, shorter hours, and development of new industries.
>
> Refusal to make use of price reductions is characteristic of mechanized industry. Price-fixing agreements among competitors are the rule rather than exception.
>
> Even during periods of greatest wage increases, unit labor costs decline, because advances in average hourly earnings are generally exceeded by still greater increases of output per man-hour.
>
> Further curtailment of working hours is distinctly remote, since legislation has established, and public opinion has accepted, the 40-hour week as the norm of employment.
>
> With the possible exception of the Diesel engine, there is in sight no great new peace industry offering promise of taking up any significant proportion of unemployment.
>
> While technology creates tremendous economic problems through labor displacement, it also induces concentration which impedes the operation of price reductions.
>
> A state of serious unbalance exists today. Under present conditions it is likely not only to continue but to become even more pronounced.
>
> The persistence of mass unemployment in the United States, despite marked economic recovery, and the growing emphasis on technological advance should cause grave concern to all thoughtful persons who seek the preservation of democracy.

The moment peace returns this is what we will be confronted with. What of that future? What are we going to do?

Why is business fearful of overexpansion? Because it is afraid the market will fail.

I want to establish now firm principles in our Nation which will prevent the home market from ever failing again.

It can be done.

It is not enough to plan for another period of deficit spending for public works when the defense spending stops or is reduced. We must develop now the basis of a continuously effective economic program—one we can live with from year to year, one that will not depend on governmental subsidies, one that will make men and industry truly free.

It can be done.

In our hearts we know what is required. Indeed, much of the legislation is already introduced; some of the machinery is already in operation. But we shall not find that program unless first we say with all our might: "It is more important for America's people to be strong and at work than it is for a few individuals to either hold out of use the Nation's medium of exchange or control and restrict its original creation."

And it must be a program which will assure full employment to our people, full use of our resources, a full and adequate home market for the products of industry and of agriculture.

WE MUST RAISE OUR SIGHTS

We must raise our sights, gentlemen. We have long enough been afraid of full employment, afraid to think in terms of the one obvious thing—namely, to see to it that consumer buying power keeps pace with producing power in the United States, or in other words that we get rid once and for all of actual poverty in the

midst of a plenty that has been or can readily be produced but which goes unsold for lack of a cash market.

Yet the whole health of the kind of economic system we are trying to run depends upon the flow of consumer buying power in sufficient volume to call forth all our powers to produce. Nothing less will do, for with nothing less can you compete with the totalitarians. This is what national defense means.

And may I merely suggest that if you will think back to the quotation I gave you from the T. N. E. C. report and really grasp its significance you will, I believe, be able to see the sense in sound proposals for national old-age pensions and you can understand such pensions not as great expenditures of public funds but as means of channeling perhaps three or four billion dollars that would otherwise lie idle into the stream of active buying power. I think also if you think back to that report you will agree with me that one of two things we must do; either we must restore and maintain competition and the opportunities of the small man in industry or else where that is impossible—as it is in the field of electric power, for example, we must by means of the Government yardstick method compel monopoly to bring the prices it charges within reason and to act in the public interest.

And so not only do I say "more power to the Antitrust Division," I say a free economic order cannot continue to exist in this technological age unless monopoly power is either brought absolutely under control or else destroyed outright, and that methods of accomplishing one or the other of these objectives have simply got to be devised and put into effect.

I must not outline today in any detail an economic program which in my opinion will provide the dynamic we must have to carry us through. Such a program should be worked out by more heads than one and some of the heads, I think, should be outside the Government. Such a program should be the work of a commission such as I spoke of awhile ago and for the creation of which I am appealing in this speech.

But perhaps I will be pardoned if I repeat once again what I have called before this the four American promises that I think have got to be made clear to the whole world and real to our own people. Upon the realization of these four promises can be built, I believe, that American new world which will be unassailable in any kind of circumstances:

There must be promise of a new world—an American new world in all we do.

That promise must include that we shall refuse to see hunger and surplus side by side. There shall be no farm surplus and no hungry children.

That promise must include that we shall refuse to waste the ability, skill, or labor of a single willing worker. There shall be no unemployment and no idle men.

That promise must include that we shall refuse to see our Nation go on paying tribute to private creators of credit. There shall be asserted the right and duty of the Congress to create the Nation's money and regulate its value.

That promise must include not governmental aid or subsidy but encouragement to every cooperative effort, movement, or organization among groups of the American people. That there shall be no stumbling block placed in their way. For cooperation is the opposite of dictatorship and of monopoly, of regimentation, of totalitarianism, of governmental control. Cooperation is, I am convinced, the basic hope of democracy.

These things are not simply questions of social reform. They are necessary foundations for the economic strength of our country and its people. They are bases of hope. And, therefore, they are absolutely essential to military strength and to national defense.

I shall not discuss in detail how we can make these promises real. But I do want merely to point out that the only thing that prevents an extension of the stamp plan for distribution of so-called farm surpluses to every low-income family in America is our lack of vision. Here is food already produced; here are farmers in need of an expanded home market; here are people in need of that food; here is a nation in need of sturdy citizens. Yet we have not yet said, as some day God grant we may say that the tickets or stamps we use to move this food from producer to consumer shall be eligible for continuous use in all the transactions of this Nation, including the payment of taxes. When we say that, we will see a living demonstration of certain truths about production, consumption, wealth, money, and economic well-being, about which some of us have been talking for a long time.

THESE THINGS WE MUST SAY OVER AND OVER

The American people have got to begin all over this Nation to say, "Of course, we know what this is all about. It is a defense of freedom, of rights for the individual which are his because he is a citizen not because some man gives them to him." The American people must have reason for saying all over this Nation, "Of course we know what this is all about. It is to protect the greatest nation on earth, a nation where there are no hungry school children and where every low-income family participates in a plan for the purchase from the farmers of all the abundant food crops they raise, a nation that is moving forward to the time when every farm and city home will be lighted with electricity that even poor people can afford, a nation that is solving unemployment in a far, far better, far, far more permanent way than any dictator can do. A nation able to produce so abundantly that not only is it arming to make itself impregnable but it sets aside out of its huge national income each year sufficient to retire in decency and health the aged citizens for whose services in industry there is no longer a need or demand, a nation finally in which a new spirit of cooperation is growing up among the people."

THE WELLSPRINGS OF HUMAN ACTION

There are only two impulses that can drive men to the greatest and most sustained effort and sacrifice. One is the impulse of desperation that comes to people when they see clearly that they must fight for survival itself. Such I believe is the impulse behind the British people today. But whether we like it or not, gentlemen, the plain and obvious truth is that the American people do not today feel any such impulse of desperation. The other impulse, and I believe the only other one that is adequate to call forth what has come to be known as an all-out effort, is the impulse of an ideal, an ideal that has some religious meaning in it, an ideal and a hope of a tomorrow that will be definitely and clearly better than today has been. It is upon the wakening of such an ideal in the hearts of the American people that we must today depend completely. And whether or not it is to be awakened depends primarily, I am convinced, on how well the Congress and the other leaders of the Nation do their job. May God grant we shall not fail.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WADSWORTH (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS), for 10 days, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 4, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, June 4, 1941. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 4454, H. R. 106, and H. R. 3366, regarding engineering experiment stations and physical-science research.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10 a. m. Wednesday, June 4, 1941, to consider H. R. 4873 (ALLEN, Louisiana), a bill to promote the national defense by limiting the entry of certain aliens into the United States. Also private bills.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet Friday, June 6, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 353, Old House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 4854.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a

further public hearing on the subject of royalty payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

589. A letter from Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

590. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of awards made under the authority of the act of March 5, 1940 (Public, No. 426, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 191. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings; without amendment (Rept. No. 736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and to Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 737). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Annie Mae Hughett; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4844) for the relief of Henry J. McCann; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDELSTEIN:

H. R. 4943. A bill to provide workmen's compensation for employees of carriers engaged in interstate transportation by motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4944. A bill to increase the monthly base pay of certain enlisted men of the Army and the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4945 A bill to amend the act approved March 5, 1940, entitled "An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 4946. A bill relating to the manning of seagoing barges; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4947. A bill to provide for reimbursement of officers on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4948. A bill to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4949 (by request). A bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition certain property for the use of or disposition by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution for the relief of the stricken and starving populations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium, Norway, the Netherlands, Greece, and other occupied countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. Res. 225. Resolution to investigate the matter of the obtaining of essential war materials from the United States by the Axis Powers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 226. Resolution for the relief of Victoria M. Vodila; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 47, relating to further development of State Highway No. 20 in California; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 148, relative to eminent domain to interstate oil pipe lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House resolution with reference to the Arkansas Valley Authority bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4950. A bill for the relief of Raymond N. Hutto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 4951. A bill granting a pension to Clarence H. Hedges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 4952. A bill for the relief of Squire Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 4953. A bill for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4954. A bill granting a pension to Roberta Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 4955. A bill for the relief of Geoffrey Orme; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4956. A bill for the relief of Georgia Spears Melvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 4957. A bill for the relief of Carl Chalker; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1268. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of sundry residents of St. Helena and Angwin, Napa County; Stockton, San Joaquin County; Vallejo, Solano County; and Sacramento, Sacramento County, Calif., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1269. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Camden, N. Y., and surrounding towns, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852 in the form in which they were introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1270. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Boston College Alumni Association, Chestnut Hill, Mass., supporting deferment to all students who are candidates for graduate or undergraduate degrees; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1271. Also, petition of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1272. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the United States to stay out of present European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1273. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Nassau County, N. Y., oppcsing enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1274. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of the Ocean View Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Long Beach, Calif., Mrs. J. J. McAllister, president, and signed by 1,537 residents of Long Beach, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1275. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Luther L. Allen and other residents of Taunton, Mass., protesting against enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1276. By Mr. PATMAN: Senate Resolution No. 148 of the Texas State Senate, requesting the Congress of the United States to amend House Resolution No. 4816 so that it will include gas pipe lines and give said pipe lines the right of eminent domain in the event said bill is finally passed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1277. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 50, relative to the making available of funds for the Corcoran Airport; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1278. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Labor's Non-Partisan League of New Jersey, urging full aid by the Government of the United States to Great Britain and China, including, if necessary, the convoying of ships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1279. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Henry LaCroix and 44 others, opposing participation in foreign wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1280. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of subsidiary No. 1 of the United Master Barbers of Illinois, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendment of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1281. Also, petition of the Georgia State Commissioner of Agriculture, petitioning amendment of laws creating trade barriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., executive secretary of the Methodist Commission on Camp Activities, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, whose remembered mercies call forth praise and whose unfailing promises warrant hope, grant us an awareness that Thou art listening and looking as we address our petitions to Thee.

Make us worthy of the divine approval as we move through the hours of this day. Deliver us from the sins that beset the soul—the folly of pride and the blindness of bigotry, the bane of selfishness and the futility of unbelief.

Grant us wisdom equal to our perplexities, strength equal to our tasks, loyalty equal to our convictions, and courage equal to our temptations. Give us, our Father, an awakened sense of all enduring values—truth and honor and beauty and faith and charity. Fit us for acceptable service to our country, our fellow men, and to all high and holy causes. May all our work be begun, continued, and ended in Thee. This prayer we offer in the name of Jesus, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4590. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 937. An act to amend section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937; and

S. 1050. An act relating to the status of retired judges.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3536) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill to the House?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been unanimously reported by the Naval Affairs Committee and the Rules Committee has already granted a rule on it. It provides for the authorization of $40,000,000 for the purpose of constructing what are known as sectional bases for small craft at various ports throughout the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These bases are all recommended by the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are all recommended by the Navy, and you may find in the report where these bases will be located. I may state that the Committee on Appropriations, in a supplementary bill, has already authorized for this identical purpose an appropriation of $10,000,000. The total amount they wanted was $50,000,000. So we are taking into account the $10,000,000 that has previously been appropriated and for which there was no authorization. So the bill on its face carries $50,000,000, but under the language of the bill it will only carry $40,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Are any of these bases located in the Great Lakes region?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Here is a list of the bases:

BASES FOR WHICH MONEY HAS BEEN ALLOCATED

Charleston, S. C.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Boston, Mass.; New London, Conn.; Tompkinsville, N. Y.; San Diego, Calif.; San Pedro, Calif.; Port Townsend, Wash.; Little Creek, Va.; Cape May, N. J.; Mariveles, P. I.; Newport, R. I.; Balboa, C. Z.; Cristobal, C. Z.; Bishop's Point, T. H.; San Francisco, Calif.; Guantanamo, Cuba; San Juan, P. R.; Burrwood, La.; Portland, Maine; Sabine Pass, Tex.; Port Angeles, Wash.; Eureka, Calif.; Astoria, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Sitka, Alaska; Dutch Harbor, Unalaska; Morro Bay, Calif.; Coos Bay, Oreg.; Kodiak, Alaska.

ADDITIONAL BASES AUTHORIZED BY THIS BILL

Rockland, Maine; Bar Harbor, Maine; Woods Hole, Mass.; Block Island, R. I.; Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.; Lewes, Del.; Curtis Bay, Md.; St. Helena, Va.; Morehead City, N. C.; Southport, N. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Mayport (Jacksonville), Fla.; Port Everglades, Fla.; Key West, Fla.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; Galveston, Tex.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Vieques Sound, P. R.; St. Thomas, V. I.; Trinidad; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Monterey, Calif.; Neah Bay, Wash.; Ketchikan, Alaska; Petersburg, Alaska; Juneau, Alaska; Seward, Alaska.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, the answer is "No." [Laughter.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not see any in the Great Lakes region.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish, at various locations, such section bases for the support of small craft as the President may deem necessary to the national defense. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy with the approval of the President may consider best suited to the purpose, and construct or acquire buildings and other necessary facilities.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $50,000,000 to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590–592), shall be applicable to all projects authorized by this act, regardless of location: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under the authority of the above-mentioned act shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "act", insert "This sum, however, shall be inclusive of the $10,000,000 appropriated for section bases and related purposes by the act approved March 17, 1941 (Public, No. 13, 77th Cong.)"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 196 was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4839) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and immediately consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill calls for the authorization of $31,115,000. We went before the Rules Committee on yesterday and asked for a rule. The Rules Committee was somewhat disturbed about one section of the bill because the gentleman who appeared before the committee did not have all the facts. The bill has been recommended by the Navy Department. The items will come

up in the supplementary appropriation bill, and the measure has been unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What type of construction is involved?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is for the purpose of building a marine base down in North Carolina costing $14,000,000, a naval operating base at Newport, R. I., costing $2,000,000, a naval operating base at Norfolk costing $500,000, a naval ammunition depot at Hingham, Mass., costing $3,500,000, replacement of marine barracks at naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va., $125,000, and for bases at the Great Lakes Training Station costing $1,265,000, and at the Rhode Island Training Station $1,095,000, and at Norfolk, Va., $1,700,000, and at the naval training station at San Diego, $1,400,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, this is a part of the naval-expansion program for defense purposes?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct, and the confusion that occurred in the Rules Committee yesterday was because the committee struck out $5,500,000 with respect to an item in the bill because it was not broken down. Under this amendment we give the break-down. It was not explained to the Rules Committee exactly how that happened in this particular instance.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. The supposed error in printing which was referred to in the hearing before the Rules Committee was not an error at all? The bill is now correctly printed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to proceed with the construction of the following public-works projects, including the acquisition of the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed the amount stated after each item enumerated:

Naval operating base, Newport, R. I.: Fleet-operating facilities, including dredging, $2,000,000.

Naval operating base, Norfolk, Va.: Replacement of marine barracks, $500,000.

Expansion of facilities at training stations, $5,500,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hingham, Mass.: Extension of facilities, including purchase of land, $3,500,000.

Naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va.: Replacement of marine barracks, $125,000.

Naval hospital, Key West, Fla.: Construction of hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories and acquisition of land, $1,000,000.

Marine aviation facilities, Neuse River, N. C., $14,990,000.

Expansion of Marine Corps training facilities, $3,500,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "proceed with" and insert "establish or develop the following shore establishments by."

Line 6, page 1, strike out the words "including the acquisition of" and insert "with which shall be included the authority to acquire."

Page 2, strike out all of line 5.

Page 2, after line 15, insert the following:

"Naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.: Expansion of facilities, $1,265,000.

"Naval training station, Newport, R. I.: Expansion of facilities, $1,095,000.

"Naval training station, Norfolk, Va.: Expansion of facilities, $1,700,000.

"Naval training station, San Diego, Calif.: Expansion of facilities, $1,440,000.

"The foregoing costs for expansion of facilities at naval training stations may each be varied upward or downward 30 percent, provided the total cost for all four stations is not exceeded.

"The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590–592), as amended, shall be applicable to all public works and public-utilities projects authorized by this act, regardless of location: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under the authority of the above-mentioned act shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

"The provisions of section 8 (a) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), shall be applicable to the public-works projects authorized by this act.

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to investigate and report to the Congress, as soon as practicable, but not later than 10 days after the convening of the session on or about January 3, 1942, upon the cost and desirability of establishing underground fuel storage facilities and underground hangars at naval shore establishments."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RICH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. JONES.

AMENDMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2097, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4, substituting therefor a new section (k), with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT.

REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD T. TAYLOR

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, Colorado was admitted to the Union August 1, 1876. Henry M. Teller was chosen at the first session of the Colorado General Assembly as one of the first two United States Senators from Colorado. He took his seat December 4, 1876. In April 1882, Teller resigned from the Senate to accept the appointment as Secretary of the Interior in the Cabinet of President Arthur, in which position he served until March 4, 1885. On that same day, having meanwhile been reelected to the Senate, Henry M. Teller again took his seat in that body. Thereafter, he served continuously as a Senator from Colorado until March 4, 1909, when he voluntarily retired to private life. The continuous public service in Washington of Senator Teller from Colorado was 32 years and 3 months.

March 4, 1909, the same day Senator Teller retired from the Senate, EDWARD T. TAYLOR took his seat in the House of Representatives as a Congressman from Colorado. Despite the vicissitudes of politics, Congressman TAYLOR, every 2 years thereafter, has been reelected by substantial majorities.

Senator Teller's total official service in Washington from our State was 32 years and 3 months. Today, June 4, 1941, Representative EDWARD T. TAYLOR has served in the House 32 years and 3 months. That makes a record of two equal immediately successive services, totaling 64 years and 6 months, extending from the year in which the Centennial State was born to this hour. In none other of the 48 States has there been or ever can be such a record by any other two men of immediately consecutive public service, extending from the beginning of one of the present States for 64½ years.

Teller was Colorado's grand old man—TAYLOR is Colorado's grand old man. [Applause.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a

recent editorial from the Delaware County Dairyman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNIFIED AIR FORCE

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, if we have learned anything from the battle in Crete just ended, we have learned the importance of a separate and unified air force. On March 26 I introduced H. R. 4192, which seeks to create such an air force and to establish a Department of Air under a Secretary for Air in the President's Cabinet. This bill now rests in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. May I urge the chairman and members of that committee, in view of the present emergency and the need for an impregnable defense, to give this bill prompt and favorable hearing and consideration?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an editorial from the New York World-Telegram of June 2, 1941, and one from the New York Daily News of June 3, 1941, supporting my contention that a separate air force is necessary for the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

W. P. A. WORKERS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

[Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE REYNOLDS BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleagues if they have not read the Reynolds property-seizure bill, introduced in the Senate on Monday last, they should do so immediately, and weep over what is proposed should be done to their country. It presupposes that the people not only do not have the capacity, but the right, to rule themselves. It is the most astounding bid for dictatorial powers that has arisen since the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Pass this bill and you give the final kiss of death to free government in America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert therein a radio address by the mayor of Newark, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a resolution with reference to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION IN VIRGINIA

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLANNAGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal dated May 31, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions and a Flag Day address by William D. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a letter from Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission, dealing with the subject of marine insurance, which was the subject of a matter introduced recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a speech I made on Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BONNEVILLE POWER

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a telegram I have just received from the Bonneville Administration in Portland, Oreg.:

Columbia River power now flowing into Pendleton. We began serving Army air base that city today under contract calling for delivery up to 1,200 kilowatts.

JOHN WHEELER,
Chief, Information Division.

This is information that I wanted to give the House. On this one small contract alone the Government in its War Department activities will save more than enough money to pay the interest for all the lines built by the Government in eastern Oregon. This is interesting in light of the big fight that was made in this House about 2 years ago to eliminate the eastward lines that the bill provided should be built in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington. The wisdom of our action in insisting upon the construction of those lines is now plainly apparent. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Farm Credit Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF PARITY LOAN ON COTTON AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when the conference report on H. R. 149, known as the parity loan bill, was voted on in the House on May 13, I was out of the city, having attended the Mother's Day exercises held by the Fraternal Order of the Eagles at Savannah, Ga., as the speaker of the day, and for that reason I was not present to vote on the conference report. However, I heartily favored the adoption of the conference report which increased the parity loan on cotton and other commodities from 75 percent, as was provided in the measure as originally passed by the House, to 85 percent. I would have voted in favor of the report had I been present.

May I observe that in view of the lack of active opposition in the House to the adoption of the conference report it was not deemed necessary by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to notify the members in advance that the conference report would be taken up at this particular time, and for this reason many Members who favored the report and who would have otherwise been present were absent and were therefore not recorded as favoring the report.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Wall Street and a little group of our international Jewish brethren are still attempting to harass the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States into plunging us into the European war unprepared; and at

the same time the communistic elements throughout the country are fomenting strikes by harassing industry and slowing down our defense program.

These international bankers are so afraid this peace movement now going on in England, this peace movement now going on behind the lines, might take root and this catastrophe be brought to a close before they can get us into it that on yesterday they held a rally in Wall Street, and Wall Street bankers made a plea to that effect.

If Great Britain can get terms of peace that will leave her Empire and her Navy intact, we ought not to stand in her way.

We are supplying Great Britain all the aid we can, but we ought to let the world know now, we ought to let the British people know now, that we are not going to plunge into this war and send an army to fight on European soil. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hitler started out by speaking about "Jewish brethren." It is becoming the play and the work of those people who want to demagog to speak about "Jewish brethren" and "international bankers."

The last speaker, speaking about international bankers, coupled them with our Jewish brethren. The fact of the matter is that the number of Jewish bankers in the United States is infinitesimal. It is also a fact that the meeting which took place yesterday on the steps of the Subtreasury was entirely controlled by persons other than Jewish bankers. I deplore the idea that any time anything happens, whether it be for a war policy or against a war policy, men in this House and outside this House attempt to use the Jews as their scapegoat. I say it is unfair and I say it is un-American. As a Member of this House I deplore such allegations, because we are living in a democracy. All men are created equal, regardless of race, creed, or color; and whether a man be Jew or Gentile he may think what he deems fit. [Applause.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Allen, Ill.	Flannery	Mansfield
Andresen, August H.	Gavagan	Martin, Iowa
Arnold	Geyer, Calif.	Merritt
Baldwin	Gifford	Mitchell
Barry	Granger	Murdock
Bennett	Green	Nichols
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	Norton
Buckley, N. Y.	Hartley	O'Day
Bulwinkle	Healey	O'Leary
Byrne	Heffernan	O'Toole
Camp	Heidinger	Ploeser
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Plumley
Cannon, Mo.	Hinshaw	Randolph
Carter	Houston	Robsion, Ky.
Cartwright	Howell	Rockefeller
Celler	Jacobsen	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Jarman	Romjue
Clark	Jarrett	Sacks
Cluett	Jenks, N. H.	Schuetz
Collins	Jennings	Shannon
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Cooley	Keefe	Smith, Pa.
Costello	Kennedy, Michael J.	Starnes, Ala.
Creal	Kerr	Stratton
Crosser	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Culkin	Kramer	Sumners, Tex.
Cullen	Lea	Sweeney
Delaney	LeCompte	Taber
Dies	McArdle	Thill
Dirksen	McGehee	Tolan
Disney	McGranery	Traynor
Domengeaux	Maciejewski	Wadsworth
Douglas	Magnuson	White
Elliott, Calif.		Youngdahl
Fish		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. MCCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will only recognize those Members who have special orders for today.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the completion of matters on the Speaker's desk and after disposition of previous orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, words fail me at this moment because of my grief, and I am sure that grief is shared by every Member of this House. You have seen a Member begin the long journey right on the floor of the House during a debate in which a man sought to protect his people, his integrity, and his Americanism. He died a martyr to a cause.

Very few incidents such as we have just seen have occurred. He was a living dynamo a few minutes ago. He is nothing now.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that this should happen at this time, because his service to the country, to his State, and to his district is so vital.

MICHAEL EDELSTEIN was an outstanding statesman; he was a lawyer; he was a friend of humanity. He has served his country well, he has served his State well; and he served his people well. I shall ask at some other time, Mr. Speaker, that proper services be had in honor of our distinguished departed colleague. The thing is so horrible that I cannot believe what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer a resolution, but before doing so I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, Congressman M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, our colleague from New York, passed away suddenly on the floor of this House. He had just finished making a speech in reply to a statement which he believed was unfair to his coreligionists and was of personal concern to him.

Congressman EDELSTEIN was a friend of mine for more than a quarter of a century. Born in Poland in 1888, he was brought to this country as a small child and continued to live in New York City, where he attended our public schools, Cooper Union, and the Brooklyn Law School. In 1910 he was admitted to the practice of the law.

Throughout that long period of our friendship I greatly admired MICHAEL for his many fine qualities of manhood. He was a kindly person, a devoted son, and a loyal adherent to the ancient faith of Israel.

Alert to opportunity, self-reliant, facile, and warm-hearted, he made his own way, owing his success to his tireless persistence and his unquenchable ardor in living. He belonged to the aristocracy of the plain people of this country.

He was a highly respected member of the bar and an able pleader. Almost daily he appeared in our courts and was regarded as an expert on Federal law and procedure. While he was an aggressive advocate he never took unfair advantage of an adversary. His conduct in the courtroom was always that of a gentleman. He represented, at the request of the court, possibly more penniless defendants than any other member of our local bar.

He was a keen and understanding student of human nature. His district, the fourteenth, is located in a congested section of the city, and he was daily confronted with the problems of his neighbors. Many of his constituents were of foreign birth, and their involved problems could only be solved by a man with the patience and tolerance of Congressman EDELSTEIN.

MICHAEL EDELSTEIN was elected to Congress at a special election held on February 6, 1940. He was thoroughly equipped to hold the office with a background of hard work, a training in the law, and a demonstrated capacity for service to

his fellow man, his God, and his adopted country.

His passing is a great personal loss to me, and I know I express the sentiments of my delegation when I say that we have lost a true friend, his district a model Representative, and the country a splendid citizen.

His family life was an example and inspiration to those favored with the opportunity to observe it. While our hearts go out in sympathy and sorrow to his mother, sisters, and brothers, we would remind them that he left behind a memory of fidelity and love which as time goes on will become as sweet as the fragrance of a perfumed flower. Truly he has left footprints on the sands of time.

He added to the sum of human joy; and were every one to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, less than an hour and a half ago our departed friend was acting in his capacity as a member of the Civil Service Committee, showing great interest in the welfare of his constituency in New York. When I walked over to the Capitol a few minutes ago and heard of his death it was certainly a great shock to me. I am deeply grieved over his death.

He has been a member of the Civil Service Committee since he became a Member of Congress. He has been a most faithful, attentive Member, interested in the work of the committee and in the welfare of the people he represented. It certainly grieves me very much that he will not be with us any longer.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, was my friend and neighbor. He represented the New York City district which adjoins my congressional district on the south, hence I had full opportunity to observe and evaluate his fine qualities of mind and spirit and his everlasting devotion to truth and the things that count most in life.

At a moment such as this the center aisle means nothing. We have lost from the Halls of Congress and from our comradeship a real man, a real citizen, who died in harness, and who, in his last words, uttered from the Well of this House just a few moments ago, expressed allegiance to those immutable and sacred principles of our Republic, for which many other great Americans have fought and died.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by what has just happened before my very eyes. About three-quarters of an hour ago the gentleman from New York, Congressman EDELSTEIN, and I walked across the Capitol Grounds together. There was nothing in his demeanor to indicate what was about to happen. As a matter of fact, there was just one thought in his mind. He was seriously concerned about a young man who had come here from New York to secure a position. Somehow, the position had not materialized and the gentleman from New York, Congressman EDELSTEIN, had left word at his office that if he showed up to be sure to give him enough money to take care of him. This was the spirit always exhibited by the gentleman from New York, Congressman EDELSTEIN. I have known him for years as a member of the bar of New York and I know many judges who have known him. I am very proud to say here that the gentleman from New York, Congressman EDELSTEIN, unquestionably was one of the foremost practitioners at the bar and a man whose word was his bond. The bar of justice has lost a brilliant lawyer and a fine gentleman, and the country at large will miss him because of his devotion to duty and his patriotism to his country, which he loved so well.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 227):

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following funeral committee: Mr. CULLEN, Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, and Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, at 11 a. m. tomorrow, June 5, 1941.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet Friday, June 6, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 353, Old House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 4854.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a further public hearing on the subject of royalty payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

591. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research-Transportation, provided by part 1, title III of the Transportation Act of 1940, in the amount of $100,000 for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 238); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

592. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, Executive Office of the President, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $39,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 239); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

593. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Post Office Department for foreign air-mail transportation in the sums of $40,053 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and $520,705 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 240); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

594. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 241); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

595. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, authorizing the employment of additional personnel in the Navy Department at Washington (H. Doc. No. 242); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

596. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to $15,000 (H. Doc. No. 243); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3466. A bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to accept title to the fish hatchery at Clark Fork, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4851. A bill to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4958. A bill to provide freshening-up courses for experienced mechanics necessary for the national defense; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 4959. A bill to further expedite the strengthening of the national defense, to provide for licensing of exports and imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LARRABEE:

H. R. 4960. A bill to provide for the transfer of surplus personal property of the United States to certain schools conducting vocational or defense training courses; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4961. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended by section 14 of the act of August 31, 1935; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLAUCHÉ:

H. R. 4962. A bill to establish the Department of Military and Naval Aeronautics; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R 4963. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Rodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4964. A bill for the relief of Elsie Hugaboom; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1282. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Charles D. Shanklin, post commander, and Jack H. Tandy, adjutant, of the Christian County Post, No. 21, American Legion, calling for all steps necessary to assure the safe delivery of supplies to Great Britain and other countries fighting the dictators and also for an end to strikes in defense industries and to sabotage of our defense efforts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1283. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Letter of protest by Earl H. Hanson, superintendent of Rock Island public schools, Rock Island, Ill., regarding additional tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1284. Also, petition of Frank J. Horn, of Macomb, Ill., protesting against proposed increase tax of 1 cent on soft drinks, Coca-Cola, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1285. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the Fourteenth District of Illinois, protesting against enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, which has to do with the Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia having the power to designate the hours of operation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1286. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Young and several citizens of North Liberty and the First Congressional District of Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2475 or Senate bill 860, providing for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1287. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 40, relative to making citrus fruits available to the enlisted personnel of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, May 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of Lights, who dost enlighten us with the warming light of faith: We give thanks, amidst the vastness of the unknown, for the day-star in our heart, for the sense of invisible presences, those illuminations of the spirit, the wonder and beauty of things that are seen even though the night abide. May we never create any shadow for ourselves or for others by our plaintiveness or our distress, but grant us always to shed abroad the light that is born of love, of a pure heart, of a conscience void of offense.

Sustain us, dear Lord, through all the evil of the evil day, and if there be no song within our hearts, help us to learn to sing, by yearning and by sighing, the prayer of the ancient Psalmist, "Send out Thy light and Thy truth, let them lead me; and let them bring me to Thy holy hill." So prepare our hearts to worship the King in His beauty, when the day of all good shall dawn, at the coming of the Son of Man. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1941.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LISTER HILL, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

PAT HARRISON,
President pro tempore.

Thereupon Mr. HILL took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, June 3, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 3, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 166. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.;

S. 167. An act to provide a right-of-way across Camp Wallace Military Reservation, P. I.;

S. 840. An act to create the grade of aviation cadet in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and to prescribe the pay and allowances therefor, and for other purposes;

S. 1063. An act to provide increased pay for certain military personnel while engaged on parachute duty;

S. 1371. An act to authorize the training of enlisted men of the Army as aviation students; and

S. 1541. An act authorizing overtime rates of compensation for certain per annum employees of the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, and providing additional pay for employees who forego their vacations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, and Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER members, on the part of the House, of a committee to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 583. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States Commissioners;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin;

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle, and the Dauterive Hospital; and

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Maynard Goss, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 829. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers;

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey; and

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the

committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k); agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RICH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 181. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Osterhaus;

H. R. 189. An act for the relief of William J. Kimball;

H. R. 191. An act for the relief of Franklin Stencil and Demonic Stencil;

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of Edna La Blanche Gillette;

H. R. 341. An act granting an increase of pension to Inez Clair Bandholtz;

H. R. 376. An act granting a pension to Bertha R. Ettner;

H. R. 439. An act granting a pension to Martha Pace;

H. R. 474. An act granting a pension to John H. Botner;

H. R. 477. An act granting a pension to Cora Arlena Ballard;

H. R. 492. An act granting an increase of pension to Rosalie C. Hood;

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, individually, and as the natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 902. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Painter Menoher;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1359. An act for the relief of Robert Edward Lee;

H. R. 1493. An act granting an increase of pension to Florence Sharp Grant;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 1576. An act for the relief of Emily Barlow;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1702. An act for the relief of Mary McCutcheon;

H. R. 1743. An act for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass;

H. R. 1746. An act for the relief of Charles J. Schay;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;

H. R. 1855 An act for the relief of Laura McStay;

H. R. 1994 An act granting a pension to Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr.;

H. R. 2010 An act for the relief of Wade H. Erwin and Vonnie Erwin;

H. R. 2063 An act granting a renewal of pension to William H. Shanklin;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John S. Small;

H. R. 2190. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. Merriman;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Reed and Rose Reed;

H. R. 2382. An act for the relief of William Cromer;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Margaret S. Holten;

H. R. 2563. An act granting a pension to Artricey K. Burden;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Lewis Jones;

H. R. 2787. An act granting an increase of pension to Ethel Wise;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2888. An act for the relief of H. E. Buzby;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Mrs. O. B. Olson;

H. R. 3308. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 3358. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Westover;

H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of the Equitable Insurance Alliance, the Fidelity & Guaranty Fire Corporation, and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3551. An act for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli;

H. R. 3607. An act for the relief of Anton Waytashek;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer;

H. R. 3801. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor;

H. R. 3802. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schwan;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Tony Cirone;

H. R. 4359. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith;

H. R. 4414. An act for the relief of Andrew Wichmann;

H. R. 4430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton Ward and Ester Ward;

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4556. An act for the relief of L. S. Jones;

H. R. 4839. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4860. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; and

H. R. 4868. An act to amend section 3 of title 1 of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire, on behalf of the people of the United States, a statue of Commodore John Barry.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gillette	Overton
Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Schwartz
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Houston	Smith
Bulow	Hughes	Stewart
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Truman
Byrnes	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	Lodge	Tydings
Caraway	McCarran	Van Nuys
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Mead	White
Danaher	Murdock	Wiley
Davis	Norris	Willis
Ellender	Nye	
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York

[Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT
(H. DOC. NO. 245)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend authorization of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, pursuant to the agreement of March 19, 1941, with Canada, as an integral part of the joint defense of the North American Continent.

Production and more production is the keynote of our all-out race for national defense. Electric power and transportation are limiting factors in the production of planes, guns, tanks, and ships.

The enemies of democracy are developing every hydroelectric resource and every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles. Are we to allow this continent to be out-matched because short-sighted interests oppose the development of one of our greatest resources?

Your action on this project will either make available or withhold 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost electric power for the joint defense of North America.

Your action on this project will either open or keep bottled up one of the greatest transportation resources ever offered a people.

Both countries need the power. Both face power shortages which threaten to grow more serious as the demands of the defense program multiply with almost incredible rapidity.

Let us remember that it takes tens of thousands of kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce the materials that go into a single airplane. Our present aluminum program alone calls for more than 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. It is constantly expanding with the need for more planes to outstrip the aggressors.

Steam power plant construction offers no substitute for St. Lawrence power. No steam plants can provide the large blocks of low-cost electric energy required for certain essential defense industries. Furthermore, we are going to need all our capacity to produce steam power plant equipment to meet the tremendous demands which are growing in other parts of the country and to build power installations to drive our merchant and naval vessels.

Our defense production is a gigantic assembly line. Transportation is its conveyor belt. If raw materials cannot flow freely to our great industrial plants and the products cannot move continuously to the front, defense breaks down. Bottlenecks in transportation are as serious as shortages of power.

Expanding production is going to burden the railroads to the limit. We are expanding their rolling stock as fast as we can, but even the present orders for new cars and locomotives are competing for manufacturing capacity which could otherwise produce tanks and other items of heavy armament.

The seaway will help prevent transportation bottlenecks. It will provide a great highway to and from important defense production areas. It will cut by more than a thousand miles the stretch of dangerous open water which must be traveled by supplies to Great Britain and strategic North Atlantic bases. It will increase our capacity to build ships.

The Great Lakes today hold many shipways and drydocks, as well as resources of men and materials for shipbuilding. They are bottled up because we have delayed completing the seaway. If we start the seaway now, scores of additional merchant ships may be built in coastal yards freed by transferring a portion of the longer-term naval program to the Great Lakes.

The St. Lawrence project must be expedited. No comparable power, shipbuilding, and transportation facilities can be made available in the time required to construct this project.

In dealing with the present emergency too many people have underestimated the degree to which our resources will be taxed. We cannot afford to make any more mistakes of that kind.

I am advised that we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time. I should like to agree with the people who say that the country's danger will be over sooner than that. But the course of world events gives no such assurance, and we have no right to take chances with the national safety.

I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war. Its authorization will demonstrate to the enemies of democracy that, however long the effort, we intend to outstrip them in the race of production. In the modern world that race determines the rise and fall of nations.

I hope that authorization will not be delayed.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 5, 1941.*

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I request that the message be referred to the Committee on Commerce and that a copy be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MAYNARD GOSS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Maynard Goss, which were, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to insert "Mr. and Mrs."; in line 6, to strike out "$650.25" and insert "$2,285.60"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JESS W. HARMON

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Jess W. Harmon, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,372.20" and insert "$4,500."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM J. FUREY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 911) for the relief of William J. Furey, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. T. EARL RODGERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 829) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers, which was, on page

1, line 7, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,500."

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAND FOR THE RINCON BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAY FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Federal Works Agency for expenditure by the Public Roads Administration with respect to access roads and the strategic network of highways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF FISCAL OFFICERS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting the existence of a disagreement between his office and the Tennessee Valley Authority, requiring the enactment of clarifying legislation to settle the fundamental issue of whether it is the intent of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to exempt the fiscal officers of the Authority from accountability under the Budget and Accounting Act, and other general statutes requiring an accounting for the disposition of public funds, etc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 4

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida, in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully memorialize and petition your honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas millions of our elderly citizens who have served their country in peace or war during the period of their natural working lives are now spending their last days in poverty and misery, dependent upon public or private charity or their relatives; and

"Whereas social security has become the dominant question before the American people, and therefore justice and the public welfare demand that ample provision be made for the health and support of these elderly citizens; and

"Whereas the only feasible plan that has been proposed to solve the social and economic problem is the enactment of the General Welfare Act, referred to as H. R. 1036, and now pending before Congress, which provides a Federal Government tax levy of 2 percent upon the fair gross dollar value of each transaction done within the United States and Territories, the proceeds therefrom to be equitably distributed among our citizens of age 60 or more, on the condition that the same be expended within a period of 30 days; and

"Whereas such a transaction tax imposed by the Federal Government will be equal and uniform in the several States and based upon the ability to pay; and

"Whereas the enactment of said plan into law will—

"(1) Provide employment for millions of persons now idle by increasing production and withdrawing large numbers of elderly people from the field of productive activity, thus creating new opportunities for the youth of our land and making employment benefits unnecessary;

"(2) Greatly reduce crime, thus saving billions of dollars expended annually for the enforcement of law, maintenance of numerous prisons, reformatories, and protective agencies; also saving tremendous direct losses to our private citizens due to crime;

"(3) Save billions of dollars now spent for the maintenance of public-welfare agencies, poorhouses, old people's homes, and other institutions and temporary organizations maintained for the care of the poor and aged; and minimize the necessity for yearly public and private charities, thus inspiring a greater spirit of loyalty to our governments and their institutions;

"(4) Substitute an economy of abundance for an economy of scarcity, and provide markets for the products of our farms and industries;

"(5) Effect tremendous savings which will offset the cost of operating and maintaining the proposed plan;

"(6) Stabilize business and industry and guard against future depressions, and establish a stable and permanent social and economic system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States (in order to accomplish the foregoing purposes) to immediately enact the General Welfare Act, known as bill H. R. 1036, and now pending in Congress—a law providing for a national old-age retirement system and create a fund for the maintenance thereof through a 2-percent Federal Government transaction tax levy, the proceeds of which shall be distributed equitably to all citizens over 60 years of age, with the provision that it shall be expended within 30 days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Became a law without the Governor's approval.

"Filed in office secretary of state, May 28, 1941."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Memorial 8

"Memorial to the President and Congress of the United States of America urging that all possible aid to Great Britain, including patrols and the convoying of ships by the United States Navy, be rendered and furnished immediately

"Whereas the United States of America will find it difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a free economy if the rest of the world is dominated by totalitarian governments exploiting slave labor of conquered countries and dictating to firms in this country as to whom they shall employ and in what newspapers and over what radio system they shall advertise as a condition to doing business with such totalitarian governments, thereby controlling employers, employees, press, and radio in this country; and

"Whereas Great Britain is fighting the battle of freedom for all mankind; and

"Whereas the preservation of the British Fleet and of a Great Britain capable of maintaining such fleet is essential to our safety; and

"Whereas Great Britain needs and requires the fullest possible aid of all the liberty-loving people of the world; and

"Whereas we cannot afford to indulge in the wishful thought that we alone will be spared by the aggressors and await our turn to be led to the slaughter alone as so many other nations have done; and

"Whereas it is cowardly for us to hesitate to do our full part in supporting Great Britain in her fight for humanity; and

"Whereas if the aggressor nations win the present war we must continue to expend huge sums for armaments until the day of conflict finally comes, as it must eventually come; and

"Whereas the people of Great Britain need our sympathy and support in this hour of trial: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:*

"SECTION 1. That we do respectfully memorialize and petition the President and the Congress of the United States of America to render and furnish immediately all possible aid to Great Britain in her struggle for human freedom, including the providing of patrols and convoys by the United States Navy for ships carrying munitions and supplies to Great Britain.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State of Florida, be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and that copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the State senate and house of representatives, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 28, 1941.

"Filed in office, secretary of state, May 28, 1941."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 893) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Marion and Hillsboro, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 893) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of Allen County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the

vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 24

"Relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General with respect to the assertion of any pretended Federal claim to the submerged lands of the State of California

"Whereas on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the original States, as successors to the English Crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution, and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

"Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

"Whereas such ownership has long been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States of America and by other Federal departments and agencies, and has not been questioned until recently, with the result that the State of California and its grantees, both public and private, relying thereon, have expended vast sums of money in the development of such lands, including harbor facilities, reclamation and filling in, and the erection of costly structures; and

"Whereas this legislature is informed that plans are being made to initiate litigation against the State of California, or its grantees, to assert a pretended Federal claim to such lands, whether with or without the authorization of the Congress; and

"Whereas any such litigation could only result in a decision in favor of this State or its grantees, would be unjust in view of the concomitant vexation and annoyance, and would seriously impair the further development of such lands and the financing thereof until the final decision: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the State of California hereby solemnly and firmly asserts the title of the State and its grantees in such lands within this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully urged not to initiate or authorize the initiation of any litigation that would becloud such title of the State and is grantees, however temporarily; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 47

"Relative to memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to aid in furthering the development of Highway 20

"Whereas there extends westward from United States Highway No. 40 at Emigrant Gap, Nevada County, a road known as State Highway 20; and

"Whereas this lateral is considered by many to be a military life line and passes through Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Lake, and Mendocino Counties, linking the Sierras with the sea; and

"Whereas many residents of the counties of Nevada, Yuba, Sutter, Colusa, Lake, and Mendocino have formed a Highway 20 Association for the purpose of furthering the military and the commercial development of this vital avenue of transportation and travel; and

"Whereas many members of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California have had occasion to travel and to view sections of this highway and to learn of some of the problems involved in the adequate development of this highway for national defense and for public travel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to make a survey and to study the possibilities of the development of Highway 20 and to take such steps in the development of the highway as such survey and study shall justify; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand resolutions adopted by the second district convention, Kansas department of the American Legion at its annual convention, held in Lawrence, Kans., May 19, 1941.

I call attention to the fact that these Kansas Legionnaires, all of whom served their country in the military service in 1917–18, desire the President and Congress to decide policies necessary to national defense. I ask that the resolutions in full be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas at its inception the day, May 18, 1941, celebrated as I Am an American Day was known and designated as New Citizens' Day; and

Whereas New Citizens' Day is the most desirable and proper appellation; and

Whereas 365 days of each year should in fact be I Am an American Day: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the second district convention of the American Legion, department of Kansas, in convention assembled, That hereafter the second Sunday in May be designated as New Citizens' Day; and be it further

Resolved, That each day of every year be known and designated as I Am an American Day.

Whereas the National Executive Committee of the American Legion has adopted the form of resolution hereinafter stated; and

Whereas the President of the United States and Secretaries of State, War, and Navy Departments have publicly stated that totalitarian aggression constitutes an immediate and grave threat to the safety of the United States; and

Whereas the people of the United States, not being fully informed of the true facts, do not understand nor appreciate the dangers of which the President and his officers speak, nor do they fully comprehend the full extent of this emergency which threatens the safety of the United States and its people, and therefore have in consequence lapsed into a peacetime complacency; and

Whereas it is essential at this time of grave emergency that there should be no lack of complete confidence in any officer of the Government if they are to obtain full unity of purpose in this Nation; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly obvious that there is a growing lack of confidence on the part of the American people in the abilities of the present Secretary of Labor to fully exercise the high responsibilities of that office; and

Whereas it appears that as long as the present Secretary of Labor is in office there will continue to be trouble in defense industries; and

Whereas for 19 years the American Legion, representative of the veterans of the war of 1917 and 1918, have advocated universal service if war should ever again be our Nation's lot; and

Whereas if this Nation is to be spared and our way of life is to continue our sacrifices must be universal. There are no private rights which transcend public safety. There are no material profits which cannot be recaptured, and there is no wage situation incapable of adjustment after the work is done; and

Whereas we have confidence in the military and naval leadership of our country and we believe that practical and necessary aid to Great Britain require that war material, food, and medical supplies be delivered to them, and there is grave danger that vessels carrying such material and supplies will be attacked by belligerent nations in violation of international law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Second District of the Department of Kansas, American Legion, in annual convention assembled as follows, to wit:

1. We urgently request the President and his officers to immediately reveal to the people of this country a full and complete statement of the facts which constitute immediate danger to this Nation and the condition of our national defense, in order that speedy and effective action may be taken for the complete protection of the country, and to insure that singleness and unity of purpose among our people which is so necessary to national safety; be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion pledge its utmost support to whatever plan of action shall be deemed by the President and the Congress to be necessary for the safety of this Nation.

2. Be it resolved that it is the opinion of this organization that the cause of national unity in national defense will be best served by the tender and acceptance of the resignation of the present Secretary of Labor.

3. Be it resolved that we demand of the national administration and the Congress legislation forbidding strikes and lock-outs in national-defense industries during the period of this national emergency.

4. Be it resolved that the disposal and use of all military and naval forces of the United States be made in such manner as is deemed necessary and wise by our military and naval authorities in whom we have complete confidence.

Whereas the Dies committee of the Congress of the United States has rendered valuable and patriotic service to our country in the disclosure of subversive and treacherous activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned and requested to continue the Dies committee in existence with further appropriations necessary to carry on its work.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka); without amendment (Rept. No. 370); and

S. 456. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman; without amendment (Rept. No. 371).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 756. A bill for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; with an amendment (Rept. No. 372).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 708. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arreas; without amendment (Rept. No. 373).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4132. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 374).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 1289. A bill authorizing the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 375);

S. 1358. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936; with an amendment (Rept. No. 376); and

H. R. 95. A bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska"; without amendment (Rept. No. 377).

By Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 357. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry by providing for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region for research and investigation relating to the mining, preparation, and utilization of anthracite coal, with special reference to conserving resources for national defense, increasing efficiency, development of new uses, markets, and matters pertaining thereto; and to further provide for safety and health in anthracite mining; with amendments (Rept. No. 378).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings; without amendment.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 374. A bill to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 379);

S. 378. A bill to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service"; with amendments (Rept. No. 383);

S. 1467. A bill to amend section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 380);

S. 1508. A bill to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 381);

S. 1529. A bill to amend the act approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 383), relative to retirement of officers of the United States Navy after 30 years' service; without amendment (Rept. No. 382); and

H. R. 3782. A bill establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 384).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1051. A bill relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor; with amendments (Rept. No. 387); and

S. 1052. A bill relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims; with amendments (Rept. No. 388).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 3, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 578. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to release certain interests in certain land which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J.; and

S. 1311. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1595. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

S. 1596. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at Bridge Street in Plymouth Borough, between Plymouth and Hanover Townships, in the County of Luzerne, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1597. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Government life insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1598. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLGREN (for himself and Mr. BONE):

S. 1599. A bill to exempt States and agencies thereof from the payment of certain district court fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY introduced Senate bill 1600, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1601. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1602. A bill to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 14), and for other purposes; and

S. 1603. A bill to provide for the extension of banking facilities at military reservations and at navy yards and stations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Goldsborough; and

S. 1605. A bill to amend the act approved March 5, 1940, entitled "An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES (for Mr. BARKLEY):

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur August 6, 1941, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 181 An act granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Osterhaus;

H. R. 341 An act granting an increase of pension to Inez Clair Bandholtz;

H. R. 376. An act granting a pension to Bertha R. Ettner;

H. R. 439. An act granting a pension to Martha Pace;

H. R. 474. An act granting a pension to John H. Botner;

H. R. 477. An act granting a pension to Cora Arlena Ballard;

H. R. 492. An act granting an increase of pension to Rosalie C. Hood;

H. R. 902. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Painter Menoher;

H. R. 1493. An act granting an increase of pension to Florence Sharp Grant;

H. R. 1994. An act granting a pension to Capt. Victor Gondos, Jr.;

H. R. 2065. An act granting a renewal of pension to William H. Shanklin;

H. R. 2190. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. Merriman;

H. R. 2563. An act granting a pension to Artricey K. Burden;

H. R. 2787. An act granting an increase of pension to Ethel Wise;

H. R. 3358. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Westover; and

H. R. 4860. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 189. An act for the relief of William F. Kimball;

H. R. 191. An act for the relief of Franklin Stencil and Domonic Stencil;

H. R. 241 An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 257 An act for the relief of Edna La Blanche Giliette;

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, individually, and as the natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor;

H. R. 732 An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1359. An act for the relief of Robert Edward Lee;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1543. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 1576. An act for the relief of Emily Barlow;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1702. An act for the relief of Mary McCutcheon;

H. R. 1743. An act for the relief of the estate of William Sandiass;

H. R. 1746. An act for the relief of Charles J. Schay;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Laura McStay;

H. R. 2010. An act for the relief of Wade H. Erwin and Vonnie Erwin;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John S. Small;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Reed and Rose Reed;

H. R. 2382. An act for the relief of William Cromer;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Margaret S. Holten;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Lewis Jones;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2888. An act for the relief of H. E. Buzby;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Mrs. O. B. Olson;

H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of the Equitable Insurance Alliance, the Fidelity & Guaranty Fire Corporation and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co.;

H. R. 3551. An act for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli;

H. R. 3607. An act for the relief of Anton Waytashek;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer;

H. R. 3801. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Batchelor;

H. R. 3802. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schwan;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Tony Cirone;

H. R. 4414. An act for the relief of Andrew Wichmann;

H. R. 4430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton Ward and Ester Ward;

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4556. An act for the relief of L. S. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; and

H. R. 3308. An act for the relief of George M. Louie; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4839. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4359. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4868. An act to amend section 3 of title 1 of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place to insert the following:

"That Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees, provided that such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees in this act or resolution: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the Disbursing Office, which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule."

Mr. ADAMS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4756, the legislative appropriation bill, fiscal year 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. (For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLIC LAND PATENTS IN PACIFIC COAST STATES

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 125), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of instances of fraud in connection with the issuance of patents to public lands in the Pacific Coast States and matters related thereto. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, by bill or otherwise.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

INVESTIGATION OF AID FROM THE UNITED STATES TO THE AXIS POWERS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 126), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the character of and the extent to which the so-called Axis Powers, or countries aiding the Axis Powers, (a) are obtaining or have obtained essential war materials, money, credit, intelligence, or other aid, directly or indirectly, from the United States; and (b) are hindering or have hindered the national-defense program of the United States. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable time the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

All hearings for the reception of testimony which involves evidence of facts which would be useful in a military sense to so-called Axis Powers shall be closed hearings, under rules determined by the committee prior to such hearings.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON] be assigned to service on the Committees on Commerce, District of Columbia, Interoceanic Canals, and Post Offices and Post Roads.

MUST WE FIGHT AGAIN?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on April 14, 1941, under the auspices of Women United, the subject of the address being Must We Fight Again? which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS ON THE INTERNATIONAL IMPACT OF EVIL

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS before the National Retail Dry Goods Association of America, at its midyear convention in Chicago, on The International Impact of Evil, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROADCAST BY POPE PIUS XII

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the recent broadcast by Pope Pius XII as published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 2, 1941, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS M. SHEA AT TOWN HALL'S MEETING OF THE AIR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Francis M. Shea, Assistant Attorney General, at Town Hall's Meeting of the Air in New York City, May 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR DEPARTMENT—EDITORIAL FROM PERTH AMBOY EVENING NEWS

[Mr. SMATHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Perth Amboy Evening News of June 2, 1941, entitled "Air Department," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL BY STANTON HUDSON ON PROXIMITY OF UNITED STATES TO WAR

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Stanton Hudson, published in the Sedalia (Mo.) Times of May 30, 1941, relative to the proximity of the United States to war, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTRACT FROM ARTICLE BY HELEN ESSARY ON THE TAKING OF POLLS

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an extract from an article by Helen Essary in the Washington Times-Herald relative to the manner of taking polls, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRIKES IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which I am introducing, which I should like to have read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill.

The bill (S. 1600) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided (1) to any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith, and (2) to any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials. Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest."

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Texas whether this bill is the product of the committee headed by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. CONNALLY. It is only the product of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McNARY. It is in the nature of an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1939?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is. I may say further to the Senator from Oregon that, as he is well aware, when the Selective Service Act was before the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] offered an amendment, which was adopted, which provided—and I am speaking from memory, not having the act before me—that if any employer, or owner of a plant, should refuse to take Government contracts or produce defense materials at a reasonable cost, the President of the United States might order the requisitioning or the taking over of the plant. Of course, the primary purpose of the amendment was to assure continuance of production. It was not designed as a punitive measure as against any employer or owner of a factory, but the purpose was to see that the production of national-defense articles was continued, and increased, and stimulated, and accelerated.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend that provision simply by expanding it so, that if the delay in production shall be caused by labor disputes or by strikes which stop or interfere with or impede or hinder the production of necessary defense articles, the President shall have the same power as in the case where production has been stopped by an employer refusing to take a contract or produce material.

Mr. President, I invoke the language of the President of the United States in his speech on the 27th of May, a speech with which I am in hearty and general agreement. Upon this particular aspect of the national problem I quote briefly from the speech:

> This is no time for capital to make, or be allowed to retain, excess profits. Articles of defense must have undisputed right-of-way in every industrial plant in the country.

That certainly applies to the owners and to the employers and to the factory proprietors. I quote further from the President:

> A Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes has been set up. That machinery must be used promptly—and without stoppage of work. Collective bargaining will be retained, but the American people expect that impartial recommendations of our Government services will be followed both by capital and by labor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In response to an inquiry of mine at the War Department this morning, I was informed that today, June 5, there are more men on strike in industries making materials for the War Department than at any time since the present emergency began.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for that illuminating information. I cannot state on my own responsibility at this exact moment the number of men who are on strike, but I have before me a memorandum, under date of May 29, giving a list of plants throughout the country in which defense materials are supposed to be manufactured or produced in which such production is being hampered or delayed or stopped entirely by strikes.

Mr. President, no one can gainsay the fact that the President of the United States, during the entire period of his administration, has maintained toward labor, toward those who toil in all the various walks of our national life, a most liberal and a most generous attitude. Numbers of legislative enactments have been placed upon the statute books to guarantee to labor the right of collective bargaining, to guarantee labor a forum in which it may assert its rights, its grievances, and its complaints, and governmental machinery has been set up for mediation, for conciliation, and even for adjudication of the rights and complaints of labor.

As one who upon this floor for many years has maintained what I conceive to be a very liberal attitude toward labor, I wish to add my voice to that of the President of the United States in appealing to labor all over the country to recognize the leadership of the President of the United States, to realize the national emergency which the Nation faces, and I appeal to labor not to stop production but to submit its disputes to conciliation and to mediation while continuing to produce the necessary materials.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon called the attention of the Senator from Texas to the Truman committee. That is a committee appointed by the Senate to investigate the production of defense materials, war contracts, and all matters relating to production. Today and yesterday responsible witnesses from the Office of Production Management before that committee testified that we are not producing as we should produce; that we are not getting the production of national-defense material which the country could produce if proper efforts were made by the War and the Navy Departments and by the Office of Production Management in stimulating and in cooperating with industry, putting pressure on industry to produce the necessary articles. But in the face of this situation, as suggested by the Senator from Maryland a moment ago, the War Department advises him that today more men are out on strikes in national-defense plants than at any other time since the declaration of an emergency in 1939.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is it the theory of the Senator's remarks that the responsibility

for these strikes rests with the operators of the plants and not with the racketeers in labor, the Harry Bridgeses and such men?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean to inquire if that is my attitude?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes. I wish to know if that is the philosophy of his speech.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am introducing an amendment to the law designed to take over all plants held up by strikes. Already we have the right to proceed against the employer. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his interruption, but I must apologize for my obtuseness and dumbness if I have created the impression on the Senator which I seem to have created. I know that cannot be attributed to him, in view of his own keen intellect and the sensitive state of his hearing. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the point I am making is that a strike at this time in any plant manufacturing or undertaking to manufacture defense articles is in effect a strike against the United States Government. Does the Senator from Oregon get the import of my remarks?

Mr. HOLMAN. I certainly understand that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. In effect it is a strike against the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the American Federation of Labor for a statement appearing in the newspapers a few days ago appealing to its subordinate unions not to strike on any defense production, but to submit to mediation and conciliation. The trouble about that situation is that the national council of the American Federation of Labor has no compulsory power over the subordinate unions of that federation, but when the national council of the American Federation of Labor issues a statement of that kind, at least, it ought to have some moral influence.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced probably ought to have some accompanying regulations and provisions. It will be remembered that during the World War, President Wilson, by Executive order, set up certain agencies to deal with and adjust labor disputes, which worked remarkably well. First, he set up the Walsh-Taft labor board, as I recall it, a member of which was Frank P. Walsh, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will remember. President Wilson set up that labor board to deal with wage disputes and to standardize wages of certain classifications of labor in certain areas, so as to remove the danger of sporadic strikes here and there. That labor board was a governmental institution. Then President Wilson set up a mediation board, such as that which we have recently set up. In addition to that, an agreement was reached, which employers and labor were called upon to accept, providing that there would be no lock-outs and that there would be no strikes.

Mr. President, if the bill I have just introduced should be enacted, there might be some person who would say, "Oh, well, if the Government takes over the plant, there would be pressure from labor for the Government to accede to its demands." But if the President of the United States should issue an Executive order, which he would have perfect authority to do under his general power of commandeering the plants, under his power as Executive of all the administrative agencies of the Government, whereby he would set up a wage board to determine quarrels as to wages in plants which might be taken over, either under the existing law, as contained in the Conscription or Draft Act, or which might be taken over under the provisions of my proposed amendment to the Draft Act, there could be no excuse whatever for a strike in a national-defense industry. There would then be in existence mediation tribunals to which the parties could submit their disputes, there would be a wage board to determine what would be a fair wage, and in the hour of the Nation's peril there would be no excuse whatever for some of the leaders to whom the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] referred—so-called labor leaders—instigating and inciting their membership to strike.

Mr. President, many men in the labor unions throughout the United States are just as much opposed to these strikes as are those of us here upon the Senate floor. I am speaking about the men who work at the benches and at the machines and in the shops. I am not speaking about the agitators who make their living by agitation and who secure an enhancement of their compensation by stirring up strikes and commotion.

Mr. President, I have in my hand, and I shall ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, a statement with respect to strikes on the date of May 29, in factories and plants affecting only the War Department, not touching the Navy, and not touching the Maritime Commission. I wish to cite a few places in which strikes are now in effect.

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif. The men on strike are mine, mill, and smelter workers. The issues are the closed shop and wage increases. The strike was certified to the Mediation Board on April 23, 1941.

Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.

Arrow Tool & Reamer Co., Detroit, Mich.

Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph, Mich.

I have named but a few. These strikes are scattered all over the country.

Mr. President, this statement with respect to strikes is significant because of the widespread character of the strike movement, which is bound to convey the conviction to an unprejudiced mind that there is a system in this movement. These are not simply sporadic strikes here and there in some particular localities, but the strikes are so widespread and so general throughout the United States that they reveal a studied plan emanating from some source, which is bound to be inimical to the welfare of our defense program.

At this point I ask that the statement to which I have referred be placed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

MAY 29, 1941.

Subject: Strikes and Labor Disputes Affecting War Department Procurement.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of War.

Wednesday, May 28, 1941: Number of strikes, 30; number of men idle, 24,900.

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.:

Strike: March 19, 1941, of 1,000 mine, mill, and smelter workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 23, 1941. Commissioner Malcom continuing negotiations at Board's request.

Interests: Borax and boric acid for Kimball Glass Co. and Corning Glass Works. Medical Corps contracts behind schedule.

Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 950 C. I. O.

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Ward assigned. Very little progress.

Interest: Subcontractor for Ordnance, supplying hot-rolled steel to Motor Generator Co.

Arrow Tool & Reamer Co., Detroit, Mich.,

Strike: May 1, 1941, of 60 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: Agreement reached to be submitted for ratification May 27, 1941.

Interest: Cutting tools for Springfield Armory and Watervliet Arsenal; not immediately important.

Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph, Mich.:

Strike: May 22, 1941, of 1,700 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Discharge of union members and right to collect dues on company property.

Status: Commissioner Dewey contacting union May 27, 1941.

Interest: Shells for Ordnance and Britain.

Black Hosiery Mills, York, Pa.:

Strike: April 11, 1941, of 100 C. I. O.

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: National Labor Relations Board holding hearings in Philadelphia. Attempts being made to remove material.

Interest: Socks for Quartermaster Corps; not immediately vital as these are for winter season. Some shipments of socks have been made.

Carborundum Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.:

Strike: May 26, 1941. United Mine Workers (C. I. O.). Very conflicting reports received as to the number of men out on strike.

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Finn assigned. Tentative agreement reached May 28, 1941.

Interest: Ordnance prime contractor and subcontractor, manufacturing grinding wheels and abrasives; also an indirect source of supply for both Army and Navy.

Continental Can Co., Jersey City, N. J.:

Strike: April 4, 1941 of 600 A. F. of L. and independent workers.

Issue: Jurisdictional.

Status: Office of Production Management Labor Consultant Blumberg on the case. Negotiations broke down May 28, 1941.

Interest: $98,667 contract for combat gas-mask canisters for Chemical Warfare. It is impracticable to locate an alternate source of supply at this time.

Crescent Tool Co.: Jamestown, N. Y.:

Strike: May 12, 1941 of 500 machinists (A. F. of L.).

Issue: Alleged discriminatory discharge of one union employee.

Status: Commissioner Goldsmith on case. Deadlock in negotiations.

Interest: Pliers and wrenches for Air Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Signal Corps.

Curtiss Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: April 8, 1941 of 300 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, vacations with pay, signed agreement.

Status: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 3, 1941. Meeting held May 26, 1941.

Interest: Portable air compressors and car washers for use by Diamond T for Quartermaster Corps; emergency stock from Holabird exhausted. Diamond T assembly line will be forced to shut down. Hoists for General Steel Castings Co. for Canadian contracts used in production of tank-top hulls. General Steel Castings unsuccessful so far in locating alternate source for these hoists. (Three thousand clutch discs for Spicer removed May 26, 1941.)

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.:

Strike: May 7, 1941 of 750 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.) and A. F. of L.

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner and Office of Production Management labor consultant on case. Men refuse to go back to work until election is held to determine bargaining agent.

Interest: Steel screens for Lake City ordnance plant; urgently needed. Also supplies machine-tool plants at Springfield and Windsor in Vermont and Fort Ethan Allen and Plattsburg barracks.

Eagle Iron Works, St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 28 A. F. of L. iron workers shopmen.

Issue: Closed shop.

Status: Unauthorized strike. Case has been before N. L. R. B. for some time on charge company fails to observe their agreement with union.

Interest: Manufacturers of structural steel used in the sulphuric acid concentration building at Weldon Springs Ordnance Plant, Missouri.

Griess-Pfleger Tanning Co., Waukegan, Ill.:

Strike: April 16, 1941, of 600 leather workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Holmes on case. Deadlock continues.

Interest: Leather to five companies having Quartermaster Corps shoe contracts.

Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va.:

Strike: May 22, 1941, of 200 electricians.

Issue: Wage increase.

Status: Engineers returned to work May 27, 1941; some electricians still out; meeting May 26, 1941.

Interest: Construction of explosives plant.

C. G. Hussey & Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Strike: May 20, 1941, of 700 A. F. of L. and independent copper workers.

Issues: Union recognition and grievances.

Status: Commissioner Moffett assigned to case. Joint conference held May 27, 1941.

Interest: Important supplier of copper. Seventy-five percent of all material manufactured is for facilities holding defense contracts.

LaFayette Worsted & Spinning Co., Woonsocket, R. I.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 315 independent textile workers.

Issue: Contract terms.

Status: Commissioner Weinstock on case; all points agreed on but closed shop; meetings continue.

Interest: Subcontractor for Princeton Worsted Mills and for Verdun Manufacturing Co.; LaFayette produces yarn for cloth manufactured by these companies for Quartermaster Corps contracts.

Louisville Tin & Stove Co., Louisville, Ky.:

Strike: May 21, 1941, of 225 A. F. of L. workers.

Issues: Wages and closed shop.

Status: Meetings to be held first of next week.

Interest: Quartermaster Corps miscellaneous cooking equipment.

Madison Woolen Co., Madison, Maine:

Strike: May 12, 1941, of 410 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Contract terms.

Status: Negotiations continuing.

Interest: Subcontractor for suiting cloth on large Quartermaster Corps contracts.

Maisel Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 33 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner went on case May 17, 1941.

Interest: Quartermaster Corps contract for 65,000 pillows.

Marlin Rockwell Corporation, Plainville, Conn.:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 1,000 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Bargaining agent and wages.

Status: Strike report just received. No details as yet.

Interest: This company is one of the largest manufacturers of ball and roller bearings in the country. Priority rating A-1-A.

Monsanto Chemical Co., Monsanto, Ill.:

Strike: April 16, 1941, of 900 chemical workers (A. F. of L.).

Issues: Union status and wage increases.

Status: Union to vote on company proposal May 28, 1941.

Interest: Fifty-six thousand pounds phosphorus for Chemical Warfare Service.

Phoenixville Iron Works, Phoenixville, Pa.:

Strike: May 14, 1941, of 1,000 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Union recognition and wages.

Status: Meeting being held May 27, 1941, or May 28, 1941. Reports that approximately 900 have signed petition to return to work if sufficient protection were received.

Interest: Structural steel. Supplies material for St. George Bridge in Delaware being built by Army Engineers at cost of $1,350,000. Watervliet Arsenal contract with J. C. Moyer & Co. for structural steel and craneways being delayed; Phoenixville is subcontractor for Moyer.

Reliance Manufacturing Co., Michigan City, Columbus, and Washington, Ind.:

Strike: April 28, 1941, of 1,200 Amalgamated Clothing Workers (C. I. O.) and United Garment Workers (A. F. of L.).

Issue: Union status.

Status: Commissioner Cofer holding conferences No details of progress.

Interest: One hundred thousand pairs cotton drawers for Quartermaster Corps at Michigan City plant; 90,000 cotton duck trousers at Columbus plant.

Seneca Wire & Manufacturing Co., Fostoria, Ohio:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 600 C. I. O.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Strike report received May 28, 1941. No further details

Interest: This company supplies Standard Products Co with wire for 155-millimeter shell grommets.

Shampaine Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 20, 1941, of 131 Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (C. I. O.);

Issue: New contract.

Status: Commissioner on case. Meetings continuing.

Interest: Manufactures hospital equipment for Medical Corps.

Sivyer Steel Casting Co., Chicago, Ill.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 250 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, closed shop, and vacations.

Status: Commissioner holding conferences; met with company president, May 26. Attempts being made to remove castings for gun carriages to the Milwaukee plant.

Interest: Castings for International Harvester for limber and gun carriages 155-mm. high-speed adapters. Harvester deliveries will be delayed proportionate to the length of this strike (critical). Castings for Allis-Chalmers, who make crawler tractors for Ordnance. Important subcontractor for Navy.

Superior Structural Steel, St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 40 American Federation of Labor shop employees.

Issue: Closed shop.

Status: Report of strike; no details.

Interest: Structural steel for St. Louis Ordnance plant and for Western Cartridge Co.

Tide Water Boom Operators, Tacoma, Wash.:

Strike: May 18, 1941, of 500 woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, union status.

Status: Commissioner on case; deadlock in negotiations.

Interest: Lumber.

Twin District Council, Seattle Wash.:

Strike: May 10, 1941, of 8,000 woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, union status.

Status: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 9, 1941. Union considering National Defense Mediation Board proposal to return to work and continue negotiations.

Interest: Lumber.

Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills, Raymond, Wash.:

Strike: May 16, 1941, of 1,700 woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, contract terms.

Status: No details since report of strike.

Interest: Lumber.

Wilson Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.:

Strike: May 15, 1941, of 1,200 bookbinders at the two plants.

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: Commissioner Schaak on the case since May 26, 1941.

Interest: Subcontractor for Quartermaster Corps manufacturing posting trays, stands, and guides for use in laundries at 37 camps, posts, and stations.

OTHER STRIKES NOT INCLUDED IN TODAY'S FIGURES

California packers and canners: Strike, May 8 and 9, 1941, of A. F. of L. packers and canners in California. Delaying shipments of foodstuffs ordered by Quartermaster Corps; not considered serious at this time.

Phillips Petroleum Co., Kansas City, Kans.: Strike, May 19, 1941, of operating engineers (A. F. of L.). Company reported making gas and oil products for defense industries. Still checking War Department interest.

San Francisco shipyards, San Francisco, Calif.: Strike of A. F. of L. machinists in San Francisco shipyards May 12, 1941, have tied up Navy production to a very great extent. Enterprise Foundry, which supplies engines for water and power at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., has been forced to cease production on these engines because of lack of materials usually obtained from these plants now at strike with the shipyards.

NEW STRIKES REPORTED MAY 28, 1941

Marlin-Rockwell, Plainville, Conn.

Seneca Wire & Manufacturing Co., Fostoria, Ohio.

Wilson-Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.

CASES WHERE MEN RETURNED TO WORK MAY 28, 1941

Armbruster Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.

Stevens Walden, Inc., Worcester, Mass. (date of return to work unascertained).

Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Indiana Harbor, Ind.

MOST IMMEDIATE DANGER (THREATENED STRIKES)

American Brass, Waterbury, Conn.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts amounting to $7,000,000; also major suppliers of raw and finished brass products. Strike vote taken May 28, 1941. Negotiations deadlocked on wages.

Bendix Aviation Corporation, South Bend, Ind.: Manufactures aviation carburetors,

parts for Air Corps. Certified to the National Defense Mediation Board May 7, 1941. Negotiations proceeding before the Board. Deadline set for May 28. Quartermaster Corps reports a slow-down which has cut production of constant-velocity type joints from 600 to 200 a day has been instigated by shop stewards.

Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.: Manufactures magnesium; leading plant in the country of this critical item; strike threatens on issue of union recognition. National Labor Relations Board started hearings May 26; election to be held some time in June.

Electric Storage Battery Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: Prime and subcontracts for Signal Corps and Air. Strike is threatened for Saturday, May 31, 1941.

North American Aviation Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif.: Manufactures trainers and bombers for Air Corps and British. Congress of Industrial Organizations demanding wage increase. Certified to the National Defense Mediation Board May 22, 1941. Strike set for May 28, 1941; averted by action of the Board; negotiators agreed no stoppage would occur while negotiations continued nor for 3 days after the Board filed its findings and recommendations, if that were necessary.

Packard Motor Car Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: Important contractor for Air Corps for air engines (Rolls Royce). Strike action authorized May 25 and union filed statutory 5 days' notice. Union seeking wage increase. Formal notice of impending strike received by State mediation board. Commissioner Dewey in Detroit seeking to prevent strike.

Schlueter Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Manufactures antitank guns for Ordnance. A strike here prior to June 5, 1941, would not seriously affect Ordnance contracts. However, after June 5 production would be affected insofar as material for the contract will be available at that time. Union considering company's proposal and settlement appears imminent.

Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.: Manufactures pistons and rings for Air Corps, Ordnance, and Quartermaster Corps. Strike vote taken; no date set. Joint conference May 27 with newly appointed State Mediation Board Commissioner Noel Fox attending. Fox will continue negotiations if a settlement is not reached by May 28.

Soft coal: John L. Lewis threatens to call out 300,000 to 400,000 soft-coal miners again unless a satisfactory wage agreement with southern operators is obtained. National Defense Mediation Board handling case since May 23; reports mediation efforts have collapsed and they are preparing to make public their findings and recommendations.

OTHER SERIOUS THREATS

American Aluminum Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Aluminum metal for Air Corps. Awaiting outcome of National Labor Relations Board election held April 30, 1941.

Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engineering Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Prime contractor for ordnance, manufacturing Diesel-driven generating units. Strike not affecting Ordnance Department at this time, but Navy contracts are seriously affected. Dispute is over the installation of machinery in a new plant. Commissioner White has advised that the carpenters are willing to do the work in question on a 50–50 basis with the machinists; however, a complete agreement is not yet in sight.

E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Prime contractor for ordnance for presses and small arms ammunition machinery ($10,000,000) for Lake City, Denver and St. Louis ordnance plants; Navy and British also have contracts. Certified to N. D. M. B. May 22, 1941; strike threatened for this morning, May 28, 1941, postponed indefinitely. Negotiations to continue before the Board in an effort to settle new minimum wage rate dispute.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.: Prime contractor for Quartermaster Corps and Air Corps for tractors and graders. Strike vote taken authorizing committee to call strike whenever it sees fit. Progress made at joint meeting May 26, 1941. Special Commissioner Haas on the case.

Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif.: Large and important contractor for Air Corps, Navy, England, Netherlands, and Canada. Negotiating new contract and terms run parallel with those being asked at North American Aviation. A. F. of L. machinists are involved here. C. I. O. at North American. O. P. M. man entered the case May 26. Progress reported at meeting May 26.

Electro Metallurgical Co., Alloy, W. Va.: Supplies steel companies with ferromanganese, manufactures 75 percent of total tonnage of alloys for the entire country. N. L. R. B. dismissed A. F. of L. petition for hearings to contest the C. I. O. victory at recent election.

Gager Lime Co., Sherwood, Tenn.: Important source of supply for lime to large defense contractors, also Wolf Creek ordnance plant, Milan, Tenn. Strike threatening within the next few days.

Kilby Steel, Anniston, Ala.: Company is prime contractor for ordnance, manufacturing 90-millimeter M58 shell, and for Navy star mine sweepers. Union demanding wage increases. Probable strike this week. Commissioner Curtis on the case. Meetings being held. Threatened strike postponed until Thursday, May 29. Negotiations for settlement are being carried on.

Scullin Steel Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Prime contractor for ordnance and British for bombs. C. I. O. and independent seeking union recognition. Joint conference with the two groups set for May 29. Commissioner Hill on the case.

Western Cartridge, St. Louis, Mo.: Supplies cartridges to Frankford Arsenal; dispute centers in the powder mill, involving 400 chemical workers (A. F. of L.). N. L. R. B. consent election held May 26. No report as yet.

J. H. Williams Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: Very important contractor for drop forgings and tools. Union considering wage offer and to ratify agreement May 25. No further report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what objection can there be to my proposed amendment of the law? It simply provides that if a plant is impeded in its production of defense material, the Government of the United States, through the proper authorities, may step in and take charge of the plant and go on producing materials. It does not mean that the men who are there employed need to quit work. It does not mean that the supervisory officials are discharged. It merely means that the Government will conduct the plant and see that those who want to continue in employment are allowed to continue their employment in the plant, and that the production of war material or national-defense articles shall go on.

There are some who may say, "Oh, well, that would tend to the socialization of industry, and we are against such socialization. We do not want the owner of this factory to have his plant taken over."

Mr. President, if strikers take over the plant, has not the owner lost control of it? If the Government takes over the plant and operates it the owner will be compensated under the Constitution and the statutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

In every case the owner has recourse to the courts, if necessary, to determine what his compensation may be; but if the employer's plant is stricken down, inactive, unproductive, and in the control of those who strike, where is his compensation?

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have not seen the Senator's bill. It was read before I came into the Chamber. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question or two.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. Is the Senator's bill based on the idea that labor in a particular plant might be conscripted?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. If the workers want to quit work they may quit, get their hats and tools, and go wherever they please.

Mr. STEWART. Would they be allowed to continue work at the prevailing wage?

Mr. CONNALLY. The bill does not go into all the details. It authorizes the President, through proper agents, to take over the plant.

I also suggested, before the Senator came into the Chamber, that no doubt the Government would set up a wage board, as it did during the World War, to determine fair wages for employees. The Government would have authority to determine working conditions. The Government would simply step in and take charge of the plant and run it.

Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I believe that one of the chief virtues of the bill is the fact that the authority under the bill would not have to be exercised more than once or twice. It would be the gun behind the door. The power and ability of the Government to step in and take charge in a contingency of that kind would prove to be a great psychological weapon to prevent the recurrence of strikes in national-defense industries. At the present time it is the knowledge that the Government cannot do such a thing and is not going to do it that gives the extreme and radical agitators the opportunity to do things which impede and hold up production, taking advantage of the critical situation. They say to themselves, "The Government must have the products of this plant. It must produce if the Government is to carry on its program. We have the Government just where we want it if the employer does not accede to our demands."

I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the bill is a double-barreled arrangement. We already have power to take over the employer's plant. I do not say that the employer is always right. I do not think he is always right. I do not think labor is always right. But if the Government steps in and takes charge, sets up its own wage board, and prescribes its own terms of employment, what could be more fair than that?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. It has heretofore been suggested in this discussion with respect to the strike situation that an amendment might be offered which would require that labor be conscripted in a particular plant at which a strike occurred, in the event it should be decided that the strike was against the public interest or retarded the advancement of the defense program, based on the idea that the workers would receive the same pay as soldiers who have been drafted.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not this bill. I am perfectly frank in expressing my view on that proposal. I do not think the Government has the power to draft private individuals and turn them over to some private employer to work in his factory. That is not constitutional, according to my constitutional knowledge and experience. I do not think it is within the competence of Congress to draft private individuals and turn them over to some employer to work under the terms and conditions he may set. That would be involuntary servitude.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. On the other hand, if the Government itself should set up a manufacturing plant, I can conceive that it might be possible—I do not know, because I have not explored that particular question—for us to pass some sort of draft act, applying to everybody in the same way, and making everybody subject to this particular kind of duty instead of military duty in the field. However, the bill does neither of the things suggested. The bill would have the Government simply step in and run the plant. If a man did not want to work, all he would have to do would be to get his hat and walk out.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has already answered my question. He has anticipated it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the fact that during the last preceding World War—I will not say the last World War, but the last preceding World War—the Government of the United States did precisely what the Senator is talking about. It practically imposed peonage by drafting men for military service and putting them to work getting out fir or other lumber in the northwest in a military capacity, which to all intents and purposes was peonage.

I am entirely sympathetic with any necessary measures for handling the present very dangerous situation. I have not had an opportunity to examine the Senator's bill. His arguments appeal to me very much. But the Senator will recall the course which President Wilson followed in the case of the Bridgeport matter. He simply notified the striking laborers, who had refused to abide by the results of mediation or arbitration, that he thought they were doing a very unpatriotic act in refusing to engage in necessary production, and warned them that if they persisted in that course they would not be employed on any Government work at any time, and that they would be subject to the draft, or any other steps the Government might be able to take.

The laborers at Bridgeport, who, I assume, were basically just as patriotic as any other American citizens—and practically all American laborers are patriotic—went back to work. That was a precedent which remained for the rest of that war and prevented any such action thereafter. It seems to me that President Wilson set a very good example in that particular case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator approve the example set by President Wilson?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do. That pattern, with whatever variation may be necessary at this time, might very well be followed. I believe that an appeal from the President of the United States, setting out the facts and setting out the recourses which the Government might have, without any drafting of labor, without any injustice to labor, and without any intention of committing injustice to labor, might have the same effect as President Wilson's great appeal in the Bridgeport case.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. If he had heard my previous remarks, he would readily concede that my bill makes no provision for the drafting of labor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From what I have heard the Senator say, I am very certain that that is true. I simply call attention to what happened during the previous war in the Bridgeport case as a suggestion which might be heeded by everyone.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that, under the terms of the bill which I have introduced, nobody will be drafted. If a man did not want to work, all he would have to do would be to get his hat and get out; but under the terms of the bill it would be possible for the Government to say to those who did want to work, "Go ahead and work and produce, and the Government will see that you are protected in the right to work."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am entirely in sympathy with that view.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to remind the Senator from Texas that on the Pacific coast we have had numerous plant shutdowns in cases in which the employers have had no quarrel with their workmen, and yet they could not operate their plants.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am surprised that with the ingenuity and ability which I know reside on the Pacific coast, things of that kind have not been settled locally through State agencies.

Mr. HOLMAN. We have also had a Madam Perkins, with her sympathy toward Harry Bridges and other such disturbing labor elements on the Pacific coast.

Mr. CONNALLY. I see.

Mr. President, I realize that the Pacific coast is more or less affected by this bad situation. The Truman committee, of which the Senator from Texas is a member, investigated a strike in a certain shipbuilding plant at San Francisco, Calif., in which 1,100 machinists were striking, though all the other employees of the plant, numbering several thousand, wanted to continue to work, but through the striking of these particular machinists the activities of all those plants were tied up.

The machinists were striking in the face of the fact that their national president, Mr. John P. Frey, a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, condemned the strike, and personally went to the Pacific coast and led his men through the picket lines, so that they could go back to work. The strike was in the face of the fact that Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, condemned the strike as an outlaw strike, and said the men ought to go back to work.

I do not know what has transpired since those witnesses appeared before the committee, but there is a classic example of a little handful of men, under bad leadership, tying up the activities of a number of shipbuilding plants, and paralyzing the arm of the Government in that area, in a dispute over 3 cents an hour. The reason for the dispute was a controversy as to whether they should get $1.12 or $1.15 an hour. That was their claim. Of course, there were other incidental questions which I think probably had more motivating influence than that particular claim, but because of a dispute over 3 cents an hour compensation they were willing to paralyze the maritime activities of this great Nation in its hour of peril.

What do Senators think should be done? Should the Government of the United States sit down and do nothing, or should it step in and say to the men in such a plant:

> The rest of these men are willing to work. You can either work or not work, but this plant is going to produce, and this plant is going to operate.

This morning I saw in the Washington Post a report of another phase of this matter on the Pacific coast:

> C. I. O. Lumber Union defiance of Mediation Board forces emergency power shutdown.

This report is with respect to west-coast lumber workers at Seattle, Wash. They have walked out of the conferences, have defied the Mediation Board, and have told the Mediation Board—well, they told them. [Laughter.] They told the Mediation Board where to go, defying the efforts of the whole industry and of the Government of the United States. If they knew the Government had authority to step in there and take charge, the strike would not last a week. They know that under present conditions nobody is going to step in.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that before he came into the Chamber I had pointed out that during the World War the labor situation was handled very effectively. First, the Government set up the Taft-Walsh

Wage Board, which undertook to stabilize wages in the various sections of the country. The Government also had a mediation board. It was a three-pronged arrangement, including a mediation board, which we already have by Executive order. Then the Government had an understanding with employers and labor that there were to be no strikes and no lock-outs; and President Wilson, in the extreme case to which the Senator from Missouri referred, had to use those extreme measures in order to stop the strike. As I recall, President Wilson did not threaten anything beyond his powers. He simply said, as President of the United States, as Executive over all governmental functions of an administrative character, "If you men strike at this time on this plant which is producing war materials, I, as President, will see that none of my subordinates ever give you a job on Government work in the future." Of course, the President had that authority. He had that power. Furthermore, he said, "If you strike on this plant, such of you as are subject to military duty will be drafted and put in the Army of the United States."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. President Wilson also specifically said that nobody who was engaged in such a strike as that for unpatriotic purposes, as the President saw the situation—and, undoubtedly, correctly saw it—would be given any exemption for military service on the ground of essential industrial occupation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I simply mentioned that fact as pointing out a method which during the last war was very successfully followed by President Wilson; because, as I recall, that was the last instance in which such a thing ever happened.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. What the Senator from Texas meant to say was not, of course, that the strikers individually would be drafted, but that the protection from the draft which the draft law gave them would be removed from them.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the newspaper accounts of the west coast affair, mentioned this morning, present a case in which the controversy was presented to the Mediation Board, and in which the Mediation Board rendered a unanimous decision.

Mr. CONNALLY. The panel.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; and, as stated by the Senator, the leaders of the striking workers have defied the Board.

At this point, for my information or for that of other Senators, I wonder whether the Senator will develop a line of thought which has occurred to me. The Senator is expressing the thought that the President of the United States should have power to take over such a plant and to operate it. I have no objection to that, if the President does not already have that power.

Mr. CONNALLY. Only in cases where it is necessary to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In cases of that sort of what value would it be for the Government to take over a plant the management of which is willing to go along and to do what the authorities had decided should be done? The issue there presented is, What shall we do with the other side, with the workers who will not work?

The Senator says they cannot be conscripted; and I agree with that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What are we to do in the other case?

Mr. CONNALLY. There might be others on the Pacific coast who are ready and willing to work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is just the point. The Senator's idea is that those who are willing to work should be protected?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with the Senator. Cannot protection be afforded with the present management as well as with Government management?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think so, and I will tell the Senator why. So long as private management still is in control of the plant, the dispute is a dispute between two private interests. In essence, of course, it may reach back to the Government, but technically it is still a controversy between the employer and the employees; and if the Government should intervene by putting troops or armed forces there, it would be claimed that the Government was taking one side or the other.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then it is a question of psychology, and not of power to protect men who are willing to work?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the State authorities would have the power to deal with the matter; and I assume, because of the national aspect, since the plants are manufacturing defense articles for the Government, that we as the Federal Government would have that power; but that is not entirely clear in my mind.

As I said awhile ago to the Senator from Missouri, it is very true that during the World War we detailed a number of men who were drafted for military service to work in the lumber camps in the Northwest for the production of fir and other lumber necessary for airplane production. In essence, it was military service a little farther back behind the lines. The men were producing lumber necessary for airplane propellors and war materials. That is very true. We also drafted a great many men whom we did not put in the front line in Europe. We put them back at Brest, in the labor camps, unloading materials. A great many colored troops were assigned—and, I imagine, rather with their own consent—to those labor services rather than to be thrown into the front-line trenches, but they were drafted for military purposes.

It is just as necessary for military purposes to get food off the ships and to get it up to the front lines to feed the troops, or to get munitions off the ships and get them up to the front lines for our Army to use as it is to perform service in any other division or branch of the Army. So, in essence, those were military services the men were rendering.

Take the case of the conscientious objectors: We draft conscientious objectors, and we exempt them from military duty in the front lines. That does not mean that we do not assign them to some other duty. We assign them to some other work, or some duty necessary for the production of materials or munitions. We could very consistently assign a number of conscientious objectors to some industrial work necessary for the national defense.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator spoke a few moments ago of some report of the Truman committee and made reference to some other report. Does the Senator have any information as to whether any of those out on strike at this time have been sent to the military service?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I cannot say that, but I assume some of them have been. Of course many of them were, no doubt, above the draft age.

Let me say further that when we passed the Selective Service Act we made special provision that skilled labor could be exempted by local draft boards. Why? Because they were any better than anybody else? No. Because they had any particular right to be exempt? No. But we were thinking about the national interest. We thought, "If this man is exempted from the draft he will work in a munitions plant or he will help to build airplanes, and, therefore, having in view the national interest we will give him through the local draft boards opportunity to be exempted from military service in the ranks." But he was expected to work in a factory, and when workers strike they are not meeting the expectations of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was prompted to rise by the Senator's remark that it is just as important to get the food off the ships as he expressed it, as it is to have the men in the front-line trenches. It occurs to me that the Senator might well emphasize the principle which lies behind that remark. I am afraid there is too great a lack of understanding in the Senate that the war now raging is going to be fought on the assembly line and not in the front-line trenches. It is much more important in modern warfare that a nation have the instruments of defense and of attack than it is that it have an army lined up behind a fortress.

France had the Maginot line, the greatest defense line that was ever constructed by any nation in the world. It failed because in the factories of France airplanes were not built. What we are overlooking is, I think, that it is not in the Army camps but in the factories that the defense effort is proceeding, and both upon the part of labor and upon the part of capital those who have any thought whatsoever that a profit is to be made out of this effort are thoroughly mistaken. The only objective these labor controversies have is to determine what share of the national deficit shall be borne. There is no money to be made out of this great effort. A tax bill will presently be before

the Senate which will take all the profit out of any possible war upon the part of capital; and the leaders of labor who fail to realize that the defense effort will bog down if we do not get defense production in the factories are doing an injustice to themselves, to the organizations they represent, to the rank and file of labor who depend upon them, and to all the people of the United States whose freedom depends upon the early production of the materials which we need.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. He referred to the Maginot line. The Maginot line proved to be an "imaginary" line. It did not hold because, with the advances in mechanized warfare and the machinery in the new avenues of warfare, the Germans simply flanked the Maginot line and come through with their tanks and superbombers and things of that kind. Of course manpower is necessary; we have got to have it; but, after all, manpower is simply masses of flesh and is not capable of making war. Men must have arms; they must have munitions; they must have mechanisms; they must have tanks; they must have airplanes; they must have ships; they must have all the paraphernalia of modern warfare. They cannot make that stuff themselves out on the battlefield; they cannot fall back, and while falling back manufacture a tank. We have got to manufacture the equipment here in the United States. The men who know how to make it are the men who must make it. The Government has been patient; it has long delayed an aggressive handling of the problem.

As I said a moment ago, the Truman committee has revealed from production authorities that the national program of defense production is not going forward as it should go; we are not getting the equipment as we should get it, and the Army and Navy are being weakened and slowed down for the lack of industrial production.

One other point, and I am done. I said a moment ago that some employers say, "Oh, we do not want that kind of a bill; it takes our property away from us." As I have already pointed out, any employer whose plant should be taken over under this measure would receive fair compensation. If strikers take it over, he does not get any compensation. The Government would not take it over for all time; it would simply take it over for the period of the emergency. It might not be necessary for the Government to take it over for more than a month or 2 weeks, because in the meantime, by mediation, settlement of a strike, according to my view, would be brought about, and the employer could step back into his plant and go ahead with production. This measure would tend to bring the minds of the parties together.

Now, Mr. President, let me say, as I said awhile ago, that many laboring men in the ranks are not in sympathy with the wave of strikes which is sweeping over the country and paralyzing and deadening the efforts of the people of the United States to arm and equip the gallant boys who are in the Army camps.

Talking about wage boards, the Government fixes the wages of the men in the Army. Why can it not set up a wage board for factories for certain kinds of labor and pay them so much and say, "If you want to work, all right; and if you do not want to work, take your hat and get out"? We do not ask the soldier in the ranks what we shall pay him; we fix it here on the floor of the Senate. We do not ask him whether he belongs to a union or whether he is to have collective bargaining. We do the collective bargaining here on the floor of the Senate. We draft him; we put him in the ranks and tell him how he shall serve and what he shall do.

As one who has sympathized with it all the years of his public life, because he himself has worked and therefore has sympathy for the man who toils, I want to say to labor that it must not be led astray by selfish and by extreme leadership in this hour of the Nation's peril. The Government will see, through its agencies, that every man receives a fair wage; it will see that through its mediation agencies every dispute has a hearing in a Government forum; but it also wants every man to go ahead and produce and work and serve the Government of the United States.

If Hitler should gain world mastery, where would these labor leaders be then? They would not be in the lodge room upstairs somewhere; they would be in concentration camps. We are trying to protect this modern civilized world against aggression, against totalitarianism, against the most brutal tyranny that has cursed the earth since recorded history; and yet we are being impeded.

Mr. President, I desire to read what some laboring men in my State think about these strikes. I have here a letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by a large number of names. I have not counted the number, but there is a whole page full of signatures, three columns. It reads:

Four hundred twenty Union Station, Houston, Tex., April 5, 1941—

It is addressed to the Senator from Texas—

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned employees of the Missouri Pacific Lines, the majority being union members, respectfully urge that immediate and vigorous action be taken by Congress to enact laws that will put a stop to strikes in defense industries.

Members of our families and friends have been inducted into the service of our country. We feel that their efforts should not be hampered by the willful and disloyal attitude of labor agitators, as is apparent in the Allis-Chalmers and Ford strikes.

I ask unanimous consent to place the letter, with the signatures, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my mail also contains many, many letters which I have received during the past months in which the writers say, in substance: "I am a labor-union man. I have belonged to the union for — years."

Then they come out with a denunciation of strikes in national-defense plants. They want nothing of that. They want to go on producing and preparing for the Nation's program.

Mr. President, I have asked that this bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee has jurisdiction of the subject matter. I see that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] has just entered the Chamber. I congratulate him upon ascending to the chairmanship of that very important committee. The committee has jurisdiction over the Draft Act which was passed by Congress last year. This bill is a simple amendment to the Draft Act. In introducing it, I do not want to have it put in cold storage. I hope the chairman of the committee will realize the importance of the bill, and that we may have a hearing on it. I should like to have the Army and Navy authorities called. I should like to have those high in authority called. I believe that if we will put the bill upon the statute books it will go a long way toward preventing strikes and labor disputes in our national-defense industries.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I noted the Senator's remark that the employee who did not care to work after the Government had set what it considered favorable and fair working conditions could take his hat and go. That being true, still the plant may not be able to produce what the country so urgently needs. When we conscript the plant, should we not take some means of engaging the labor necessary to operate the plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that he probably did not hear me awhile ago when I discussed the power of the Government to draft men and turn them over to private employment. Let me further say to the Senator that whenever the Government steps in and takes charge of a plant, and the boys put on their hats and walk out, they are not going to walk very far. They will walk down the road, and they will know the plant is operating, and they will know that other men are working at their jobs, and they will know that some other men from the outside probably will come in and get jobs; and when the sun gets a little hot down the road those who walk out will take a hitch in their belts and turn around and walk back to the plant and go to work.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, may I make an observation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to have an observation.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have been a pay-roll maker and an operator nearly all my life. I have never had labor trouble. I have great confidence in the patriotism and loyalty of the man who works; but there is another class of individual in this labor situation—as I call him, the racketeer of labor—of whom one Harry Bridges is an outstanding example. Those racketeers of labor create a reign of terror in which honest workmen are intimidated. They have "beat up" squads and ex-prize-fighters and thugs who encounter the

honest workmen on their way to and from their homes and actually beat them up, knock them down, kick them in the face, and knock out all their teeth. They frighten the wives of honest labor. They terrify them as to what will happen to their children going to and from school.

In my opinion, it is time the Government and the Department of Labor should take cognizance of this situation, which is not only destructive of peace and harmony in our country, but is delaying and defeating the plans for national defense. We must reach out for men like Harry Bridges and others who are creating the disturbances which the Senator is attempting to remedy.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I am aware of his views. However, I think the bill introduced by me is the best approach to the problem at the moment. I think it will accomplish in a very large measure what is desired, because, if what the Senator says is true—that the mass of these men want to work, and are patriotic—they will continue to work, and the racketeers will be the ones who will walk off down the road, and perhaps keep on going. I hope so. Most of the men will not go very far down the road. They will come back and go to work if they know the plant is going to continue operation without their services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement of man-days lost in strikes important to War Department procurement for the week ending May 21, 1941; a statement of cases before the National Defense Mediation Board; a statement of threatened strikes and controversies; and a statement of settled cases.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

420 UNION STATION,
Houston, Tex., April 5, 1941.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned employees of the Missouri Pacific Lines, the majority being union members, respectfully urge that immediate and vigorous action be taken by Congress to enact laws that will put a stop to strikes in defense industries.

Members of our families and friends have been inducted into the service of our country. We feel that their efforts should not be hampered by the willful and disloyal attitude of labor agitators, as is apparent in the Allis-Chalmers and Ford strikes.

Arthur Peterson, D. W. Barker, Roy Gunter, J. E. Flynn, E. B. Banks, H. P. Ward, Grace Harris, Alma Francis, C. S. Davis, Katharine Heiser, James H. Roberts, Katherine Moffett, Mary A. Harris, B. W. Stone, Nat Schany, Leroy Hill, Albert E. White, R. T. Chamber, Irene B. Wilson, Elsie C. Arnold, B. M. Cesak, J. B. Owens, W. H. Sellers, E. Maubert, L. D. Carter, G. H. Curtis, V. C. Teague, L. M. Edington, A. A. Cobb, Cora Helen Kendall, Mrs. F. A. Roemer, L. D. Lewis, C. B. Cox, R. S. Gaston, F. E. Turner, Margie Bowman, W. L. Andrews, J. P. Laz, I. S. Mayfield, E. D. Myers, Thos. J. Clark, R. E. Blanchard, Lillian Morris, Earl V. Hyde, Dixie Cunningham, C. L. Mims, Nadine Mann, N. Paul Wiley, Mrs. Ola Miller, Mrs. J. A. Barnett, B. B. Bacon, F. E. Browan, Mrs. Carl G. Meyer, D. S. Cage, V. A. Sala, Fred S. Carter, Mike Byrne, A. V. Keenan, Frank Eldredge, H. R. Fields, W. G. Bell, A. C. Jessen, F. P. Hodnett, R. C. Hilton, C. E. Camp, E. E. Casey, F. Brady, V. H. Liebert, R. E. Lander, Arthur Evans, G. W. Hawley, C. R. DuBose, E. J. Sheerin, H. L. Robertson, F. W. Partridge, D. D. Carter, Rose Crane, Rita Mims, Cornelia Higgins, Laura Miller, Ethel Randle, Nell McGraw, Ethel Chapman, Geo. D. Meekey, Mrs. N. E. Whaley, C. L. Farmer, Jr., De La Motta Brown, Mrs. Geo. Stewart, Rose Crane, Geo. Stewart, H. H. Hodgkins, A. E. Simpson, Fanny McCannon, W. G. Harris.

APRIL 9, 1941.

EMPLOYEES, MISSOURI PACIFIC LINES,
420 Union Station, Houston, Tex.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: Thank you for your letter signed by so many fine citizens and employees of the Missouri Pacific Lines with respect to strikes in national-defense plants.

You may be sure that I am just as opposed to these disturbances as you are. Strikes in such industries must stop.

I favor the Government taking over any plant producing national-defense articles in which strikes and labor disputes hinder or delay such production, and I favor the Government conducting the plant in the public interest alone.

Attached are press release and copy of letter relative to strikes and subversive activities, to which I call your attention and knew you would be interested.

With cordial good wishes to each of you, I am,

Sincerely,

TOM CONNALLY.

EXHIBIT 2

MAY 22, 1941.

The following figures represent the man-days lost in strikes important to War Department procurement for the week ending May 21, 1941. As it is not possible to ascertain accurately those plants operating Saturday and Sunday, the time lost on those days is not included in the computation.

Date	Number of strikes	Man-days lost
Thursday, May 15, 1941	32	[1] 49,900
Friday, May 16, 1941	28	[1] 48,700
Monday, May 19, 1941	25	21,800
Tuesday, May 20, 1941	26	22,800
Wednesday, May 21, 1941	27	26,700
Total		169,900

[1] The discrepancy between these figures and those on the daily report represents the 15,000 (approximate) men engaged in War Department defense work in the General Motors plants which were closed on these days.

CASES BEFORE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

Cases in which work has ceased

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.: Strike of 1,000 mine, mill, and smelter workers (C. I. O.) on March 19, 1941, for closed shop and wage increases. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 15, 1941. Company supplies borax and boric acid to Kimball Glass Co. and Corning Glass Co. for use in Medical Corps contracts. Meetings are being held in the field.

Curtiss Manufacturing Co., St Louis, Mo.: Strike of 300 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) on April 8, 1941, for wage increases. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 3, 1941. Company has Air Corps and Quartermaster Corps contracts for compressors and car washers. No date set for hearings as yet.

Twin District Council, Seattle, Wash.: Strike of 2,200 woodworkers (C. I. O.) around May 8, 1941. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 9, 1941. Part of Pacific Northwest lumber situation. Hearings being held.

Cases in which work is continuing

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., La Porte, Ind.: Strike of 1,200 Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) on May 7, 1941, for wages and closed shop. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 9, 1941. Men returned to work May 16, 1941. Company has contract for gun mounts for Watertown Arsenal. Meetings continuing.

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: Threatened strike of 1,400 United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (C. I. O.) for closed shop. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 3, 1941. Manufactures electrical appliances for Quartermaster Corps contractors. Settlement reached May 9, 1941. Ratification to be voted upon.

Bendix Corporation, South Bend, Ind.: Threatened strike April 2, 1941, of 8,100 United Automobile Workers of America (C. I. O.) for wage increases. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 7, 1941. Manufactures aviation carburetors and parts. Settlement reached May 16, 1941. Ratification to be voted upon.

Columbia Basin area loggers, Portland, Oreg.: Threatened strike April 29, 1941, of 10,000 woodworkers (C. I. O.) for wages. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 12, 1941. Important lumber contracts in Pacific area. Meetings are being held.

International Harvester (four plants): Strikes at Chicago Tractor Works, Richmond, Ind., plant, McCormick plant, and Rock Falls, Ill., plant of 25,000 F. E. W. O. C. (C. I. O.) for wages were certified to National Defense Mediation Board March 27. Men returned to work March 31. Company manufactures tractors and parts for Ordnance and Quartermaster Corps. National Defense Mediation Board investigating issues.

Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, Minn.: Threatened strike April 15, 1941 of 1,800 A. F. of L. and C. I. O.—jurisdictional dispute. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 28, 1941. Manufactures telescopes and sights for Air Corps and Ordnance. Agreement reached May 6, subject to union ratification.

Roebling Sons Co., John A., Trenton, N. J.: Strike April 15, 1941, of 4,000 S. W. O. C. (C. I. O.) for union recognition and wages. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 22, 1941. Men returned to work May 6, 1941, subject to union ratification of agreement. Company manufactures cables and rope for Air Corps, Signal Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Ordnance.

United Engineering & Foundry, Vandergrift, Pa.: Strike May 7, 1941, of 750 S. W. O. C. (C. I. O.) for union recognition. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 9, 1941. Men returned to work May 10, 1941. Agreement reached May 16, 1941, subject to union ratification. Manufactures rolling-mill equipment and howitzers for Ordnance.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.: Strike February 10, 1941, of 400 C. I. O. workers for wages. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board March 27, 1941. Men returned to work March 30, 1941. Board is investigating issues. Company manufactures special steel.

Current strikes

Company	Contracts	Issues	Union	Number affected	Status
Amos Hosiery Mills, High Point, N. C.	Quartermaster Corps (socks)	Wages	Boarders	45	Strike May 19, 1941. Meetings being held.
Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.	Ordnance (subcontracts)	Closed shop and wages	Congress of Industrial Organizations.	950	Strike May 19, 1941. No details.
Armbruster Manufacturing Co., Springfield, Ill.	Quartermaster Corps (tents)	do	do	86	Strike May 16, 1941. Conciliator conducting meetings.
Arrow Tool & Reamer Co., Detroit, Mich.	Ordnance (machine tools)	Wages	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	60	Strike May 1, 1941. Meetings continuing.
Black Hosiery Mills, York, Pa.	Quartermaster Corps (socks)	do	Hosiery Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	100	Strike Apr. 11, 1941. Day shift is working, bringing production up to ½ of normal.
Chicago Foundrymen, Chicago, Ill.	Basic (iron and brass foundries)	do	Molders and Foundrymen (American Federation of Labor).	3,000	Strike May 12, 1941. Meeting held May 19, 1941.
California Packers, California area.	Quartermaster Corps (foodstuffs)	do	Cannery Workers (American Federation of Labor).	(1)	Strikes May 8 and 9, 1941. Not vital. Meetings being held.
Crescent Tool Co., Jamestown, N. Y.	Air Corps, Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps (pliers and wrenches).	Grievances	Machinists (American Federation of Labor).	200	Strike May 12, 1941. Meetings continuing.
Detroit Steel Products, Detroit Mich.	Ordnance (sashes)	Union recognition	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	750	Strike May 7, 1941. Deadlock in negotiations.
Fabric Associates, Johnstown, N. Y.					
Feiner & Sons, Inc., New York City.	Signal Corps (mountings and antenna brackets).	Closed shop and wages	Construction (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	60	Strike May 2, 1941. Deadlock in negotiations.
General Tire & Rubber Co. Wabash, Ind.	Chemical Warfare Service (mask parts).	Unascertained	Rubber Workers (American Federation of Labor).	50 (?)	Strike May 20, 1941. Meetings being arranged.
Hall Sheet Metal Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Ordnance (machine-tool parts)	Wages	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	236	Strike May 14, 1941. Meetings continuing.
Hudson Motor Car Co., Detroit, Mich.[2]					
Hussey & Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Copper	Closed shop	American Federation of Labor.	700	Strike May 20, 1941. Conciliator conducting meetings.
LaFayette Worsted Co., Woonsocket, R. I.	Quartermaster Corps (cloth)	Contract terms	Textile Workers (independent).	315	Strike May 6, 1941. Agreement expected shortly.
Maisel Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Quartermaster Corps (pillows)	Wages	Textile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	33[3]	Strike May 9, 1941. Meetings continuing.
Midwest Glove Co., Chicago, Ill.	Quartermaster Corps and Air Corps (gloves).	Union recognition	Amalgamated Clothing Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	80	Strike May 4, 1941. Conciliation conducting meetings.
Monsanto Chemical Co., Monsanto, Ill.	Chemical (phosphorus)	Wages	Chemical (American Federation of Labor).	900	Strike Apr. 16, 1941. Union voting on company proposal.
Phoenixville Iron Works, Phoenixville, Pa.	Structural steel	Union recognition	Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	1,000	Strike May 14, 1941. Negotiations stalemated.
Star Metal Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Air Corps (cafeteria equipment)	Wages	American Federation of Labor.	180	Strike May 14, 1941. No further details.
Tide Water Boom Operators, Tacoma, Wash.	Lumber	do	Woodworkers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	500	Strike May 18, 1941. Negotiations continuing.
Vulcan Proofing Co., Brooklyn N. Y.	Quartermaster Corps (rubberized material).	Wages and union status	United Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	350	Strike May 6, 1941. Joint meeting for May 21, 1941.
Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills, Raymond, Wash.	Lumber	Wages	Woodworkers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	1,700	Strike May 16, 1941. No details.

[1] Unascertained.
[2] Quartermaster Corps reports that an alternate source of supply has been found for material manufactured by Fabric Associates. Case not to be reported subsequently.
[3] Strike May 15, 1941, but War Department contracts are not affected. Case not to be reported subsequently.

Current strikes in which little or no change in status has been reported during the last week

Continental Can Co., Jersey City, N. J.: Chemical Warfare, gas-mask canisters.

Griess-Pfleger Tanning Co., Waukegan, Ill.: Quartermaster Corps, shoe leather.

Madison Woolen Co., Madison, Maine: Quartermaster Corps, suiting.

Reliance Manufacturing Co., Michigan City and Columbus, Ind.: Quartermaster Corps, trousers and drawers.

Rock Island Sash & Door, Rock Island, Ill.: Sashes and doors for arsenals and Government plants.

Threatened strikes and controversies

Company	Contracts	Issues	Union	Number affected	Status
MOST IMMEDIATE DANGER					
Combustion Engineering Co. Chattancoga, Tenn.	Ordnance and Navy, nitric acid manufacturing equipment.	New contract	Boilermakers	900	Conciliator Smith on the case; conference May 18 1941, to discuss new proposals.
Dow Chemical Co., Midland Mich.	Manufacturers of chemical products and magnesium-critical items.	Union recognition	United Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	4,000	National Labor Relations Board to hold hearings May 26; strike not probable before then.
Schlueter Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Ordnance (antitank mines)	Union recognition and wages.	Congress of Industrial Organizations.	300	Commissioner Hill entered conference May 19; strike threatening for May 22.
Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.	Air Corps (pistons and rings)	Union recognition, closed shop and wages.	United Automobile Workers (American Federation of Labor).	1,160	Conciliator on the case since Apr. 24; Office of Production Management representative investigating, May 18, 1941.
Soft coal	Entire steel industry requires soft coal as do many other important defense industries.	Wages	United Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations)	[1] 300,000	Negotiations continuing in New York between union and southern operators; if no agreement is reached by May 23, 1941, case will be brought before the National Defense Mediation Board.
Sivyer Steel Castings Co., Chicago, Ill.	Ordnance (castings)	Wages, union recognition	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	(?)	Strike vote taken May 18; action withheld pending efforts of commissioner to settle case.
OTHER SERIOUS THREATS					
Aluminum Co. of America, St. Louis, Mo., Massena, N. Y., and Mobile, Ala.	Ordnance, Quartermaster Corps, Supply Corps (vital ore).	Wages	Aluminum workers (American Federation of Labor).	1,900	Negotiations of May 16 proceeding favorably; American Federation of Labor to submit committee proposals to company.

[1] Approximate.

Threatened strikes and controversies—Continued

Company	Contracts	Issues	Union	Number affected	Status
OTHER SERIOUS THREATS—cont'nued					
E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Ordnance (presses and ammunition machinery).	Wages	United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	1,200	Conference held May 20. Commissioner on case.
Busch Sulzer Diesel Engineering Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Ordnance and Navy	Jurisdictional dispute over installation of machinery in new plant being constructed.	Machinists and Millwrights (American Federation of Labor).	75	Plant almost complete; suggestion made to have machinists install the machinery and if the building trades step in certify the case to the National Defense Mediation Board; the Board had refused to take the case on May 3, 1941, on ground that the case was between two unions and not employer vs. employees.
Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.	Ordnance (tractors)	Wages	Farm Equipment Workers' Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	13,500	Union requested commissioner May 20; possibility strike may be avoided at Government's request.
Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va.	Construction of explosives plant	do	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (American Federation of Labor).	150	Construction quartermaster to confer with officials in charge; Commissioner to attend conference May 20, 1941.
McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis, Ind., St. Louis, Mo., and Connersville, Ind.	Air Corps (engine compressor rings)	do	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	1,200	Connersville plant threatens to strike if wage negotiations are not reopened; the other two plants had agreed to company proposal but had not signed. Commissioner on the case.
Western Cartridge, St. Louis, Mo.	Supplies cartridges to Frankford Arsenal.	Wages and union recognition.	Chemical Workers (American Federation of Labor).	400	National Labor Relations Board election to be held around the 24th of May to determine the bargaining agent.
J. H. Williams Co., Buffalo, N. Y.	Ordnance and Signal Corps (drop forgings and tools).	Wages and union shop	Steel Workers Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	2,000	Struck for 1 day May 15; returned to work and began negotiations. Commissioner requested May 19, 1941, as no progress was being made.
LABOR DISPUTES WHERE STOPPAGE DOES NOT APPEAR IMMINENT					
Alden Rubber Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Quartermaster Corps (raincoats)	Wages	United Rubber Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	160	Struck May 8 and returned May 9 with expectation of starting negotiations immediately; Commissioner assigned May 17 when negotiations were delayed.
Appalachian Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.	Quartermaster Corps (undershirts and other clothing).	Closed shop	International Ladies Garment Workers Union (American Federation of Labor).	2,000	Struck Apr. 15 to 21; continued to discuss controversial issues; commissioner on the case and tentative agreement reached on all points at issue. Conference for May 20.
Boeing Aircraft Corporation, Seattle, Wash.	Air Corps (aircraft)	Jurisdiction	American Federation of Labor (several factions involved).	8,000	Reorganization going on within the American Federation of Labor local; negotiations to start on wages, etc.; Congress of Industrial Organizations still continuing efforts to secure application cards.
Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Farrell, Pa.	Ordnance (armor plate for tanks)	Unascertained	Congress of Industrial Organizations.	1,800	Controversy since the 13th of May; company charges the union is coercing the employees into membership.
Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif.	Air Corps, Navy, England, Netherlands, and Canada (aircraft).	Grievances	Machinists (American Federation of Labor).	(?)	Commissioner Malcom on the case; new proposal submitted by union to be discussed at meeting May 21, 1941.
Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Air Corps (aircraft)	Closed shop and new contract.	Steel Workers Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	800	Meeting scheduled for May 17, no progress made at prior meetings.
Dow Chemical Co., Bay City, Mich.	Fabricates magnesium steel castings for airplane production.	Union recognition	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations) and independent.	1,000	National Labor Relations Board is investigating representation question; company has agreed to disestablish the independent at this plant.
Electro Metallurgical Co., Alloy, W. Va.	Supplies steel companies with ferromanganese.	Bargaining agent	Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations and American Federation of Labor).	1,000	National Labor Relations Board certified Congress of Industrial Organizations; American Federation of Labor contesting it; facility has been negotiating with Congress of Industrial Organizations since election; trouble is expected.
Gager Lime Manufacturing Co., Sherwood, Tenn.	Supplies lime to large number of defense contractors.	New contract	Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers (American Federation of Labor).	185	Negotiations continuing with progress reported; last meeting, May 19, 1941.
Gardiner & Warring, Inc., Florence, Ala.	Quartermaster Corps (underwear)	Wages	International Ladies Garment Workers (American Federation of Labor).	(?)	Commissioner Finch on the case; last meeting, May 21, 1941.
Hercules Powder Co., Pulaski, Va.	Construction of explosives plant	do	Bridge and Structural Workers (American Federation of Labor).	50	Increase was granted for the structural workers on May 16; details being checked.
Isolantite, Inc., Kearny, N. J.	Signal Corps (material having A-1 priority).	do	American Federation of Labor.	470	Company rejected union proposal but agreed to continue negotiations May 20, 1941.
Jackes-Evans, St. Louis, Mo.	Ordnance (machine gun belt links)	Wages and closed shop	do	250	Company opposed to closed shop; strike vote taken May 14; no date set.
Scullin Steel Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Ordnance and British (bombs)	Union recognition	Steel Workers Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	2,000	Conferences May 20, Commissioner Hill attending. Strike vote not yet taken.

Threatened strikes and controversies in which little or no change has been reported since prior progress report

American Aluminum Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Basic metal.

Auto Specialties Manufacturing Co., St. Joseph, Mich.: Ordnance—shells.

Eastern Malleable Iron Castings Co., Wilmington, Del.: Ordnance, Quartermaster Corps, Chemical Warfare Service, yokes for mortars.

French & Hect, Springfield, Ohio: Air Corps, runway marker assemblies.

Fuld & Hatch Knitting Co., Cohoes, N. Y.: Quartermaster Corps, undershirts and drawers.

G. M. Manufacturing Co., Long Island City, N. Y.: Ordnance, tubes for fuses.

Hamilton Standard Propeller, East Hartford, Conn.: Air Corps, propellers.

National Zinc Co., Bartlesville, Okla.: Basic metal.

Norton Laboratories & Manufacturing Co., Lockport, N. Y.: Signal Corps, Quartermaster Corps, suppressor casings and telegraph keys.

Parke, Davis & Co., Detroit, Mich.: Medical Corps contracts, vaccines, serums.

St. Louis Steel Fabricating Cos., Missouri: Ordnance, gun mounts.

Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.: Quartermaster Corps, underwear.

White Sewing Machine Co., Cleveland, Ohio: Ordnance, fuse boxes and m51 sets.

Wolverine Tube Co., Detroit, Mich.: Ordnance and Air Corps, subcontractors.

Settled cases

Company	Contracts	Issues	Union	Number affected	Data on settlement
American Type Foundry, Elizabeth, N. J.	Ordnance (howitzers)	Wages, closed shop	American Federation of Labor	(?)	May 20, 1941, union and company negotiated new labor contract, effective May 19, 1941, expires May 31, 1942. (Controversy.)
Allen D. Cardwell Manufacturing Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y.	Signal Corps (radio parts)	Union recognition, wages	Y. E. R. N. W. A. (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	40	Strike settled May 19, 1941. Men are back to work.
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Power	Union recognition, grievances.	United Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	725	Threatened strike: Case settled May 16, 1941.
Colt's Patent Firearms Hartford, Conn.	Ordnance (machine guns)	Wages	American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and independent.	4,800	Strike: May 20, 1941; case settled.
Detroit Building Trades, Detroit, Mich.	Ordnance (construction)	Wages, recognition, closed shop.	Building Trades and Teamsters (American Federation of Labor).	30,000	Strike: May 19, 1941; case closed.
Ex-Cell-O Corporation, Detroit, Mich.	Ordnance, air (engines and machine tools).	Contract changes, union shop wages.	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	3,700	Settled strike: May 17, 1941 (National Defense Mediation Board).
General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.	Ordnance, air, Quartermaster Corps and Supply Corps (antiaircraft).	Closed shop, wages, new agreement.	do	175,000	May 17, 1941 threatened strike: Case closed.
Gibbs Knitting Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Quartermaster Corps (underwear)	Wages	Textile (Congress of Industrial Organizations), workers.	375	Strike: Men returned to work May 20, 1941.
Moench Tanning Co., Tonawanda, N. Y.	Quartermaster Corps (leather)	(?)	Congress of Industrial Organizations.	300	Case settled May 15, 1941 (strike).
Murray Corporation, Detroit Mich.	Quartermaster Corps air (airplane parts).	Union shop recognition	United Automobile Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	7,000	Threatened strike: May 19, 1941; strike temporarily averted, contract not yet signed.
New Haven Foundry Co., New Haven, Mich.	Quartermaster Corps (cylinder blocks).	Wages, vacations	do	475	Strike: Settlement last night reported, May 15, 1941.
Parker Appliance Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	Air Corps (valves)	Wages	Machinists (American Federation of Labor).	1,200	Threatened strike: May 12, 1941; union accepted wage increase; union shop and paid vacations granted.
Rivoli Shirt Co., Bridgeport, Conn.	Quartermaster Corps (shirts)	(?)	Amalgamated Clothing Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	65	Strike: Report of May 16, 1941, says case settled as of May 12.
Smoot Sand & Gravel Co., Washington, D. C.	Construction	Wages	American Federation of Labor.	380	Strike: May 16, 1941, settled.
Superior Duck Clothing Co., New York City.	Quartermaster Corps (mosquito bars).	(?)	Amalgamated Clothing Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	(?)	Strike: Men returned to work May 14, 1941.
Thew Shovel Co., Lorain, Ohio.	Ordnance (cranes)	Wages	Steel Workers Organizing Committee (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	650	Strike: Men returned to work May 16, 1941.
Triton Chemical Co., Glen Wilton, Va.	Ordnance (TNT)	(?)	Construction workers (unorganized).	250	Strike: May 16, 1941, case settled.
United States Reduction Co., East Chicago, Ill.	Ordnance (aluminum and brass)	Wages	United Mine Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	200	Stoppage: Settlement; men returned to work May 19, 1941.
Utica & Mohawk Cotton Mills, Utica, N. Y.	Quartermaster Corps (sheets and pillowcases).	Union recognition, wages	Textile (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	2,000	Strike: May 17, 1941, case closed.
Woods, S. A., Machine Co., Boston Mass.	Ordnance (shells)	Union shop, new contract	U. E. R. M. W. A. (Congress of Industrial Organizations).	1,193	Threatened strike: May 16, 1941; wage increase granted; check-off; no trouble anticipated.

DISASTER LOAN CORPORATION, ELECTRIC HOME AND FARM AUTHORITY, AND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the act approved February 11, 1937 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 15, sec. 605k–1), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'in the years 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940' and inserting in lieu thereof 'occurring during the period between January 1, 1936, and January 22, 1947.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the act approved March 31, 1936 (49 Stat. 1186), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'June 30, 1941' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 22, 1947.'

"SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', except as provided in section 4 (a) of the Public Debt Act of 1941.'

"(b) Section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but also with respect to (1) the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, and any other corporation heretofore or hereafter organized or created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 5d of this act, as amended, to aid the Government of the United States in its national-defense program, (2) The R. F. C. Mortgage Co., the Federal National Mortgage Association, and any other public corporation heretofore or hereafter organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and (3) the Disaster Loan Corporation, and any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to the loans made, and personal property owned, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by any corporation referred to in clause (1), (2), or (3) of the preceding sentence, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes.

"SEC. 4. (a) The fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (3) thereof the following new subsection:

"'(4) When requested by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and subject to such conditions and limitations as may be set forth in such request, to make loans, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to any foreign governments, to their central banks, or to any person, commission, association, corporation, or bank acting for or on behalf of such government, for the purpose of achieving the maximum dollar exchange value in the United States for the securities or property of any such government, central bank, person, commission, association, corporation, or bank. Such loans may be made only upon the security of bonds, debentures, stocks or other such obligations of (a) the Government of the United States or any State, municipality, or political subdivision of any State, or (b) any private corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State.'

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (3) of such fourth paragraph is hereby amended to comprise four sentences to read as follows:

"'(3) When requested by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, to create or organize, at any time prior to July 1, 1943, a corporation or corporations, with power (a) to produce, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials as defined by the President; (b) to purchase and lease land, purchase, lease, build, and expand plants, and purchase and produce equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, and supplies for the manufacture of strategic and critical materials, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, any other articles, equipment, facilities, and supplies necessary to the national defense, and such other articles, equipment, supplies, and materials as may be required in the manufacture or use of any of the foregoing or otherwise necessary in connection therewith; (c) to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such land, plants, facilities, and machinery to others to engage in such manufacture; (d) to engage in such manufacture itself, if the President finds that it is necessary for a Government agency to engage in such manufacture; (e) to produce, lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire railroad equipment (including rolling stock), and commercial aircraft, and parts, equipment, facilities, and supplies necessary in connection with such railroad equipment and aircraft, and to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the same; (f) to purchase, lease, build, expand, or otherwise acquire facilities for the training of aviators and to operate or lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such facilities to others to engage in such training; and (g) to take such other action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator may deem necessary to expedite the national-defense program, but the aggregate amount of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which may be outstanding at any one time for carrying out this clause (g) shall not exceed $200,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Corporation to take any action, directly or indirectly, with respect to the proposals heretofore considered by the Congress and known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, Passamaquoddy, Florida ship canal, and Tombigbee River projects, or to the project known as the Nicaragua Canal. The powers of every corporation hereafter created or organized under this subsection shall be set out in a charter which shall be valid only when certified copies thereof are filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and published in the Federal Register, and all amendments to such charters shall be valid only when similarly filed and published. The charters of corporations heretofore so created or organized shall be so filed and published before July 1, 1941, and amendments thereto shall be valid only when certified copies thereof are hereafter so filed and published. No corporation heretofore or hereafter created or organized by the Corporation pursuant to this subsection shall have succession beyond January 22, 1947, except for purposes of liquidation, unless the life of such corporation is extended beyond such date pursuant to an act of Congress.'

"SEC. 5. The amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by $1,500,000,000."

And the House agree to the same.

CARTER GLASS,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, only one change of general interest was made in regard to this bill by the conferees.

It will be recalled that there was considerable discussion over the possible power that might exist under the bill on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to bypass Congress and embark on the construction of large projects such as the St. Lawrence Waterway, the Florida ship canal, the Passamaquoddy power project, the Tombigbee River project, and the Nicaraguan Canal. The Senate tried to cover that situation by providing that no project which had been considered and rejected by the Congress since 1926 should be undertaken under the powers contained in the bill. We also placed a limitation of $300,000,000 on the amount that could be expended under this provision.

The House changed that provision by making the limit $100,000,000 instead of $300,000,000, but striking out all reference to projects that had been heretofore rejected by the Congress.

In conference we provided that the limitation should be reduced from $300,000,000, as fixed by the Senate, and increased from $100,000,000, as fixed by the House, to $200,000,000. But we specifically spelled out the five projects which have caused the most discussion, namely, the St. Lawrence Waterway, Passamaquoddy, Florida ship canal, Nicaraguan Canal, and the Tombigbee River, and provided that none of those projects should be undertaken under this act.

The inclusion of those provisions in the exception is not to be considered as any determination on the part of the committee, the conferees, or the Senate that we are either for or against these projects. We merely wanted to provide that they could not be undertaken without first applying to the Congress under the rather extraordinary power which is contained in this subdivision of the bill.

There were no other material changes. Some minor matters were cleared up and a provision relating to a local tax situation in Michigan in the House amendment was accepted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was some discussion on the floor of the Senate, at the time the bill passed, in which it was pointed out that the bill as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency gave to the R. F. C. the power to create corporations which would have a life beyond that of the R. F. C. itself, and that such corporations, created under the authority of this measure, would be empowered to operate after the life of the R. F. C. had terminated. Has anything been done about that?

Mr. BROWN. Before the bill left the Senate, after hearing the argument of the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the argument made by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the argument presented by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I agreed, on behalf of the committee, to accept an amendment which reads as follows:

No corporation heretofore or hereafter created or organized by the Corporation—

That is, the R. F. C.—

pursuant to this subsection, shall have any succession beyond January 22, 1947, except for the purpose of liquidation.

I think that fully covers the point which the Senator from Wyoming so ably presented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does cover that point. Of course, there are other features in the bill which are worthy of very close consideration and which might be made the subject of argument. I feel that the action of the conferees in including this limitation goes far to eliminate these various aspects, because it demonstrates an intention to grant these powers for the purposes of the present emergency, the existence of which we all recognize.

Mr. BROWN. To recapitulate, there are the three limitations: First, it must be for national defense; second, it may not be any of these enumerated projects; third, it may not be done after January 1, 1947.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, with this limitation excluding certain specific projects, we now have this situation, that whenever the R. F. C. determines that any particular project, except these, is desirable for purposes of national defense, it may create a corporation to carry out such a project?

Mr. BROWN. So far as that side of the controversy is concerned, it is limited to 1943, not to 1947, and, of course, it is limited to $200,000,000, which is a comparatively small sum, in contemplation of Government finance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

PLANT PROTECTION FORCE FOR NAVAL SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Naval Affairs I have already reported favorably sundry bills for the calendar.

From the Committee on Naval Affairs I now report back, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4671) to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 385) thereon. As it is of an emergency nature, I desire to ask unanimous consent that it be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is a short bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which the clerk will read.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think a statement should be made concerning the bill before consent is given. I have great confidence in the able Senator from Massachusetts, but, inasmuch as the bill is not on the calendar, I should prefer to have a statement before granting consent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4671) to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I have reported for the calendar sundry bills from the Committee on Naval Affairs, which do not require immediate action, in my opinion, except one. The bill to which I am now calling attention is of a special emergency character, so much so that the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the Committee on Naval Affairs yesterday, and not only favored the bill but asked for early action. It has already passed the House. The bill authorizes the creation of a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments.

The Navy is responsible for all its civil employees, of which it has an exceedingly large number. Prior to the emergency, the number was over 100,000. I assume there must be now in the various naval establishments almost double that number of civilian employees.

The bill would permit the Secretary of the Navy to establish a force of detectives, or officers who would serve and perform duties similar to those performed by the F. B. I., but they would be assigned solely to naval shore establishments for the purpose of detecting sabotage. Very briefly, that is the purpose of the bill.

The Secretary of the Navy thought it was so important that he wanted it discussed in executive session. I suppose he did not want the public to know to what extent sabotage existed or was suspected to exist in the shore establishments.

It is proposed that these officers of the law be placed in the various plants in order to be able to discover and ascertain when and where sabotage is being planned or where there is threat of sabotage among the civilian employees. The only persons who are now in a position to do this work are the Marines of the Navy, who perform guard duty at these establishments, and they are not trained for this unusual and rather skillful work. There is a group of civilian employees called guards who stand at the gates, and who direct people, but who are not especially trained for this kind of work.

When the bill passed the House, it provided for an appropriation of $3,000,000, and one of the amendments of the Committee on Naval Affairs recommends that that be reduced to $1,500,000. The other amendment is one providing that the selections shall be by the civil service, and under the Classification Act, as amended, "or otherwise, as he may elect," referring to the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy thinks that in most instances he can get from the civil service the employees desired, but he thinks that in some instances it will be necessary to go outside the civil service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Are they to have a naval or military status?

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are to be civilians?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; without uniforms.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are to be guards?

Mr. WALSH. Detectives; just the same as those in Mr. Hoover's organization, but to operate in the naval shore establishments.

Mr. CONNALLY. The guards and others around these plants should have a naval or military status; they should not be civilians. They should be persons who could be disciplined or controlled. These are to be detectives; plain-clothes men, in other words?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has expressed a view which many hold.

Many believe there ought to be no one allowed to have authority inside a naval establishment who is not an officer or enlisted man of the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH. I have felt that the Marines should do most of the guard work.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not require the use of any more men if those employed in such duty were given a naval or Marine status.

Mr. WALSH. That is disputed very much by some of the naval officers and particularly by the Commandant of Marines. The Marines, he states, are soldiers, and the Commandant of Marines does not want them to do guard duty.

Mr. CONNALLY. They could have a different classification, if necessary. They could be called something else. They could be given a new classification, but they ought to be under military control and under military discipline. Suppose the civilians employed in this duty wanted to strike. They could go out on strike.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell us whether or not the bill defines the term "sabotage"?

Mr. WALSH. It does not.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell us what these intelligence officers, whom he has described as detectives, will look for?

Mr. WALSH. I suppose they will find out who, in the employ of the Government, are concocting plans or schemes to destroy Government property, set fire to Government property, steal Government property, or in any way interfere with the processes of production in our naval plants.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, down to the last sentence of the Senator's answer I followed him, and understood him, and agreed with him, but when he said "or will in any way interfere with the processes in the Government plants," I wonder if he meant the term to be as broad as that alternative clause would imply.

Mr. WALSH. Well, if a wrench is thrown into a valuable and expensive machine, the machine would be sabotaged. The word "sabotage" is not a new word. It is used in various acts.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is using it, as he explains the bill itself, to apply to willful and destructive acts which will deleteriously affect production. Is that not a fair way to describe it?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but these employees or officers will only be informants to the Navy Department if civilian employees are indulging or engaging in what the Senator is describing.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Massachusetts does not tell the Senate that these detectives are to be engaged in spying upon their fellow employees and reporting their activities, whether they be in the nature of formation of labor unions and the like?

Mr. WALSH. These F. B. I. men in the Navy, if I may use that term, are to do exactly what the F. B. I. men do outside the Navy in detecting and discovering attempts to commit sabotage.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the term "sabotage," to the extent of their surveillance, apply to industries operating upon and under Navy contracts?

Mr. WALSH. It does not. That has been taken care of by the F. B. I., and they are now performing that duty.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California rose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WALSH. I yield gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want the floor in my own right when the Senator from Massachusetts shall have concluded his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator spoke of the F. B. I. Will the Navy obtain these men from the F. B. I.? Will they be F. B. I. detectives?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Should they not be?

Mr. WALSH. The officer the Secretary of the Navy has in mind for the head of this bureau or organization is, I understand, an officer now in the F. B. I. He will expect to and seek to obtain men for these positions who are possessed of the qualifications which are required by the F. B. I.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It is not intended by this bill to exclude the F. B. I. from conducting any investigations they may desire to make in their normal work for the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. I now yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of trepidation that I approach this subject at all, particularly when my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], has presented the bill. But this bill, if I read it correctly, means providing Frank Knox with a private army. That is all it means. It gives to him the right to select—it does not say the number—any number he desires. It gives to him the right to pay them out of a fund of one and one-half billion dollars—excuse me for saying "billion." I am so used to it now that I constantly make that mistake. [Laughter.] But it gives to Frank Knox one and one-half million dollars with which to provide the expenses of the force that is to be named

by him. I cannot understand why it is not possible to have the Marines attend to this duty, or why it is not possible to have the agency in charge of carrying out the provisions of the Draft Act attend to it, or why any other of the innumerable military authorities cannot attend to this matter.

This is what is authorized by the bill:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and to maintain and operate the same until June 30, 1933, unless Congress shall have, in the meantime, by concurrent resolution, declared such a force no longer necessary. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a plant-protection force.

It may be used against the insects that crawl into those particular plants, or it may be used for other purposes, but there is no provision of this bill which prescribes the duties of the force, except that it says:

The duties of this force shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

I think I am justified in saying that this is a bill for the protection of Mr. Frank Knox, estimable gentleman as he is. I would not under any circumstances have him attacked by 150,000 people and not have any force at his disposal to repel the attackers. He is a most estimable gentleman in every regard, and we should protect him at all hazards, but I cannot see the necessity for wasting a million and a half dollars in providing a force that is to be chosen by him, the duties of which are not described, and the duties of which cannot be told.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to say to the Senator that the Secretary of the Navy says the number who will be employed under this amount of money will be about 300.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What will he do with the rest of the money?

Mr. WALSH. He says that is all this amount of money will provide for, namely the selection of about 300 officers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I was not present at the meeting, so I cannot testify from first-hand information The Secretary of the Navy says that the bill would permit the employment of 300 men, and that that is all it would permit. It may be that the reason is found in the last section, which provides that the civilian in charge of the group is to be paid a salary of $7,500 a year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It occurs to me to suggest that if there are to be only 300 persons in the force, and an appropriation of $3,000,000 is to be authorized, a simple arithmetical calculation shows that it amounts to $10,000 for each individual in the force.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that owing to somebody's vigilance the $3,000,000 has been cut down to $1,500,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That means $5,000 for each of the 300 members.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, well, what of it?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I agree that the defense projects should be policed, but it occurs to me that it is a very unusual thing to have a secret police force under the personal direction of any member of the Cabinet, unless it be under the Department of Justice. I may be entirely mistaken, but it seems to me that the bill would open up a policy or program which might spread like the Gestapo or secret-police system of Germany and Austria. Certainly the properties ought to be protected; but why not enlarge the bureau in the Department of Justice known as the F. B. I.?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The proposed organization would be an F. B. I. of the Navy.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The property must be protected; but are we to establish secret-police forces in different sections of the country under the various bureaus of the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not unusual. There are secret police forces in many departments of the Government, about which I assume the Senator knows nothing. We learn of them only when somebody steps on our toes. Various departments of the Government have their secret police today, and they manage the thing as they see fit.

I am so satisfied that the end is near that it makes no difference whether we appropriate $1,500,000 or $3,000,000. I am so satisfied that we are close to the end of our tether that I do not care whether or not we put a private army at the disposal of Mr. Frank Knox; but I think this body ought to know what it is doing. From now on I propose to call attention to the system which we are legislating in regard to various institutions.

I submit the matter to the Senate. The Senate may do with it as it pleases.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, first of all, the bill is merely an authorization bill and is limited to 2 years. The amount of money is limited to $1,500,000. The Secretary of the Navy says that if the bill is passed he expects to appoint slightly more than 300 individuals.

I do not care what this body does with the bill, but I will not deny a department of the Government the right to have detectives in our Naval Establishment to stop men being planted there by subversive organizations to do harm to our Government in its hour of peril.

That is the whole story. Those who want to take that responsibility may do so, but knowing what is going on in this country, I cannot refuse to take steps to prevent it. I do not exaggerate. I have always felt that the extent of subversive activities is very limited, and that the number of Communists and other dangerous citizens is limited. But they are here, and one of their methods is to get into private defense industry and into Government establishments. No one knows what harm they may do, or when they may do it. Private detectives under the direction and control of a Government official would enable us to know something about the civilian employees whom we are hiring daily. They may be good mechanics, but they may have interests other than American interests. As I say, I cannot refuse to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent what may happen. If it does happen it will be an exceedingly great loss to our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Califorina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Senator labor under the delusion that any Member of this body would wink at any such practices as he suggests?

Mr. WALSH. I have made no such intimation. However, I do say that the purpose of the bill is to create officials of the Government who will discover subversive activities in advance of injury being done to property and to our national defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then why does not the Senator write a bill of that character? There is nothing in this bill that defines sabotage. There is nothing in this bill that defines the purpose of the police force. The only thing the bill does is to give to Frank Knox a private army. I would as soon trust some of the individuals in the private army to which the Senator refers as to trust the Honorable Frank Knox with it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not feel it necessary to make any defense of Secretary of the Navy Knox. He is Secretary of the Navy. He has grave responsibilities. He knows what is going on. He came before our committee to tell us. I regret that the Senator from California was not present. The Secretary thought that the matter was of such a character that it ought to be discussed in secret session of the committee. He has asked me to try to obtain speedy action, which I dislike very much to do, because I believe in proceeding in the regular order.

Every Member of the Senate knows that I have not been wholeheartedly in favor of the administration program so far as it relates to our foreign relations. But I shall not fail to do whatever the constituted authorities of the Government ask to have done in the name of national defense, to prevent disloyalty anywhere, any time, and under any circumstances.

I am reporting this bill with the unanimous consent of the members of the committee who were present, because I believe it is in the interest of national defense. It is only a 2-year measure. It would be operative only during the present emergency.

In our naval establishments many thousand men are employed. Many of them have never been previously employed by the Government. Some of them are skilled mechanics, but even a skilled mechanic can be a schemer and commit sabotage.

So far as defining the word "sabotage" is concerned, the word runs through a chain of bills. I have reported bill after bill with the word "sabotage" in it. On the calendar are some bills which I reported today, which refer to sabotage.

Mr. President, I want to have my position understood. However, my opinion on questions of policy may differ with the views of the Secretary of the Navy, I will not refuse to give him every weapon and every dollar necessary to prevent and stop disloyalty. Disloyalty is not an open crime. It does not appear on the surface. Sabotage is not a public crime. It is a hidden, secret crime. It can be discovered in advance only by men trained as detectives to find out its inception steps.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator has given me the only possible argument there is in favor of the bill; but he has had to go far afield in order to do it. He has had to talk about saboteurs, and those who would do harm to our program of national defense. It is proposed to protect our property by means of a private army under the direction of Frank Knox.

The Senator's logical processes in this matter seem to me a little at fault. A request for $3,000,000 came over from the House. The Senate committee cut it to $1,500,000. Yet the Senator says he would not refuse to vote for any payment that might be requested by the Secretary of the Navy or by anyone acting in his behalf.

Mr. WALSH. The Secretary of the Navy did not ask for $3,000,000. The House put that amount in the bill. The Secretary of the Navy asked for only $1,500,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The House put in the $3,000,000 amount?

Mr. WALSH. The House itself did it. The Members of the House were so anxious to prevent sabotage, and to prevent possible harm that might come by reason of sabotage, that they made the amount $3,000,000.

Of course, the Senator knows the representatives of the Navy Department would have to go before the Appropriations Committee; they would have to show whom they were going to employ. After all, this is only an authorization bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have heard the same statement before. Why did we not in the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs increase this sum to $17,000,000, and allow that amount for the personnel expenditure of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. It is conceivable that that might yet have to be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I see that that is in the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. It is in my mind that there are elements in this country who are disloyal to the extent of committing sabotage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And if it can be stopped, I want it stopped.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. So do I.

Mr. WALSH. And if it can be detected, I want that done. Will the Senator suggest some other way of doing it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will I suggest some other way of doing it?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would take what was necessary from the Army of the United States in order to stop it. I would take a part of the Army of 5,000,000 men we are going to raise under the conscription law, and I would put whatever number might be necessary in Mr. Knox's office; and in that fashion perhaps we would stop the terrible holocaust that is going to occur.

Mr. WALSH. One of the arguments made by the Secretary of the Navy is that under this bill it will be necessary in some instances to employ an ordinary mechanic to work side by side with a person under suspicion. I do not like to go into details, but in instances the Navy has been of the opinion—it cannot prove it, but it suspects very strongly—that there are in the Government service persons who have been in touch with foreign countries and have transmitted valuable information. The Navy has no detective force to determine whether what they suspect to be true is absolutely true, but they have reason to believe that in some instances such activities have been occurring.

I do not desire to give the impression that I think such activities are general, by any means. I have too much respect and regard for the spirit and loyalty of the workers. But we are living in an unusual time and under circumstances which are exceptional. Men are disturbed and feel very deeply and keenly on both sides of this war issue. The mail of every Senator shows that to be so. I speak of that only to show that the people are confused, they are troubled, they are disturbed; and none of us can tell to what extremes people may go to commit acts which ordinarily they would not commit.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I was one of the committee who joined in recommending the passage of the bill. Among other things developed was the fact that our normal expenditures for the Navy ran about $700,000,000. This year we will expend about $3,500,000,000. It seemed to me that the $1,500,000 that was asked was a measure of insurance which we could not forego.

There is no difference of opinion regarding the $3,000,000. The bill originally provided for an expenditure of $3,000,000. That was to cover a 2-year period. The bill now provides for $1,500,000 annually; and that makes $3,000,000.

So it seems to me that the matter of employing 350 competent men and paying therefor $1,500,000 a year, in order to safeguard the products of an expenditure of $3,500,000,000, would be a very small additional insurance premium. We should also take into consideration the fact that there has been sabotage. When we look to Syria and see the present infiltration into Syria of "travelers" of the Axis Powers—some going there as wounded soldiers, some going as camouflaged mechanics—what about America? How about the "travelers" who have come to America?

We are going to spend billions of dollars, and shall we be so childish as to think that if things get much closer, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from California, there will not be persons conveniently located to disrupt our national-defense program? They already have done so. There is no question about the commission of sabotage on some of our airplanes. There is no question that there are in our Navy some persons who are ready to do harm there.

It would seem to me that the program sought to be developed by the bill is not only needed, but is imperatively necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator speaks on the theory that someone wants to promote sabotage. All of us want to do whatever is necessary to prevent sabotage; but I object because of this crisis, to organizing a private army, with insufficient definition and insufficient duties, that is all.

Mr. WILEY. I say to the distinguished Senator from California that the answer to that is that the Government is seeking to employ about 350 men equipped for this particular job, just as we would employ a mechanic for a particular job. These men would be in the shops, mixing with those who might sabotage or injure. I cannot see any harm in employing such men, and it seems to me we cannot afford to take the risk of not doing the job. That was my judgment in the committee, and that is my judgment now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr President, I desire to be fair. If any Senator wishes to object to immediate consideration of the bill, I am ready to have the bill go over for further study and consideration. I have no feeling about it at all. I am doing my duty, as it has seemed to me, as chairman of the committee. If any Senator feels he would like to have the bill go over, I am willing that it may take that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not object, but I desire to ask if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I resent the implication that some Senators do not desire to protect the property of the Navy or of the Federal Government against sabotage. I do not know whether that implication was made.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, that is all moonshine; and people who utter that thought concerning any Member of the Senate—well——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not know of any language I used or that the Senator from Wisconsin used that would indicate that either he or I, or anyone, has the slightest impression that every Member of this body is not as keen to prevent sabotage as we are; and this is one way presented to try to stop it. There may be a better way; and it is for the Senate to say whether there is a better way. This is the way the Secretary of the Navy wants to do it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is the purpose for which I arose.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We have the F. B. I., we have the military intelligence service of the Army, we have the military intelligence service of the Navy, and there are billions of dollars available to increase those services if the authorities wish to have that done. That is what came to my mind. Why not increase these services, which are under regular jurisdiction and under existing law, rather than start a new private organization? There may be some reason for it. To whom will these employees be responsible? To the civil law? They will not be responsible to military law unless they are in the military service.

Mr. WALSH. They will be responsible to the Navy Department.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will they be under military law? Will they be inducted into the service? Will they be subject to court martial?

Mr. WALSH. There are now civilian employees serving as guards at navy yards who get $1,200 a year. What capacity have those men for training for the kind of work we are talking about here? Could we expect men who receive $1,200 a year to protect against sabotage?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Why could they not be in the Naval Intelligence Service?

Mr. WALSH. First of all, if they were in the Naval Intelligence Service they would have to wear uniforms; they would be officers. There are no enlisted men that I know of in the Naval Intelligence Service. The officers of the Naval Intelligence are mostly lawyers, and their duties are chiefly to attend court-martial hearings, to have charge of censorship, and to make investigations of various kinds that would inform the Navy.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If they had to go around in uniforms, that, of course, would make them conspicuous and perhaps would not be conducive to helping the Service.

I am not going to object to the bill, but I wanted some information, because, in view of the fact that we have three such services—one in the Department of Justice, one in the Army, and the Navy Intelligence Service—I could not understand why the money that has already been appropriated and which we can appropriate should not be used to increase the Naval and Military Intelligence Services or the F. B. I. instead of providing a personal—I do not mean that as a reflection upon Colonel Knox, but I am thinking of what seems to me to be a policy of providing a personal secret army for an individual, no matter what his position in the Government may be.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, it would not be possible under the circumstances, and the bill is limited to 2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have about the same question which the Senator from Minnesota has asked. First, I want to say that I am very much in favor of the bill, as I understand it, and am in complete accord with the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts; but it occurs to me that the F. B. I. might very well do this work, and I am wondering why the F. B. I. cannot be assigned to this task.

Mr. WALSH. Personally, I feel that the F. B. I. ought to confine its efforts and its activities to private industries and not to Government establishments such as the Navy has. I think that the supervision of civilian employees—and the Navy is responsible for every civilian it hires—the obtaining of knowledge about them, finding out their associations, finding out what subversive organizations they may belong to, or what subversive persons they may be associated with, seems to me particularly to be an obligation and a necessary function of the Navy itself, which is responsible for every man in its employ. In my opinion, its own men should do this detective work and make the investigations for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator understand that there will be a close cooperation between the F. B. I. and this proposed new agency?

Mr. WALSH. Indeed, that is contemplated. As I said a moment ago, the Secretary of the Navy says he has been in communication and in cooperation with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover about the whole matter and that he expects to select as the head of this bureau or division one of the trained and trusted and best officials of that agency.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far the F. B. I. has not found any sabotage at all. I saw a statement in the press not long ago to the effect that the F. B. I. had not found any cases of sabotage. So if we are going to get their experts to head this new organization, probably it will not find out much.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is the reason why we add 300 experts by this bill, so they may find out.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know. Is the Senator supporting the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I said "we." I said we added 300; but, of course, I referred to the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator from California is on the Naval Affairs Committee, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but I was not present at the meeting.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not attacking the F. B. I.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator will be interested to understand that Communists have actually enlisted in the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not doubt it.

Mr. WALSH. They have passed out circulars and literature to many of the enlisted men.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not doubt it at all.

Mr. WALSH. They have tried to suggest to them, as has been discovered, things they should do or could do which would be harmful to our country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator. What I meant was I am sure there has been sabotage but the F. B. I. has not found any of it; they have reported publicly that the F. B. I. has discovered no sabotage within American factories and plants. I hope the Secretary of the Navy will find someone who can locate it, because I am sure it is going on.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Under this bill, there will be a search for it?

Mr. CONNALLY. We are not going to find it unless we do search for it. Nobody is going to come around now and say, "Senator JOHNSON, I am going to sabotage in about 20 minutes; hang around and watch me sabotage."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the Senator refers to me, no one will ever "sabotage" me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that if I was going to sabotage I would never "sabotage" the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Of course not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to sit right here in the Senate under the spell of the words and under the inspiration of the example of the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I inquire if the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded.

Mr. WALSH. I will conclude in a moment by simply saying that if I have been at all strenuous in presenting this matter to the Senate it was merely because I felt it was my duty to indicate how strongly I feel that we should not neglect to do everything possible to prevent sabotage. There was no intention whatever of reflecting upon those who differ with me or the committee in desiring some other machinery of the Government to be put in operation for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WALSH. It is easy to suspect one of thinking that everybody else is crooked and disloyal, but I hope I have not that type of mind. I say again I think the whole picture has been overdrawn, but even a little of it is too much, and it ought to be stopped before the menace grows greater. I therefore have been rather strenuous in pointing out the importance of stopping sabotage.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if I may make a further suggestion, while I am not on the Naval Affairs Committee, it seems to me that the committee should

have considered militarizing this force. We are going to have a lot of men hunting around for saboteurs and sabotage and maybe some of the saboteurs themselves will get on this force. It ought to be militarized so that not only could its members be disciplined promptly but military measures could be taken against the members of this guard if they should become in any wise involved in subversive activities. It ought to be militarized under the organization of the Navy. We shall have a large number of civilian employees, civil-service employees who come under the Hatch Act, running around and supposed to be under the control of the Navy, when the Navy, if it is to have them, ought to have them just as it has the officers and the men in the Navy. It ought to have a hard-boiled military control of them.

Mr. WALSH. Would the Senator militarize the F. B. I.?

Mr. CONNALLY. The F. B. I. has a broader scope. It covers everything—civilian activities and everything else. Here, however, we have a military establishment, a navy yard, or a naval base. Everybody else in it is militarized—the officers and the men—and yet the very key men who are to discover treachery and are to discover sabotage will be civilians running around, belonging to some outside organization, up here every day kicking about our not raising their salaries, and they will not be under any military discipline or under any military control.

I think the Naval Affairs Committee ought to put these men under that sort of control and let the Secretary of the Navy himself pick them out; and then, if they do not deliver, let him throw them into a court-martial, where they can be made to deliver. I think failure to do that is a very serious error in the Senator's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I most respectfully ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] whether this bill has been before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am flattered that the Senator from California should single me out among all the members of the Appropriations Committee on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I could see the Senator most plainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with one of the supplemental defense bills, an item was presented with a Budget estimate, providing for a system of guards for the shore establishments of the Navy. The matter was presented to the committee. I have forgotten whether it was in the third or fourth supplemental defense bill, but it was considered by the committee. The Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps and several other witnesses testified concerning it. The committee rejected the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did that occur more than once?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall its ever having been before a subcommittee of which I was a member except on one occasion.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from California, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considered a proposal on this subject; not this proposal, but one for 3,000 or some other very large number of men. I think my recollection must be in error about the 3,000; but we were asked to provide for quite a number of men, which force it was proposed at that time should take the place of the Marine guards at the stations. That was an entirely different proposal from this one, which, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, is limited to 350 men for the detective work which has been described. It was not the same proposal, but it was something along the same line.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The arithmetic of the Senator from South Carolina is at fault, is it not, in saying that it would cost a million and a half dollars to pay 300 men?

Mr. BYRNES. I did not hear the Senator say it would cost that much for 300 men.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, I will not tax the Senator's recollection so far.

Mr. BYRNES. No; it might be overtaxed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not even in thought have an idea of disloyalty or bad intentions on the part of anyone connected with this bill. I have no doubt that the Secretary of the Navy is moved by the best of motives. I have, of course, full faith and confidence in the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who reports the bill; and I cannot deny that some measure of this kind may be necessary. I think we all know that sabotage takes place. We probably have disloyal men in the Army and the Navy. I do not know of any, and I should feel very sorry indeed to discover that there were any.

I know, as everyone else knows, that if our Army and our Navy are not loyal it will be only a question of time until our Government must sink into oblivion or be easily captured by some evil genius like Hitler. I do not believe anything of that kind can occur. I think proper precautions ought to be taken and that we ought, if it be necessary, to provide by legislation so that precautions can be taken to prevent any disloyal act of sabotage or otherwise in the Army, in the Navy, or anywhere else. It had not occurred to me until I heard this bill read by the clerk that there was any idea on the part of the Army or the Navy or of any other Department that a special detective force was necessary. I supposed that was provided for.

Any student of history must know that the existence of a secret police in any government that is founded on human liberty and freedom will eventually bring about its downfall. No matter what care is exercised in the beginning, at least, if we continue it, that kind of action puts us on a level, does it not, with Russia and Hitler?

No citizen of Germany is safe. He probably realizes that whether or not he is guilty even in thought of any lack of appreciation of his country, he is watched by somebody connected with the government. That is true also in Russia; and we hear and read with pain and regret of the terrible things that happen once in a while in those countries, of the purging of high officials. When it is over, nobody knows where they are or what has become of them, but we all feel that they have met death.

One of the reasons for bringing about such a situation in any country is the existence of a secret police, when a citizen knows that what he does may be secretly reported. When reports are made it will not be long until every report will be exaggerated and the citizen will be condemned and punished without a trial and without an opportunity to be heard.

This may be necessary, Mr. President; but, if it is, we are exceedingly close to impinging upon the liberties of our own citizens.

I have not heard the Secretary's testimony. It was heard in secret, I understand, by the committee. I might feel differently if I had heard it or knew what it was. I feel as though I were groping in the dark. I do not know the facts in the case, but I have a supreme hatred of secrecy in government, of snooping detectives who go around and make a case whether or not one exists. Those who have had experience with ferreting out and punishing crime know that that often has happened in our own free country.

Of course, we do not want men in the Navy who are traitors. How long will it be, if such a condition exists in a Navy, before we will have similar private detectives selected in every other branch of our Government? Is there anyone who thinks that if sabotage exists to a great extent in the Navy it does not also exist in the Army, and in private factories? I know it is dangerous for us, even in our thoughts, to object to our taking some step thought necessary by honest men, wise men, men who are wiser than we are, who have studied it more than we have had opportunity to do.

This comes to me as a sudden proposal. I cannot make myself believe that it is necessary to take this step in order to protect my country. I think I should, in my official position, have an opportunity to know more than I do now about these insinuations, which are made without proof, before I join in putting someone to spying upon the thousands and thousands of patriotic men in the Government service. As I have understood, among the employees and officials of this Government, the Navy would be the last place I would go to find disloyalty. If the camel gets his nose under the tent in the Navy, it will not be long before the camel himself will be in the tent in the Navy and in all other branches of the Government.

There is danger, Senators, grave danger, in a secret police. It seems to me there is grave danger to the perpetuation of our Government. Although it is

heartbreaking to do it, I cannot have a clear conscience in performing my duty here unless I now object to the consideration of the bill; which I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to give notice that Tuesday I shall move to take up the bill which has just been discussed.

STRIKES IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, unfortunately for me I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs this morning when the very able senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] addressed the Members of this body in regard to strikes which today are taking place, and have been for some time, throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. That is a subject in which, of course, all of us who are concerned in the development of a perfect national defense for this country are vitally interested.

Regardless of what our views may be upon subjects innumerable which are presented to this body for consideration almost hourly during these trying days, there is certainly national unity in the desire for adequate national defense. Upon that subject we are not divided, nor will we ever be.

From the few words I heard uttered by the able senior Senator from Texas this morning, I assume his remarks were directed primarily to the subject matter of strikes pertaining to national-defense activities, and, to repeat, I was sorry indeed that I was not present to hear him, because he discusses every subject interestingly, and provides much information for his colleagues.

Mr. President, I recur to the remarks of the Senator from Texas for the reason that I desire at this time to call the attention of the Members of this body to a resolution which I offered in the Senate a number of weeks ago, a resolution which interests itself in America's protection. I offered a resolution providing that no labor union or any labor organization should be permitted to have as an agent or representative any alien, any Communist, any Nazi, any Fascist, or any American citizen who had been convicted of a felony, thereby being deprived of American citizenship.

I am very unhappy to have to report at this time that no action has been taken upon my resolution. I hope sincerely that the committee to which it was referred will give it consideration. At least I have done my duty in bringing the subject itself to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and particularly to the members of the committee which now has the resolution on file.

I believe that a great deal of the trouble which the American people are experiencing today in reference to defense strikes is attributable fundamentally, and in many cases exclusively, to the fact that there have crept into many of the labor organizations, in some instances without the knowledge of American labor leaders, men who are not friendly to our American form of government, who are not desirous of our perfecting the national defense, to which we are entitled. I believe that there have crept into labor organizations innumerable aliens, thousands of Communists, Nazis, Fascists, and in some instances American-born men who have been convicted of felonies, thereby being deprived of their American citizenship.

I might say, before making further statement, that I have always been and am now a friend of labor. I believe that if the labor organizations of this country were to rid themselves of all the aliens who hold office in the unions or labor associations, or all aliens who represent labor organizations, would rid themselves of Nazis, and of the thousands upon thousands of Communists who are in labor organizations, as well as Fascists of many stripes, the number of defense strikes would be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. President, we have given much time and much thought to matters occurring upon foreign shores—to world conditions—but, unfortunately for the 130,000,000 people constituting the population of the United States, we have neglected to make ourselves secure here at home for the present, and are neglecting to fortify ourselves against the enemies who are constantly seeping in from without.

Before proceeding further, I wish to say—and I say it without the slightest hesitation—that if I had my way about it at this hour I would today build a wall about the United States so high and so secure that not a single alien or foreign refugee from any country upon the face of the earth could possibly scale or ascend it.

That brings me incidentally to mention, in passing, that I have pending before the Senate Committee on Immigration a bill which would prohibit the admission of a single alien to this country for the next 10 years, or until such time as every American citizen who is employable has been provided with employment. Unfortunately for the American people, according to my attitude, the bill has not been acted upon.

Mr. President, we have arrived at a time when I believe we must rid our country of the alien enemies who are now here, and put up the bars so that from now on no alien of any nationality upon the face of the earth will be permitted to enter the United States. We are the biggest-hearted people upon the face of the earth. I dare say that almost a majority of us are giving more time and attention to the protection and the purification of other peoples and nations than we are to the United States of America. I say we should stop—and stop now—the refugees who are seeping into this country by the thousands every single month to take the jobs which rightly belong to the native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator has spoken of barring immigration, and for the present not permitting any more aliens to come into this country. Does the Senator have any information that any aliens are coming in at the present time?

Mr. REWNOLDS. Yes. I have information to the effect that the thousands who are coming into this country now are coming in as the result of tourists' visas having been issued to them, and I cite the Senator to the fact that during these days there is not a passenger ship that enters the harbor of the great city of New York, or any other of the gateways to America, which is not loaded down with aliens, loaded down with refugees. I unhesitatingly make the statement upon information I have received over a period of time, that with every boatload of refugees that comes to this country there are Nazi and Communist agents, and if we do not stop it, this country will become soon a cesspool of revolutionary activities created by the so-called intellectuals of Europe whom some Americans are now so generously welcoming.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator have in his possession immediately any figures showing the number that have come in during the past 30 days or 60 days?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not have the figures for the past 30 days, but the Senator, of course, knows that the press, particularly the newspapers published at the seat of the great metropolitan ports, such as New York and San Francisco, report the number of aliens on every ship that comes into the United States, and I have particular reference to ships of the American Export Lines.

Mr. STEWART. I have had some information, principally through the press, that there were what I thought to be a comparatively small number coming into this country, but I was really surprised to hear the Senator say there was a large number of aliens coming in.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, there is.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know from what country they come principally? Does he have those figures, and can he place them in the RECORD?

Mr. REYNOLDS. A few aliens are coming from the Orient, but they are Europeans, and they come principally through Russian ports and Chinese ports, particularly Shanghai. Some of them come from Yokohama and Kobe. But the bulk of those coming into the country are coming through the port of New York. I shall be very glad to ask the State Department to furnish me figures showing the number of tourist visas that have been issued to intellectuals and to labor leaders and to educators within the past several months.

Mr. STEWART. I think it would be very interesting information to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to request that information. As to whether I shall receive it, I am unable to say. I will likewise make a request for similar information from the Department of Justice.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I do not suppose the Senator from North Carolina contends that these aliens are entering the United States in violation of the immigration law, except that perhaps some of them are coming in on spurious passports. That, of course, is not the fault of the immigration authorities at the port of New York or the port of San Francisco, nor is it the fault of the immigration authorities of the Department of Labor.

It seems to me that if aliens are entering this country on false certificates or visas, it would be more than likely that such immigrants might be of the questionable variety, and that matter should be run down and investigated. A great many refugees are coming into this country on legal visas.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator from New York that I had reference to those coming in on legal visas. I oppose the legal entrance of any aliens to this country now.

Mr. MEAD. But the Senator does not find fault with the patriotism or the loyalty of all these aliens, some of whom the Senator admits will make very fine citizens.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not.

Mr. MEAD. However, I believe the Senator makes a good point, and that some of them are coming into the United States on false visas. That is a matter that could be stopped.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Doubtless some of them are. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I will say to him that some of the finest citizens we have in America today are those who have come from foreign shores and have been naturalized. They have taken an active patriotic interest in our American life. I am referring to the fact that I oppose the issuance of any visas to anybody at this time. I do not care whether he would make a good citizen or a bad citizen. I am opposed to the issuance of any visas. I shall come to that point in a moment. I should like to yield further to the Senator, but I cannot because I have a record which I wish to read, and I am sure all Senators will be interested in hearing it. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MEAD. I merely wished to bring out the fact that there are good and bad prospective citizens among the refugees.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. MEAD. The agents at New York and the officers of the department whose duty it is to pass upon the entrances are really not at fault.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all. I was merely trying to drive home the point that I am opposed to letting anybody from any part of the world come into the United States now. If we should let 25 people who may be interested in becoming United States citizens come in on tourist visas under the immigration quota laws, merely to remain here during the duration of the war, we should get some bad ones.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know that I propose, as soon as I can obtain recognition, to ask for the consideration of a bill which was unanimously reported by the members of the Immigration Committee who were present at yesterday's meeting of the committee, and which is highly recommended by both the State Department and the Department of Justice, to place further restrictions on the admission of immigrants into the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand that. A moment ago I read the bill to which the Senator has referred. I shall yield to him as soon as I can.

Mr. President, last fall I visited every country of Central and South America and talked with their officials. In many of those countries I was advised that the admission of refugees had been almost entirely stopped, and on inquiring the reason why, I was advised that it was found that Nazi agents were coming in with the so-called refugees.

I have before me a copy of a cablegram which was sent by our Ambassador to Russia, Mr. Steinhardt, from the embassy at Moscow under date of October 5, 1940. I wish to read it. I desire to acquaint the Members of this body with the fact that we have at least one representative in that section of the world whose prime interest is the interest of his country, the United States of America, and who is not interesting himself in providing protection against firing squads in Europe to the thousands of alien refugees who are securing tourist visas to come into this country. I want the Members of this body to know what is going on, and at the same time I want them to know the attitude of Mr. Steinhardt. I congratulate the Government upon having him as a representative, insofar as his attitude in regard to the subject matter which I am privileged to discuss is concerned. I do not know Mr. Steinhardt. I have never seen him.

This is the cablegram which Mr. Steinhardt, the American Ambassador to Russia, sent to the State Department:

INCOMING TELEGRAM 1940

[File copy]
Code: Gray
From: Amembassy Moscow
Rec'd: October 5, 2:50 a. m.

50 October 4, 3 p. m.

I have sent the following telegram to the Department. 1261, October 2, 2 p. m.

Reference Department's circulars to Bern—

Meaning Bern, Switzerland.

Reference Department's circulars to Bern, June 5, 6 p. m., June 29, 1 p. m., August 22, 9 p. m.; circulars to Moscow of September 19, 7 p. m., and September 26, 7 p. m.; Department's telegrams to Kaunas 112 of July 6, 135 of July 24, 199 of August 24, and telegrams to Moscow 455 August 17, 4 p. m., 560 of September 19, and 578 of September 23.

The Department's circular to Bern of June 5, 6 p. m., stated that in view of the international situation it is essential that all aliens seeking admission into the United States be examined with greatest care, and that all applications should be carefully scrutinized in the light of war conditions and other factors, and that a visa should be issued only when the applicant conclusively established a legitimate purpose or a reasonable need for his presence in the United States rather than the need for his departure from abroad.

The Department's circular to Bern of June 29, 1 p. m., directed that in validating nonimmigrant visas a most careful examination should be given to ascertain that the alien's entry would not be contrary to public safety, and to ascertain that the entry involves a reasonable need or legitimate purpose. This circular ended with the statement, "It is essential to take every precaution at this time to safeguard the best interests of the United States."

That was the circular sent by the State Department in Washington to the office in Bern, Switzerland.

Ambassador Steinhardt continues:

Since the above instructions were issued by the Department, the international situation has undergone no such change for the better as would justify the slightest relaxation of vigilance on the part of consular officers in the field in examining aliens with a view to safeguarding the best interests of the United States and I know of no changes in the immigration laws or in the regulations for their administration which relieve consular officers charged with the handling of visas from their responsibility under the law to determine whether aliens applying for documentation as nonimmigrants are properly classifiable as such. Note 7, supplement A of the Foreign Service Regulations, part 2, provides that "the Department may assist the consul in reaching a correct decision in a particular case by explaining points of law or by conducting investigations of references in the United States at the consul's request when deemed essential to prevent fraud but it cannot relieve him of his responsibility under the law."

Mr. Steinhardt, the Ambassador to Russia, continues in the cablegram:

In the cases of the so-called well-known refugee intellectuals and labor leaders, the consular section of this Embassy has not requested the Department to qualify investigations of references in the United States as information available from and concerning the applicants themselves, makes it apparent that the vast majority of them are in no position to apply for visitors' visas notwithstanding any assurances which the sponsoring organizations in the United States may have given to the Department.

I digress at this point to state that I am informed that there are sponsoring organizations in the city of New York, serving in an advisory capacity to the State Department or some other department, advising the Departments as to certain intellectuals who should be permitted to come to the United States. I allege that in many instances they are intellectual revolutionists.

Ambassador Steinhardt continues:

The Department's circular telegram to Bern of August 22, 9 p. m., instructed the examining officer not to issue visas to refugees unless satisfied that the applicants were "well-informed intellectuals or labor leaders."

I want to repeat that:

The Department's circular telegram to Bern of August 22, 9 p. m., instructed the examining officer not to issue visas to refugees unless satisfied that the applicants were—

What?—

were "well-informed intellectuals or labor leaders."

I contend that in many instances they would be well-informed intellectual revolutionists and radical labor leaders, the type that has given us the trouble we are experiencing in the United States today. Yet, in the face of all the trouble we are experiencing here, it appears from

this document, which I have every reason to assert is an exact official copy of a cablegram sent by our Ambassador at Moscow to our State Department, that no refugees are to be permitted to enter the United States unless the foreign representatives of the American Government know that such refugees are well-informed intellectuals or labor leaders. The well-informed intellectuals of Europe who are flocking in here and the labor leaders of Europe who are radical Communists and Nazis are the very ones we want to keep out of this country, but it appears that the American people do not care how many of them come in or how much trouble they get into.

The Ambassador continues:

In the case of visitors, the officer was to be satisfied that they intended and would be able to go from the United States upon the termination of their visit. Apparently at the time that telegram was sent, it was understood by the Department from the sponsoring organizations that at least the great majority of these applicants were well-known intellectuals or labor leaders.

It is now apparent from the substantial number of applicants already examined here that in those cases in which assurances were given the Department that the applicants were well-known intellectuals and labor leaders, misrepresentations were made to the Department on such a scale that they could not have been inadvertent.

I place emphasis on the word "inadvertent."

It is also apparent that even though the support of these applicants in the United States and their ability to proceed to a third country may be assured they are in large part nevertheless not properly classifiable as visitors within the meaning of section 3 (2) of the act, since most of them are unable to convince the examining officers—

That is abroad—

that they have the slightest intention of ever leaving the United States.

I add, if once they are admitted.

The Department's subsequent telegram of September 26 indicates that neither the alleged intellectual attainments of these applicants, their alleged status as labor leaders, nor their intentions with respect to the duration of their stay in the United States need now be considered by the examining officer as one of the bases for determining their admissibility. It thus becomes clear that the Department is now relying on the sponsoring organizations in the United States—

The sponsoring organizations in the city of New York, that I mentioned—

to the extent of virtually waiving—

I add, doing away with—

the examination which it is my understanding the statute requires, be conducted in the field inasmuch as the Department's telegram September 26 categorically states that these applications "should be granted visitor's visas in the absence of reason to believe they will engage in activities inimical to the United States." I am unable to comprehend such reliance on alleged information said to be available in the United States with regard to large numbers of individuals residing thousands of miles away, virtually none of whom are personally known to their sponsors as appears from their examination. The fact that the sponsoring organizations have grossly misrepresented to the Department the intellectual or labor status as well as the future intentions of virtually all of these aliens thus far examined appears to me to be highly significant.

With regard to the one remaining ground for examination of this large number of applicants which has been left to the judgment of the officers in the field—the possible future activity of these aliens in the United States—it would appear from the wording of the Department's telegram of September 26 that the Department has shifted the burden of proof from the applicant to the consular officer to establish the admissibility of the alien although section 23 of the act of 1924 provides that the burden of proof is on the alien to show that he is not excludable under any provision of our immigration laws. Obviously it will be virtually impossible for the examining officer to obtain specific information regarding the possible future activities of these individuals in the United State and in order to be able to assume that there is reason to believe that they will engage in activities inimical to the United States. In safeguarding the interests of the United States under present world conditions, I believe it to be not unreasonable to withhold visas when there is even a doubt regarding the past or future activities of applicants even though the examining officer may not be in possession of sufficient evidence to be able to make the categoric statement referred to above. The Department supports this view in its circular of September 19, 7 p. m.

I find that in many cases—

The American Ambassador to Moscow still speaking—

the applicants whose names were transmitted by the Department were politically active in Poland and elsewhere.

Politically active.

Some were office holders and members of the Zionist Labor Party and of the Bund; others are employees of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in Warsaw—

Poland, of course.

and subsequently in Vilna. Some of the alleged rabbis have never had congregations outside of their own families. Several of the applicants appear to have been professional political agitators. Thus far, not a single well-known intellectual or labor leader has made an appearance at the Embassy unless a teacher of geography in a Kovno high school is to be regarded as a well-known intellectual and anyone performing manual labor is to be regarded as a labor leader. I am persuaded that the best interests of the United States at this time will not be served by admitting individuals of this type in large groups, especially individuals who have coordinated with one another over a period of years and who might well transplant their entire political organization to the United States, particularly as I am not convinced that many of them intend to depart from the United States at the expiration of these so-called visits. Furthermore, I believe it to be dangerous to allow groups to enter the United States indiscriminately merely because the members of these groups have been sponsored by organizations in the United States which have not hesitated to misrepresent to the Department and who are obviously more interested in finding a haven for these unfortunates than they are in safeguarding the welfare of the United States at the most critical period of its history. I still regard admission to the United States as a privilege, not a right.

In the absence of instructions foregoing and particularly by reason of my doubts with regard to the past and future activities of many of these applicants, I have requested the consular section to suspend action in all doubtful cases pending the receipt of further instructions from the Department.

When the inevitable prospects by the organizations which have misrepresented the status of many of these applicants in order to procure their admission to the United States by subterfuge, I have no objection to the Department's acquainting the sponsoring organizations with the contents of all or any part of this telegram as representing my personal views.

The foregoing is repeated for the information of Mr. Avra Warren.

I assume he refers to Mr. Avra Warren, of the State Department.

Mr. President, it is, indeed, appalling to my mind, in view of what has been happening recently, and, as a matter of fact, has continued over a number of years at various periods, that the American people have not more thoroughly interested themselves in the matter of the class and character and number of refugees who are entering the United States of America.

I refer to Mr. Harry Bridges, the alien, Communist labor agitator. I repeat that Col. John Thomas Taylor, the able legislative representative of the American Legion at the Capitol for more than 3 years, has endeavored to bring about the deportation of one alien but that one alien's influence has been so potent that the United States Government itself, possessed of all its wealth and all its strength and all its power, has been unable to deport that one single alien.

In that connection, I recall that last year there was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ALLEN, of the State of Louisiana, a bill calling for the immediate mandatory deportation of the alien, Communist, radical, trouble-maker Bridges. That bill passed the other House, thanks and congratulations to its Members, and came to the Senate, but was not passed here. I recall that during the closing hours of the debate on the lend-lease bill, a bill the passage of which I opposed with all my might, I offered an amendment to that bill which would have provided for the immediate deportation of alien Harry Bridges, but in this body there were not a sufficient number of hands raised to provide me with a record vote. Bridges is still here, and I should not be surprised if alien, Communist, radical, trouble-maker Bridges should remain here, because, insofar as influence is concerned, he seems to be possessed of more than any other individual or collection of individuals in the United States, despite the fact that the American people know that that foreigner, that alien, that Communist, has caused more trouble in this country and has provided more inspiration for his fellow trouble-makers and fellow Communists and fellow aliens than has any other alien or any other collection or organization of aliens in this country. I say that such a situation is deplorable, and I repeat that it is appalling to me that the American people, at this troubled hour, do not demand that Bridges and those of his ilk be put upon the ships yet remaining in the possession of the United States and deported to their respective lands, to the countries which would still take them back.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to correct the statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that "all the powers of the Government" have been futile in the attempt to deport Harry Bridges. "All the powers of the Government" have not been so used. Harry Bridges has been supported and maintained in this country through the efforts of the Secretary of Labor and the Bureau of Immigration, and I think it is time to call public attention to, and place the responsibility for, the subversive acts of those who have brought about the defeat, in a degree, of measures for national defense, and of the reform of the abuses of the immigration laws.

Mr. President, in this connection I may call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina and of the Senate to the fact that on January 6 last I introduced a bill (S. 152) providing for the punishment of persons who escaped or attempted to escape from the custody of officers or employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and on March 27 I introduced a bill (S. 1237) to prohibit the admission into the United States of immigrants who are nationals of certain countries. Here it is the 5th day of June and no action has been taken on those reformatory measures, because they have been held up in the Bureau of Immigration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before closing I desire to make another observation. I am reminded of this since the distinguished Senator from Oregon mentioned the name of the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, who at one time had supervision and direction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; but, as we all know, it was removed by Executive order from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice.

I very well recall that several years ago—perhaps 4 or 5—the United States Government, through the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor, had brought about the apprehension and detention by bond or prison of approximately 3,000 alien criminals, some of whom had entered the country legally and remained here illegally, some of whom had entered here illegally and had remained here illegally, but every single one of whom was an alien criminal. At that time I visited the rooms containing the files of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Labor, and asked the clerk in charge thereof to hand me 100 of those cases. I told him I did not want to select the cases myself, because it might be charged that I had picked out the cases of the worst criminals in the lot of 3,000; so he handed me 100 cases. I brought them to the floor of this body, and brought to the attention of the Members of this body innumerable of those 100 cases, making particular reference to the crimes that the various aliens had committed, evidencing the fact that they were alien criminals. At that time I asked for action upon the deportation of those 3,000 alien criminals in the United States whom we were housing and feeding and clothing and maintaining at the end of the American taxpayer; and the officials of the Department of Labor said, "We have not deported these poor fellows because we are sympathetic with them. If we deport them, we shall separate them from their families."

That brings me back to the thought that when it comes to dealing with aliens, even alien criminals, they always get the sympathy of the American people, in contrast to the American people providing sympathy to the home-grown native American criminal. No one would ever say, "No; let us not send him to prison; it would separate him from his family, and that would not be right." However, we hear that very argument made in regard to the alien criminal whom we are maintaining; and, as a result, Mr. President, no general effort was made to deport those persons.

The war came on in 1939. Europe and a portion of Asia have been conquered by the Axis Powers. As a result thereof, the alien criminals that we have here now are the same ones we had here 5 years ago; and today they cannot be deported to the countries from which they came, for two reasons. In the first place, those countries say, "No; we do not want them. You have the scum of our country. You have the law violators of our lands. You let them in. You kept them there. You continue to feed them and house them and clothe them and maintain them." In the second place, those countries would not take them back now even if we had an opportunity of transporting them aboard the few vessels that are plying the Atlantic and are not employed in the transportation of goods to the British Isles.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to take a few minutes to make some observations with reference to the Secretary of Labor. I do so because I have sat on the floor of the Senate time after time in the few short months I have been here and heard accusation after accusation made against the Secretary of Labor which, in my opinion, if the accuser were called upon to prove, he would fail to prove just so surely as a Member of the House of Representatives who introduced a resolution of impeachment of the Secretary of Labor failed a year or so ago when the resolution of impeachment was introduced.

I admire the Senator from North Carolina for the fight he is making with reference to the aliens in this country who should be deported; I admire him for the fight he made against the lend-lease bill, because I am sure of his sincerity; but I think it is incumbent on me, I think it is incumbent on any other Senator, when a member of the Cabinet of this great country is attacked day after day, at least to call the attention of the Senate to a few facts with reference to her.

We hear her condemned nearly every day in the week because Harry Bridges was not deported; but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that she did everything she was called upon to do under the law to deport Harry Bridges. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of Labor ordered the deportation of Joe Strecher, who was accused of being a Communist. One of the circuit courts ruled that the evidence against Joe Strecher was so meager, so unsupported, that the court issued a writ of habeas corpus telling the Labor Department to discharge him and give him his freedom.

The Secretary of Labor was not satisfied with that decision, and appealed the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States. I sat in the Supreme Court of the United States and heard that case argued; and I am frank to say that I never heard an abler argument than was made by the Solicitor General of the United States at that time in support of the position of the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins. On the other hand, Joe Strecher was defended by an able lawyer; and there we saw two of the great lawyers of the United States pitted against each other, one asking for the deportation of a man who the Labor Department had found should be deported; the other lawyer citing to the Court the fact that under the Constitution of the United States even the meanest, the most despicable alien had a right to be heard before that Court.

After the arguments were made and submitted, what happened? Was the position of the Secretary of Labor that Joe Strecher should be deported upheld? Absolutely not. An opinion handed down by Mr. Justice Roberts said:

> Notwithstanding what the Labor Department has found, notwithstanding what the Solicitor General of the United States has argued here, there is not sufficient evidence to deport Joe Strecher—

and they ordered him released.

An impeachment resolution was filed in the House of Representatives against Madam Perkins, based on the Strecher case and on her actions in the Bridges case. She appeared before the Judiciary Committee of the House, made up, as the Senator knows, of Republicans and Democrats, and I should say made up at that time of a majority of members who did not think too much of the Secretary of Labor. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that after the hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary on the resolution of impeachment it was unanimously unfavorably reported to the House of Representatives.

There is the record of the Secretary of Labor. She may have made mistakes, but are there any of us who do not make mistakes? She might not have suited me, she might not have suited the Senator from North Carolina, in all that she has done, but we find the Department of Labor ordering the deportation of Joe Strecher, and the Supreme Court of the United States, under the opinion of Justice Roberts, saying that it cannot be done.

I hope that the Senate of the United States, in dealing with Madam Perkins, I hope that Senators in making their accusations will remember that she is an American citizen, will remember that she is a Cabinet member, and that she is entitled to some respect and some consideration, and an absolute state-

ment of the facts here before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I am glad he made reference to these points. Of course we all know the record in reference to Harry Bridges speaks for itself.

In regard to the innumerable aliens placed under arrest, at this time I wish to say that immediately upon the adjournment of the Senate I shall request the Department of Justice, which I believe now has in charge all records formerly under the care of the Immigration Division of the Department of Labor, to provide me with the name and the record of every alien recorded in the so-called hardship cases, anywhere from 3 to 5 years ago. At that time there were about 3,000 of those so-called hardship cases, 100 of which I brought to the Senate, and most of them to the attention of the Members of this body. In support of the statements I have made, I repeat, I shall ask that the Department of Labor or the Department of Justice, whichever has in charge the so-called hardship cases I have mentioned, provide me with the name and the record in each individual case. Then I shall seek opportunity to bring them again to the attention of the Members of this body, because I know that there are several Senators who were not here at the time the hardship cases were before us. I believe the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] was a Member of the House of Representatives at the time I discussed the hardship cases.

REFUSAL OF VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization acted favorably on Senate bill 913, all the Members present voting in the affirmative. From that committee I report back, without amendment, the bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety, and I submit a report (No. 386) thereon. Inasmuch as a recess is likely to be taken until Monday, I should like to have the bill considered at this time.

I may say that I have conferred with the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], with reference to the bill, and he interposes no objection to its consideration. It is a very brief and a very simple bill. It purports to confer a power on the members of the Consular Service abroad which I already thought they had. It merely permits the consuls to refuse visas to aliens whom they know or have reason to believe are persons whose presence in the United States will be inimical to the public interest. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill is recommended by both the Department of State and the Department of Justice, and the letter from the Department of State says that it is very important that the bill be enacted into law at an early date. I shall not tire the Senate with any remarks on the bill at this late hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any American diplomatic or consular officer knows or has reason to believe that any alien seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States, he shall refuse to issue to such alien any immigration visa, passport visa, transit certificate, or other document entitling such alien to present himself for admission into the United States; but in any case in which a diplomatic or consular officer denies a visa or other travel document under the provisions of this act, he shall promptly refer the case to the Secretary of State for such further action as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to occupy a few moments of the time of the Senate in discussing two subjects. First I wish to speak on the strike situation. I returned to the Senate just last night after an absence of a few days, during which I was traveling about and had an opportunity of talking with many people. In connection with the international situation, and the national-defense program, the one subject which I heard discussed generally was the strike situation. As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, I wish to speak briefly on that subject.

Chaos reigns wherever strikes are under way in plants engaged in defense-production work. A small handful of racketeering labor leaders, some of whom are Nazis, many of whom are aliens, and a large percentage of whom are Communists, are calling and continuing defense strikes at will. They are proceeding without regard for the Nation's welfare, and in many cases arrogantly defying the feeble and wholly inadequate attempts of Government agencies to stop strikes.

The latest evidence of this came last night. Then O. M. Orton, president of the C. I. O. Woodworkers Union, refused an urgent unanimous request by the National Defense Mediation Board to permit his men to return to work at higher wages pending settlement of other issues in what has been a prolonged strike. Further, Orton issued a statement accusing the Board, including C. I. O. officials, of "trying to bulldoze our workers and attempting to mislead them with false and hysterical statements."

Thus the Nation is faced with defiance of the only plan suggested by the President of the United States in his recent fireside chat for dealing with strikes in defense industries. He then said that he expected both employers and employees to abide by the decisions of the Board, and continue work pending settlement of controversies. Other than that he had nothing to offer. Now that his single-stringed plan has been defiantly cast aside by one union leader speaking for 12,000 men engaged in an important defense industry, what is he going to do?

It is up to the President himself to answer this question for the present intolerable defense strike situation is one of his own making. For years in the face of every effort of members of his own and other political parties to remedy our present inadequate labor laws, he has defiantly refused to permit them to be touched. When, at the last session of Congress, the House, after a thorough investigation of the workings of the Wagner Act, voted overwhelmingly to amend it in accordance with fair practices, the White House saw that the proposed bill was killed in the Senate committee. Later, when strikes became widespread in defense industries, hampering the production program, especially in badly needed bombers, the President, his Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, and various New Deal "yes" men tried to minimize these strikes by saying only a fractional part of defense labor was involved. This was true, so far as numbers were concerned, but it later was developed that communistic labor leaders were tying up defense work generally through strikes in small but vitally important key industries. The number of men involved directly in the strikes was of little importance. The important feature was that through tying up those small producers of badly needed defense machinery parts the whole national program was being seriously affected.

That these strikes do not, in the main, express the desires of the workers themselves has been made crystal clear. The men usually responsible for them, it has been shown repeatedly, are radical leaders, often enrolled Communists, who have been calling strikes at will almost without regard for the wishes of the rank and file of their members. And let me say here that I believe workers generally in this country, whether members of unions or not, are eager to work steadily on the defense program. As a whole, they are patriotic and good Americans. They do not want to strike. The fact is they often know nothing about pending strikes until they are called. Their leaders usually resort to the subterfuge of getting a vote of confidence for themselves and then calling strikes, with no more authority than this vote. To his surprise, the worker, without having had a chance to express himself directly on the strike question, finds himself out in the street, obstructing a patriotic program which, in his heart, he desires to aid in carrying out.

Certainly, then, the blame for these strikes cannot be laid on the workers. Neither, in most cases, are employers to blame. Review the whole sorry record of strikes in defense industries during the last year, and how often have hearings shown that employers were being unfair? Not often. Only infrequently has there been any serious trouble over wages or working conditions. Employers as a whole have been more than liberal in agreeing to wage advances and

adjustments in hours of labor and vacations. The very large majority of defense strikes have been settled with marked wage advances. The only hitches have come in regard to conditions which would give radical labor leaders greater holds on the plants and men involved so as to permit calling other strikes.

These facts are well known to every person in a Government position of responsibility in dealing with strikes, but he is helpless to do anything. The reason is that the President, as a major feature of his one-man government plan, has repeatedly refused to permit passage of any sort of legislation which would help remedy the situation and has also refused to do any constructive thing himself. To him the Wagner Act is sacred. To me it is right in principle, but should be amended. The radical labor leader who is responsible for the trouble must not be disturbed; for what reason no one knows. And, somehow and in some way, he feels property owners, who certainly are being put over a barrel at every turn, must be made responsible for defense strikes and eventually made to pay.

In his latest fireside chat, instead of putting the finger on the irresponsible leaders who are promoting these strikes, he sought to leave the impression that the primary cause of the trouble was that industrialists were fighting among themselves. In a later press conference he also hinted that management was partially to blame for the famous Allis-Chalmers strike, one of the worst that has occurred in connection with defense production. The fact is that this strike was promoted by a communistic element and was marked by a fraudulent strike vote, which was publicly exposed by the Wisconsin State Labor Board.

Incidentally, so devoid was that chat of any promise to crack down on racketeers that they were greatly encouraged. Signs of their encouragement have developed in their replacing in several defense industries, intelligent, patriotic American labor leaders with pronounced radicals with foreign backgrounds. These newcomers boast that they are going to "speed things up."

Recent evidence of the President's determination to make these property owners pay the high cost of his coddling of radical labor leaders is found in the introduction of a House bill designed to permit the President, at will, to take over any kind of personal property. His personal explanation of the purpose of this bill is that it is designed to help him settle defense strikes.

No more drastic legislative proposal ever has been made. It is so bad that the Democratic introducer of the bill in the House stated specifically that he was putting in the bill "by request" and that he was opposed to it. Many of the most ardent followers of the New Deal also have voiced their opposition to the measure.

The claim that the bill is needed to help settle defense strikes is highly preposterous and deserves attention now. To say that private property must be seized as a safeguard against strikes, which in the main are being promoted by racketeering labor leaders and not by patriotic American workmen, is equivalent to urging the burning down of a house to rid the basement of a few rats.

When the seizure of private property by Government is contemplated, the question naturally arises: Who will run these seized plants? Since the administration seemingly has more faith in racketeering labor leaders and its immediate New Deal family, consisting chiefly of former social workers and essayists, are we to believe that personal favorites from these groups would be made industrial managers? It would seem fair to assume so. Because of its peculiar grudge against other property owners and its tender regard for the comfort and prosperity of alien, communistic, and radical labor leaders, will it continue to promote its theory that industrial peace lies in the path of its taking defense plants away from capable and patriotic managements and putting them under control of sound grammarians who have traveled in Soviet Russia?

The sober truth is that a mere handful of radical labor racketeers are being protected by the President at the tragic expense of the rest of the Nation, workers included. He, and he alone, can remedy the situation. It will not be necessary to seize the properties of innocent investors and wreck them with amateurish New Deal management in order to get results. By a little simple legislation, he can strip these strike-breeding racketeers of their power, stop most of these strikes, and get the defense program actively under way without cost or injury to anyone except the racketeers themselves. Best of all, he can really be of service to the great mass of workers who want to work and not strike and who are real Americans.

The effective way to industrial peace is actually to put the power to call strikes, after a reasonable cooling-off period, into the hands of the workers themselves. No strike should be permitted until a majority of the men have voted by secret ballot at a Government-supervised election to go on strike. Workers who go on strike illegally should be stripped of their privileges under the Wagner Act and lose their preferential standing as employees.

These very simple changes could be made possible by Executive order and certainly by law within 48 hours if the President would endorse them, and they would quickly settle our present defense production troubles. The majority of both Houses of Congress would gladly put power to strike directly in the hands of the workers. All the President needs to do is to indicate that he trusts the workers more than he does their racketeering leaders. Given the power to express their personal wishes, the mass of patriotic workers will fall in step with the defense program. Only the President is stopping them.

Let us look at the matter for a moment in review. There would be a reasonable cooling-off period, and then a Government-supervised election by secret ballot, in which the workers themselves, and not racketeering labor leaders, would determine whether or not they would go on strike. If we do that we will put in the hands of the American workingman himself the right to declare a strike or the right to pass on strikes, or to continue with his work on the national-defense program. That move is sound. The President of the United States and the administration leaders say they trust American labor and trust the American workingman. There should be no legitimate objection to the program suggested. There would be a reasonable cooling-off period and then a Government-supervised election by secret ballot. Let the workers decide. Take the power out of the hands of some of the labor leaders of the racketeering kind, many of whom have communistic or Nazi leanings, who do not have the interests of the United States at heart, and who are disrupting the defense-production program.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, I wish now to talk for a moment about the St. Lawrence waterway. Today the President sent a special message to Congress on the St. Lawrence waterway. I have before me a copy of an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of today, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 5, 1941]

NEED FOR THE SEAWAY PLAN IS STILL TO BE SHOWN

The Senate refused in 1934 to ratify a treaty with Canada providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project. For several years the Senate defeat seemed to have put the quietus on a long agitation. With the opening of the defense emergency, however, the seaway project again came to life.

The seaway plan is not now called a treaty; it is an agreement under the terms of an earlier treaty, and may take effect by mere majority approval of the two Houses. With such a legislative maneuver in mind, the administration reported the agreement to the Congress in March. A House bill, H. R. 4927, on which hearings are about to open, provides for approval of the agreement and for actual authorization to begin the project.

But a Senate-House conference has just indicated a continuing suspicion of the plan in its action on the measure increasing R. F. C. borrowing power by $1,500,000,000. For it has specifically provided that the St. Lawrence and certain other equally grandiose projects are not to be financed out of these new R. F. C. funds. The possibility remains, to be sure, that the administration can secure majority approval of the agreement where it failed in 1934 of ratification of a treaty in the Senate.

But the objections which were good against the plan in 1934 are as good as ever; and there are equally strong objections to the new defense arguments now advanced. The major objection on this score was suggested by no less a personage than the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mackenzie King, when he discussed the matter by letter with Mr. Roosevelt a few weeks before the agreement was signed. Somewhat diffidently, Mr. King reminded the President that Canada was involved in a war straining her resources in money, matériels, and manpower to the utmost. He intimated that such a time was not the best to launch a great pub-

lic-works project, even under the guise of defense.

That argument applies equally to the United States. The cost of the St. Lawrence project will run to hundreds of millions. We confront serious shortages already in men and materials, and this project will not be ready for years, the power facilities not for 4 years, the 27-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the sea not until even later. The President has from the beginning emphasized that what we need is defense production now. If we thus direct our energies toward ends not immediately achievable, we may find the war over before the seaway project is complete.

Mr. BRIDGES. In my judgment, the arguments which the President makes with regard to the St. Lawrence waterway are unsound. The St. Lawrence waterway project would probably cost around $1,000,000,000. It would require 6, 7, or 8 years to complete. In a time of great emergency, the St. Lawrence waterway project would divert to a questionable project men and material vitally needed to build tanks, planes, and guns. Many in Canada have objected to this project right along. As quoted in the editorial from the Baltimore Sun, the Prime Minister of Canada made quite a statement recently. Prime Minister McKenzie King stated that Canada was involved in a war straining her resources in money and materials to the utmost. He intimated that this is not the time to launch a great public-works project, even under the guise of defense.

Mr. President, I have sat in committees and listened to the testimony of experts. I have talked with our military experts, who have stated that if this country is ever invaded the best way for a foreign power to invade it would be down the valley of the St. Lawrence, splitting this country in two. If we should build the St. Lawrence waterway, we should be offering to any hostile invading power an excellent opportunity for invasion by building a paved highway to the heart of America.

It is time we were thinking about cutting down nondefense expenditures and giving a little thought and attention to cutting corners on unnecessary things rather than thinking of new ways to spend money. No. 1 on the list of unnecessary things should be the St. Lawrence waterway. It would injure our port cities. It would throw tens of thousands of railroad workers out of employment. It would disrupt our transportation, and it would not work, because the St. Lawrence is frozen over for about 4 months of the year. All in all, it is a project on which I think we might well look with suspicion at this time.

I notice that the President said that we would finish it before the emergency is over. I hope not, for I hope the emergency will not last 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years. If it does, there will be very little left of the country. We ought to be conserving our resources now and utilizing our manpower and matériel on the vital things needed in the defense program, rather than thinking of new ways to spend the taxpayers' money on questionable projects and diverting our resources from the defense-production program. The St. Lawrence waterway should be defeated.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

LISTER HILL,
FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JAMES A. O'LEARY,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have been advised by the able Senator in charge of the conference report that he has conferred with Senators who objected to some of the provisions of the bill, and that they have no objection to considering the report. Therefore I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I have conferred with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. They were both minority members of the conference. They did not sign the conference report. As the Senator from Oregon knows, they opposed the bill, but I advised them that it was my intention to submit the report this afternoon, and they stated that they did not care to discuss the report.

Mr. McNARY. It was very thoughtful on the part of the able Senator to do so.

With that statement, I have no objection to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the recess of the Senate, the enrolled bill, Senate bill 1438, to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, which has been agreed to by both Houses.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is there a conference report?

Mr. BYRNES. There is a conference report, which has been agreed to by both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION OF SIOUX FALLS HIGH SCHOOL BAND AT LAUNCHING OF BATTLESHIP "SOUTH DAKOTA"

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in our country, whenever there is an accomplishment of some kind or other, local, State, or National, it is customary to have fitting ceremonies to celebrate the event. In the case of local accomplishments we have exercises when the boys and girls graduate from high school. When the State opens a bridge the Governor usually attends the ceremonies, the local chambers of commerce have a parade, and the bridge is fittingly opened to the public.

In the case of a national event we always have a celebration. There is one scheduled for Saturday of this week, June 7, at which time a battleship will be added to the defense forces of our country. The State of South Dakota has been honored by having the battleship named *South Dakota*. Fitting ceremonies will be held at Camden, N. J., on that date. In connection with the ceremonies, a large high-school band of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has seen fit to schedule its tour so that it can be on hand at Camden, N. J., on Saturday of this week.

Radio stations having union musicians in their employ are required by the union to employ only union musicians. Almost all, if not all, radio stations are compelled to comply with this requirement. Consequently it is impossible for any radio station or network to broadcast music played by a nonunion organization, even though it be a patriotic organization such as a high-school band.

On this particular occasion the Sioux Falls High School band had been asked to take part in the ceremonies. There will be speeches, of course, probably by the Secretary of the Navy, and a few others, lasting possibly 15 or 20 minutes; and in order properly to complete the ceremonies, the band intended to play incidental music, such as the Star-Spangled Banner, or Anchors Aweigh.

Seeking to cooperate with them, my colleague [Mr. BULOW] and I directed a telegram to the head of the Musicians Union. I should like to read the telegram to the Senate and have it appear in the RECORD, and so that not only the Members of the Senate, but also the public at large, may have full notice of what has been done.

The telegram is directed to Mr. James C. Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians, New York City. It reads as follows:

Mr. JAMES C. PETRILLO,
President, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N. Y.:

Washington High School band coming from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Saturday, June 7, to participate in ceremonies of launching battleship *South Dakota* at Camden, N. J. Understand major networks and local stations planning complete broadcast. We request that you give them permission to broadcast, in addition to speeches, the incidental band music. If you will telegraph your approval to us, we will contact network representatives here.

WILLIAM J. BULOW,
United States Senator.
CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator.

That is the telegram which was sent yesterday. The reply, received from James C. Petrillo this morning, reads as follows:

June 4, 1941

WILLIAM J. BULOW and CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate:

Federation not in position to sanction Sioux Falls High School band playing over

network Saturday. By so doing we would be placed in an untenable position in having refused many such similar requests.

JAS. C. PETRILLO.

Mr. President, all Americans should, whenever possible, help in the celebration of any accomplishment along the line of national defense; and certainly the launching of a battleship is a large link in our national-defense program. It is not my intention at any time to applaud any organization which does not seek to celebrate in a proper manner and cooperate in a proper manner in connection with any event of this kind.

DISMISSAL OF CHARGES AGAINST W. E. MANIS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last fall in the campaign between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie I stood on the floor of the Senate and called attention to a little item of Tennessee justice. At that time a man by the name of Bill Manis had been arrested and put in jail for circulating a humorous parody on President Roosevelt. I made some rather drastic and caustic comments about the case, and also about the reaction of the officials in Tennessee in handling the matter. The able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] defended Tennessee justice, and there was quite a dispute about the case at the time.

I hold in my hand articles from the Knoxville News Sentinel and the Knoxville Journal, which I ask to have inserted in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News Sentinel of May 26, 1941]

F. D. R. POEM CIRCULATOR GETS OFF IN COURT

Distributing "semi-Republican" literature, including a satirical poem about President Roosevelt, during the election campaign last fall did not constitute disorderly conduct, Judge L. H. Carlock ruled today as he dismissed charges against W. E. Manis.

Mr. Manis was arrested at a plant on Dale Avenue last year while distributing the poetic satire among the workers.

City Policeman B. P. Ammons testified that the workers were "resentful" and that Manis was arrested because there was fear of a public disturbance. He denied that politics was involved in the arrest.

Defense Attorney Hal Clements characterized the literature being distributed by Manis as "Willkie literature, or sort of half Republican."

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 27, 1941]

WRITER OF PARODY ON PRESIDENT WON'T HAVE TO PAY $10 FINE

Bill Manis, the man who got arrested here last fall for distributing a parody on President Roosevelt, won't have to pay his $10 city court fine, after all, Second Circuit Judge L. H. Carlock ruled yesterday.

He had been fined by City Judge R. P. Williams on a charge of disorderly conduct and had been arrested after distributing copies of the Roosevelt parody near the gates of an industrial plant in West Knoxville. Manis appealed the fine.

Manis' arrest and fine were publicized nationally last September, and several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were required to publish statements made by Republican and Democratic Senators.

Arresting policemen said politics was not involved in the arrest but said it was made to prevent possible trouble. Judge Carlock, in dismissing the case, said it appeared to be a matter of "overwrought emotions during a political campaign."

Mr. BRIDGES. The articles indicate that at this late date, some 7 months after the Presidential campaign, Bill Manis finally has had his trial and has been acquitted. At last Tennessee justice and American justice have prevailed, and Mr. Manis is free, without jail sentence and without fine. The position which I held at that time and the criticism which I made have been justified; and I am glad that at last Tennessee and the municipality have rendered justice.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that all the Senator desires to say is that the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire has been confirmed?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and myself, I report back favorably, with amendments, House bill 4693, to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 389) thereon.

May I ask the acting majority leader whether it is probable that we shall take up this Federal housing bill on Monday?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have talked to the minority leader, and he has agreed that on Monday we shall proceed to consider the bill. We had an informal agreement with respect to the consideration of the bill reported by the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has requested that consideration be given to the bill which was objected to today. He will be unavoidably absent from the city on Monday; but he desires to give notice that on Thursday he will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill which was under discussion for some time today.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I had heard that that motion would be made on Tuesday. Is it now understood that the motion will be made on Thursday of next week?

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Massachusetts will not be back on Tuesday, and I have told him that we could not consider the bill before Thursday.

Mr. MCNARY. That is quite satisfactory.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations and texts of notes amending a treaty were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Howard O. Hunter, of Illinois, to be Commissioner of Work Projects, Work Projects Administration.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, being the texts of notes exchanged at Washington on May 20, 1941, between the Governments of the United States and Canada, amending in its application article 5 of the treaty signed on January 11, 1909, between the United States and the United Kingdom, to permit for the duration of the emergency and in all events subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion, for power purposes, of the waters of Niagara River above the falls; without amendment (Ex. Rept. No. 8).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—GANSON PURCELL—NOMINATION REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1942, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1942, vice Jerome N. Frank.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that this is a reappointment.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President. Mr. Purcell has been with the Commission for some time, but he has not been a member of the Commission.

Mr. MCNARY. Then what is the emergency requiring us to proceed in this fashion?

Mr. BYRNES. I must say that I know of no emergency. I understood the Senator from Alabama to say that he had talked with the Senator from Oregon, and that there was no objection to proceeding at this time to consider the nomination. If the Senator has any objection, I shall ask that the nomination be placed on the calendar and considered in the regular order.

Mr. MCNARY. I had understood—possibly erroneously—that it was a reappointment. I consider reappointments in a different aspect from new appointments. However, under the circumstances, in order that the Senator from Alabama may not think that I have changed my mind, I withhold objection.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say that the reason urged by the Senator from Alabama was that Mr. Henderson, who was a

member of the Commission, now is engaged in work with the O. P. M.; consequently it is necessary that the position formerly occupied by Mr. Henderson be filled.

Mr. McNARY. I withhold objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, I request that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Ganson Purcell to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS OF MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATES REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I report favorably the list of cadets scheduled for graduation at the United States Military Academy June 11, 1941, who have been nominated to be second lieutenants in the Regular Army.

Because of the brief intervening time before the graduation exercises, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION—HOWARD O. HUNTER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has reported favorably the nomination of Howard O. Hunter, of Illinois, to be Commissioner of Work Projects, Work Projects Administration. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard O. Hunter to be Commissioner of Work Projects, Work Projects Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the nomination on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. BYRNES. The nomination is not on the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not on the calendar; it has only just been reported; but I ask unanimous consent that it be considered without being on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate in confirming the nomination of Mr. Howard O. Hunter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the consideration of nominations on the calendar be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the nomination of Hon. Claude L. Draper to the Federal Power Commission, which has just been confirmed, is a reappointment, and that Mr. Draper has served with conspicuous ability in this position for several years, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Luther Harr, of Pennsylvania, to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that consideration of that nomination be passed over at this time. I have been requested by a Member to ask that it be passed over today.

Mr. McNARY. In the absence of two Senators, I was going to make the same request. So I join in the request of the able Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps may also be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE EDELSTEIN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives which was read as follows:

House Resolution 227

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 4, 1941.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know the late Representative EDELSTEIN, of the Fourteenth District of the State of New York. He was always a patriotic, loyal citizen, and an advocate of tolerance and equality. He was the leader of his district and was the Representative in Congress from the district for the last two terms. He was a self-made man, and his untimely death will be a great loss to the city of New York, to the State he served so well, and to the Nation. So, Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read and considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 127) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

RECESS

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 9, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 11, 1941

Corps of Engineers

2. Elmer Parker Yates.
3. Wadsworth Paul Clapp.
4. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr.
5. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr.
6. John Roy Oswalt, Jr.
7. John Frederick Harris.
8. Allen Jensen.
10. Vincent Paul Carlson.
11. William Charles Gribble, Jr.
12. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr.
13. Sears Yates Coker.
14. Howard Warren Clark.
15. Charles Leonard Peirce.
17. Frank Austin Gerig, Jr.
18. Cargill Massenburg Barnett.
19. Roy Skiles Kelley.
20. Paul Wyman Ramee.
21. Donald Haynes Heaton.
22. Jess Paul Unger.
23. Charles Henry Schilling.
25. John Edward Schremp.
26. John Field Michel.
27. Richard Delaney.
28. William Thomas Seawell.
29. Howard Clarke Goodell.
30. Guy Harold Goddard.
31. Robert Mack Tarbox.
32. Kenneth Wade Kennedy.
33. Lynn Cyrus Lee.
34. Fred John Ascani.
36. Robert Graham Waitt.
37. Herbert Campbell Clendening.
38. James Henry Carroll.
39. Harold Edward Nankivell.
41. Harry Charles Besancon.
43. Joseph Jackson Thigpen.
44. William Miles Linton.
45. Robert Sealey Kramer.
48. Frederick John Baker.
50. Joseph Ingram Gurfein.
51. Ben Isbel Mayo, Jr.
52. Paul Demetrius Duke.
53. Joseph Stanley Grygiel.
55. John Webb VanHoy, Jr.
60. Edward Leon Rowny.
62. Ernest Durr, Jr.
64. Herbert Richardson, Jr.
65. Walter Edward Mather.
68. Robert Patterson Pierpont.

Signal Corps

16. Richard Gentry Tindall, Jr.
24. David Seavey Woods.
59. Gordon Thomas Gould, Jr.
69. Richard Magee Osgood.
73. Joseph Meryl Silk.
94. Henry Nathan Blanchard, Jr.
127. Max Woodrow Hall.
129. Wallace Michael Lauterbach.
136. Robert James Colleran.
149. DuVal West 3d.
157. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr.
163. William Frank Starr.
176. Richard Waggener Couch.
178. Walter Francis Molesky.
187. Paul Chester Day.
188. Herbert Welcome Frawley, Jr.
199. Albert Howell Snider.
202. Joseph Patrick Ahern.
206. Leo Charles Henzl.
241. George Henry Pittman, Jr.
255. Merritt Lambert Hewitt.
293. George Lincoln Andrews.
297. John Carl McIntyre.

Cavalry

1. Alfred Judson Force Moody.
42. Stanley Meriwether Ramey.
56. Emory Ashel Austin, Jr.
83. Ralph Edward Kuzell.
91. Roy J. Clinton.
96. Straughan Downing Kelsey.
99. John Millikin, Jr.
104. Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr.
105. Richard Pressly Scott.
128. Max Campbell Tyler.
130. Gregg LaRoix McKee.
138. Elkin Leland Franklin.
141. Paul George Skowronek.
155. Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr.
156. Isaac Owen Winfree.
164. Dan Holton Eaton.
175. Paul Rutherford Larson.
182. Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr.
200. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr.
201. Jack Leith Bentley.
223. Donald Vincent Thompson.
224. James Philip Walker.
227. Richard William Kline.
239. Harold Alexander Tidmarsh.
240. Robert John Coakley.
244. Heister Hower Drum.
248. Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick.
258. John Calvin Clark.
262. Reynolds Robert Keleher.
279. Harry Howard Ellis.
280. Charles MacArthur Carman, Jr.

Field Artillery

40. Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr.
46. Kenneth O'Reilly Dessert.
54. George Philip Seneff, Jr.
63. John Langford Locke.
67. Cecil Leo Smith.
72. Clarence John Lokker.
74. John Holmes Camp.
75. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr.
85. John Francis Thomas Murray.
86. Allan George Woodrow Johnson.
88. Jack Curtright McClure, Jr.
90. George Lawrence Slocum.
92. Lee Bradley Ledford, Jr.
101. Robert Vaughan Elsberry.
106. Hyman Bodzin.
108. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr.
111. Ernest Jeunet Whitaker.
114. Perry Thompson Jones.
115. Lloyd Robert Salisbury.
117. John Nathaniel Hauser, Jr.
118. William McVay Petre.
122. George Bissland Moore.
125. Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr.
131. Frederick Clinton Stanford.
143. Wilson Russell Reed.
147. John Adams Brooks 3d.
150. Robert Edward Panke.
159. Charles William Fletcher.
162. Lanham Carmel Connally.
168. Charles Knightor Harris.
170. James Oscar Green 3d.
174. William Eugene Clifford.
184. Harold Wesly Norton.
185. Oscar Charles Tonetti.
190. Joseph Lippincott Knowlton.
195. Samuel Bertron Magruder.
204. Jacob Heffner Towers.
205. James Henry King.
207. Horace Maynard Brown, Jr.
215. William Morris Hoge, Jr.
217. Robert Edward Lanigan.
219. Ralph Robinet Hetherington.
220. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr.
221. William Hunter Woodward.
225. Thomas Winston Curley.
229. Auburon Paul Hauser.
247. Robert Paul Johnson.
252. Thomas Abbott Hume.
254. Benjamin Berry Kercheval.
256. Paul Gray, Jr.
257. Max Price.
271. Charles Manly Busbee, Jr.
274. Wendell Pollitt Knowles.
278. Herbert Irving Stern.
287. Edwin Boynton Buttery.
289. Linton Sinclair Boatwright.
290. Joseph Tuck Brown.
309. Thomas Ward Maxwell.
316. Thomas Courtenay O'Connell.
317. Henry Durand Irwin.
321. James Henderson Dienelt.
324. Harry Niles Rising, Jr.
328. Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr.
332. Alexander Frank Muzyk.
333. John Ellis Rossell, Jr.
336. John Gavin Tyndall 2d.

Coast Artillery Corps

47. Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr.
58. Thomas Legate Fisher 2d.
61. Robert Merrill Tuttle.
70. Charles Dorsey Maynard.
71. Richard Bradford Polk.
77. Denis Blundell Grace.
79. James William Roy.
81. John William Burtchaell.
84. James William Stigers.
89. Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek.
93. John Rose Richards.
95. Charles Edwin Jones.
97. John Miles Henschke.
100. LeMoyne Francis Michels.
103. John Jay Easton.
107. David Gabriel Gauvreau.
109. Donald Leroy McMillan.
112. Malcolm Corwin Johnson.
119. Frank Pleasants Stainback, Jr.
120. John Gabriel Redmon.
132. Robert Stanley Reilly.
135. James Gerard Healy.
137. Curtis Francis Betts.
139. Floyd Sturdevan Cofer, Jr.
140. Willis Bruner Sawyer.
142. Joseph Hester Ward.
145. Marshall Warren Carney.
146. Frank Ely Locke.
151. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr.
158. Eric Thomas de Jonckheere.
160. William LeRoy Mitchell, Jr.
165. Leon Herman Berger.
166. George Lawrence Theisen.
167. John Benjamin Manley, Jr.
171. Edwin Watson Brown.
181. David Cooper.
189. Tom Depher Collison.
192. Arthur Lloyd Meyer.
194. Charles Gleeson Willes.
196. Matthew Clarence Harrison.
198. Miroslav Frank Moucha.
209. John Charles Linderman.
210. Robert William Horn.
211. Walter Leon Moore, Jr.
212. Windsor Temple Anderson.
213. Robert Putnam Detwiler.
216. Michael Frank Aliotta.
218. Willard Russell Gilbert.
232. Robert Evarts Clark.
233. Benjamin McCaffery, Jr.
238. James Edward McElroy.
246. Thomas Rees Cramer.
250. John Leonard Robinson.
263. James Raine Laney, Jr.
267. Howard Frank Adams.
268. Arnold Ray Thomas.
269. Gerald Anthony LaRocca.
270. Joseph Scott Peddie.
281. Frank Benton Howze.
282. William Faye Roton.
285. Samuel Wilson Parks.
288. Leon Arthur Briggs.
291. Ben Marshall West
292. Robert Willoughby Garrett.
302. Thomas Wilson Sharkey.
304. Charles Love Mullins.
305. Edwin Charles Kistel.
307. Alfred George Hayduk.
311. Paul Edgar Pigue.
312. Maynard George Moyer.
313. Charles Sumner Seamans 3d.
323. Wharton Clayton Cochran.
327. Walter Singles, Jr.
329. William Kneedler Cummins.
330. Gwynne Sutherland Curtis, Jr.
345. Benjamin Alvord Spiller.

347. Richards Abner Aldridge.
349. Edward Joseph McCrane, Jr.

Infantry

35. James William Strain.
49. Hume Peabody, Jr.
57. Mills Carson Hatfield.
78. Alexander Ramsey Nininger, Jr.
82. Wayne Edgar Rhynard.
102. George Winfield Stalnaker.
110. Glenn Alfred Lee.
116. Leroy Hugh Watson, Jr.
123. David Ernest Kunkel, Jr.
124. George Roopen Adjemian.
133. Clarence Lewis Elder.
152. Jonathan Edwards Adams, Jr.
153. Clifford Elbert Cole.
161. George William McIntyre.
169. George Hamilton Stillson, Jr.
179. John Norton.
180. Richard Van Pelt Travis.
186. Charles Joseph Canella.
191. Lyman Saunders Faulkner.
193. Lawrence Vivans Greene.
197. Paul von Santen Liles.
203. Andrew Julius Evans, Jr.
208. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene.
214. James Fuller McKinley, Jr.
222. Harley Truman Marsh, Jr.
226. George William Cooper.
230. William Graham Gillis, Jr.
231. Hill Bialock.
235. Maurice Guthrie Miller.
236. Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr.
237. Clyde Arnold Thompson.
245. Paul James O'Brien.
251. Arnold Jacob Hoebeke.
253. George Bibb Pickett, Jr.
259. Gibson Niles.
264. William Wallace Brier 4th.
265. Dick Stanley Von Schriltz.
266. Clinton Field Ball.
272. Rob Reed McNagny, Jr.
273. Jesse Duncan Thompson.
276. Peter Kirkbride Dilts.
277. William Thomas Gleason.
284. John Coles Barney, Jr.
286. Ira Boswell Cheaney, Jr.
294. William Augustus Purdy.
296. Victor Woodrow Campana.
298. Charles Robert Murrah.
299. William John Dooley Vaughan.
300. Paul Crawford Root, Jr.
301. Richard Mar Levy, Jr.
306. Irving Perkin.
314. James Richardson.
318. Nelson Paul Monson.
320. Thomas James Cleary, Jr.
325. James Daniel Fowler.
326. William Annesley Kromer.
331. John Raymond Sands, Jr.
335. Thomas Edwin Reagan.
337. Horace Grattan Foster, Jr.
338. Hector John Poli[illegible].
340. Donald Lyons Driscoll.
342. Ernest Franklin Poff.
343. George Scratchley Brown.
344. Robert Lloyd Cummings.
346. Mercer Presley Longino.
348. Riley Smith King.
350. Harwell Leon Adams.
351. David Burch Taggart.
352. Justus MacMullen Home.
353. Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr.
354. Hamilton King Avery, Jr.
356. Joseph Scranton Tate, Jr.
357. Robert Toombs Dixon.
358. Albert Samuel Dalby.
360. James Paul Forsyth.
361. Joseph John Weidner.
363. Howard Lawrence Feichlin.
364. Stanton Claude Hutson.
365. Martin Andrew Shadday.
366. Earl Vincent Brown.
367. Leslie Wilmer Bailey.
368. James Rayford Sykes.
371. Bradish Johnson Smith.
372. Harry Lee Jarvis, Jr.
373. William Gardner.
374. Bert Stanford Rosenbaum.
375. George Luther Hicks, 3d.
376. Stephen Kellogg Plume, Jr.
377. Sam Hardy Barrow.
378. Edison Kermit Walters.
379. Burton Curtis Andrus, Jr.
380. Maxwell Weston Sullivan, Jr.
382. Francis Joseph Troy.
383. Edgar Clayton Boggs.
384. Charles Fuller Matheson.
385. Bernard Schultz.
388. Edgar Thornton Poole, Jr.
389. Theodore Bernarr Celmer.
392. William John Hershenow, Jr.
393. Robert Harold Rosen.
395. Robert Bernard Keagy.
396. Francis Joseph Myers, Jr
397. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Jr.
399. Thomas Goldsborough Corbin.
400. Harry Canavan Harvey.
401. Alden George Thompson.
402. Clinton Earl Male.
405. John Wilson Callaway.
406. Roderic Dhu O'Connor.
407. Harry White Trimble.
408. Edgar Mathews Sliney.
410. George Hollenback Welles
411. Robert Gilman Loring.
412. William Thomas McDaniel.
413. Frank Holroyd Linnell.
415. Charles Edwin Thomas 3d.

Quartermaster Corps

9. Raymond Ira Schnittke.
66. Robert Walter Samz.
80. Norman Kitchener Coker.
87. Richard John Rastetter.
113. Walter James Woolwine, Jr.
121. Edward Joseph Geldermann.
134. Roger Stevens Neumeister.
144. Duward Lowery Crow.
148. Alpheus Wray White, Jr.
173. Roger Longstreet Lawson.
177. John Moore Christensen, Jr.
183. Malcolm Graham Troup.
228. Thomas Rodgers Lawson.
234. Henry Boswell, Jr.
242. Robert Huff Edger.
243. Robert Channing Borman.
249. Matthew Gordon Harper, Jr.
260. Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr.
261. Ralph Allen McCool.
275. Felix John Gerace.
283. Fred Milas Hampton.
295. William Harold Gurnee, Jr.
303. James Isaac Cox.
308. Walter Raleigh Mullane.
310. Ralph Earl Freese.
319. Carroll Freemont Danforth.
322. Peer de Silva.
334. Daniel Salinas.
339. John William Meador.
341. Paul Richard Kemp.
355. Angelo Augustine Laudani.
359. Truman Eugene Deyo.
362. John Breed Deane.
369. Thomas Martin Ward.
370. John Henry Zott, Jr.
386. Ralph Reed Upton.
387. James Wetherby Graham.
390. Peter Schuyler Tanous.
391. Robert Hendrick Brinson, Jr.
394. Junius Edward Dillard.
403. William Doyle Pratt.
404. Earl K. Buchanan.
409. James Lawrence Kaiser.
414. Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite Edgerton.
416. Lester Strode White.
417. Roy George Hendrickson.
418. Edward Benedict Zarembo.
419. John Vincent D'Esposito.
420. John Earl Atkinson.
421. Edwin Forrest Harding, Jr.
422. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr.
423. Kenneth Oswald Due.
424. Bruce Campbell Cator.
425. Earle Wayne Brown 2d.

Cadet Theodore Knox White, United States Military Academy, who is scheduled for graduation on June 12, 1941, to be second lieutenant of Quartermaster Corps with rank from June 12, 1941, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 24e, National Defense Act, as amended and in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 25, 1939. (Graduation No. 315.)

Cadet Harry Kendall Bagshaw, United States Military Academy, who is scheduled for graduation on June 30, 1941, to be second lieutenant of Quartermaster Corps with rank from June 30, 1941, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 24e, National Defense Act, as amended and in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 25, 1939. (Graduation No. 126.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM MAY 31, 1941

Lt. Col. Abraham Garfinkel, Philippine Scouts (colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Edward James Oliver, Infantry (colonel, Army of the United States).

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1941

Lt. Col. Frederic Waldo Whitney, Cavalry (colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Clifford Mitchell Tuteur, Field Artillery (colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Arthur Eugene Rowland, Coast Artillery Corps (colonel, Army of the United States), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Leon R. Cole, Field Artillery (colonel, Army of the United States).

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Thomas West Hammond, Jr., Infantry, with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Ray Olander Welch, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. William Charles Haneke, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. James Louis McGehee, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1938.

First Lt. Alexander James Stuart, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1937.

First Lt. Francis Joseph McMorrow, Coast Artillery Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1936.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Loren Boyd Hillsinger, Cavalry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

×Capt. Clarence Woodson Hardy, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 15, 1941.

×Capt. Robert Edward Lee, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 16, 1941.

×Capt. Robert Edwin Peyton, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 16, 1941.

×Capt. Harold Hanson Twitchell, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 17, 1941.

×Capt. Clement Franklin St. John, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 18, 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. John Austin Booth, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 3, 1941.

First Lt. Robert James Goldson, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 15, 1941.

First Lt. Robert Scurry Anderson, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 17, 1941.

First Lt. Arthur Thomas Jones, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 21, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Culmer Scamahorn, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 21, 1941.

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

×Capt. Eugene Edward Manning, Dental Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 2, 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. Calvin George Hagerman, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 17, 1941.

First Lt. Herbert Lester Gullickson, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 19, 1941.

First Lt. Lawrence Carlton Radford, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 24, 1941.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

×Capt. Harvie Russell Ellis, Veterinary Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 24, 1941.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Edward J. Driscoll, July 1, 1941.
William C. Neaf, September 1, 1941.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Fritz R. Jackson, July 10, 1941.
John A. Hammer, June 20, 1941.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James E. Mulcahy, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice John J. Kelly, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ganson Purcell to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Howard O. Hunter to be Commissioner of Work Projects, Work Projects Administration.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Elmer Parker Yates et al.

(NOTE.—For a full list of the names of the persons nominated to be second lieutenants, whose nominations were this day confirmed, see Senate proceedings of today under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name "Elmer Parker Yates" and ending with the name "Harry Kendall Bagshaw.")

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Claude L. Draper to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

W. Clark Cooper
David E. Price
Charles L. Williams, Jr.
William S. Hotchkiss
Harold J. Magnuson
Charles C. Shepard
Llewellyn E. Kling
James L. Baker
Richard K. Winston
Wayne W. Carpenter
William D. King
Jack C. Haldeman

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Ross T. Kemper, Arroyo Grande.
Thomas A. Gianella, Marysville.
Fred R. Carpenter, Middletown.
Nellie A. Britten, Three Rivers.
Maude A. Northey, Williams.

IOWA

George H. Abernathy, Blakesburg.
Ralph M. Griesy, Keystone.
Norvil B. Richards, New Sharon.
Wayne O. Thomas, Rake.
Elizabeth L. Fisher, Spencer.
John N Lichty, Toledo.
George W. Montag, West Bend.

KANSAS

Edith Lawson Gray, Alden.
Charles E. Hanlon, Caney.
Elnathan B. Gray, Jewell.
George W. Ryan, Lincoln.
Vernon T. Hill, Logan.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Bellew, Mansfield.
John E. Higgiston, Milford.
Kathryn C. Smith, Petersham.
Leah D. Burke, West Falmouth.

MICHIGAN

Fred Clair McOmber, Allegan.
William J. Schindehette, Bay City.
John D. Campbell, Douglas.
Clarence S. Goodrich, Elsie.
Edward J. Weipert, Ida.
Christopher C. Lerg, Lake City.
Frank M. Gierke, Sr., Manistique.
Harrison D. Sweet, Marcellus.
Marguerite M. Ryan, Mattawan.
Ethel A. Hruska, Nahma.
Mark B. Hawes, Parma.
Carl S. Schmid, Jr., Petersburg.
Fred B. Wadsworth, Pittsford.
Charles A. Vogelheim, Rogers City.
Regina K. Bresnahan, Roscommon.
Edgar L. Erskin, Vestaburg.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fred A. Sommars, Carrington.
Earl T. Atha, Linton.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

John S. McCain
Randall Jacobs
Richard S Edwards

To be captains

Charles D. Swain
Edwin T. Short
William A. Teasley
Charles F. Martin
Allan W. Ashbrook
Benjamin S. Killmaster
Robert A. Dyer, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Clifton M. Hocker
William Gregg

To be medical directors

Thomas A. Fortescue
Louis H. Roddis
Robert L. Nattkemper
Alma C. Smith

To be passed assistant dental surgeon

Aloysius C. Grosspietsch

To be pay inspectors

Charles E. Sandgren
James E. Sanner
Cyrus D. Bishop
Russell D. Calkins
Hugh A. Phares
Ellsworth F. Sparks
Charles Schaaf
Charles E. Leavitt
Samuel E. McCarty
Melbourne N. Gilbert

To be passed assistant paymasters

Hugie L. Foote, Jr.
Donald W. Twigg

To be lieutenants

Enrique D. Haskins
Theodore R. Vogeley
James H. Campbell
Charles L. Moore, Jr.
Dale Mayberry

To be captains

William A. Heard
Charlie P. McFeaters
Elroy L. Vanderkloot
Alexander R. Early
John R. Palmer
Donald Royce
Alfred H. Balsley
William E. Malloy
Wilder DuP. Baker

To be pay inspectors

Roark Montgomery
Paul K. Coons
John Ball

To be commanders

Gordon B. Parks
Stuart H. Ingersoll

To be a lieutenant

Clinton J. Heath

To be a paymaster

Norman A. Helfrich

To be captains

Albert H. Rooks
Charles E. Rosendahl
John G. Moyer
Richard L. Conolly
William A. Corn
John B. W. Waller
William I. Causey
Roy Dudley
Herbert K. Fenn
Henry M. Briggs
Paul Cassard
William W. Meek

To be lieutenant commanders

William C. Sprenger
Henry C. Bruton
William R. Smedberg 3d
John H. Simpson
Roy A. Gano
Edward L. B. Weimer
Fondville L. Tedder
Robert G. Armstrong
Joseph H. Willingham, Jr.

To be a paymaster

William A. Gerth

To be a lieutenant

Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Paul L. Dudley
Eugene S. Karpe
Olin P. Thomas, Jr.
Charles J. Whiting
Harold J. Pohl

To be a paymaster

Mark W. Clay

To be passed assistant paymasters

Leland P. Kimball, Jr.
Lamar Lee, Jr.

MARINE CORPS

To be a lieutenant colonel

William F. Brown

To be majors

Peter P. Schrider
Robert H. Rhoads
Frank M. June

To be first lieutenants

John A. Saxten
Robert W. Shaw
Carlo A. Rovetta
Alfred L. Booth
Dorrance S. Radcliffe
Charles M. DeHority
Howard B. Benge
William P. Spencer
Richard B. Church
Nathan T. Post, Jr.
Alton D. Gould
John S. MacLaughlin, Jr.
Randolph C. Berkeley, Jr.

To be second lieutenants

William P. Pala, of Pennsylvania
Harold R. Thorpe, of California
Robert A. Churley, of California

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, life of our life and soul of our soul, persuade us with the profound assurance that the best life is that which is a venture made with Thee. When there goes out of our lives a sense of Thy nearness and awareness, we become inadequate and weak to face the fierce dilemmas of this world. May we lay hold of this truth and hide it away in our hearts, keeping the power of our moral resistence unbroken. O Thou Giver of life, as our lives are so often misused and contradictory, teach us that our love and faith are to be judged by that which we are willing to sacrifice and suffer. Thou in whose all-loving embrace we dwell and in whom all our longings, hopes, and aspirations spring, grant that these sacred moments, at the altar of prayer, may prepare us for our labors with unfaltering faith in an unfailing God. Heavenly Father, we are saddened and touched by the sudden death of a Member, devoted and zealous in the public service. Comfort, we pray Thee, the sorrowing ones and give them peace. "Cold in the dust the perished heart may lie, but that which warmed it once can never die." Blessed truth which bridges the gulf and makes the continuity of life an enduring reality. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 3, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Charles E. Allison;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Herman E. Schorr;

H. R. 1771. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2426. An act for the relief of H. B. Wilson;

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Charles R. Woods;

H. R. 2828. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa., and to authorize its construction by the Dauphin County (Pa.) Authority;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Marijo McMillan Williams;

H. R. 4305. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the diamond anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Columbus, Ohio, September 14 to 19, inclusive, 1941; and

H. R. 4368. An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy.

STRIKES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a letter by Ralph S. Ruth, which is self-explanatory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4816, the so-called petroleum pipe-line bill, that general debate be confined to the bill, and not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders fixed for today I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Col. Phillip Matthews, State administrator of the Federal Work Projects Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

SKILLED LABOR IN INDUSTRY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter addressed by me to the Mayor of New York and also an editorial from the Home News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1300) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think the gentleman from Florida should explain the bill. It is an important bill. I know of no objection to it, but I think the gentleman should take a little time to explain the bill.

Mr. SIKES. I will be very happy to make an explanation.

Four groups are interested in this bill. It is not a major bill, but affected by it to some extent are the farmers, principally of the Northwest, who produce seed for soil-building crops; the farmers of the South and East, who use those seeds and other soil-building materials; the tradesmen who ordinarily distribute those products; and the United States Department of Agriculture, under whose general supervision soil-conserving and soil-building practices are carried on. All of these groups have expressed a favorable interest in the passage of S. 1300.

The title of the bill is not a very good indication of the actual content or purpose of the measure. It is entitled "An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services."

S. 1300 is intended simply to route the trade in seed and other materials used in the soil-conservation program back through the tradesmen. The bill provides means by which the distribution

of these products may be conducted through established channels of commerce. It will provide farmers who are participating in the agricultural conservation program of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration with credit for the purchase of seeds and other materials necessary for compliance. In my opinion, the measure will aid in the orderly marketing of seeds through established channels of commerce and encourage and increase domestic production of certain products important in the program.

At present these materials are distributed largely through the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Lacking the legislative authority provided by this bill, great volumes of seed and other soil-building materials of necessity have to be purchased, distributed, and sold by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in direct competition with established business channels. This diverting of trade from business to Government channels has been caused by the farmers' financial problems, which made it difficult and sometimes impossible for him to obtain money for his purchases, and similarly difficult for tradesmen to finance long-time supply operations. S. 1300 permits, through a simple extension of credit, the means by which private industry can provide the necessary materials used in compliance with the conservation program. It does not place any burden on farmer compliers. In operation, as I understand the proposed program, the farmer will be given orders for the materials he needs in the soil-building program. He may take his order to any merchant who can supply his needs.

May I point out that the bill is not mandatory? It is permissive legislation. It is not in any sense a price-fixing measure, but, on the contrary, it redirects the products named back into the competitive channels of commerce, where service, supply, and demand have free play. Certainly, Government has not shown the ability to function in business channels more economically than business itself. Lower prices—not higher prices—to the farmer should result from its passage.

All in all, the bill has as its primary function the restoration to legitimate businessmen of the trade in this specific field, which now goes through Government channels. It represents a harmonious approach by all interested groups, by which they seek a solution to a stated problem.

I confidently believe S. 1300 is a safe solution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MURRAY. Really, then, the two things you are accomplishing are, first, you are going to make arrangements so that the Government goes out of business instead of getting into business; you are going to let the fertilizer and seed people handle that end of the business?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. They can get an advance on their checks, so that they can finance themselves?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Then the other part of the legislation, which I do not think was brought out clearly, if the gentleman will pardon my saying that, is that with this legislation the farmers are able to get hold of these fertilizers that are necessary to carry out their soil-building practices, because they can finance themselves in this way, whereas they cannot at the present time, in many instances?

Mr. SIKES. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming, and other soil-conditioning materials, trees, or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers at not to exceed a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "any."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AUTHORITY

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Act approved February 11, 1937 (U. S. C., 1934 edition, Supplement V, title 15, section 605k–1), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "in the years 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940" and inserting in lieu thereof "occurring during the period between January 1, 1936, and January 22, 1947".

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act approved March 31, 1936 (49 Stat. 1186), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 22, 1947".

"SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except as provided in section 4 (a) of the Public Debt Act of 1941".

"(b) Section 10 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but also with respect to (1) the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, and any other corporation heretofore or hereafter organized or created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 5d of this Act, as amended, to aid the Government of the United States in its national-defense program, (2) The RFC Mortgage Company, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and any other public corporation heretofore or hereafter organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and (3) the Disaster Loan Corporation, and any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to the loans made, and personal property owned, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by any corporation referred to in clause (1), (2) or (3) of the preceding sentence, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes."

"SEC. 4. (a) The fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (3) thereof the following new subsection:

"'(4) When requested by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and subject to such conditions and limitations as may be set forth in such request, to make loans, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to any foreign governments, to their central banks, or to any person, commission, association, corporation, or bank acting for or on behalf of such government, for the purpose of achieving the maximum dollar exchange value in the

United States for the securities or property of any such government, central bank, person, commission, association, corporation, or bank. Such loans may be made only upon the security of bonds, debentures, stocks or other such obligations of (a) the Government of the United States or any State, municipality, or political subdivision of any State, or (b) any private corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State.'

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (3) of such fourth paragraph is hereby amended to comprise four sentences to read as follows:

"'(3) When requested by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, to create or organize, at any time prior to July 1, 1943, a corporation or corporations, with power (a) to produce, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials as defined by the President; (b) to purchase and lease land, purchase, lease, build, and expand plants, and purchase and produce equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, and supplies for the manufacture of strategic and critical materials, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, any other articles, equipment, facilities, and supplies necessary to the national defense, and such other articles, equipment, supplies, and materials as may be required in the manufacture or use of any of the foregoing or otherwise necessary in connection therewith; (c) to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such land, plants, facilities, and machinery to others to engage in such manufacture; (d) to engage in such manufacture itself, if the President finds that it is necessary for a Government agency to engage in such manufacture; (e) to produce, lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire railroad equipment (including rolling stock), and commercial aircraft, and parts, equipment, facilities, and supplies necessary in connection with such railroad equipment and aircraft, and to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the same; (f) to purchase, lease, build, expand, or otherwise acquire facilities for the training of aviators and to operate or lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such facilities to others to engage in such training; and (g) to take such other action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator may deem necessary to expedite the national-defense program, but the aggregate amount of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which may be outstanding at any one time for carrying out this clause (g) shall not exceed $200,000,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Corporation to take any action, directly or indirectly, with respect to the proposals heretofore considered by the Congress and known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, Passamaquoddy, Florida ship canal, and Tombigbee River projects, or to the project known as the Nicaragua Canal. The powers of every corporation hereafter created or organized under this subsection shall be set out in a charter which shall be valid only when certified copies thereof are filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and published in the Federal Register, and all amendments to such charters shall be valid only when similarly filed and published. The charters of corporations heretofore so created or organized shall be so filed and published before July 1, 1941, and amendments thereto shall be valid only when certified copies thereof are hereafter so filed and published. No corporation heretofore or hereafter created or organized by the Corporation pursuant to this subsection shall have succession beyond January 22, 1947, except for purposes of liquidation, unless the life of such corporation is extended beyond such date pursuant to an Act of Congress.'

"SEC. 5. The amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by $1,500,000,000."

And the House agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill and the House amendment were substantially the same except in the following respects:

(1) The House amendment contained a provision that the exemptions from taxation applicable to personal property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or of any corporation created or organized by it, should not apply in any State to buildings or structures which by the laws of such State were considered as personal property for taxation purposes. There was no corresponding provision in the Senate bill. The conference agreement retains the House provision except that it is limited to "buildings" instead of "buildings or structures."

(2) Under the Senate bill and the House amendment certain powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in connection with the national-defense program were enumerated. This was followed by a general clause authorizing the Corporation to take such other action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator might deem necessary to expedite such program. In the Senate bill there was a limitation of $300,000,000 on the amount that might be outstanding at any one time for carrying out this general clause, and there was also a specific provision prohibiting the Corporation from taking any action, directly or indirectly, with respect to any project which the Congress had considered and rejected since January 1, 1926. The House amendment eliminated this specific provision, but reduced the amount from $300,000,000 to $100,000,000 for carrying out such general clause. The conference agreement fixes the amount at $200,000,000 and adds a proviso which would prohibit the Corporation from taking any action, directly or indirectly, with respect to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, Passamaquoddy, Florida Ship Canal, and Tombigbee River projects, or to the project known as the Nicaragua Canal.

The conference agreement makes certain clarifying amendments in the provisions relating to the filing of charters of the corporations created or organized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is far from satisfactory from the standpoint of desirable legislation. It still does not remove all of the objectionable features which were called to the attention of the House at the time of the passage of the bill, but I do believe we have placed some restrictions in it with reference to the use of these funds, especially in connection with the projects which I believe should be directly passed upon by the Congress before they are approved.

The bill as it left the House provided for the creation of these corporations without any limitation whatsoever upon their authority so long as the President found that their activity was in connection with the defense program. The Senate previously had provided that none of the moneys made available under the bill would be used to construct any project which had been rejected by the Congress since 1926. The compromise which the conferees agreed upon was to list certain of the projects which could not be constructed by the creation of a corporation and the subscription to the capital of those corporations by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There was written into the bill in conference a prohibition against the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, the Passamaquoddy project, the Florida ship canal, the Tombigbee River project, all of which have been passed upon at different times by the Congress either in the form of bills or treaties, and we added to that the Nicaragua canal. We did not pass upon the merits of those projects because we felt that if they were to be constructed, the Congress should reserve its jurisdiction to consider the projects before any work was done upon them.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This language in the conference report, then, eliminates the charge that the passage of one of these measures, the St. Lawrence seaway or the Tombigbee inland waterway, would require the expenditure of money immediately? In other words, if those measures were passed later, they would be merely authorizations, and additional legislation would have to be passed to provide funds? Is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct, according to my understanding, that no action can be taken under the authority contained in this act to start these projects without definite action being taken by the Congress with respect to each of them.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. These projects are all pending, with the exception of the Nicaragua canal, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member; but the legislation now being considered by that committee merely provides for an authorization. This would answer the charge that if that were passed money would be expended immediately without further consideration of Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Unless the rivers and harbors bill to which the gentleman has referred made a specific reference to this act and amended this act to authorize the use of these funds or to create a corporation under this act, I doubt whether it could be done under the bill referred to. There would have to be a separate appropriation in consequence of the authorization the gentleman's committee might report out.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. The fact is that the officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, also the Administrator under whose control and administration these corporations will be, stated positively that there was not the slightest thought on their part to expend any of the funds authorized under the general provisions of this bill in any manner toward the development of any of the five projects named—Passamaquoddy, St. Lawrence waterway, the Florida ship canal, the Nicaragua canal, or the Tombigbee River project.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman will yield further, this merely states that it does not pass on those projects one way or the other, but merely provides that these funds may not be used for that purpose in the absence of further legislation on that particular point.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct according to my understanding.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to be responsible for the kind of corporation they might set up?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The President and the Federal Loan Administrator. They can set up any kind of corporation they want, to do anything that may enter their heads except construct these projects.

Mr. RICH. Look at the corporations this administration already has set up. I think with the passage of this bill, allowing the setting up of any kind of corporation to do anything, certainly we are fast becoming communistic.

Mr WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I made the statement when this bill was being considered in the House that it authorized the President if he saw fit to do so to set up a Fascist state in America; and so far as my understanding of the bill is concerned it has not been changed in any of those particulars. The majority passed upon the bill at that time, however, and the objective of the conferees on the part of the House, as is usual, was to protect the House bill. The bill as it is reported from the conference committee carries limitations that remove some of the objections, but not the principal objection we had at that time.

We on our part have called attention to the fact that it is possible under this bill to destroy the American form of government. This bill must be read in connection with other recommendations of the President in respect to the condemnation of private and real property of whatever nature, tangible, and intangible.

This bill read in the light of those further recommendations must make very plain to the Congress what it is doing by these progressive steps which may result in the destruction of the American form of government. We made our fight on the bill, we made our record. At least 116 of us have declared by our opposition to the bill that we are in favor of the perpetuation of the American form of government. The responsibility is on the majority Members of Congress. They have voted to give the President this power. If their conscience is clear in that respect, I am sure they have done their duty as they saw it, and it is their responsibility, not ours. Those of us who saw fit to protect the American form of government say the bill has been passed by the House, it has been passed by the Senate. It comes back to us for final action, and the only question involved is whether or not we shall accept the amendments agreed upon by the conference committee. I believe the amendments tie up the bill a little tighter than it was when it left the House, especially in respect to these projects which I have named.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We have so many bills brought into Congress which aim to do what can be done under this bill, namely, destroy, as the gentleman says, our system of free enterprise. Does it not appear that there is a definite purpose, a definite plan on the part of the powers that be to destroy our system of enterprise and our form of government?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If they ask for this authority, it is, of course, reasonable to presume they are going to make use of it, and might make use of it to the prejudice of the American way of life. It is my understanding they want the power for that purpose. They have been very cagey in telling us what they want to do under the authority delegated to them. Whether they ever use the power or not, it seems to me not in keeping with at least my interpretation of the American form of government to delegate this power to any individual, whether he ever uses it or not.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Instead of granting this blanket power if the President or anybody else wanted certain legislation passed and came to Congress and made specific the thing they wanted to do, then the Members of Congress would assume the responsibility of giving that particular authority to the President or whomever he might designate; but to pass a bill such as this giving blanket authority and delegating away all the power the Congress should exercise is entirely wrong.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That argument was well applied to the passage of the bill when it was before the House last week, and that is what we tried to impress upon the Members of the House, namely, the dangers of this bill as it passed the House. They have not been removed. However, the House has passed on that, and it is not before the House at this time. The question is whether these amendments shall be voted up or down.

I believe the conference report should be adopted because it at least limits the authority contained in the bill as it passed the House the other day. The only other point that might be of interest is that we make available $200,000,000 for the capital of these corporations established under subsection (g) instead of the $100,000,000 voted by the House. This amount is a compromise between the $300,000,000 voted by the Senate and the $100,000,000 voted by the House. As we know, all legislation is the result of compromise. Personally I will not object to it, although I think $200,000,000 is too much to finance this authority.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to discuss the provisions of this bill. The debate in the House when the bill was under consideration covered the substance of the bill. There are specific authorizations enumerated in the bill, providing for various activities that may be undertaken in aiding the program on national defense. The bill, as passed by the Senate, provides a general authorization under which $300,000,000 would be available for use. The House reduced this to $100,000,000. The conferees agreed upon $200,000,000. The conference agreement adds a proviso which would prohibit the Corporation from taking any action, directly or indirectly, with respect to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, Passamaquoddy, Florida ship canal, and Tombigbee projects, or to the project known as the Nicaragua canal. There is no substantial change in the bill as passed by the House except in these two instances. The minority members of the conference were heartily in accord with the changes that were made.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When you give this $200,000,000 in the conference report for the purpose of setting up corporations, then when we will have a tax bill coming in here very shortly which is going to tax the corporations of this country almost to the death, and we set up corporations in competition with them, how are they going to survive, and again, where are you going get the $200,000,000 to put up for these fellows to pay for their own death knell? It seems to me that this is as inconsistent as any legislation that has ever come before Congress.

Mr. STEAGALL. We are going to use this money entirely for defense purposes to supplement the service that can be

rendered by existing private institutions. The money is going to be raised by expanding the borrowing powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency of the Government which was established under the administration of President Hoover.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—1942

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 741), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWERS reserved all points of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD concerning the junior Senator from Texas, the Honorable ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, and to insert in connection therewith his biography in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also the speech of Gov. W. Lee O'Daniel when Senator HOUSTON was appointed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1942

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reference to Senate amendment No. 42, known as the Jones amendment, will the gentleman advise us if the conferees on the part of the House will not agree to this being eliminated until the matter is brought back to the House for a separate vote?

Mr. RABAUT. I assure the gentleman I will not agree to that until it is brought back to the House for further consideration.

Mr. JONES. Will the other conferees agree to that, also?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in this connection, may I say that on April 4, 1941, because of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] that was passed by the House, I addressed my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] as follows, and, as I stated, this letter is dated April 4:

APRIL 4, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN DIES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday the House, while making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year 1942, inserted an amendment in the bill the effect of which is to make available $100,000 of the funds appropriated to the Federal Bureau of Investigation "exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government, who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress."

It has come to my attention that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has not the list of Government employees compiled by your Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities who are members of subversive organizations or who advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government.

May I respectfully request, therefore, in order that the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be properly informed of the findings of your committee in the matter of these individuals, that your committee make available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the list to which reference is made?

Cordially yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary.

Under date of April 7 I received the following reply:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 4, 1941, addressed to Congressman DIES.

Please be advised that Mr. DIES is out of town at the present time. However, I shall be glad to bring your letter to his attention upon his return to the city.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. STRIPLING,
Secretary.

A telephone call today to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made as late as an hour ago, revealed that up to the present time the F. B. I. has not received the list to which reference was made in the letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, KERR, HARE, HOUSTON, BEAM, HARRINGTON, CARTER, STEFAN, and JONES.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain newspaper comments and a resolution I am introducing in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

UNIFIED AIR DEFENSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington News of June 4 on the subject of a separate air force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Charles C. Littlefield, mayor of Haworth, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE KINGSBURY ORDNANCE PLANT

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCHULTE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. CRAWFORD asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

LABOR AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, with the reporting of the $10,000,000,000 Army supply bill for next year, we are going to take up on the floor of the House

the big question before the country, the labor question. Twenty thousand loggers are striking today in Washington State. There are strikes all over this country. There is the feeling everywhere that the President is not going to do anything about them, and I say there is a feeling that the majority Members of this House are not going to do anything about the Vinson bill or any bill to curb strikes. While I am not in sympathy with the foreign policy of the administration, I am for unity for defense. I feel unless there is a change that this Nation is due to whip itself before it starts to whip anybody else. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEFENSE-BOND PROGRAM

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Treasury Department that in the first 24 days of May there were sold $347,861,000 worth of the so-called defense baby bonds, savings certificates, and so forth, and that the Secretary of the Treasury will take the air tonight to explain what has happened in this program during the first month, beginning May 1. I suggest that all Members of the House listen to this broadcast tonight and then study, in connection therewith, the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury of January 29, 1941, and of April 24; also the statements of Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department, of May 7; of Mr. Graves, of the Treasury Department, of May 5; of Mr. Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, of May 1; and a release issued by the Department of Commerce under date of March 26.

In my opinion, these sales are not running 25 percent as much as the program will eventually call for, and I believe this is something for the country to be concerned about. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HALLECK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement on the N. Y. A. activities in Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the President of the United States and an editorial from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the president of the Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union on defense and strikes in defense industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on inflation by Chester Rowell, appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle of May 31, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we hear every day something about the strikes that are going on against national defense. We hear about the Department of Labor and Madam Perkins doing nothing about them. We have a Committee on Labor in the House that does nothing. The President has the power to do something, but he also does nothing, and the Congress sits here on a sit-down strike and does nothing. It seems to me we will find ourselves in the same position that France found herself in when we need national defense to protect ourselves against all enemies. I implore the majority side of the House to do something, and to do it now before it is too late. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, our people are not afraid of Hitler or anything he can do, but they are afraid, if my mail is any indication, of what may happen here in our own country.

They are afraid of the abdication of Congress and of the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and of our failure to curb subversive groups. Your attention has been called this morning to these strikes which prevail throughout the country, but the people no longer are finding fault with the President or the administration. They do not hope for anything from the administration. They are looking to the Congress. My mail, let me repeat, indicates it is about time that Congress does something. You may say we talk about it, but we do nothing.

This morning I introduced a bill amending the N. L. R. B. Act and by that amendment I provide that any organization which fails to comply with the directions or the requests of the President's Mediation Board be deprived of the benefits extended by that act. This does not prohibit strikes, it does not prohibit a man quitting his job, but it does provide that if a man refuses to go along or an organization refuses to go along with this national-defense program for which we have appropriated so many billions of dollars, then that man, that organization, shall lose the benefits which we have given him through the N. L. R. A. Now, why not pass it? [Applause.]

THE GREAT BASEBALL GAME

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make the announcement that Mr. B. M. Baruch, one of our outstanding citizens, former head of the War Industries Board, and now contributing his time and great experience to promoting our defense, has contributed $100 for tickets for the House employees, and for the page boys of the House and the Senate, to attend the great baseball game on Saturday next. If any of the employees want tickets, they should come to my office.

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAYS PROJECT (H. DOC. NO. 245)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend authorization of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, pursuant to the agreement of March 19, 1941, with Canada, as an integral part of the joint defense of the North American Continent.

Production and more production is the keynote of our all-out race for national defense. Electric power and transportation are limiting factors in the production of planes, guns, tanks, and ships.

The enemies of democracy are developing every hydroelectric resource and every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles. Are we to allow this continent to be outmatched because short-sighted interests oppose the development of one of our greatest resources?

Your action on this project will either make available or withhold 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost electric power for the joint defense of North America.

Your action on this project will either open or keep bottled up one of the greatest transportation resources ever offered a people.

Both countries need the power. Both face power shortages which threaten to grow more serious as the demands of the defense program multiply with almost incredible rapidity.

Let us remember that it takes tens of thousands of kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce the materials that go into a single airplane. Our present aluminum program alone calls for more than 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. It is constantly expanding with the need for more planes to outstrip the aggressors.

Steam power-plant construction offers no substitute for St. Lawrence power. No steam plants can provide the large blocks of low-cost electric energy required for certain essential defense industries. Furthermore, we are going to need all our capacity to produce steam power-plant equipment to meet the tremendous demands which are growing in other parts of the country and to build power installations to drive our merchant and naval vessels.

Our defense production is a gigantic assembly line. Transportation is its conveyor belt. If raw materials cannot flow freely to our great industrial plants and the products cannot move continuously to the front, defense breaks down. Bottlenecks in transportation are as serious as shortages of power.

Expanding production is going to burden the railroads to the limit. We are expanding their rolling stock as fast as we can, but even the present orders for new cars and locomotives are competing for manufacturing capacity which could otherwise produce tanks and other items of heavy armament.

The seaway will help prevent transportation bottlenecks. It will provide a great highway to and from important defense production areas. It will cut by more than a thousand miles the stretch of dangerous open water which must be traveled by supplies to Great Britain and strategic North Atlantic bases. It will increase our capacity to build ships.

The Great Lakes today hold many shipways and drydocks, as well as resources of men and materials for shipbuilding. They are bottled up because we have delayed completing the seaway. If we start the seaway now, scores of additional merchant ships may be built in coastal yards freed by transferring a portion of the longer-term naval program to the Great Lakes.

The St. Lawrence project must be expedited. No comparable power, shipbuilding, and transportation facilities can be made available in the time required to construct this project.

In dealing with the present emergency too many people have underestimated the degree to which our resources will be taxed. We cannot afford to make any more mistakes of that kind.

I am advised that we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time. I should like to agree with the people who say that the country's danger will be over sooner than that. But the course of world events gives no such assurance; and we have no right to take chances with the national safety.

I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war. Its authorization will demonstrate to the enemies of democracy that, however long the effort, we intend to outstrip them in the race of production. In the modern world that race determines the rise and fall of nations.

I hope that authorization will not be delayed.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 5, 1941.*

PRODUCTION AND MORE PRODUCTION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, much is being said continually about the delays which have taken place in regard to our national-defense efforts. The message which we have just listened to from the President of the United States indicates, of course, that production and more production must be the policy of our Government and the policy of the country in general.

I hope that the country and the Congress understand the significance of the last statement of a memorandum which I received from the Solicitor of the Department of Labor on May 9 of this year. I again read, as I have heretofore read that statement, and, of course, call upon the authorities of our Government to do something about these delays, and to do it quickly. The concluding thought to which I have reference in the memorandum by Gerard D. Reilly, who is the Solicitor of the Labor Department, states:

> And, finally, for the occasional situation in which both prevention and impartial mediation are unsuccessful, the Government has authority to step in and act directly to assure resumption of production or an adequate alternative source of supply.
>
> GERARD D. REILLY,
> *Solicitor of Labor.*

That statement was made prior to the declaration of the unlimited emergency. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened with a great deal of interest to the message of the President of the United States in respect to the St. Lawrence waterway. I do not want to comment at this time upon the advisability of constructing that project, but I do call attention to the fact that we are asked to construct that project now as a national-defense measure. I think the President has gone pretty far when he claims that he can justify the construction of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project upon the ground of national defense. He states that it will take 4 years to complete the project. If so, it will be at least 6 years before there will be any production or benefits as a result of it. I think this matter should be presented to the Congress upon its merits, and should not be passed in consequence of any hysteria which we are undergoing at the present time with respect to the national defense. [Applause.]

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4926, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> PAR. 15. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 63, line 8, strike out all of lines 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered undertakes to strike from the bill a limitation which would prevent the use of these funds to pay civil-service employees. When the bill came before the House a year ago last March for the current fiscal year, my colleague from Georgia, the Chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. TARVER] opposed a similar amendment, and in the course of his argument he used the following language:

> * * * if the Ramspeck bill passes the Senate and is approved by the President after the passage of this appropriation bill, the Ramspeck bill, whatever its provisions may be, will take precedence over the provisions of this bill; and if, when this bill reaches the Senate and is ready for action by the Senate, the Ramspeck bill shall have already been enacted into law, which I do not anticipate will be the case, because I think this bill will undoubtedly pass first, yet the Senate should, and undoutedly would, take action to remove from this bill any provisions which might be in conflict with the Ramspeck bill.

So I see no possibility of the situation arising on account of which my colleague is concerned. If his bill is enacted into law after the enactment of the pending bill, it will certainly repeal any conflicting provisions of the pending bill; and if it is enacted into law before the enactment of the pending bill, then certainly the Senate will take out of the bill any provision which might be in conflict with it.

What my colleague predicted happened. The Senate passed the Ramspeck bill after the appropriation bill had passed and therefore the terms of that bill repealed the prohibition against civil service for employees of the National Youth Administration.

Under the terms of the Ramspeck bill the President on April 23 of this year issued an Executive order which will bring the employees of the National Youth Administration under the Civil Service Act as of July 1 this year. At least, the positions will come under, and all future vacancies will be filled in accordance with, civil-service procedure.

The employees themselves will be permitted to qualify by noncompetitive examinations on or after January 1, 1942. If the section known as paragraph 15 of this bill is enacted into law it will discriminate against the employees of the National Youth Administration. It will bar them from the provisions of the President's Executive order and it will bar them from civil service. It will throw open to patronage again the positions in the National Youth Administration. It will be the only agency, with the exception of the W. P. A. and the Tennessee Valley Authority, which will be barred from civil service and will constitute a gross discrimination against those employees and will subject the National Youth Administration to all of the combined pressure of those who seek patronage and will disrupt the operation of this splendid agency.

I think it would be a tragic mistake for this Congress, and certainly a mistake on the part of those who voted for the Ramspeck bill, to permit this exemption from civil service to be written into this appropriation bill. I hope the House will see fit to adopt this amendment and let the President's Executive order become effective as to bringing under civil service the National Youth Administration.

I think this agency is doing a splendid work. It is dealing with an educational problem, a problem which concerns national defense at this time, and we ought not to make it a football of politics any more than we would the War or the Navy Departments.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman's amendment prevails it will have nothing to do with the future set-up of the National Youth Administration? It only applies to the employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. And if at some future date the Congress refuses to appropriate money for the National Youth Administration, no harm has been done?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct. The bringing of these positions under civil service does not give any added life to the National Youth Administration. If, in the wisdom of Congress, at some future time they decide no longer to appropriate money for the National Youth Administration, these employees, regardless of the fact that they are brought under civil service will be out of employment. It is true, of course, that bringing them under civil service will give them the privilege of reinstatement if they can find positions in the Government service, but it does not give them any further tenure of office than they would have outside of civil service, and it does not in any way affect the life of the agency involved here.

It seems to me that we ought not now, by the action of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, concurred in by the Committee of the Whole, upset and disrupt a program which the House adopted on a roll-call vote in the passage of what is now known as Public, No. 880, the civil-service extension bill. As a matter of fact, I am surprised that this subcommittee has brought in this provision, after the language which I quoted from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], was delivered on the floor of this House last year, indicating to me at least that the subcommittee would go along with the action of the Congress in its consideration of Public, 880, generally referred to as the Ramspeck bill.

I hope the members of the committee will support this amendment and let this agency take its place along with the others under civil service. It is going to make a bad administrative problem to have these employees outside and other employees inside the Government service, under civil-service procedure. It means that qualified persons in this agency will be unable to transfer to other agencies where their services might be valuable to the Government where they might establish a career service for themselves. We have many fine people in the National Youth Administration and I do not think they should be discriminated against and their opportunities for careers in the Government service circumscribed by stopping the operation of the President's Executive order under the terms of the Ramspeck bill, as is proposed by this section of the pending appropriation bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, making 10 minutes in all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I, as, of course, are all my colleagues from Georgia, am very proud of the service which our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has performed in the interest of civil service—more, certainly, than any other Member of Congress has rendered in many years—and rendered in an intelligent and capable manner. I sometimes think, however, that my colleague becomes too enthusiastic in his efforts to have everybody connected with the Government in any capacity become a civil-service employee. I think this is one instance where his enthusiasm, although based undoubtedly upon the most sincere and conscientious reasons, ought not to be endorsed by the Committee of the Whole through the adoption of this amendment. What was said in debate last year was, of course, entirely true. The effect of the Ramspeck Act was to repeal the provision which was carried in last year's bill. Certainly there is now in prospect the covering of an undetermined number of National Youth Administration employees into the civil service.

I am not an expert on civil-service legislation, as is my colleague, but I have studied the Ramspeck Act and also the Executive order which was issued thereunder, and our subcommittee has developed evidence with reference to the effect of the act and the Executive order. I feel that if the information developed by the hearings is to be accepted at full face value there is a possibility even that enrollees in the National Youth Administration work might be covered into civil service. They are employees of the Government. Why should they be excluded? There is a possibility that these 800,000 young people might, under some possible construction of the Executive order and action of the Civil Service Commission, be taken in as civil-service employees of the Government.

Surely, however, the possibility of such a construction of the act and Executive order is remote; but I want to read to you from the hearings how the Executive order and the law is construed by Mr. Williams, the head of the National Youth Administration. On page 253, part II, of the hearings this colloquy took place between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and Mr. Williams:

Mr. KEEFE. How far does the blanketing order go, Mr. Williams, in your organization?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have the right to recommend the positions that will be excluded. What the civil service will do with our proposal we do not know. They make the final decision as to what positions go under the act. They might include everyody except myself. They might agree to include fewer than that. They might agree to leave out heads of divisions in Washington or the field representatives or State administrators.

So it appears, according to the construction given the law and the Executive order by the head of the National Youth Administration, that certainly the Congress is not advised as to just what and how many positions may be included in civil service in the further consideration of this matter. There are 2,276 employees of the National Youth Administration. If the law and the Executive order go any further than to provide for their being covered into the civil service upon the basis of noncompetitive examinations, it certainly is something that, in my judgment, ought not to be allowed to be carried through at this time. We may, of course, if we reject this amendment and include this language in the

bill as recommended by your committee, be to that extent modifying the provisions of the Ramspeck Act; but when the Ramspeck Act excluded W. P. A. employees, I feel sure that at least some Members of this House felt that the N. Y. A., which was originally set up as a part of W. P. A. but was thereafter taken out of W. P. A. by Executive order and set up as a separate organization, would be in that same category as the W. P. A. It is in the nature of a relief organization. It has not yet been made permanent by Congress.

I am one of those who admire the work which has been accomplished by the National Youth Administration. I have been doing what I could in my own way on this subcommittee to foster the purposes of this organization and to secure the making of adequate appropriations for it; but I do not believe that at this time the Congress ought to permit, even if it requires the changing of the Ramspeck Act, the covering into civil service of all the employee personnel of this organization. If we do that, their influence, of course, will be exerted in many ways toward their continuance in Government employment. One of these days, if there is ever to be a real effort at economy brought about by the Congress, we must give consideration to reducing the number of people who are in Government employment, and the larger the number of them covered under civil service, the more difficult it will be to make the reduction.

Another consideration to which I desire to call attention is the increased cost which would come about by reason of covering these employees into civil service. Once they are covered under civil service, they acquire civil-service status, which means increase in compensation for many, and no additional money for that purpose is provided in this bill. I base this statement upon the testimony of the N. Y. A. Administrator himself, and I quote therefrom, first, a question asked by myself:

Mr. TARVER. For 6 months of the fiscal year for which you are presenting here you are going to have to pay higher salaries provided by the act or Executive order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We could not anticipate that, because the Ramspeck Act did not exist at the time we made out the estimates.

Mr. TARVER. I know. But you are justifying it now under its present condition. We are trying to get all the information that we can which will enable us to make adequate provision for your organization for the next fiscal year. The circumstances of the passing of the Ramspeck Act and the Executive order passed thereunder and promulgated, I think, a day or two ago and the entire terms of the law and the Executive order are now in your knowledge and affect necessarily the amount involved for the next fiscal year. Can you give us further information as to how it affects the amount that you need and how much more, if any, you will need? Shouldn't that be before the Bureau of the Budget and in the estimate that is before us to consider?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be very glad to submit it.

Mr. TARVER. You will have that prepared and submitted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The material referred to is as follows:

"Since the National Youth Administration will have adjusted its departmental salary scales to the Classification Act by the time the provisions of the Ramspeck Act are effective, the application of civil-service rules and regulations will not require any salary adjustments in the departmental service.

"The State offices of the National Youth Administration are now being paid on Executive order pay scales. The application of the Classification Act standards to these positions will probably have the effect of increasing the salaries of a certain proportion of the positions, but this cost cannot be determined until the classification of positions now under process is completed. It will be possible at that time to determine accurately the additional funds that will be required."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I want to call the attention of my colleague and the Committee to the fact that the extension of the Classification Act to the field service is not mandatory under my bill, but is discretionary with the President, and he has stated that probably it will be some time before he would undertake to make this extension.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I am not able to anticipate what the President may do, but the gentleman indicates that it is possible under his act for the President to extend the provisions of the Classification Act to the field service. It develops from the evidence of Mr. Williams that it is not only probable but certain that there will be a considerable increase in the salaries of the supervisory personnel of this organization if this organization is permitted to go under the civil service for the next fiscal year. Notwithstanding what the provisions of the Ramspeck Act may be or how they may be construed—and I confess there seems to be some indefiniteness about that construction, as shown by the evidence in the hearings—it seems to me it would be the wise thing on the part of Congress to make absolutely certain that this organization will not be covered into the civil service until some time later. This is no time to deal with this organization as a permanent proposition, nor is it time to increase the salaries of the members of the personnel of either this organization or any other organization.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have listened with great interest to the gentleman from Georgia when he made the statement that when we freeze into the civil service all of the employees we make the Government really top-heavy in the number of employees we have on the pay roll.

Mr. TARVER. I think it is top-heavy already.

Mr. RICH. We have increased the salaries of Government employees, and we have given them time off for vacations and for sick leave. There are no other employees in the whole world that compare with the Government employees. If you increase these salaries, the taxpayers have to stand the bill. Does the gentleman think that the taxpayers back in his district and the district represented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] feel that is the kind of legislation they want us to enact?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. And my district, too.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman will have observed from my remarks that I am not in favor of this amendment.

Mr. RICH. I know; and I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he made.

Mr. TARVER. Therefore, I think the gentleman's inquiry should be addressed to somebody else.

Mr. RICH. What I want to know is whether the gentleman's taxpayers, my taxpayers, and all of the people who have to work back home want us to give more to the Government employees.

Mr. TARVER. I am doing what I can, as I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania appreciates, to make as small as possible the burden of taxation upon all of the taxpayers of the country in these times of stress. It is unfortunately impossible to do very much, but we should not take steps to add to that burden by increasing at this time the salaries of the personnel of one of the largest organizations in the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by my colleague, while I regretfully differ from him, ought not to be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 13, nays 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are now considering an appropriation for the St. Elizabeths Hospital, which takes care of the insane. It requires a lot of money to keep this institution in operation.

I came from the Appropriations Committee a few moments ago, and I want to say that that committee has brought in a bill or will bring in a bill to be considered following this one appropriating some $10,000,000,000 for the Army of the United States next year. This means that the appropriations we have made up to now and including that bill for the national defense, including our Army and our Navy, will run close to $40,000,000,000 for last year and this year. The total is listed as $30,115,051,142, but this does not include the $7,000,000,000 we gave to the President of the United States to give to any countries he sees fit, nor does it include the authorization of an additional $1,200,000,000 in the lease-lend bill. Think of it, $40,000,000,000 for national defense. Then we talk about St. Elizabeths Hospital. How soon will it be necessary to have an

insane institution big enough to hold all of the people who are running wild? That would include many, many men in public office.

We are going wild, it seems to me, in all of our considerations. We are wild in the things that we do in the guise of national defense. I am worried for our country. I am worried for our form of government. I am worried because we are making a real dictatorship here in America. I have watched it grow for 8 years, and I forecast it 6 years ago, and it is about here. God forbid such is our lot. We are not in sympathy with communism or with a dictatorship.

I hope we will come to a realization very shortly before it is too late that we have to do several things in this country and we have to do them very quickly. You talk about these great expenses for national defense, and then you see the strikes that are going on all over the country. Right now the newspapers carry headlines to the effect that workers at another airplane factory have gone out on strike, yet this administration sits supinely by and lets things go.

A while ago I called your attention—and I say it again—to what happened to France in an emergency of this kind. We are going through the same process. How in the world we, as sound, sane, and sensible American people, can appropriate all these fabulous sums for our national defense and then sit here and let the country go almost into bankruptcy and into a condition that will put many, many people in this country into insane institutions like St. Elizabeths, that we are talking about here in this bill, I cannot understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is talking about sound, sensible people. The gentleman is not talking about Congress, is he?

Mr. RICH. I am talking to the people of this country who I think ought to be sound and sensible, and that is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think present company ought always to be excepted?

Mr. RICH. I always say "we" when I speak about the Congress, and that puts me in the same class with you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you not ashamed of yourself, then?

Mr. RICH. I like all my colleagues, but I do not like the things we do. We may not be fools, but we do the things fools would do. I do not have a crow to pick with any Member of Congress, and I do not want any, but I do say that we have wishbones where our backbones ought to be.

Just recently it was intimated to this Nation by a special ambassador that was sent from Great Britain to the President of the United States that they are contemplating peace in Europe. I have a right to believe that. Let the President propose to the world that we want peace and let him insist on it before we go to war. War will be the worst thing that can happen to America.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to interfere with the remarks of my colleague, whom we hear so very seldom, but he is not addressing his remarks to the merits of the bill, and I must make the point of order that he is not proceeding in order.

Mr. RICH. I still have my 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the insane.

Mr. TARVER. Not to talk about matters that are not in point.

Mr. RICH. I have been talking about St. Elizabeths, an institution for the insane, and that is in the bill, and if we get in foreign wars, those who are responsible I believe to be insane, and should go to St. Elizabeths.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot permit this bill to pass without taking the opportunity to express my appreciation of the splendid work the chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER has done, not only on this bill, but during the past several years during which I have been associated with him as ranking Republican on this subcommittee. He has done a splendid job in the committee, as the hearings will show.

As far as I know this is the only subcommittee that has functioned after a bill has been passed. There have been numerous occasions in which the gentleman from Georgia has called bureaus before the committee with regard to matters pertaining to a bill that had been passed in the preceding session.

Mr. Chairman, there never was a time when there was a difference of opinion between the majority and the minority members of this subcommittee based upon personal or political differences. We worked together on this bill, and I believe we have a splendid bill here.

I also wish to express my appreciation of the splendid work that has been done by Lt. Jack McFall, the committee clerk. Lieutenant McFall was appointed clerk of this subcommittee a year ago. He was given this bill, which covers the entire social-security field, the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A., and other agencies aggregating approximately $1,250,000,000. He made a study of the agencies covered by this bill and worked day and night in order to familiarize himself with this work. This is the type of service we find is often rendered by Government employees—services that are not always appreciated.

Jack is going to leave us. He is going to take his place in the United States Navy, being called out as a Reserve officer, with the grade of lieutenant. I know every Member of the House, particularly the Committee on Appropriations and more particularly this subcommittee, wishes him Godspeed. We know he will render the same service to the people of the United States as an officer of the Navy as he has rendered to the members of this subcommittee, to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the House of Reprepresentatives. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that for years I have opposed lump-sum appropriations. I have taken the position that these appropriations ought to be earmarked. A year ago I commented upon the fact that the C. C. C. and the Social Security Board appropriations, aggregating approximately $1,000,000,000, had not been earmarked, that these funds were being turned over to these agencies in a lump sum. I am glad to report that the C. C. C. and the Social Security Board appropriations today come before this committee earmarked, each item being specifically appropriated for. This means that if Congress appropriates a certain amount for a definite purpose, and that amount is not expended, the balance reverts to the United States Treasury.

During the past years I have discussed the question of hospital employees. Several years ago the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am a member, was instructed by the House of Representatives to inspect the various veterans' hospitals. I came back to you here with a story regarding low-paid employees in these hospitals, pointing out among other things that they were charged with quarters, subsistence, and laundry during periods of time when they were on leave and not at the hospital.

I want to call your attention to the committee hearings, beginning at page 320, where I discussed the matter of pay of these low-paid employees at marine hospitals. On page 320 you will find the following testimony:

Mr. ENGEL. We have had some discussion regarding the compensation of these low-paid employees or attendants in the hospitals. That is involved in the appropriation we are now considering, is it not?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Continuing the quotation at page 320 of the hearings:

Mr. ENGEL. On page 184 of the committee print of the bill we have an itemized statement showing the grades of these employees, with the range of pay. It shows the number of positions in each grade. In grade 1 the salary range is from $600 to $840, with an average of $641. There are 250 employees in that grade. In grade 2 the salary range is from $1,080 to $1,380, and there are 976 employees in that grade with an average salary of $1,112. Is that the base pay?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the gross average salary.

Mr. ENGEL. And from that you make a deduction for board and room?

Mr. HARRIS. Not in all cases do we make the entire deduction.

Mr. ENGEL. In the case of those employees who are receiving an average of $641, just what do you deduct from that pay?

Mr. HARRIS. If they receive quarters, full subsistence, and laundry, the deduction would be $450 per annum.

Mr. ENGEL. Leaving them less than $200 a year in actual pay?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

Here we have a group of employees in the United States Hospital Service who are receiving a salary as low as $641 a

year, and from which the Government is deducting $450 for subsistence, laundry, and quarters, leaving them approximately $191 a year of actual cash.

Again quoting:

Mr. ENGEL. I assume that they get the regular leave.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. When they go on leave, do you charge for the room? Do you make that charge when they go on leave?

Mr. HARRIS. The deduction is made on an annual basis, and taken out proportionately each month.

Mr. ENGEL. And the deduction is made during the period of 30 days' leave despite the fact that they do not eat there. Is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

In other words, not only do they take out this board money for the time they eat there, but when the employee goes on leave for 30 days and does not eat there, they still charge him for 30 days' board.

Again quoting from the hearings:

Mr. ENGEL. They work, you say, 44 hours a week, and the base pay would be about $40 per month.

Mr. HARRIS. They work approximately 2,000 hours a year.

Mr. ENGEL. And they are getting a salary of $641. That is less than 30 cents an hour.

Mr. HARRIS. That figures about 32 cents per hour.

Mr. ENGEL. What has become of the minimum-wage law?

Mr. HARRIS. The minimum-wage law has not been in force in the Federal field service, It is not applicable here.

May I say in conclusion that the committee placed enough money into the bill to enable these people to stay at home with their families and commute back and forth. I believe it is an outrage for the Government to pay these employees as little as $641 and then take out of that small wage $450 for board requiring them to stay at the hospital, which only leaves them $190, and in addition to that charge these low-paid employees for food which they do not eat. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I subscribe to the philosophy recently announced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in that the Congress should ever be on the alert with reference to appropriations and to see that there is ample justification for each penny appropriated, but I cannot subscribe to the philosophy he announced that the country and everybody in it is going extravagantly wild, and in support of my position I call attention to a recent press report in my district giving an account of the frugality of one Lewis C. Cockfield, an enrollee in one of the C. C. C. veteran camps near Greenwood, S. C. This man went into the service 4 years ago at a salary of $30 a month. Out of that $30 he resolved to lay aside $22.50 a month. He was able to economize and demonstrate the frugal virtues referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and out of the savings he was able a few days ago to take $1,095 to the postmaster or local bank and purchase $1,450 worth of defense bonds. I refer to this to show that all of the people in the country have not gone wild over spending money, that there are some who are still anxious to economize and practice economy in order to lay aside a nest egg sufficient to care for them in their declining years—a philosophy to which I fully subscribe and one that is worthy of emulation by everyone, including the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that opportunity is not afforded for a discussion of all of the provisions of the bill now under consideration, but in concluding the debate let me state that the hearings justifying the various items herein extended over a period of several weeks and the testimony recorded covers practically 1,800 pages of printed matter. A great deal of the testimony was not printed. It has been no little job, and I would like to take time to pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. If you will take the time to read the hearings, you will find that there is no item in the appropriation about which proper interrogations and investigation were not made. It takes time and patience to act efficiently as chairman of a subcommittee. It takes time and patience to inquire into every item, and it takes time and patience and unusual ability to be able to analyze and interpret the justifications submitted. During my 10 years experience in the Congress, with due credit to the many able men with whom I have served, I have not found one more painstaking, more patient, more considerate, more tolerant, and yet more efficient in the conduct of an examination of matters of this kind than Judge TARVER. [Applause.]

I would like now to speak of a few matters involved in this appropriation. We frequently speak of large and increasing appropriations from year to year but fail to suggest definitely where they can be reduced. Every Member is anxious to balance the Budget or to see that our national expenses are not greater than our income, but in recent years we have not succeeded. I may not be able to touch the button that will turn the trick, but I want to discuss a practice, custom, or policy found in most of the departments of Government that is not only responsible for much of the increased appropriations from year to year but is responsible for some of the criticisms of the actions of Congress.

My guess is that 95 percent or more of legislation enacted by Congress for the general welfare of the people has under normal conditions proven to be quite satisfactory. It is true that in the administration of laws enacted objections at times have arisen and Congress subjected to criticism. However, in many cases the criticisms may be properly directed to matters not contemplated by Congress when the legislation was enacted.

My observation since becoming a member of the Appropriations Committee is that practically every department and nearly every agency or subdivision of the departments maintain a corps of what is referred to as research workers who are frequently able to read into a law services or activities never mentioned in the hearings presented to the committee in charge when the legislation was under consideration, and not in the discussions and were never really contemplated by the Congress, and whenever an activity is enlarged that means increased appropriations. I refer to this practice not for the purpose of discouraging research work specifically provided for by the Congress or for the purpose of reflecting upon the ability of anyone engaged in research that has for its object or purpose increased efficiency in the administration of a law, but I am calling attention to it for the purpose of showing why increased appropriations are requested in practically every agency of the Government from year to year.

When Congress provides for the creation of a governmental agency it endeavors to state with some particularity the duties and functions of such agency, but there seems to be a growing custom that as soon as an agency is established those in charge think it is necessary to have a corps of research workers who may not have any particular objective in view, but appear to proceed upon the theory that the work of the agency must be broadened with the process of suns, and they begin at once to look for new or what is referred to as related fields of service, without waiting for their value, wisdom, or necessity to arise from experience obtained in the actual operation of the law. The result is the agency is soon undertaking to render a service not originally contemplated by the Congress. The further result is that enormously increased appropriations for maintaining these unforeseen and originally unintended governmental activities are demanded every year.

Some will argue that such research work is indispensable in promoting the functions of government and the welfare of the people. That may be true and it is not my purpose to discuss that thought in any detail, but I do want to suggest and emphasize that in a democracy legislation, as a rule, should be in response to the known demands of the people based upon their studied convictions of the functions of government. "The liberty of a people," said Cowley, "consists in being governed by laws which they have made themselves, under whatsoever form of government it may be." That is, the action of Congress should be in response to fundamental suggestions growing out of the Constitution and expressed will of the people, instead of formulas worked out by a few who think such formulas or programs should operate to the economic and social advantage of the people. The latter course is a theory or policy that does not conform fundamentally to the principles of a representative democracy and if continued through a long period of years is calculated to undermine or actually destroy the fundamental part the people are supposed to play in perpetuating our system of government. Of course, there may be some difference of opinion as to this idea, but I am making these observations with the thought that Congress should hesitate to make increased appropriations from time to time for use of "research workers" that has no further objective than to enlarge the

activities of a governmental agency. I would suggest that there will be good reasons for enlarged activity of a governmental agency from time to time, but I insist that such necessity will naturally, logically, and normally manifest itself to the heads of such agencies and the necessity will be of such a nature that the analysis and solution will be logical and in harmony with the needs and demands of the public. In other words, if a law when enacted fails to operate as was contemplated by the Congress its imperfection or disability will show up in the administration of the law and should be corrected but this does not give rise to the necessity for "researchers" spying into and trying to read the future long in advance of actual necessity. The work of such researchers frequently amounts to a premature and unnatural birth of a governmental activity. The elimination of appropriations for this type of work will not only mean a great deal in the saving of money in paying the salaries of such researchers but it will mean future savings in amounts that cannot be estimated by decreasing or eliminating the most of these "related" but unnecessary governmental activities.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Chairman, the Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor has, in addition to its other functions, undertaken to assist in promoting programs for increased safety and better health in industry. The purpose of the program is quite commendable and has heretofore received the endorsement and support of Congress by way of appropriations. Of course, it is a large field for service and there is a great opportunity for establishing regulatory and mentally conscious standards that will promote safety in decreasing the number of accidents and will increase efficiency in production by better standards of health. We were gratified to learn from those who appeared before our subcommittee of efforts being made in cooperation with State agencies and representatives of industry and labor in promoting standards that would remove accident hazards and increase the standards of health in various industrial activities. However, we were somewhat surprised to find that no definite standards have been fixed by this Division for the guidance of those industries having contracts under what is known as the Walsh-Healy Act, or suggested standards for industry otherwise. We learned that much attention has been given to promoting comfortable and sanitary conditions in practically all industries. We were particularly impressed with the efforts being made to insure employees the best possible ventilating and heating systems in plants of different types but we were again surprised to learn that no study has heretofore been made with reference to air-conditioning in plants operated under excessively high temperatures, particularly during summer months. Our thought is and has been that if the health and efficient production of an employee can be increased by requiring comfortable and uniform temperatures in industrial plants during cold winter months it would be well to know whether the health and efficiency of such employees cannot be promoted by maintaining a comfortable temperature during hot summer months. In other words, it has occurred to me that the efficiency of an employee would be decreased as much by having to work under excessively high temperature as it would under a condition of low temperature and I am really surprised that no thought or attention has been given to studying ways or means of promoting comfortable working conditions during summer months, particularly in view of rapid strides made in recent years in air-conditioning systems.

We were told in the committee that in one or more of the Government offices in New York City it has been estimated there is a loss of production on the part of the employees of from 20 to 25 percent during summer months. If the same is true in industry it appears it would not only be a valuable investment on the part of industry to provide air-conditioning for employees from a production standpoint, but it would certainly be a great service from the standpoint of health and sanitation. I have seen many operatives in textile plants, both men and women, emerge from plants with their clothes wet from perspiration and physically exhausted from excessive heat, and it would certainly be a function of this Division to find out, if possible, how much the production of such operatives is decreased daily or monthly on account of the conditions under which they work, and it appears further that it would be an easy matter to determine whether it would be good business judgment to have air-conditioning systems installed in industrial plants, for such a system should prove to be of great benefit to the health of the operatives and increased income to stockholders. I was in a plant in my district a few weeks ago where such a system has been installed, and I am sure it would be valuable information to know what effect, if any, the system has had in such plants upon the health, the productive and earning capacity of the employee.

I do not think the Federal Government has the right or authority to require the installation of such a system in such plants, but I think it is a matter of such significance to warrant a careful study by the Department of Labor and ascertain for the benefit of those who may be interested information and data indicating the cost of installation and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

THE CONCILIATION SERVICE

In view of the disagreements and conflicts between employers and employees in recent months I again desire to express my interest in the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor and renew a suggestion made last year when a similar bill was before us for consideration. The Congress in recent years has enacted a number of laws designed to promote the conciliation of disputes between employer and employee in industrial and transportation activities. There can be no doubt but what the Service has met with commendable success, but it is regrettable to note that we have not reached the point when open breaches are averted. As a matter of fact, the number and complexity of controversial issues seem to be increasing in spite of the efforts on the part of both the Conciliation Service and the additional mediation boards created since the passage of a similar appropriation bill a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I am a firm and strong supporter of the Conciliation Service, although my remarks may appear to be critical. If so, they are to be construed as constructive criticisms and are made for the purpose of perfecting this Service. According to Poor Richard, "Our friends are those who tell us of our mistakes and help us to mend them." The necessity for recently added mediation agencies I fear is somewhat a reflection upon the Conciliation Service because it indicates on its face that its service has not been successful to that degree anticipated. I am fully conscious of the highly efficient service rendered, but I am calling attention here to what appears to be the necessity of having to provide for more governmental agencies charged with the duty and responsibility of doing the same kind of work. One reason assigned for the creation of this additional mediation service is to secure men of wider and broader training and experience.

My thought is that one agency should be sufficient and since the Conciliation Service is a definitely established agency, I feel that its efficiency should be increased to such an extent that we may in the future be able to reconcile any honest and reasonable difference that may arise between employer and employee, and at the same time create or develop an industrial philosophy which will repudiate a dishonest and unreasonable difference. There is no use to flirt with the problem, because I believe it is one that can be solved. I believe we have men who are able to do the job and their services should be obtained, even if it is necessary to reduce the existing force and increase their salaries proportionately, which should make additional mediation boards unnecessary.

It may be that we could utilize the Conciliation Service in some organized or systematic, educational way far enough in advance of a breach, where we might hope to reach a point some time in the future when we could reasonably expect to make a reduction in appropriations for employing inspectors, investigators, and prosecutors. That is, if we could place some of the conciliators in front of a breach instead of after it, it appears to me that within a generation open conflicts between labor and industry, such as strikes and shut-outs, would be a thing of the past. This appropriation could then be reduced to a minimum; hundreds of inspectors referred to here today as "snooping detectives" could be eliminated, capital could emerge unafraid from its hiding places, and labor would no longer be afraid of oppression or the empty dinner pail, because there would be an intelligent and honest understanding between the two most productive organizations of this Nation—

labor and industry. The stockholders in industry are interested in such an objective, the efficient employer is interested, the employee who earns his daily bread by the sweat of his brow is interested, the public generally is interested, and the social and economic welfare of the Nation are demanding it.

A conciliator should not only be able to assist in adjusting differences that may arise between employers and employees but he should be able to analyze and interpret the real or underlying cause of such differences and suggest ways and means of solving the problem. Strikes and shut-outs in industry are not accidents. They do not occur overnight. They come only after days of caviling. If the matter involved in such cases is adjusted after the breach develops, it is reasonable to assume that adjustment may have been made before the breach just as easily, because you have the same parties to contend with and the same facts to consider in either event.

The Congress, no doubt, thought that the service would be able to bring about a situation where there would be such an understanding of the rights and duties of all interested parties that there would be no major conflicts and it would be an easy matter to adjust minor differences. However, recent developments do not lend much encouragement to this objective. The recent strikes in defense industries present an unusual problem, and the thing that gives us some concern at this time is that our Labor Department, with all of its facilities and opportunities, was not able to learn long ago that most of these strikes were being promoted by the communistic leadership at the head of some of our organizations, a fact now generally admitted to be true. I may be mistaken, but it appears to me that highly trained and experienced conciliators could and should have been able to find out before now that Communists were in control and directing a number of these organizations, and it should not have been left to an "unlimited emergency" to enable thousands of innocent, hard-working, patriotic citizens to discover that they had ingeniously been deceived and misled by communistic agents, who would destroy the very foundations of this Republic.

This Government cannot allow any organization headed and directed by Communists to defy and thwart a program designed for the defense of this country. We have had suspicions for several years that the agents of Stalin and Hitler were cooperating in their efforts to undermine and destroy the democratic ideals of this country. The proof now is they started their organized system of propaganda 6 or 8 years ago—about the time that Hitler and others definitely began to prepare and execute their program for world domination by the destruction of democratic systems of government. It appears now that the zenith of their program in this country was timed to coincide with the Nazi program in Europe. In the light of recent disclosures we now recall how these alien agents or emissaries of communism, acting under the livery of labor organizers, went into practically every community of our Nation proclaiming a "new order" and a new opportunity in life for the unemployed. They succeeded in misleading not only thousands of employees but many of their interested friends. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the story, but I have been told that three of these alien agitators appeared at one of the industrial centers in my district about 4 years ago and, following one of their meetings one evening where they expounded their new philosophy for the special benefit of textile operatives, they were seized and thrown into a nearby mill pond. I assume they swam ashore and then left the community. At least there are no labor organizations in that section headed and directed by alien and communistic leaders. My only comment here is that if labor in other sections of our country had been as careful and critical in deciding whose philosophy they would follow as did the textile operatives I have just referred to, possibly this country would not be subjected to strikes in our defense program, nor would the membership of our various organizations be called upon to decide whether it owes greater allegiance to organization leaders than to organized government. The situation is regrettable and alarming. However, I am not certain but what it is a blessing in disguise, for, had we not learned of these communistic and subversive influences and they had been allowed to continue their borings toward the center of our social and economic structure for another 10 years, and continued to make progress as they have within the last decade, I can vision the possibility of a disastrous undermining of our governmental structure and many of the institutions established under it. The field for the Conciliation Service is large and "the harvest truly is plenteous," and I am supporting this item in the bill with confidence in its opportunity for increased usefulness.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

When this bill was up for consideration last year I discussed the necessity for an amendment to the Social Security Act providing for more equitable contribution to the old-age assistance fund by the States and Federal Government, and called special attention to the testimony before our committee by the Director of the Social Security Board, where he proposed that in place of the fifty-fifty contribution by the Federal Government and the States as now provided the proportion of the contribution should be variable grants to a State on the basis of per capita wealth in those States where the average is less than the average per capita wealth for the United States.

I have always felt that the present plan was unfair to those States where the per capita income is low. The fundamental basis upon which the Federal Government enters into this field of legislation is that the people of the country are citizens of the United States and not citizens of the several individual States, and one reason advanced for requiring the States to contribute to this fund was to decrease the cost of administration as much as possible, and to eliminate to some extent the possibility of the question becoming a biennial political issue for increasing appropriations to the point where it would become an unwarranted burden to the taxpayers by providing contributions far in excess of actual necessity. Under existing law the maximum amount that may be received by any person is $40 per month, the State contributing $20 and the Federal Government $20. Of course, in the poorer States where they are not able to contribute the maximum or anywhere near the maximum to all persons who may be eligible this plan when adopted and followed by the wealthier States operates as an unfair burden on the poorer ones because they are called upon to assist in paying taxes to the Federal Government to meet its contribution, and then levy taxes to meet their own contributions.

To illustrate, where a wealthier State has agreed to pay its old-age eligibles an average of $30 per month, the State will pay $15 and the Federal Government $15. Of course, the people of the poorer States must contribute to the Federal Treasury to help pay the $15 per month contributed by the Federal Government, which may prove to be such a burden on the taxable resources of the poorer State there may be little left in the way of taxes or funds for the State to contribute to its own needy eligible old people. However, under the proposed arrangement to have the States contribute in proportion to their per capita wealth as compared with the average per capita wealth of the United States, the result would be an equitable and fair contribution by both, and then the failure of States to make appropriations for their share of the contribution would be a matter to be determined by such States.

In this connection I would like to call attention to H. R. 3333, an amendment I suggested to the existing law a short time ago, which provides where a State makes an allotment to a person eligible for assistance in an amount between $10 and $20 per month and the average per capita wealth of such State is less than the average per capita wealth of the United States, the contributions to such an allotment by the States and the United States shall be in proportion to their average per capita wealth. I can best illustrate the operation of the amendment, if approved, by calling attention to a report issued by the Department of Commerce in 1940 showing the per capita income for the United States to be $536 for the year 1939, whereas the per capita income in my State in the same year was $268, or exactly one-half of the per capita income for the United States. If the amendment referred to were adopted and the average per capita income or wealth of the State and United States should remain the same and a person in my State should be allotted $15 per month, the State would pay $5 and the Federal Government $10.

I am glad to report there was testimony before our committee by the Chairman of the Social Security Board that it is hoped legislation embodying the principle outlined may be enacted at this session of Congress.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION AND THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

In view of the defense training experience provided for in the N. Y A., together with a number of other reasons that could be assigned, I am supporting this appropriation; and in view of the Soil Conservation Service and the defense training experience to be furnished, I am supporting the appropriation for the continuance of the C. C. C. camps; but I am not unmindful that there is some opposition to these particular appropriations on the ground that there is apparent duplication of effort by these two agencies and that it is a field of service where our Federal Government should not enter permanently. This is a very vital question, and it would take too long to discuss it in detail, but I think it should be observed that, if the Federal Government undertakes to assist materially every boy and girl from 18 to 25 years of age, there is a danger of these same people insisting that they be continuously cared for, and that in the course of time, instead of having a democratic system of government, we will have substituted a socialistic system. I do not make this statement because of any lack of interest in young people who have to labor, because labor has been my stock in trade from early boyhood up until the present day, and my sympathies are always with the person who labors under the necessity of earning his or her living; but I must confess a fear that if the proposed program continues and increases from year to year as it has for the past few years, and the Federal Government undertakes to take care of all persons between 18 and 25 years of age who file application, these same persons may continue to look to the Federal Government for support all through life. This is not a fanciful conclusion, for we are told that if you train a child in the way he shall go, when he is old he will not depart from it; and my theory is, at the expense of repetition, if the Federal Government undertakes to supply the demands of all persons until they become 25 years of age, it is going to be a very hard matter for them to depart from the receipt of such aid when they reach that age, and the result will be that the ideals of democracy which encourage individual initiative will be lost and the ideals of socialism substituted therefor.

This will not take place in a year or possibly a decade and it will not be designedly done or with the purpose of destroying our system of government. It will be a rather long process and a road marked with apparently unselfish and considerate efforts on the part of the representatives of the people to serve or execute the will of the people. My theory is that every boy and girl of this country should be furnished with ample opportunity for training which will enable him or her to develop productive and earning capacity to such an extent that they will develop the spirit of self-reliance and be able to take care of themselves throughout life. Again we are reminded of an observation by Bovee, who said:

Next to faith in God is faith in labor.

The Congress, therefore, should not only guard against any policy that would weaken or destroy faith in the virtue, value, and never-ending necessity for honest work, but it should be equally ready to encourage and promote opportunities for employment and perpetuate the philosophy that "the laborer is worthy of his hire."

According to the testimony submitted to our committee it is estimated the appropriation carried in this bill will provide for an average employment in schools of approximately 435,000 young people with a little more than 200,000 youth per month in the out-of-school program. The in-school program is carried on in a little over 29,000 high schools, secondary schools, parochial, and public schools. Upward of 1,700 colleges participate in the college program. At the present time there are 336,000 employed in the high-school program, 121,000 in the college program, and 3,000 in the graduate program. The average monthly earnings of those in the high-school program amount to $4.45 per month, the college-program average is $14.17 a month, and the graduate program averages $19.61. The types of work performed by students in the high-school program consists in construction and improvement of school grounds, building recreational facilities, making laboratory equipment and supplies, janitorial assistance, repairing books and classifying them in public libraries, doing work of various types in county offices and other public activities.

The students in both high schools and colleges are selected by whoever may be in charge of the school or college. The N. Y. A. Administrator takes no part in selecting these students. However, there are requirements which stipulate certain conditions under which they may be designated.

In the out-of-school program there are at present 35,794 resident centers where nonresident students reside for full time or half time who work in shops or on construction work. They are usually engaged in mechanical and manual labor of practically all types. At present 104,282 are employed at these resident centers, constituting about one-fourth of the total enrollment. At these centers are maintained machine shops, sheet metal shops, welding, founding, radio, electrical, autotained machine shops, sheet-metal shops, farm implements, equipment, aviation service, woodwork, sewing, domestic machines, drafting, blueprinting, and other activities. During the past year special attention has been given to building farm shops and vocational buildings in agricultural areas. These shops are usually constructed in connection with rural high schools, it being the policy to require them to furnish the ground and a good portion of the material. When completed the shops and buildings become the property of the school and are designed to develop mechanical and manual training. However, the N. Y. A. does not undertake to equip, operate, or furnish instructions in these shops or buildings. The primary objective in this part of the program is to afford opportunities for youth to obtain training with actual work experience designed to fit them for employment in industry or related activities in the national-defense program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I likewise compliment the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for the bill that they have brought before the House, dealing with these various agencies. I am going to vote for its passage. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call the attention of the House to the splendid services and benefits we are receiving in Montana from the National Youth Administration. I call attention to the fact that we have a total of 5,320 male and female youths who are receiving education and instruction in various lines in my State. In out-of-school work the total is 2,181, consisting of about half male and half female. The student work program totals 3,139; and the college and graduate program, 819, which is about equally divided. The funds expended in Montana for 1936 through April 30, 1941, amount to $2,816,325. This money has been very judiciously and well expended in Montana. I think we have one of the most competent youth administrators in Montana that there is throughout the United States, Mr. James Love. His subordinates are also very competent. I think in Washington at the head of the National Youth Administration the Government is exceedingly fortunate in having a gentleman at the head of it with the capacity, energy, and ability of Mr. Aubrey Williams. He is doing a fine job. We in Montana feel that the youth of the country have a great friend in him.

The type of projects covered by this work in Montana includes resident projects, work-shop production, construction, roads, streets, bridges, building construction and repair, recreational facilities other than buildings, conservation, irrigation, and flood control. They do a lot of work upon these small irrigation and flood-control projects, which is of great use and permanent benefit to the country as a whole and to the State of Montana in particular. That is not all. There is the professional and clerical total, doing work along the line of clerical assistants, research, statistical survey assistants, public health and hospital assistants, library services, arts and crafts, recreational assistants, nursery and school assistants, school lunch and food preparation and health projects. Nearly everything is covered by the work in Montana in this Youth Administration work that is for the development of the boy and girl.

The students that are employed on the N. Y. A. student work program are selected on the basis of need and scholarship. Studies have shown that more than half of the young people who leave school do so because of lack of funds to continue their education. The National Youth Administration, with the cooperation of local education institutions, has provided part-time work for many of these youths. The earnings on this program are sufficient to keep them in school, reducing the number who would otherwise be out of school and seeking

work. Remember this, that if such employment was not given the majority of these students they would be on the labor market if they did not have this chance to earn enough to stay in school. This program widens democracy in education. We cannot have too much democracy, and young people want to see democracy in action and not have it all talk. Maybe some of us who secured an education without any help from any source and who went to school rather than being sent to school do not approve of this program, but times have changed since a lot of us were in school. Machines have replaced manpower to the point where the work is not left that used to be. In other words, I doubt if the youth of today, although he may have the will to do, has the chance we of the older generation had to make our living while we were getting our education. It is indeed encouraging for the future of the country to see the Congress with such unanimity of opinion back the educational programs for those needy young students. It shows a great desire to not only help the youth but to keep afloat our great country, as the youth of today will be the man of tomorrow, and we want that youth to have a chance in the world and to love his country, which he will if he has had a break.

While we are doing fairly well by the youth now, we should do better in the future, as there are many undermining influences abroad to wreck our form of government in the form of all sorts of "isms" that underneath are destructive of our ideals, morals, religious rights, and freedom, and it is upon the youth these vicious influences are first applied.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT OPERATIONS—NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM IN MONTANA

I. EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs, total	5,320	2,571	2,749
Out-of-school work program, total	2,181	1,065	1,116
Student work program, total	3,139	1,506	1,633
School work program	2,320	1,052	1,268
College and graduate work program	819	454	365

II. FUNDS EXPENDED, 1936 THROUGH APR. 30, 1941

Fiscal year	Amount		
	Total	Student work program	Out-of-school work program
1936	$243,880	$167,300	$76,580
1937	487,650	245,230	242,420
1938	423,536	163,185	260,351
1939	561,000	142,324	418,676
1940	573,964	171,748	402,216
1941 (encumbrances through Apr. 30, 1941)	526,295	139,697	386,598
Total, all years	2,816,325	1,029,484	1,786,841

Out-of-school work program

III–A. EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, APRIL 1941

Type of project	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
Total	2,181	1,065	1,116
Resident projects	184	111	73
Workshop-production	714	299	415
Construction, total	567	566	1
Roads, streets, and bridges	16	16	
Building construction, repair	393	393	
Recreational facilities other than buildings	97	96	1
Conservation, irrigation, and flood control	61	61	
Professional-clerical, total	716	89	627
Clerical assistance	540	67	473
Research, statistical, and survey assistance	8	8	
Public health and hospital assistance	19	1	18
Library service	12		12
Arts and crafts	11	7	4
Recreational assistance	9	3	6
Nursery school assistance	70	1	69
School lunch and food preparation	46	2	44
Health projects	1		1

III–B. EMPLOYMENT ON WORKSHOP PRODUCTION PROJECTS BY TYPES OF PRODUCTION, APRIL 1941

Type of production	Number of youth employed			Number of units
	Total	Male	Female	
Total	753	298	455	55
Welding	12	12		1
Auto maintenance and repair	73	72	1	8
Machine shop	14	13	1	4
Electrical	5	5		2
Radio	9	9		2
Woodworking	289	181	108	14
Drafting, map making, blueprinting	4	1	3	2
Sewing	336	5	331	21
Other production	11		11	1

III–C. EMPLOYMENT IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, APRIL 1941

Type of Military Establishment	Number of youth employed	Number of establishments
Total	39	3
Army	35	2
Selective-service boards	4	1

III–D. TERMINATIONS FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, JULY 1940 THROUGH APRIL 1941

	Number of youth
1940	
July	323
August	19
September	38
October	41
November	42
December	32
1941	
January	55
February	107
March	195
April	250
Total	1,102

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941

	Number of youth
Private employment, total	389
Manufacturing industries, total	27
Food and kindred products, and tobacco	8
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products	12
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	1
Nonferrous metals and their products (excluding machinery)	4
Other machinery and equipment	1
Ship and boat building and repairing	1
Nonmanufacturing industries, total	217
Agriculture, forestry (excluding logging), and fishing	63
Mining, quarrying, and petroleum production	14
Construction	7
Railroads (interstate)	13
Other transportation and services	1
Telephone, telegraph, and related services	4
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities	1
Wholesale and retail trade	69
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7
Service industries (excluding domestic service)	29
Domestic service	9
Unknown industry	145

III–F. CERTIFIED YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, APRIL 1941

Total	1,048
Male	471
Female	577

III–G. VOCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND FARM SHOP CONSTRUCTION, JULY 1940 THROUGH FEB. 28, 1941

Type of work	Number of buildings		
	Total	Completed	In progress
Total	10	2	8
New	8	2	6
Repair	1		1
Additions	1		1

IV. STUDENT WORK PROGRAM, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth			Number of institutions	Average earnings
	Total	Male	Female		
Total	3,139	1,506	1,633	217	$6.68
School	2,320	1,052	1,268	205	4.79
College	819	454	365	12	12.02

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 702. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any person appointed to a non-civil-service position, under the appropriations in the respective titles in this act, if the effect of such appointment is to increase the number of non-civil-service employees from the State of residence of any such non-civil-service appointee beyond the number of non-civil-service employees to which such State is entitled, under the appropriations in the respective titles of this act, on a basis of population: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any position, the appointment of which is made by the President: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to positions in the Civilian Conservation Corps or the Public Health Service outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 83, line 2, after the word Corps", insert "the Conciliation Service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: On page 83, line 2, after the word "Corps", strike out the word "or" and insert a comma.

Page 83, line 3, after the word "Columbia", strike out the period, insert a comma and the words "National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, or Railroad Retirement Board."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered by me affects very few persons. These persons are appointed by the National Mediation Board, which endeavors to settle railroad labor disputes. The National Labor Adjustment Board, another agency for the settlement of railway-labor grievances and which is located at Chicago, and is composed entirely of railroad-company representatives and railroad workers; and lastly the Railroad Retirement Board. There are very few positions in any of these agencies which are at all affected, but the few are very important. They are non-civil-service positions and were deliberately and purposely given such status in the laws as passed originally. There were good reasons why persons filling such positions should be non-civil-service employees.

For example, an arbitrator could not very well be appointed by the Mediation Board to settle a dispute on the railroads if it were required that he have civil-service qualification and reside in a certain part of the country. The most suitable person could generally be selected to act as arbitrator if it were required that he be taken from a civil-service list or appointed according to some system of proration among the States. Generally speaking, we have enough trouble as it is in securing an arbitrator satisfactory to the contending parties. The Mediation Board should, therefore, be excepted from the effect of the section.

Then the National Railroad Adjustment Board is composed of an equal number of railroad workers and railroad operators, who meet at Chicago, and frequently they find themselves unable to settle grievances. Hence, they must appoint a referee to settle the dispute. Certainly we do not want the appointment of a referee subjected to the requirement for proration among the States, in accordance with the law. That was avoided intentionally originally.

Lastly, we have the railroad retirement system, which is after all a private system, has what is called the actuarial advisory committee. The work of the actuarial advisory committee is very technical in its nature and there must be the widest possible leeway to enable the Board to appoint persons who can do that work and do it effectively. I have referred now to all of the positions that will be affected by the amendment I am offering, which merely adds to the list of exceptions in the following language:

The National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, or the National Railroad Retirement Board.

The agencies are generally excepted from operation of general statutes, and I think it should be done in this case to assure the satisfactory discharge of the functions provided for in the specific statutes establishing such agencies.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. The railroad workers are desirous of having the exceptions made. I would have appeared before the committee if I had not been unavoidably prevented from being present to do so. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] knows more about the operation of laws under which these three organizations have been set up and are functioning in 1 minute than I shall probably ever know because these matters have been his first love. He has been very careful in his attention to them and has had a great deal to do with the legislation by which they were set up, and I will go further and say that he may be absolutely right in everything he has said. Our subcommittee, however, had the officials of these three organizations before us for hours. We questioned them with regard to every detail of their operation and their difficulties. No official of either of these organizations ever indicated they were hampered or interfered with in any way by the provisions of section 702, which is in the law for the present year. In other words, they have functioned under it ever since July 1, 1940, and no single official of either of these organizations during these long hearings we had indicated that they had any difficulty whatever in carrying on their operations under the restrictions imposed by the section.

It does seem to me that it would not be wise to legislate upon the motion of a member of the Committee of the Whole, supported by a 5-minute argument, however able that member may be and however much confidence we may have in his knowledge of the problem he undertakes to discuss—I mean so far as arbitrators are concerned. I can conceive that there may be considerable difficulty in the operation of this section. The members of the personnel of these organizations who appeared before us, however, did not indicate that there had been such difficulty during the present year, but there are many other members of the personnel of these organizations who might conceivably be affected. I think there ought at least to be some investigation by somebody at a hearing where witnesses may testify and detail just what the effect of this amendment would be and how many positions would be affected thereby. Personally, if it develops that only the positions mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio are affected, and if the Senate puts in his amendment, I, as one of the conferees, would be inclined to agree to it, and I believe my colleagues on the conference committee would take the same position, but I hope that the House will not today undertake to add this amendatory language when the matter has not been of sufficient importance in the minds of the officials of these organizations to justify their even mentioning it to the members of the subcommittee during the course of the hearings which we had.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CROSSER) there were—ayes 52, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RICH. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. RICH. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICH moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the bill back to the House with reductions in non-national-defense items aggregating $35,848,778.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on next Wednesday after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks I made on the bill just passed I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks a table showing the number of students in the N. Y. A. and the amount expended in connection with their education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Du Bois City Council on the Townsend question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF INTERSTATE PETROLEUM PIPE LINES RELATED TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4816) to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate pipe lines related to national defense.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4816, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill now before the committee is to correct as speedily as we can a situation resulting in an admitted shortage of petroleum, both crude and refined products, along the Atlantic seaboard and in the southeastern part of this country, due primarily to the withdrawal of 50 tankers recently from such service, and turning them over for use in other places.

The petroleum industry is today possibly our largest industry. The railroad industry might be larger; at any rate, those two mentioned are certainly our two largest industries, regardless of the order in which they should be named.

In 1934, when the present distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a special committee to investigate the petroleum industry was appointed. I had the honor at that time of being designated chairman. For 2 years under appropriate House resolution it went into the oil fields of this country for observation, preliminary to a study made later of the many interesting and ramifying aspects of the petroleum industry.

Later we recommended legislation, which was reported by the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it was not considered by the House. Personally, I have always felt that the industry itself made a mistake in not accepting our recommendations of 1935.

Later we continued as a subcommittee on oil to consider the Connally bill and the State compact legislation presented by most of the major oil-producing States. In 1939, President Roosevelt asked that the investigation of 1934 and 1935 be brought up to date and, as a result thereof, the committee was directed by resolution of the House to continue its study.

Because of the long association with the petroleum industry which your committee has had, when President Roosevelt addressed a letter to Congress recently, calling attention to the pipe-line situation, we were able to give prompt attention to the problem because of our familiarity with the general subject. Hearings were held for the benefit of all witnesses desiring to appear, but it was possible to shorten the testimony very materially.

We are here today in answer to the President's appeal of January 23, 1941, but more especially because of a later decision by the Maritime Commission withdrawing 50 tankers from service along the Atlantic seaboard, which aggravated the situation presented by President Roosevelt. Having a total of 260 tankers in all, you can readily appreciate how a withdrawal of 20 percent of the total needed to supply the oil consumed along the Atlantic seaboard each day will affect that great part of our country. The Atlantic seaboard, for instance, consumes about 1,700,000 barrels a day, while we are producing slightly over 3,700,000 barrels a day.

Let us analyze some of the admitted facts applicable to the position we find today along almost the entire Atlantic seaboard and in most of the Southeastern States of this Nation. It is shameful for us to find ourselves in such a situation at this time. A lot of it, we believe, can be attributed to the fact that responsible governmental agencies and legislative bodies have been too unwilling to face boldly the facts before them in a way their country demanded.

From Florida to Maine, water transportation provides virtually the entire supply of petroleum used along the Atlantic coast. One-eighth of the total is consumed by the area south of Hatteras and seven-eighths by the area north of Hatteras. Western Pennsylvania and New York supply a very small part of the total consumption, and this is the only local contribution to the large consumption in this area. It will be immediately admitted, therefore, that the supplying of oil to the Atlantic coast presents a problem which is essentially one of transportation. A few pipe lines of the large number now in operation in the United States make their way into our Atlantic seaboard area, but not more than 4 percent of the total demand is supplied by such lines.

Oil tankers, or oilers as they are called by the Navy, about which we hear so much at this time, deliver each day of the year to ports on the Atlantic seaboard about 550,000 barrels of crude oil; 400,000 barrels of domestic, industrial, and commercial fuel oils; nearly 350,000 barrels of gasoline; 75,000 barrels of kerosene; and smaller amounts of lubricants and miscellaneous oils.

During 1940, nearly 1,400,000 barrels of crude oil and petroleum products were delivered daily to Atlantic-coast ports, and it is expected that 1941 needs will require a daily delivery of at least 1,500,000 barrels. Forty percent of this total is crude oil which is delivered to refining plants near Marcus Hook, Pa., Bayonne, N. J., and, to a lesser extent, New England and other Atlantic-coast ports. Sixty percent is received in finished form, ready for consumption upon delivery. Refineries along the Louisiana and Texas Gulf coast are the principal source of these finished petroleum products. Of the total Atlantic-coast supply of crude oil and refined products, about 83 percent has been received from Gulf-coast ports, 14 percent from nearby foreign ports, 1 percent from California, and the remaining 2 percent by land. If these percentages remain constant during 1941, and if, as anticipated, a daily supply of 1,500,000 barrels will be required, the domestic tanker fleet operating between the Gulf-coast and Atlantic-coast ports will be called upon to deliver 83 percent of the total, or approximately 1,250,000 barrels a day. Barge shipments from Gulf coast to South Atlantic ports, including the west coast of Florida, contribute only 20,000 barrels daily of this total.

Petroleum statistics generally assume such astronomical dimensions that it is difficult to reduce them to terms which come within the experience of those who are purchasers of oil products, a few gallons at a time. For instance, at a daily rate of 1,250,000 barrels, it is evident that at least 450,000,000 barrels of oil should be shipped this year by tankers from Gulf-coast to Atlantic-coast ports. That total, however, must be broken down if it is to be understood in terms of transportation. The average tanker will carry about 87,000 barrels per voyage; hence,

the delivery of 450,000,000 barrels during the year will require about 5,200 loadings, an average of about 100 loadings each week, or 14 each day. If 14 tankers are to sail each day, a tanker must be loaded and ready to leave some Gulf-coast port each 100 minutes throughout the year.

Although the majority of our present tankers are old and slow, recent additions to the fleet have been of larger size and faster. Each such addition increases the average speed of the entire fleet. In addition, particular attention has been given to reducing the time consumed in loading and unloading. The net result of these changes and increased efficiencies is that our present tanker fleet now can make about 20 round trips a year between Gulf-coast and Atlantic-coast ports, which they do with the regularity of a ferry service. Each vessel, on the average, can be expected to move about 1,700,000 barrels in the 20 round trips. At this rate it would require a domestic fleet of 260 tankers engaged in this service to move 450,000,000 barrels from Gulf-coast to Atlantic-coast ports during the year.

It should be recognized also that where movements of such magnitude are involved, delays or losses which may appear insignificant when expressed as a percentage become surprisingly important when the effect on deliveries of such delays or losses is translated into actual quantities of oil. A delay or loss of only 15 percent would reduce annual deliveries by 67,000,000 barrels, which is more oil than is now held in storage on the Atlantic coast.

Although calculations show the need for 260 tankers during 1941 in continuous operation between Gulf coast and Atlantic coast ports, the record so far this year shows that such a level has not been maintained. The record shows that 272 tankers were engaged in this service during January of this year, 260 in February, 239 in March, and 253 in April. As a consequence, deliveries of oil to Atlantic coast ports so far this year have not been equal to the demand and it has been necessary to draw upon the oil held in storage along the Atlantic coast. Reports of the Department of the Interior show that Atlantic coast stocks of crude oil and petroleum products were reduced during the first quarter of 1941 by 11,684,000 barrels.

If conditions had continued normal, it is quite probable that the American-flag tanker fleet, with the addition of such new ships as might be delivered this year, would have been able to transport the oil which will be needed on the Atlantic coast this year, although that accomplishment would have required the continuous operation of the fleet throughout the year and might have involved some draft on stocks. Other and newer demands, however, have been placed upon our tanker fleet. The situation became critical on May 1, 1941, when the Maritime Commission, in response to the President's call, asked the tanker owners to cooperate by allocating 50 tankers to be used in what is described as a shuttle service between Caribbean or Gulf coast ports and United States ports north of Hatteras, where the cargoes are turned over to foreign-flag boats for the voyage across the Atlantic. The tanker owners responded promptly and agreed immediately to allot 25 of their present tankers to this service, with arrangements for the transfer of the second 25 boats to be made subsequently. The Maritime Commission now has notified the tanker owners that the second 25 boats will be needed immediately. Of the first 25 tankers which now are being transferred to this shuttle service, 20 are being taken from the Gulf coast to Atlantic coast trade, 2 from the Pacific coast, and 3 from the Atlantic foreign service.

It is evident that the first transfer of 25 tankers already is having an effect upon our domestic affairs. One company, within the past few days, has chartered a foreign-flag tanker for use between Venezuela and the North Atlantic at a rate of 80 cents per barrel, which is 30 cents per barrel higher than the previous rate. It is reported also that some domestic-tanker owners are asking a similar charter rate for American-flag tankers in the Gulf-to-Atlantic trade. Sales of fuel oil and gasoline now are being made in New York and Boston at prices which are higher than those which prevailed before the transfer of these vessels.

The transfer of the second group of tankers will cut deeper into the Gulf-to-Atlantic fleet. Eighty percent of our American-flag tankers normally operate in that service; hence, it is that service which must be affected most seriously by these transfers. The net effect of these transfers probably will be to reduce the fleet in this service to about 210 ships, or 50 less than the 260 tankers needed.

It is obvious that other means of moving oil to the Atlantic coast must be provided without delay if we are to avoid the higher prices, and possibly the restriction of oil consumption to essential uses, which are certain to follow this contraction of our customary transportation facilities. The minimum requirement for such supplemental transportation is approximately 300,000 barrels daily or, roughly, one-fourth of the anticipated consumption in the Atlantic-coast area during the present year. A definite effort is being made at present to utilize existing pipe-line and rail facilities to the fullest possible extent, but such changes can only add the proverbial "drop in the bucket." The problem is that of providing new ways of shipping about 100,000,000 barrels of oil to the Atlantic coast this year and that cannot be done unless additional pipe lines of large capacity are built immediately.

The bill before you has the enthusiastic support and endorsement of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Office of Production Management over the personal signature of Mr. Knudsen. Only because in the report accompanying the bill you do not find the letter from the Department of the Navy, I refer to a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce but not received in time to be printed in the report. In this letter the Secretary states:

> The Navy Department is vitally interested in the development of the pipe-line facilities contemplated in this bill to insure the expeditious, safe, and economical transportation of petroleum products.
>
> The Navy Department recommends that the proposed legislation be enacted.

Upon a finding by the President of the United States as to the need therefor, and the issuance by him of a proclamation to that effect, private companies or individuals or both are permitted to construct pipe lines throughout this country, only, however, where and when the President finds it advisable in the interest of national defense. If private undertaking is not available in an acceptable form the Government can build such lines. The power of eminent domain attaches to the authority which is granted by the Federal Government, making it possible to take private property and take it at once, and pay for it afterward.

After June 30, 1943, the expiration date of this legislation, if there are any Government-owned or private-owned lines they would be continued in operation under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, subject, of course, to the rate structure established by that Commission. They would, of course, be common carriers.

The bill is presented to you today with the unanimous support of your subcommittee, which I have stated before, is functioning under a special House resolution, and also of the main committee, with the exception of one slight difference which may be presented in the form of an amendment.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the fact that with the withdrawal of water transportation as rapidly as has taken place up to this time, and I believe we can safely say more so in the future, we must have some substitute to bring petroleum into the eastern part of this country.

I have been accused in some quarters, editorially and otherwise, of being selfish in recommending this legislation because I happen to represent a major portion of the large industrial section of Maryland. It is true that the district I have the honor of representing comprises almost one-third of the population of Maryland, including about one-half of the area of Baltimore City, and one-third of its population, along with my home County of Baltimore, which surrounds the city, but when it is realized that over 50,000 men are employed today in activities such as the Bethlehem Steel plant at Sparrows Point, and the Glenn L. Martin aviation plant, and many others of real importance to the national-defense program, and, furthermore, that the Aberdeen Proving Ground and Edgewood Arsenal, Camp Holabird, all among our most important war activities, are within the borders of my district, I am sure those who know me will not be critical as I admit that I am vitally concerned about the situation facing my district at this time. The main concern, however, is the entire Atlantic seaboard, which is quite similar to the conditions in my own district. My thought today is addressed not to one isolated section, but to the welfare of our entire country, and

no one can read this legislation and fairly comprehend and admit of its purposes without conceding that such is what the legislation is for. I do not have the time to discuss at greater length the purpose of the bill. It is a simple measure. It accomplishes its purpose in a legal, fair, and proper way.

With the amendments which the committee recommends and one additional amendment which the committee will offer, I hope the bill will have the favorable consideration of this committee. For the information of the Members, I recommend the reading of the hearings held by our committee, all of which are now in print.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. While I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has made an exhaustive study in regard to granting the right to install pipe lines to the eastern seaboard, I am wondering what effect this will have on the lives of the railroad men, not at this particular time but when peace is declared and we go back to normal. What will happen to the men who will be displaced, undoubtedly, by reason of the construction of these pipe lines?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The railroad men and the railroad management, both labor and management, have taken a splendid attitude toward this measure. It is possible if a line is constructed in competition with the railroads that later it might have such effect as the gentleman has in mind. I do not know. However, I have before me a letter addressed by the Association of American Railroads to the Office of Production Management, with this concluding paragraph:

> I may say, in connection with the attitude of the southeastern railroads toward the construction of new pipe lines, that I am advised that at a meeting of these roads held in Washington today, such steps were taken as make it certain that the railroads will advocate no policies which will tend to obstruct the program of national defense.

This bill admittedly is endorsed by all agencies of the Government to which we look for any expression along that line. The labor men at first opposed any legislation which would deal with the situation in the Southeast alone, but that was all before the withdrawal of the 50 tankers.

I hope that in the administration of this act those responsible for the building of the lines will keep very definitely in mind what the distinguished gentleman has just pointed out and try to avoid any possibility of that in the future.

Mr. SCHULTE. I may say that I realize the sympathy the gentleman from Maryland has toward those who find it necessary to work for a living and especially the sympathetic regard he has always shown for railroad labor, and I was reasonably sure that he would give them all the consideration under the sun, but I was just wondering if the gentleman knew what would happen to them in the event peace was declared and we found it necessary to do something about the pipe lines.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement. It is especially appreciated because I regard the distinguished gentleman as one of the best friends labor has in this body. My record as a member of this great committee will show that I have consistently supported all worth-while legislation in which railroad labor was interested, most of which has come from this committee. If a line is constructed with private capital with the approval of the President, it will continue after the life of this bill as a common carrier, subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission the same as any other pipe line. If it is constructed by the Federal Government it will do the same. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] I understand is to offer an amendment dealing with that subject, an amendment which the committee has discussed, and if it is in the language I believe it to be it will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is speaking of the construction of these pipe lines by the Government. It is conceivable that the Government will not operate these pipe lines, and they may ultimately be owned and controlled by the Standard Oil Co., after they were built at Government expense.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The committee hopes that the Government will not be required to put any money into this activity but that private capital will be attracted to all these projects. I do not know whether the Standard Oil or any other company is coming into it, but I know it is needed. If we can bring private capital into this field let us do it, and stop spending so much more Federal money.

Mr. WHITE. The argument for this legislation is to build the pipe lines with Government money, is it not?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Not necessarily. The committee report states that we hope they will be constructed with private capital.

Mr. WHITE. But they can be built with Government money if some private individual does not do it?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITE. They will be built with Government money.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Unless private capital is available.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that when they were trying to obtain spruce stands for airplane construction in the World War emergency the Government built a railroad, and it later developed that the railroad went 40 miles away to open up privately owned timber, and finally the railroad was sold at 10 cents on the dollar to the Milwaukee Railroad?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. No; I did not know it, but I am glad to hear about it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Did the gentleman give any consideration to including pipe lines for natural gas in this legislation?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes; we did. There was a request for natural gas to be included in the bill. The committee felt, in view of the fact that natural gas is a subject of special regulation under the Natural Gas Act administered by the Federal Power Commission, it is questionable whether there can be provided the same factual basis without much delay for the inclusion of natural gas in conferring the power of eminent domain upon private individuals under the theory of national-defense need. For that reason and others, which I do not have the time to state, we thought it ought to be the subject of separate legislation. I may say to the gentleman that I can very easily see where the future use of these lines might be better for natural gas than petroleum if tankers are available to supply the needs of the Atlantic coast.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I have two questions, one of which has been partially answered. I wanted to know if the committee had measured in dollars the probable cost under this bill. I think the gentleman answered that question by saying that, perhaps, no Federal money would be involved.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. We hope not, although it is difficult to say. It depends on how many lines are needed, the size of the lines, and where they will be constructed.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the committee have any information before it as to the comparative cost of transportation of oil as between rail, water and pipe lines?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes, the tanker method is much the cheapest of all.

Mr. DONDERO. Even cheaper than the pipe line?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Decidedly so. In fact, pipe lines have difficulty in competing with tankers which, I think is directly responsible for the condition we have today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it correct to assume that this act prohibits the construction of an interstate pipe line for transmitting petroleum unless the President makes the finding as provided in section 2?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The finding provided for in section 2 is a prerequisite to the building of any line under this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill (H. R. 4816) to facilitate the construction, extension, and completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense is designed to meet a serious situation that has arisen in the oil industry

because of lack of adequate transportation facilities, particularly, affecting the States along the Atlantic seaboard.

The seriousness of the situation was brought to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee of the House, having jurisdiction of the subject matter, by a letter from the President dated January 23, 1941, in which he said:

The Atlantic coast area now is dependent upon ocean transportation for nearly its entire supply of crude-petroleum products. Present facilities for such transportation do not afford much leeway under normal conditions and very likely will prove inadequate in an emergency. It is in the interest of national defense to augment currently these facilities, especially if this can be done by private agencies without extra cost to the Government.

Upon receipt of this letter from the President, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], directed the petroleum subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., is chairman, and the gentleman from California, CLARENCE F. LEA; the gentleman from Illinois, EDWARD A. KELLY; the gentleman from New Jersey, CHARLES A. WOLVERTON; and the gentleman from Massachusetts, PEHR G. HOLMES, are members, to make an immediate study of the situation and make such recommendations with respect to legislation as the circumstances would seem to require.

In accordance with the request of the President, the petroleum subcommittee immediately arranged to take up consideration of the necessity of additional pipe-line facilities to meet the present emergency growing out of war conditions abroad, to provide an adequate national defense, and promote the movement of oil in interstate commerce. Hearings were arranged and all interested parties given the opportunity to appear and present their views. A study of the testimony and the supporting data presented to committee leaves no doubt that a real need exists for additional transportation facilities for oil to the Atlantic seaboard, and, particularly is this true with respect to the States in the southern and southeastern portion of this area. The need and the advisability of providing increased facilities for the movement of oil in this section is accentuated by the presence of many Army camps, flying fields, and defense industries, as well as the usual consumer demand for oil for industrial and private use. Altogether it presents a problem the solution of which is vital to the public welfare.

An analysis of the facts relating to present facilities for transportation of petroleum in the Atlantic seaboard section of the country will reveal that from Florida to Maine, water transportation provides virtually the entire supply of petroleum used along the Atlantic seaboard.

The testimony of Dr. Robert E. Wilson, consultant of the Petroleum Production Division, Office of Production Management, makes crystal clear the imperative need for increased transportation facilities to provide for possible contingencies growing out of the present war emergency. In his testimony before the subcommittee on March 27, 1941, he said:

The only possible bottleneck which gives us concern is in tanker transportation to the east coast. About 95 percent of the petroleum products consumed by the east coast States is delivered there by tanker, either in the form of crude or refined products, and mainly from our Gulf coast. The movement from the Gulf coast alone, which is about 82 percent of the total, amounts to about 1,250,000 barrels per day and requires the services of a fleet of 260 domestic tankers, plus a few more that will be added by building. This large tanker fleet normally has some excess capacity, but a combination of circumstances has resulted in a rather tight situation at present. These circumstances are, first, the fact that a large percentage of our tanker fleet was built during and shortly after the last war, and hence is nearing the end of its useful life; second, during the past 2 years a considerable number of ships has been transferred into foreign service to replace ships which have been sunk and to make up for the longer hauls and less efficient use of tankers brought about by war conditions. In addition to this, 8 large high-speed tankers with more carrying capacity than any other tankers in the fleet, I believe, have already been requisitioned for the Navy, and several more are likely to be so requisitioned, especially in the event of war.

In the event of a naval war in the Atlantic, which might result in the loss of some tankers and necessitate the use of a convoy system, there would undoubtedly be serious difficulty in supplying civilian requirements on the east coast and for this reason we have been urging the industry to relieve this situation by all possible means.

With regard to the matter of the proposed pipe lines in southeastern United States, I feel that, for reasons already indicated, the construction of such lines is definitely desirable from a defense standpoint and that to permit one interstate carrier to block the right-of-way of another interstate carrier, especially under the emergency conditions we are facing, is indefensible. Pipe lines also have the advantage of being less vulnerable to hostile attack and more easily repaired than are most other methods of transportation. While the railroads and tank trucks could undoubtedly handle the amount of oil which could be carried by any one or two pipe lines, the cost of such transportation would be two or three times as great, and to be properly prepared for an emergency in the Atlantic we need to augment all methods of transportation to the east coast, because the combined efforts of all of them would probably be inadequate.

The southeastern section is the only part of the country which does not now have the benefit of pipe-line transportation, and yet from a national-defense viewpoint this is the most important place to have it in order to reduce the amount of tanker transportation required around the Florida Peninsula. I understand that one of the proposed lines will obviate the need for about five average tankers, and even this could readily be expanded.

It seems fortunate that it is possible to have such facilities constructed by private capital if the legal obstacles can be eliminated. It is difficult to understand the unwillingness of the Georgia Legislature to pass the necessary enabling legislation in view of the recent united recommendations of the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, but it would seem that it must be based on a lack of appreciation of the seriousness of the situation.

The importance from a national-defense standpoint of having additional transportation facilities provided to supplement the present tanker was forcibly presented by President Roosevelt in a letter dated March 18, 1941, addressed to Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, which in part said:

I have received the following letter signed by the Secretaries of War, Navy and Interior:

"We respectfully recommend that transportation facilities which will permit the shipment of petroleum products to Atlantic coast areas by methods which will relieve the present dependence upon tankers are essential to the national defense. In our opinion, gasoline pipe lines which extend from Gulf coast ports into areas now served wholly or partly by tankers and which contact intermediate points of military importance should be classed as facilities which are essential to the national defense. The Southeastern pipe line, originating at St. Joe, Fla., and the proposed Plantation pipe line designed to originate at Baton Rouge, La., are present examples of such pipe lines. This recommendation is based upon existing conditions, as follows:

"1. The Atlantic coast, with 40 percent of our population and the greater part of our industries, depends upon ocean transportation by tankers from ports in Texas, Louisiana, California, and nearby foreign countries for virtually all of its petroleum. Present pipe lines to the Atlantic coast cannot handle more than 4 percent of the oil which needs to be delivered.

"2. Present tanker facilities are not more than adequate to meet current peacetime needs and are certain to prove inadequate in the event of a full emergency. Tankers plying between Gulf coast and Atlantic coast ports deliver 81 percent of the Atlantic coast oil supply. During February 1941, 260 tankers engaged in this service. Most of those boats are old and are approaching the end of their economic life. Their average speed is 10.5 knots, with 18 days required for an average round trip. They are capable of making 20 round trips yearly, or 5,200 sailings annually for the present fleet. The average load per vessel approximates 83,000 barrels. If operated at full capacity, the present tanker fleet engaged in the Gulf-to-Atlantic trade could transport 436,000,000 barrels during the year, which now appears to be a minimum 1941 requirement for shipments in this service.

"3. There are no supplemental sources from which additional tankers could be obtained readily in quantities sufficient to meet the accelerated needs of an emergency without infringing upon other essential needs. A few additional tankers operate from time to time in the Gulf-to-Atlantic trade but recent developments indicate that other demands for tanker transportation may prevent the transfer of any substantial number of such tankers to this service. Some of the present fleet, such as the 4 national-defense tankers still operating in this commercial service, are likely to be called into naval service. About 70 new tankers are under construction or contract, but their delivery dates extend over the next 3 years, with an approximate completion rate of 2 tankers per month, and it is possible that other needs for their services may develop prior to their completion.

"4. In the event of hostilities which would subject oceangoing tankers to enemy attack or necessitate the adoption of a convoying system, the reduced speed and delays connected therewith would lower the annual delivery capacity of the tanker fleet and might involve the loss or destruction of some vessels. Delays or losses of only 15 percent would be sufficient to reduce annual deliveries by 65,000,000 barrels, which is nearly as much oil as is now held in storage on the Atlantic coast. In the event of a real emergency, such delays or losses are likely to be substantially in excess of 15 percent.

"5. Approximately 4,000,000 barrels of petroleum products are shipped monthly by water from Gulf coast refineries to ports in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, from where shipments are made inland into the area which will be served by the Southeastern and Plantation pipe lines. The direct shipment of gasoline into these areas by pipe line will reduce correspondingly the demand for tanker transportation. According to present plans, the Plantation pipe line would be capable of delivering to its final terminal a quantity of gasoline equivalent to that which could be transported by six average tankers. This quantity could be increased by additions to the line and pumping equipment. The routes selected for these pipe lines contact points of military importance.

"6. In our opinion, the present situation with respect to the Atlantic coast petroleum supply is such as to require the full development of all supplemental means of serving the needs of that area. This should involve also the increased utilization of rail and truck facilities in some sections and an expansion of storage capacities. The construction of all such facilities by private capital is directly in line with the present program for national defense."

I feel fully justified in advising you that this pipe line is essential to our national-defense program.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Further references to the testimony before the committee with supporting data could be given, but that already referred to is abundantly sufficient to support and make plain the imperative need of providing immediately for the construction of pipe lines from the oil fields of the Southwest to the Atlantic seaboard to supply the domestic and defense-program needs. There is a duty upon Congress to act and act quickly in passing the legislation necessary for such purpose.

The need for additional transportation facilities to bring petroleum from the southwestern oil fields to the Atlantic seaboard becomes greater every day. Even since the committee held its hearings 25 tankers have been taken out of the Gulf to Atlantic ports service at the request of Government officials in an effort to aid Britain and transferred to a service that will bring oil from South American fields for transshipment to Britain. And from information that has come to the committee, another 25 tankers are to be taken. This will reduce the present fleet to 210 tankers. This creates a situation that cannot do otherwise than seriously affect the whole Atlantic coast area. Already there has been a considerable rise in the price of fuel oil and gasoline throughout the Atlantic seaboard States. In my own locality, southern New Jersey, there has been an increase in the price of gasoline of 2 cents per gallon. This has all taken place since the transfer of the tankers to which I have just referred.

The situation will undoubtedly become worse as additional tankers are taken from their present service, and the result will be to place an additional burden upon domestic and industrial consumers. It is also plain, beyond argument, that unless some means are provided to move oil to the Atlantic coast there will be not only an increasing price to the consumer but possibly the restriction of oil consumption to essential uses. There is no doubt of the ability of the oil industry to produce whatever is necessary for domestic, industrial, and military uses. The critical situation that we face is not due to production. It is entirely due to lack of transportation facilities.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a way for the oil companies to build their pipe lines and get their product to the private consumer and also meet the demands of our Army and Navy in a time of emergency. Furthermore, the building of their lines is to be done at their own expense. They are ready and willing to invest the millions of dollars that is necessary for its accomplishment. All that stands in their way is the selfish opposition of a competing form of transportation. This is no time to let any such consideration thwart a program that is so vital to our national defense and the welfare of our people. Every possible precaution and protection of the public interest has been thrown around the right of eminent domain, which this bill gives the right to exercise. It should have the unanimous support of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. As between rail transportation and pipe-line transportation, which is the cheaper?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Generally speaking, pipe-line transportation is the cheaper.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the committee have any information as to whether or not rail facilities now established would be sufficient to bring this oil to the Atlantic seaboard if the tankers were taken out of use?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. It is my opinion that if all the tankers were taken out of service it would not be possible, today, for railroads with the increased demands upon them to provide adequately for the transportation of oil in the section of the country to which I have made reference. The gentleman will note, however, from the statement I have made that the building of there pipe lines is intended to relieve a serious situation which results from lack of tankerage space. At the present time all but 4 percent of the petroleum transported to the Atlantic seaboard is transported in tankers. For this reason any shortage of tankers creates a serious situation especially in the event of war.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in accord with the gentleman's views on the subject entirely.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Does not the gentleman think some protection should be thrown around section 4? It seems to me the language of that section is very broad. It gives the President the power to put pipe lines anywhere he wants to and for as long as he wants to.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. It is my opinion that the provisions of the bill so limit the exercise of the power by the President that there is nothing to be fearful of in the way that has been indicated by my distinguished friend from New Jersey. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending here this afternoon is of vital importance not only from the standpoint of national defense but also from the standpoint of the consuming public, as defined so well by the able and distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE], who has been chairman of this subcommittee for the last 7 years, and also by the able and capable gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. Chairman, the real bottleneck existing today in the oil industry is the problem of transportation. It is not a problem of production, but of transporting oil from the producing section of this country to essential points on the eastern seaboard and to areas of the greatest consumption and uses.

As you have been told that 95 percent of all the crude oil and its derivatives, now used from the coast of Maine to Florida, must rely upon water transportation that provide virtually the entire supply of petroleum used along the Atlantic coast.

During 1940 nearly 1,400,000 barrels of crude oil and petroleum products were delivered daily to Atlantic-coast ports and it is expected that 1941 will demand an increase of some one or two hundred thousand barrels daily.

Forty percent of this total is crude oil which is delivered to refining plants near Marcus Hook, Pa., and Bayonne, N. J. Sixty percent is received in its finished form ready for use. Refineries along the Louisiana and Texas Gulf coast are the principal source of these finished products.

If conditions had continued normal it is quite probable that the American-flag tanker fleet, with the addition of such new ships as might be delivered this year, would have been able to transport the oil which will be needed on the Atlantic coast this year, although that accomplishment would have required the continuous operation of the fleet throughout the year and might have involved some draft on stocks. Other and newer demands, however, have been placed upon our tanker fleet.

The situation became critical on May 1, 1941, when the Maritime Commission, in response to the President's call, asked the tanker owners to cooperate by allocating 50 tankers to be used in what is described as a shuttle service between Caribbean or Gulf-coast ports and United States ports north of Hatteras, where the cargoes are turned over to foreign-flag boats for the voyage across the Atlantic.

No patriotic group of men could have responded more freely and promptly and agreed immediately to allot 25 of their present tankers to this service, with arrangements for the transfer of the second 25 boats to be made subsequently.

The Maritime Commission now has notified the tanker owners that the second 25 boats will be needed immediately.

It is evident that the first transfer of 25 tankers already is having an effect upon our domestic affairs.

Sales of fuel oil and gasoline now are being made in New York and Boston at prices which are higher than those which prevailed before the transfer of these vessels.

The transfer of the second group of tankers will cut deeper into the Gulf-to-Atlantic Fleet.

Eighty percent of our American-flag tankers normally operate in the service; hence, it is that service which must be affected most seriously by these transfers.

The net effect of these transfers probably will be to reduce the fleet in this service to about 210 ships, or 50 less than the 260 tankers needed.

From a commercial stand it is obvious that other means of moving oil to the Atlantic coast must be provided without delay if we are to avoid the higher prices and possibly the restriction of oil consumption for essential uses, which are certain to follow this contraction of our customary transportation facilities.

A definite effort is being made at present to utilize existing pipe lines and rail facilities to the fullest possible extent, but such changes can only add to a small part of this picture.

The problem today is that of providing new ways of shipping about 100,000,000 barrels of oil to the Atlantic coast this year, and that cannot be done unless additional pipe lines of large capacity are built immediately.

A controversy recently occurred which resulted when two companies endeavored to build gasoline pipe lines in the Southeastern States.

This bill does not have that situation solely in mind. For these lines, when completed, would only be able to deliver up to 60,000 or 70,000 barrels of gasoline daily into the Atlantic-coast area; with those lines completed it would still leave nearly 250,000 additional barrels of oil for the transportation of which pipe-line facilities must be provided. This bill is aimed at the broader national picture and is designed to give the support of the Federal Government to the pipe-line construction which is necessary for the national defense. In all discussions which have been had as to the laying of these lines, it has been evident that the strong support of the Federal Government is necessary in obtaining right-of-way, priorities on material and equipment, and other related matters.

Whether it will be possible to complete these pipe lines in time to avoid a crisis in the present serious situation, that is a question which cannot be answered.

It will depend upon the time in which to construct pipe lines, the availabilities of getting materials, and, of course, obtaining rights-of-way; many delays may be encountered; manpower may be a factor in its construction, delays may occur in the manufacture of the pipe and its delivery to points where it is needed.

Since the subcommittee closed its hearings on the subject herein discussed, attention has been noticed of a substantial increase in the price of gasoline per gallon to the consumer along the Atlantic seaboard, all of which is attributable to, or at least by the reports, requisitioning of tankers for the national-defense program.

It is evident that if gasoline prices are to be raised, fuel-oil prices will be raised. If sufficient supply is not available, the effect upon many activities, due to curtailment in use, must be contemplated.

The subcommittee reports with all the emphasis it commands that this situation is serious and requires an immediate solution at the hands of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I think this question has been ably covered by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE], the ranking minority member from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY]. I especially call attention to and emphasize the seriousness of this situation at the present time. I call attention to page 4 of the report and quote from that the following:

> Oil tankers, or oilers, as they are called by the Navy, about which we hear so much at this time, deliver each day of the year to ports on the Atlantic seaboard about 550,000 barrels of crude oil; 400,000 barrels of domestic, industrial, and commercial fuel oils; nearly 350,000 barrels of gasoline; 75,000 barrels of kerosene; and smaller amounts of lubricants and miscellaneous oils.
>
> During 1940 nearly 1,400,000 barrels of crude oil and petroleum products were delivered daily to Atlantic-coast ports and it is expected that 1941 needs will require a daily delivery of at least 1,500,000 barrels. Forty percent of this total is crude oil which is delivered to refining plants near Marcus Hook, Pa., Bayonne, N. J., and, to a lesser extent, New England and other Atlantic-coast ports. Sixty percent is received in finished form, ready for consumption upon delivery. Refineries along the Louisiana and Texas Gulf coast are the principal source of these finished petroleum products. Of the total Atlantic-coast supply of crude oil and refined products, about 83 percent has been received from Gulf-coast ports, 14 percent from nearby foreign ports, 1 percent from California, and the remaining 2 percent by land.

Even under the present condition with our tanker fleet—and I believe we had about 272 tankers in operation in January, and they have been materially reduced to 253 tankers, and during this month it is presumed that 25 additional tankers of the 50 allocated for the shuttle service will be taken out—it will seriously handicap the entire Atlantic coast insofar as getting the necessary crude and refined petroleum products.

If we take this entire Atlantic area, we will find in this industrial area that about 36 percent of the petroleum products are consumed there. These industrial plants in the eastern half of New York and Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the New England States are in daily need of petroleum products, and today they are very seriously worried about whether they will have a source of supply sufficient to keep their plants going, in addition to the other industrial activities and home consumption of fuel oil through this coming winter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned that eventually 50 tankers would be taken out of service. I notice in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning the following:

> The 50 American tankers recently requisitioned by the Government for British use may be used by the British, not to carry American oil overseas, but to pick up and transport South American and Dutch East Indies fuel to Britain.
>
> This fear of being forced to give up their own facilities to foster foreign competition was voiced yesterday by local spokesmen for the petroleum industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, that matter has been under consideration by the subcommittee for some time during the consideration of this bill. I do not know from whom the statement read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania emanates, but it is our understanding that they are going to utilize these 50 tankers for the shuttle service between the Caribbean and South American ports up along the North Atlantic coast.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Mr. BOREN. Is it the gentleman's contention that these pipe lines are essential for ordinary commercial uses as well as national defense?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. BOREN. Would the gentleman have any objection to putting the same provision in the bill for natural gas as we have for oil? If the line is essential for commercial purposes and industrial use, why are not these pipe lines provided for natural gas also? Would the gentleman object to inserting natural gas?

Mr. HOLMES. I want to say under normal conditions the normal industrial situation would not be affected one iota, but it is because of the tremendous national-defense demand upon industries in this section, which also affects local consumption of normal industrial operations. Primarily this is a national-defense problem.

Mr. BOREN. If it were strictly a national-defense program it would be sufficient for the Government to build a pipe line for its exclusive use, would it not?

Mr. HOLMES. Of course, that all depends upon the interpretation. I would not agree to that interpretation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MASSACHUSETTS SETS A FINE EXAMPLE OF ECONOMY WHICH THE CONGRESS SHOULD FOLLOW

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in these days of extravagant Federal expenditures and ever-mounting debt, it is refreshing to note that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has set a fine example by reducing its debt from $40,000,000 in 1938 to an anticipated $10,000,000 during the present biennium.

Great credit is due to Governor Saltonstall and the Republican legislature for having placed the finances of Massachusetts on a sound basis. This has been accomplished by keeping a tight rein on the purse strings, by economical and efficient administration, and by applying the strictest acid test of necessity to all proposals for encumbering the credit of the Commonwealth.

Think of what an example the State of Massachusetts in that respect is setting for the Federal Government and this Congress.

I have had the pleasure of examining the report made by Hon. Albert F. Bigelow, chairman of the ways and means committee of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, in presenting the general appropriation bill for the fiscal years 1941-42. In his report Mr. Bigelow well says:

> Despite all the new financial theories of recent years, the old-fashioned philosophy of prudence and caution in employing the public credit is still unassailable.

I desire to call to the attention of the House the following additional statements contained in Mr. Bigelow's report, which I heartily endorse:

> If we act carelessly and spend lavishly, we shall heap cruelly unjust burden upon the backs of our citizens whose Federal tax bills next year will be from three to six times what they are this year. But if we act thoughtfully and prudently, conscious of the overpowering need to conserve the resources and income of our citizens so that they may better meet the financial demands of the defense program—by that very course of action we can make a patriotic contribution to the cause of democracy and set a splendid example for others to follow. * * * There is very little indication of savings in Federal nondefense expenditures, and that regrettable fact adds one more compelling reason why other units of Government must keep their expenditures within prudent limits. * * * In our committee action upon this budget we have kept these considerations constantly before us. We have held to a strong conviction that the best form of assistance which we could give our constituents in these times would be to prepare for the financial storms which are bound to come by keeping the State's functions operating economically and efficiently, but by turning a stern face of refusal upon any unnecessary expansions.

I submit that that is splendid advice to this Congress. We on the Republican side have been trying as best we knew how to see if we could not bring about some economy in nondefense appropriations. It does not seem to be possible to do it under the Democratic control that exists in this House at the present time.

I commend Mr. Bigelow's splendid statement to this House. The Federal Government should follow the example of Massachusetts by reducing nondefense expenditures to the bone. Thus far, as Mr. Bigelow points out, there has been no evidence of any substantial efforts along that line.

In fact, he is very modest in making that statement, because the trend has actually been in the other direction. In trying to save on nondefense items we find ourselves up against a stone wall.

The Ways and Means Committee, working hard, as we are now, on the new tax bill, find our difficulties increased by the extravagance of the present Congress. If the Government was not spending so much for civil purposes, the defense program would not be so great a burden.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when this House can no longer ignore the imperative necessity for eliminating all nonessential expenditures and for curtailing all other nondefense items to the lowest possible level. An examination of the record of appropriations to date discloses that we are proposing to spend as much for civil purposes in the fiscal year 1942 as we spent for all purposes, including defense, in 1938. This is being done despite the fact that our defense program, which already exceeds forty billions, has placed a heavy strain on the public credit and necessitated an unprecedented tax burden upon the people. There can be no possible justification, in the light of these conditions, for the administration's failure to take appropriate steps to curtail civil expenditures.

Our present situation calls for strong leadership, looking to a definite program of economy in nonmilitary functions of Government. The President very properly assumed that leadership in 1933 when he sent his since-forgotten economy message to Congress. We have not heard any repetition of that advice, nor any effort to carry it out, since 1933. Why not have the President assume the responsibility of endeavoring to protect the taxpayers of this country and relieve the strain on the national credit by reducing nondefense items? I know that the great majority of the American people would support him if he reassumed that leadership today. It is the President's constitutional duty to advise the Congress on matters of national policy, and we all know that without the support of the executive branch it is impossible to secure the desired results.

The responsibility for expenditures is a joint one between the President and the Congress. There should be no "buck passing" from one branch of the Government to the other. No one seems to deny the necessity for economy, yet the Executive continues to recommend, and the Congress continues to pass, appropriations for nondefense purposes which are at least equal to, if not greater than, those of the preemergency period.

The way to economize is to economize. Action is what we need. We must stop talking economy and begin voting economy. Unless we do it soon, the people are going to have to take the matter into their own hands and send men and women to Congress who will carry out their wishes in the matter. The Democratic majority have full control of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and the responsibility for inaction is on their shoulders.

Republican Members have been making efforts to reduce the amounts carried in the various appropriation bills, but we have had little or no support from the Democratic side. I have been trying for some time to secure consideration of my resolution providing for the creation of a joint committee of Congress to coordinate revenues and expenditures, but I have received no assistance from the majority side.

Where is the leadership in the Democratic Party today? The President has admitted that we are headed for national bankruptcy if we continue our present policy of extravagance and unlimited borrowing. Are you going to stand idly by and let our Government be wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy?

We are asking the people of this country to make sacrifices for national defense. Why should not the various bureaus and departments of the Government do likewise? Let us apply the priority principle to the taxpayers' dollars, and devote some of the money we are now spending for nonessentials to the purchase of planes and guns and tanks. This will save us from having to impose so great an additional burden on the taxpayers of the country and at the same time relieve the strain on the national credit.

I repeat that it is up to the Democratic leadership to take the lead in bringing about economy. We Republicans have not sufficient votes to do it alone. If you of the majority fail to assume that leadership, you will have to answer to the people at the next election. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this Act—

(1) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce between any point in a State and any point outside thereof or between points within the same State but through any place outside thereof.

(2) The term "person" includes an individual, firm, copartnership, corporation, company, or association, and any trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof.

SEC. 2. Whenever the President finds that the construction of any pipe line for the transportation and/or distribution of petroleum or petroleum products moving in interstate commerce, or the extension or completion of any such pipe line already wholly or partly constructed, is or may be necessary for national-defense purposes, he shall by proclamation declare such finding.

SEC. 3. (a) If the President is of the opinion that such action is desirable in the interests of national defense, he may provide for the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line by such department or agency of the Government as he may designate.

(b) The department or agency undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by purchase or by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. In case the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line is undertaken otherwise than as provided in section 3, the person or persons undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 4 and insert:

"SEC. 3. In case the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line is undertaken otherwise than as provided in section 4, the person or persons undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line.

"SEC. 4. (a) In the event that it is impracticable for any private person promptly and satisfactorily to construct, extend, or complete any such pipe line, the President, if of the opinion that such action is desirable in the interests of national defense, may provide for the construction, extension, or completion of such pipe line by such department or agency of the Government as he may designate.

"(b) The department or agency undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by purchase or by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line."

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 3, line 15, strike out the word "or" at the beginning of the line and insert the words "or operation" after the word "completion."

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, in this section you will notice nothing is said about the operation of these pipe lines even in case a Government agency takes them over, builds and completes them. My amendment would merely make it possible for the appropriate Government agency to operate such pipe line.

I can see no reason why the committee should not accept the amendment.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. May I ask the gentleman what this provides?

Mr. IZAC. It merely adds the words "or operation" after the word "maintenance."

Mr. BOREN. On what page?

Mr. IZAC. On page 3, line 16. It is an amendment I offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Section 7 of the bill, of course, provides for the operation of the lines on such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe. As I stated earlier, an amendment will be offered that 1 year after the expiration of this act the operation of any Government-owned line shall cease.

The clear intent of the act, of course, is that the lines should be operated if, by the Government then only during the emergency.

Mr. IZAC. This section does not specifically so state in the place where it should be stated.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. If there is any doubt about it in the mind of the gentleman I have no objection to its being cleared up.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman, and, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the next amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE of Washington) there were—ayes 45, noes 1.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 3, insert a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

"Any pipe line constructed by a department or agency of the Government as provided in (a) and (b) of this bill shall remain the property of the United States and shall be operated, first, for the transportation of petroleum products needed in the interest of the national defense; and, secondly, as a common carrier for the benefit of all shippers and consignees making application for the transportation of petroleum products."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. I should like first to clarify my objection to the gentleman's amendment by saying that it went to the fundamental character of the word "operate," which might be construed as constituting a direction to the Government. And I want to ask the gentleman about the word "remain" in the pending amendment, "shall remain the property of the Government."

Mr. IZAC. In other words, after the Government constructs these pipe lines we hope they will not turn them over to one of the big oil companies for the express purpose of keeping out the little fellows. As the gentleman knows, in Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, all the oil-producing States, we have a great number of small producers who would be squeezed out by the big fellows when he transports his great mass of oil and gives preference to his own group.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman wants to be certain that the pipe lines remain common carriers?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the bill provides specifically that these lines shall be disposed of following the expiration of this act. Did the gentleman mean to place a limitation on the word "remain"? I would ask the gentleman whether he meant for the lines to remain the property of the Government until 1943, for instance, or some specific date, or forever?

Mr. IZAC. I am especially interested in seeing that while we build these pipe lines the Government shall operate them until this emergency is over or the date in the bill is reached.

Mr. BOREN. The point I am making is that the words "shall remain" is a forever proposition. There should be some limitation on it if the gentleman has in mind limiting the period of Government operation of these lines. It is a fundamental matter.

Mr. IZAC. If the gentleman will take cognizance of the remainder of the amendment, he will see that I am striving to make of these lines a carrier for the national defense while the national defense exists, and that afterward we make them common carriers subject to the provisions of the law and under the control of the I. C. C.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman will notice, speaking of the future status of these lines, that section 9 provides that after 1943 the President shall not have any power conferred by section 2, 3, 4, or 6 of the act, but makes no reference whatsoever to section 8 of the act which says that they shall remain subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission Act. Without reference to section 8 they may go on forever if the President wishes to issue an order permitting them not to come under the act.

Mr. IZAC. I see the gentleman's point. I have no objection to putting a limitation in here if it will clarify the meaning, but what I am endeavoring to do is not permit the Government to turn this over to one oil company to the detriment of all the oil producers and consignees, and you people all over the country are interested in the consignees because they are the ones who are going to get the oil that we send up from the South to be distributed among your people.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. Would not the gentleman's amendment also have the effect of putting into operation additional pipe lines which will serve to break down the already existing monopoly, whereas the four principal oil companies have already raised the price of gasoline?

Mr. IZAC. Yes. We are in favor of additional pipe lines that will make it possible for people in all parts of the country to get this oil, even in spite of the national emergency in which we find ourselves.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I have just read the amendment offered by the gentleman and it clearly has for its purpose

to continue the Government in the pipeline business after this emergency is over.

Mr. IZAC. No; not at all.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. It says that it shall remain the property of the United States.

Mr. IZAC. It shall remain, yes; but you have a limitation in this bill of 1943. At the end of that time the Government is going to have to do something with aircraft factories, with pipe lines, and with all the other things that we are building now.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. If it is the purpose of the amendment, and I can read it in no other way, to have the Government continue to operate these pipe lines after a reasonable time following the expiration of this act, and the Government shall be in business, that is about as opposite to the purpose of this legislation as anything could possibly be.

By inserting the word "operation" in section 4 of the bill as the gentleman's amendment provides, it seems to me that when you read section 9 in connection therewith, it will mean that any Government-constructed and operated line would automatically cease to function on June 30, 1943. For that reason I believe if the gentleman's amendment is adopted in order to clear up the situation he has presented, it will be advisable to amend section 7 in a way which I shall later suggest so as to permit very definitely the operation of Government-owned lines as contemplated in the language of that section. I will be glad to talk to the gentleman from California while the bill is being further debated and I think I will be able to convince him of the need of a slight amendment to section 7.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I direct the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to section 9 which provides that after June 30, 1943, neither the President nor any department or agency of the Government, nor any person shall exercise any of the powers conferred by sections 2, 3, 4, or 6 of this act, and this is an amendment to section 4.

Mr. IZAC. Absolutely.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. June 30, 1943, remains as a limitation. It cannot remain beyond that date by the provisions of the gentleman's amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE], has properly appraised the effect of this bill. Here is what this bill seeks to do. It says in effect that there is a defense emergency before the country, and a shortage in petroleum and petroleum products threatens on the eastern coast. There are certain obstacles in the way of building the proposed pipe line promptly and expeditiously by private capital, so we are going to facilitate the building of the line by private capital by removing those obstacles, hoping it will be done that way. If it is not done that way the Government will step in and build the line and operate it.

Section 7 of the bill proposed by the committee says that if the line is built by the Government, it may be operated by the Government or its proper agency, but after that time the Government may dispose of the line.

I think the proposition presented by this amendment gets right down to this: Are we going to socialize another part of our country, a part of the great transportation system that has been carried on as a matter of private enterprise subject to proper Government regulation? Are we going to take the critical situation in which the country presently finds itself, with a critical need for national defense and for prompt action by the Government to meet the needs of the national defense, and under that guise socialize one thing after another as a part of our system of private enterprise and write it as a policy of our Government to be continued after the crisis and the emergency is over?

I do not think we want to legislate that way. I do not think the Congress feels that way about it. If there is a monopoly in the hands of the big oil companies that is wrongfully discriminating and operating against lesser producers, then I say go after that monopoly, but I am not in favor of putting the Government in business permanently and for all time to transport oil by a common-carrier operation in competition with its own citizens. Why, the very intent of this bill and the idea of the committee in its report is the hope that private capital will build this line.

I hope that private capital will build the line and that private capital and private enterprise will come forward when the restrictions are removed to the end that all parts of America may be made secure from attack and the needs and necessities of our situation may be met.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think that Section 9, which reads:

> After June 30, 1943, neither the President, any department or agency of the Government, nor any person shall exercise any of the powers conferred by Sections 2, 3, 4, or 6 of this act

will take care of the things that the gentleman is proclaiming against here and that that will prevent the Government from operating after that date?

Mr. HALLECK. No; it does not. The amendment does not prevent the Government from operating after that date because the operation power is contained in section 7 which section is not included in section 9.

Now, when the amendment of the gentleman from California on page 3, line 16, section 4 (a), was offered, to include the word "operation" then it might be that the termination date as fixed in section 9 would apply to operation at least insofar as operation is provided for in that particular section; but insofar as operation is provided for in section 7, then the limitation which the gentleman has read and to which he has referred in section 9, would not apply.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We have adopted an amendment which provides for operation, and that does not apply under section 9.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is essential or necessary even to do the thing that he thought he wanted done as I believe operation is clearly provided for in section 7.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. If the gentleman's position is correct, and I am inclined to agree that it is, then what is there in this bill at the present time that will prevent the Government from continuing operation of this line exceeding even the date of 1943? Section 7, which the gentleman cites, is simply a broad grant of powers. It states that the President may do this, he may lend it, he may lease it, or he may do this and that.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] in his opening statement indicated to the committee that an amendment which I propose to offer, and which I understand will be acceptable to the committee, is designed to limit that operation, that is, to do the specific thing the gentleman has in mind, which will require the termination of operation by the Government within a year after the emergency is passed.

Mr. BOREN. I hope the gentleman will set that date back to the expiration of the act instead of a year after.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. Would there be any objection to offering an amendment to section 7, so that when the Government does dispose of these pipe lines, as a part of the agreement they shall always be public carriers. In other words, I do not believe we could discharge our responsibility by saying we could prosecute monopolies, when we have it within our power, if the Government does construct these pipe lines, to make them always public carriers, available for large and small interests alike.

Mr. HALLECK. The Government, or its proper agency, will have this line, if they construct it under this act, which I do not believe will happen, but if they do construct it they will have it for disposal. They can, if they wish, sell it to a common-carrier corporation, organized for the very purpose the gentleman has in mind, which is to transport oil for anybody who presents it for transportation.

Whether they sell it to that sort of corporation, or whether they find it better to sell it to one company, which might even be a large company, or a group of large companies, would be for the Government and its agency to determine at the proper time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California.

It seems to me it is about time that the Congress of the United States, when about to authorize the use of the power of the Government of the United States in the aid of the greatest monopoly in American history, the oil monopoly, should safeguard that grant with every possible protection in the interest of the taxpayers.

You are about to authorize something for which the oil monopoly has been fighting for 50 years, and fighting in vain. You are about to give them the right to own and operate pipe lines with Government backing and Federal eminent-domain powers. The Legislature of the State of Georgia prevented a certain pipe line from going through that State, yet the pipe-line company which sought to send that pipe line through, in the dead of the night crossed railroad rights-of-way and under highways three different times. The railroad people and those interested down there had to get injunctions from the courts of the State of Georgia to prevent that violation of the law. What the gentleman from California proposes may be epitomized by stating that the Government shall have it in its possession, if it constructs the pipe line during the period of the operation of the act, which will expire on June 30, 1943, contemporaneously with that date the other powers granted under this act in certain specific sections shall cease.

Why is there not a definite provision assuring the right of common carriers under this act? What is wrong with giving the power and benefits of common carriers under the provisions of this bill? You will notice in a section of the amendment here that it is stated that the pipe line shall remain the property of the United States and it shall be operated, first, for the transportation of petroleum products needed in the interest of the national defense, and secondly, as a common carrier for the benefit of all.

What about these pipe lines? There is a bill now pending in the Congress of the United States, and it has been pending for lo these many years, and we cannot get a vote on it, providing for the divorcement of pipe lines from the major oil companies. That is the Harrington bill; also the Izac bill. There is a bill pending in the Senate of the United States providing for the same thing. That is the Gillette bill.

The independent oil operators in this country for a long while, as well as the consumer organizations and the distributors of the Nation, have been requesting the enactment by the Congress of legislation providing for the divorcement of ownership of pipe lines from the major oil companies. Now we are reversing the whole process under the impact of war hysteria and national defense, and we are going to lend the support of Uncle Sam to the major oil companies.

Good God, gentlemen, are you going to turn this whole country over to the largest combination of capital in the history of the world, representing an investment of capital of $14,000,000,000, the oil monopoly of the United States?

What have they done? Under threat of Secretary Harold Ickes, the newly designated national oil administrator, that we are going to have gasolineless Sundays, these monopolists have raised the price of gasoline recently on an average of 2 cents in more than half the States of the Union. Under the threat of gasolineless Sundays and cutting down the use of fuel oil in the homes of America the ostensible justification has been supplied for this kind of legislation. Note the clever press campaign to soften our people for the blow. They are being conditioned to accept sacrifices and arrangements they would normally reject.

Let us go into this situation just a minute. Fifty tankers, they say, have been turned over to Great Britain, but what about the other tankers which have been transferred from American registry? Let me read you a startling story about other tankers.

The tankers to which I now direct your attention were transferred at the beginning of the war emergency to a foreign flag in order to get them out from under the American flag so they would not have to operate under American laws requiring fair working conditions and fair hours for the seamen, it has been charged. It is likewise probable that these tankers, thus transferred as to flag registry and ownership, were to be used in a manner which would violate the spirit and the letter of the Neutrality Act. Whatever the reason the American people were thus deprived of a formidable number of valuable vessels indispensable to them in transporting oil. Why not repossess these tankers? Why not recapture these assets for ourselves? Shall we sit by supinely and permit the beneficiaries of the instant legislation to deny to us these needed vessels? Note carefully the quality of these boats. Because of their transfer we are now confronted with what is claimed to be a woeful paucity of oil supplies in the East. These tankers were taken out of American registry for the purpose of profit and to circumvent the restrictions of American laws, but by virtue of this unprecedented measure we lend the potent backing of our Government to the oil monopoly, while prices to consumers are raised. Where States refuse to facilitate the expansion of this combine this bill will supersede such prohibitions.

Tankers transferred from American registry to foreign registry, according to United States Maritime Commission, September 1939

Tanker name	Gross tonnage	Owner	Purchaser	Registry
H. H. Rogers	8,807	Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.	Panama Transport Co.	Panamanian.
Charles Pratt	8,982	do	do	Do.
Beaconlight	6,926	do	do	Do.
W. H. Libby	7,902	do	do	Do.
I. C. White	7,052	do	do	Do.
H. M. Flagler	8,207	do	do	Do.
Joseph Seep	7,088	do	do	Do.
Elisha Walker	7,007	do	do	Do.
Beaconhill	6,941	do	do	Do.
Standard	9,724	do	do	Do.
Geo. H. Jones	6,914	do	do	Do.
Dean Emery	6,664	do	do	Do.
Beaconoil	6,893	do	do	Do.
W. C. Teagle	9,551	do	do	Do.
James McGee	9,859	do	do	Do.

NOTE.—The Panama Transport Co. is the wholly owned subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

October 1939: Tanker *C. J. Barkdull*, 6,773 gross tonnage, from Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to its subsidiary, Compania de Petroleo Lago, Caracas, Venezuela, with transfer to Venezuelan registry.

January 1940: Tanker *Capt. A. F. Lucas*, 4,188 gross tonnage, from Standard Oil Co. of California to a subsidiary of its subsidiary, Balboa Transport Corporation, Colon, Panama, with registration under Panamanian flag.

February 1940: Tanker *Santa Maria*, 8,482 gross tonnage, by Union Oil Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif., to Panamanian-flag registry.

February 1940: Tanker *Norman Bridge*, 4,323 gross tonnage, by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to its subsidiary, Compania de Petroleo Lago, Caracas, Venezuela, with registry under Venezuelan flag.

March 16, 1940, P. R. 590: Tanker *Warwick*, 4,469 gross tonnage, from Union Oil Co. of California to Joaquim Monteiro de Carvalho, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and transfer to Brazilian registry.

March 18, 1940, P. R. 594: Tanker *Coalinga*, 875 gross tonnage, from Tide Water Associated Oil Co., New York City and San Francisco, to Cia. Peruana de Vapores y D. C., Callao, Peru, South America, with transfer to Peruvian registry.

June 24, 1940, P. R. 635: Tankers *T. J. Williams*, 8,211 gross tonnage; *George G. Henry*, 6,265 gross tonnage; *John Worthington*, 8,166 gross tonnage, from Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to its subsidiary, Panama Transport Co., Panama City, Panama, with transfer to Panamanian registry.

May 27, 1940, P. R. 600: Tanker *Texas 173*, gross tonnage 658, from Texas Co., New York to the Texas Co. (Panama), Inc., with registry under Panamanian flag.

August 10, 1940, P. R. 688: Tanker *T. J. Conway*, of 480 gross tonnage, from Diesel Tanker T. J. Conway, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., to International Petroleum Co., Ltd., Toronto, Canada, with transfer to Peruvian registry.

August 28, 1940, P. R. 697: Tanker *Wm. G. Warden*, 9,114 gross tonnage from Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to its wholly owned subsidiary Panama Transport Co., with transfer to Panamanian registry.

October 24, 1940, P. R. 734: Tankers *H. C. Folger*, of 7,096 gross tonnage, and *J. E.*

O'Neil, of 7,070 gross tonnage, from Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia, Pa., to Lloyd Brasileiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, with transfer to Brazilian registry.

March 12, 1941, P. R. 859: Tankers *Yorba Linda*, of 6,900 gross tonnage, and *Algonquin*, of 7,229 gross tonnage, from Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., New York City, to Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd., Panama, Republic of Panama, with registry under Panamanian flag.

March 28, 1941, P. R. 873: Tanker *New York*, of 6,400 gross tons, from the Texas Co., New York, to the Texas Co. (Panama), Inc., with transfer to Panamanian registry and flag.

NOTE: On May 24, 1941, the Fore River plant of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., Boston, commissioned a tanker of 16,550 gross tonnage for the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., but technically for its subsidiary, Petroleum Shipping Co., Ltd., of Panama, hence this ship, *Stanvac Cape Town*, like its sister ship, *Stanvac Calcutta* (launched March 15), and another coming off the ways soon, will be under Panamanian registry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. These are in addition to the 50 tankers we are told were transferred to Great Britain, but these tankers I have just described were not transferred for national-defense purposes. These were transferred in order to get out from under American laws enacted for the protection of our seamen and our neutrality.

This is an interesting situation when we are faced with a shortage of transportation facilities for gasoline and oil that these ships were transferred from the American flag and are not available for the use of the American taxpayers. It seems to me this Congress should be very hesitant, under the bludgeonings of national defense to put through a bill without properly safeguarding the interests of our country. If we are going to put Uncle Sam back of the major oil companies in order to get something they have wanted for 50 years in the establishment of great pipe lines across the United States in competition with one of our greatest industries, the railroads, all of whom are opposed to the bill—and the railroad brotherhoods are also opposed to the bill—we had better be very vigilant to see that proper amendments are accepted to this bill, and one of those amendments should be one giving all competing oil companies the same right to use these transportation facilities. In doing this we do not provide any extension of the economy of scarcity whereby we limit the production of gasoline while we tell the American people we have not enough gasoline for them to use in their automobiles.

Do you know that at the present time in the United States we are limiting the production of gasoline on the ground that it is an exhaustible resource, and under the Connally Hot Oil Act, enacted by the Congress, we regard as hot oil any oil shipped in interstate commerce which contravenes the State proration statute? Some of the oil-producing States now have limitations on the amount of oil they produce, but one State, notably California, refused to enact such a law.

The whole power of certain Government departments was put behind that bill at the time it was submitted to a vote of the people and even the Governor of that State changed his original opposition to the bill to support of the bill known as the Atkinson Act, and yet in spite of that fact the good people of the Golden State of California defeated the measure by a vote of over 2 to 1. That bill sought to impose a limitation upon the production of oil in the second largest oil-producing State in the Nation. Now, are we going to put through measures without providing for common-carrier rights to all users, and without assuring that the little independent shall have the same opportunity accorded to him?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I regret that time does not permit me to yield because, as I recall very distinctly, during all the debate on this bill, only proponents were vouchsafed the privilege of speaking, not that we were denied the right, for we were not, but the only Members who were accorded the prerogative of speaking were proponents of the bill, and for that reason a few of us hoped that we might engage in a discussion of the question and point out some of the dangers and ominous implications and sequelae of the act, during the reading of the bill by sections.

It may be interesting to note that all the major oil companies in America are in favor of this bill. Mr. W. S. Farish, when he addressed the annual meeting of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Tuesday, June 3, announced that the regular dividend would be increased by the directors from 50 cents a year to $1 a year and that in all probability the prospects for profit and extra dividends were as promising as at any time in their history.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. As I see the matter, there is no justification for the adoption of the pending amendment. As I understand the amendment, it provides for two things. One is that the Government-owned pipe lines which may be constructed under this bill, shall remain in Government ownership and operation after the emergency has passed. The bill as it now stands gives the President authority to dispose of these Government-owned pipe lines so that they may pass into private ownership and regulation. The other purpose of the amendment is to provide that these pipe lines shall be common carriers. The bill already provides for that. If the gentleman will read section 8 (b) he will see that it provides that these pipe lines shall be subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, which provides for Federal regulation of interstate pipe lines as common carriers, and so the law provides for that as it is now.

Section 1 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act applies to common carriers engaged in "the transportation of oil or other commodity * * * by pipe line." Section 1 (b) (3) provides that "the term 'common carrier' as used in this part shall include all pipe-line companies."

The right to regulate these pipe-line companies is not dependent on whether or not they are what is ordinarily known as common carriers. They are subject to regulation because they are engaged in interstate commerce.

The situation is this. This bill provides for two kinds of pipe lines, one Government owned and the other privately owned. The bill makes it possible, after the emergency is over, that each of these two kinds of pipe lines shall be put into the same status as the other pipe lines of the country; that is, subject to regulation as privately owned carriers. If they are public lines, they can be sold to private owners and then become subject to regulation automatically under the Interstate Commerce Act. If they are privately owned, they will be subject to regulation from the beginning. In either case we would have Federal regulation of these pipe lines. The pipe lines provided for in this bill will be, in substance, in the same status as about 100,000 miles of pipe lines now in this country, of which the interstate ones are subject to regulation. So we believe we have chosen the right course consistent with existing law and the public policy of the Nation.

I know of no reason, after this emergency is over, to justify making these pipe lines different from the pipe lines generally over the country; that is, they should be subject to regulation. There would be little sense, as I see it, in having one pipe line owned by the Government and the Government compelled to retain it while probably 100,000 miles of other pipe lines are subject to the usual Federal regulation. In my judgment, the Government should not, in the name of an emergency, build and operate a mere fraction of our pipe lines in competition with privately owned lines, the one small fraction operated by a mere executive agency and all the other lines compelled to operate under a regular established regulatory agency.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman will notice, however, that the Government has not built these other pipe lines. We are talking of pipe lines that the Government is going to build to take care of the national emergency. Why should they not belong to the Government, and not be disposed of until the emergency is over, or at the expiration of the time set forth in the bill?

Mr. LEA. They would be subject to disposal, and the present bill does not compel them to remain in public ownership, but contemplates and provides for their coming under private ownership after the emergency is over.

Mr. IZAC. If the gentleman will permit, perhaps the better word than "remain" is "be" in my amendment, though the meaning is the same.

Mr. LEA. Does the gentleman think that the Government should retain ownership of these pipe lines?

Mr. IZAC. Where they have been built by the Federal Government; in other

words, so that they cannot be given away and become like the aircraft plants we are building.

Mr. LEA. There is a radical difference in policy between the bill and what the gentleman proposes. It seems to me, as a permanent policy, it would be absurd for the Government to own one pipe line from Texas to New York, say, under arbitrary Executive control, while 100,000 miles of other pipe lines are subject to general Federal regulation.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman would like to see all the smaller producers able to ship their oil through these pipe lines, which they cannot do today, because they are all owned by the Big Four.

Mr. LEA. I concede there is an evil in the regulation of the pipe lines at the present time, but there is an administrative remedy that should be applied to correct that condition.

Mr. IZAC. But it has not been applied.

Mr. LEA. The Interstate Commerce Commission is investigating the subject now with the idea of more strict control. The pending amendment would not provide a remedy for the present difficulty.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman has emphasized the words "subject to regulation." Can the gentleman state to me where any of these pipe lines are operated today as common carriers?

Mr. LEA. They are now regulated. I agree with the gentleman that there should be more strict regulation.

Mr. WHITE. I distinguish between "operated" and "subject to." Are they being operated as common carriers?

Mr. LEA. They are; but I would not say that they are satisfactorily regulated. The law now possibly authorizes better regulation. If not, it should be appropriately changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE and Mr. IZAC) there were ayes 36 and noes 64.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEYER of Maryland: At the end of the committee amendment insert:

"(c) Any pipe line constructed under the provisions hereof shall be operated, first, for the transportation of petroleum products needed in the interest of the national defense, and, secondly, as a common carrier for the benefit of all shippers and consignees making application for the transportation of petroleum products;

"(d) In the operation of such pipe line the tenders for shipment shall be reasonable and in case of dispute shall be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The pyramiding of tenders for shipment by any one shipper or consignee shall be prohibited so that all shippers and consignees needing the services of the pipe line shall be treated equitably."

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering now as an additional section to the committee amendment eliminates the feature that was brought up before with reference to the difficulty of the Government continuing ownership of these pipe lines indefinitely. I have left out entirely the words—

Any pipe lines constructed by a department or agency of the Government as provided in (a) and (b) shall remain the property of the United States.

That has been left out entirely. I have changed it to read:

That any pipe line constructed under the provisions hereof shall be operated, first, for the transportation of petroleum products needed in the interest of the national defense, and, secondly, as a common carrier for the benefit of all shippers and consignees making application for the transportation of petroleum products.

That certainly seems to be a very sensible way of handling this oil situation. After all, national defense does come first. That is the real problem we are trying to work out at this time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the order made by the President giving the Secretary of the Interior the right to use his discretion with reference to the transportation and use of oil anywhere in the country in the interest of national defense take care of the matter suggested in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. The gentleman has reference to the matter of priorities with reference to oil over other commodities?

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the Secretary of the Interior has a right to absolutely control the output, production, consumption, and use of all oil products under the President's order.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Yes; I yield.

Mr. IZAC. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan, that is exactly what your amendment does. It provides for priorities for national-defense purposes now, but, secondary to that, that this shall be operated as a common carrier in the interest of all the people, which is not happening today.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does this not give congressional sanction to the setting up of an oil dictatorship?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. No; I cannot agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I think it does.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. I do not agree with the gentleman. The principal thing that we wish to bring out is to designate the common-carrier aspect of it. I do not know, but there are some who will contend that that will be surplusage; but even if it is, we would like to have it in there. It certainly can do no harm.

Then the next portion:

In the operation of such pipe lines the tenders for shipment shall be reasonable, and in case of dispute shall be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That is certainly placing that responsibility where it belongs. The question of the tenders for shipment, after all, means the amount or volume that is offered. We do not want someone to order a ridiculously small quantity. After all, there is some limit. But so long as they are reasonable and the degree of reasonableness is to be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, I do not see why there can be any confusion about that part of the paragraph:

The pyramiding of tenders for shipment by any one shipper or consignee shall be prohibited so that all shippers and consignees needing the services of the pipe line shall be treated equitably.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems to me the adoption of the gentleman's amendment would mean that this Congress was approving a policy of breaking down present monopolistic practices.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. I agree. That is what we are attempting to do. In fact, we are trying to exercise some of our own prerogatives and our own powers, and show our constituents that we are doing just that.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is the meaning I intended. I may have used the word "dictatorship" wrongly. I meant to say that the gentleman's amendment gave congressional sanction to the priorities in transportation.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. And in doing so it has a healthy effect upon the country.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And it is Congress doing it instead of having it done by Executive order.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. It is being done by the right body, the Congress which was elected by the people, the ones who really should do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is about as vague and unnecessary an amendment as could be offered to this legislation. If my distinguished friend from Maryland knew as I know how desperate Baltimore and the eastern seaboard of this country are for legislation of this character he would not at this time be attempting to inject an amendment into it that has never been considered by the committee and which I am frank to say I am hardly able to understand as to its purpose. If it means anything at all it means that we are going to write into this legislation what the Interstate Commerce Commission shall do, an agency of this Government which I believe has the confidence and respect of the people and of the Members of Congress, possibly as much as any other agency we have, in other words to tell them what they shall do in apply-

ing the provisions of this bill. Let me say to my friend from Baltimore: Do not offer an amendment to this bill such as the one he now proposes or any other, except something which is going to assure the speedy building of these lines to the Atlantic seaboard. They must be built expeditiously. There is no part of the country more in need for such legislation than the district represented by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]; the amendment he offers will definitely interfere with this program. I ask for its defeat.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago the grand old man of Idaho, Senator Borah, introduced what I think was the first oil-divorcement bill—pipe-line-divorcement bill. I introduced a companion measure in the House. Other bills are before both Houses. I understand the Senate will soon begin an investigation of this whole practice. Let me outline to you what some of the abuses are.

Here is a big producer, one of the Big Four. He builds himself a pipe line, and under the laws of the country he says, "Why, this is a common carrier. All you boys can come on in and use this pipe line." But out in California, Texas, Illinois, and all of the oil-producing States there are lots of little fellows—men who produce a little oil; they may have only one little well. They pool their resources, go to the big fellow, and ask if they can send some oil through his pipe line. The big fellow says, "Very sorry, but unless you can give us 100,000 barrels we cannot bother with it. We are too big for that stuff." And here is another group of little fellows farther away. They, knowing that the big fellow will not take less than 100,000 barrels, agree to get together and ship 100,000 barrels of oil. But about the time the 100,000 barrels are offered for shipment the big boy says, "Sorry, boys, but several of the others have been here ahead of you." They have pyramided the tenders, just as mentioned in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Baltimore; they have pyramided them, so that the big fellow is there today, he is there tomorrow, and will be there the following day, and the little group cannot get their 100,000 barrels taken care of. The independents constitute a great group of producers made up of these little fellows, and it is their interests we are trying to protect.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Then there is the matter of price manipulation. These big fellows operating the lines reduce the price of oil at the well, make up their own tariffs of high charges for the use of these pipe lines, and put the small operator right out of business.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I should have explained a little further that while owning the pipe lines they get the rebates of all the profits made in the transportation of oil, and, of course, they can underbid the little fellow. This is why you people here and in New England and all over the northern sections of the country have to pay more for your automobile gasoline and your heating oil. They fix the rate the little fellow has to pay when they let him use the line, then take the profits and underbid him.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Can the gentleman see how on earth it could delay construction of a pipe line that the Government builds with its own money by requiring that the pipe line should be continuously operated as a common carrier?

Mr. IZAC. Not at all. If it is good for it to be a common carrier today, it is good for it to continue to be a common carrier tomorrow—before it is built, after it is built, and all the time. All these pipe lines should be common carriers, should be divorced from the ownership of those who produce the oil, so that everybody, big or small, would have his oil taken care of and delivered to the people of this country at a price they can afford to pay.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. FLANNERY. Who could possibly object to making these common carriers?

Mr. IZAC. None should, but we have had a hard time throughout the years even to get these two bills I have mentioned studied by committees of the Congress.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. FLANNERY. Have such rights for piping oil been asked for by the big oil companies and been refused?

Mr. IZAC. Such rights as what?

Mr. FLANNERY. Laying pipe lines.

Mr. IZAC. They have the pipe lines now. It is the big companies who own the pipe lines. We are not against having more pipe lines. I should like to see them all over the country. Let everybody send his oil that way. Think of what it will mean to the consignees.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is not one of the chief objectives of this bill to extend the right of eminent domain to these big companies to condemn rights-of-way all over the country?

Mr. IZAC. There is a clause in here that makes it very easy for them to condemn property, but if it is necessary for national defense we say that is all right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEYER of Maryland and Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 33, noes 63.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and also to speak for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, before the gentleman is recognized, may I say that I promised the leadership that a very important matter could be taken up this afternoon at the conclusion of this measure. I am wondering if we can agree that all debate on this section end in 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section be limited to 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] that he may proceed out of order?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, one of our Washington newspapers this morning carries a double eight-column headline announcing that "C. I. O. lumber union defies United States in test of emergency powers." The head of the C. I. O. lumber union, O. M. Orton, delivered a violent denunciation of the Defense Mediation Board and then stormed out of the parley to which he had been called all the way from the west coast.

In proclaiming his defiance of the United States Government, O. M. Orton ran true to form. On October 24, 1938, the Dies committee identified O. M. Orton as a Communist from Aberdeen, Wash. We published that fact to the whole country. Mark you, almost 3 years ago—on October 24, 1938, I repeat—we informed this country and this Government exactly what it could expect. Despite the abuse and ridicule which we had heaped upon us, we continued to warn the country of the menace of Communist leadership in the lumber union and other C. I. O. unions. We were not dealing in fairy tales. We were amassing and publishing thousands of pages of testimony which dealt with sober facts. What was done about it? Absolutely nothing. O. M. Orton, and hundreds of his kind, went right ahead entrenching themselves in our industries which are vital to the very existence of our Government. We were a voice crying in the wilderness of a shallow and sentimental toleration of subversive forces. The kind of misleadership which has characterized the C. I. O. from its very inception entails disastrous consequences not only upon legitimate organized labor but also upon the country as a whole.

I doubt if we are even now fully awake to the menace of Communist leadership entrenched in the C. I. O. unions. More than 2 months ago, on April 3 to be exact,

I made a speech on the floor of this House, and in the course of that speech I specifically called this body's attention to the fact of O. M. Orton's established connections with the Communist Party. That was 2 months before O. M. Orton issued his defiance of the United States Government. In my speech I said—

that the program of the Communist Party is a program of civil war—civil war which waited only upon the arrival of a great national emergency. That program of civil war is now in operation.

Three months ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] made a statement to this body in the course of which he specifically called your attention to the fact that O. M. Orton is one of the C. I. O. leaders sponsoring the American Peace Mobilization. Last week we heard indisputable testimony to the fact that the Communist Party organized and now controls the American Peace Mobilization, and further that the major aim of the American Peace Mobilization is the undermining of our national-defense program.

Despite all those facts, we have as yet done nothing. The Defense Mediation Board has stated to the public that the lumber strike, under the leadership of O. M. Orton, is seriously crippling our defense program. How long must we wait for action? How long will it take the C. I. O. rank-and-file membership to rise up against its subversive leadership?

Last week we heard the testimony of a small group of courageous rank-and-file members of the C. I. O. who are endeavoring to oust the Communist leadership from the C. I. O. unions on the Pacific coast. I took occasion at the time of their testimony to applaud their brave efforts to serve their country by driving the Communist leaders from their unions. I now take this opportunity of again applauding their efforts. But these men need more than our applause. They need our protection. Their lives are in danger. I hold in my hand a telegram which has just arrived from Los Angeles. I am informed by our committee's representative in this telegram that one of those witnesses—Mr. Jay Bolling—who appeared before us last week was sent to the hospital last night with serious face and head wounds received from unknown assailants as he left the headquarters of the C. I. O. in Los Angeles last night. Another of those five witnesses—Mr. Inger—has received two telephone calls threatening to blow up his home. Mr. Chairman, I have no words with which to describe my feelings about a situation such as this. I here and now challenge Mr. Philip Murray to cease his abuse of our committee and let the country know what he is going to do about the Communist leadership of his unions. I here and now challenge Mr. John Llewellyn Lewis to speak out and let the country know what he is going to do about the Communist leadership in the organization which he has created. It is an outrage, damnable beyond description, when a patriotic American citizen appears before a committee of this House and then, as a result, finds his very life unsafe on the streets of our cities. That, Mr. Chairman, represents a defiance of the United States Government which amounts to civil war.

Today a strike has been called in the North American Airplane Plant in California. Eleven thousand employees engaged in the production of aircraft, which are absolutely necessary to the defense of democracy, have been called out by C. I. O. leadership which is demonstrably communistic. Last week the president of the striking local of the United Automobile Workers at North American, Elmer J. Freytag, came to Washington. He walked into our hearing room and I placed him on the witness stand. Under oath he admitted that he had registered as a Communist voter in Los Angeles in 1938. Accompanying Freytag at our hearing was Lou Michener, the chief C. I. O. organizer on the Pacific coast. Again and again Michener has been identified as a Communist. He was so identified before our committee for the first time as long ago as August 1938. Today I have received, and hold in my hand, a photostatic copy of the Communist Party membership book of Lou Michener. We are in possession of reliable information that Lou Michener returned to Los Angeles to organize goon squads to get the witnesses who testified before our committee.

A strike has been called in the aluminum plants in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. For several weeks our committee has known of the plans of the Communist Party to tie up this vital defense industry. The leader of the striking union in the aluminum plants in Cleveland is one Alex Balint. Three years ago, in August 1938, Alex Balint was identified in sworn testimony before our committee as a member of the Communist Party. Our committee has other indisputable evidence of Balint's Communist Party membership.

I do not know how much longer we are going to permit our very existence as a democratic people to be placed in jeopardy by the Communist henchmen of Philip Murray and John Llewellyn Lewis. For myself I know that the time for some effective action against treason has arrived. Our committee can do no more than it has done for these 3 years. We have apprised the Congress and the country of the facts. We shall continue to publish the facts. The responsibility for immediate and effective action lies with others. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) The exercise of the right of eminent domain under the authority of this act shall be by a proceeding instituted in the district court of the United States for the district in which the land is located, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain", approved February 26, 1931 (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 40, secs. 258a to 258e, inclusive).

(b) Where such proceeding is instituted by any person or persons under the authority granted by section 4, the provisions of such act of February 26, 1931, shall apply with respect to the acquisition of the land or interest in land by such person or persons in the same manner, as nearly as may be, as in the case of the acquisition of land or an interest in land by the United States in a proceeding instituted thereunder by and in the name of the United States, except that in addition to the deposit in the court of the amount estimated by such person or persons to be just compensation for the land or interest in land being taken, such person or persons shall give such bond as the court may deem proper to secure the payment to the persons entitled thereto of the amount of compensation finally awarded in the proceeding, with such interest as may be payable under the provisions of such act of February 26, 1931.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 11, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in order to reply to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and under the circumstances I will not object, but I serve notice now that I shall object to any other requests this afternoon to make speeches other than on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr Chairman, I am sorry to take the time of this Committee which has been studying a very important question, but I do so because of the remarks of the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], who spoke out of order. He has repeatedly called the attention of the House to charges that have been made before the Dies committee against certain union members connected with the leadership or rank and file of unions that have been engaged in strikes.

The issue of the red herring has been raised in order to conceal the question of bread and butter and pork chops that are involved in all of these strikes. American workers do not strike because they like to. American workers do not strike because any person, be he Republican, Democrat, Communist, or Socialist, tells them, as the gentleman from Alabama would have you believe, to strike for political reasons or for any other reasons extraneous to the question of hours, pay, and working conditions. When workers strike they do not strike because of the politics of any leader or member of their union. They are motivated by the question of food, fuel, shelter, and the welfare of their families. This is essentially real and typical Americanism.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. Why is it that those who are so involved in connection with the need for pork chops and so forth are

always under the domination of what has already been proven to be the wrong kind of leadership in America, the very kind of leadership we have been trying to expose in this Nation—communism?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. First of all, the gentleman has not established that. Mere charges before the Dies committee without opportunity of making a defense do not establish what you say. Secondly, does the gentleman contend that American workers in his district and in all districts are led by the nose when the gentleman very well knows that American workers have a mind of their own and decide to go on strike by democratic procedure, that they strike as a last resort, and that in every strike the issue is not communism but pork chops, beans, bread and butter, shelter and fuel, wages and hours on the one side, with mounting profits and an increased cost of living on the other side? This issue the gentleman evidently seeks to dodge by raising the smokescreen of communism. For instance, let us take the last strike that the gentleman has mentioned, that of the International Woodworkers in the lumber industry in the Northwest.

The gentleman from Alabama has not told you that one of these employers increased its profits by 43,000 percent, yet the same company refuses to give to its workers the same rate of pay which other companies in other sections of the industry pay their workers, and these companies are in direct competition with this company. He has failed to tell you that another company has increased its earnings 60 percent, from $5,151,522 in 1939 to $8,248,795 in 1940. He has failed to tell you that there are 20,000 workers out on strike who seek a 7½-cent raise across the board, a most conservative raise. No; he did not tell you of the profits of the companies, nor of the increased cost of living, nor of the hard times these people have had to endure. All he told you was that somebody had charged before the Dies committee without cross-examination that Mr. Orton, president of the International Woodworkers of America, was a Communist. However, he did not tell you that Mr. Orton was never given an opportunity to defend himself, nor, as the well-paid chief investigator of the committee well knows, that Mr. Orton enlisted in the Marines during the last war. According to the gentleman from Alabama, it is by reason of this charge that Congress must do something to force these people—20,000 of them and their families—to give up their strike, their only defense against starvation wages and indecent working conditions. Yet he asks you to do nothing about the 43,000-percent profit. Oh, it is un-American and unpatriotic when American workers ask that the dollar which is being paid to them in the form of wages shall match the high cost of living and acquire for themselves and their children a living in keeping with the American standard. And whenever they go out on strike because they are forced to go out on strike by industries that are increasing and increasing and increasing their profits, we hear gentlemen of this body stand up here, ignoring the question of hours and wages, ignoring the question of working conditions, ignoring the question of profits and of daily increased cost of living, and absolutely refuse to discuss the issues involved in the strike, and all we hear is communism, communism, communism.

I submit that it is about time that the Members of this Congress treat the question of labor and capital realistically. You are not going to solve industrial disputes by having "phonies" appear before a committee and smear people without an opportunity of having the persons who are smeared cross-examine these people, and by then coming here and crying "communism" without discussing the genuine issues involved in the strike. Industrial disputes in America are serious and important. You cannot deal with such a serious and important problem by flag-waving and by shouting, "communism" on this floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that before we pass this bill, and I believe we will pass it, and I expect to vote for its passage, we should give some consideration to what is being done to our transportation facilities whereby we would otherwise be able to transport oil from the oil-producing areas of this Nation to the oil-consuming areas.

One of our colleagues has already given some figures showing where some of the oil tankers have gone. I believe this Congress owes it to the people to determine what has become of the transport fleet owned by the oil companies of this Nation. What are the tankers doing that have been transferred into foreign registry? What oil are they carrying? Who is carrying oil to Japan today? I want to know who is carrying that oil. I called the Maritime Commission and they cannot tell me. They could not tell me how that oil is going. I cannot find out who in authority in this Nation will admit knowledge of how that oil is getting there, although there is no denial that the oil is moving across the Pacific Ocean, taking many times as long to make the trip across that ocean as it takes to bring a load of oil from Port Arthur to New York or from Houston to Baltimore.

Why tie up this vital transportation facility, these tankers, in moving oil from the United States to a nation where we know it is to be used against democracy all over the world? Why do we not stop moving oil? Why do we not stop providing the means of carrying instrumentalities of war to those who may, and likely will, use them against us in the near future?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I may say to the gentleman that there is a resolution now pending before the Committee on Rules, upon which they are now engaged in having hearings, seeking to find out why this oil and material of war is going to Japan and the Axis Powers, and seeking to do something about it.

Mr. POAGE. I hope the committee will take favorable and quick action on that, and will also find out what is being done about transferring our tankers to foreign registry and then hauling Venezuelan oil to the nations of Europe or to Great Britain instead of taking American oil. Why this discrimination against American oil? Why this discrimination in favor of foreign oil? Why this discrimination in favor of those who are likely to destroy our very Nation?

While I want to do everything that is possible to take care of the situation, and while I am going to vote to build this pipe line even though it is forced upon us by reason of a situation that ought never to have existed, let us find out why we cannot have American-owned tankers, built by American money and owned by the Texas and the Standard companies, engaged today in moving oil from the Gulf ports to the Atlantic seaboard rather than in moving oil to enemies of democracy, or rather than in moving foreign oil in competition with American oil.

I want this committee to give serious thought to that problem. I believe every Member of this House owes it to the people of America to give thought to these problems. I hope the Committee on Rules will give prompt action and bring before us a bill that will enable us to put a stop to this sort of situation. It is not fair; it is not American.

I go along with this bill because it is all we can do today. As the chairman of the committee says, no man should offer amendments except to hasten those things that are necessary for national defense. We should not have gotten in this condition, but we meet a condition, so let us meet it and do the best we can with it. Let us correct the condition as fast as we can. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. In case the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line is undertaken otherwise than as provided in section 3, the President, for the purpose of facilitating such construction, extension, or completion, may provide for the making of such advances as he deems advisable, through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, to the person or persons undertaking the proposed construction, extension, or completion. Any such advance shall be made upon such security and at such rate of interest, shall be amortized by means of such periodical payments of principal and interest over such period of time, and shall be made subject to such other terms and conditions, as the President shall prescribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 3, after "section" strike out "3" and insert "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. In any case where a pipe line is constructed, extended, or completed as provided in section 3, the President may direct that any department or agency of the Government designated by him may exercise such powers and functions with respect thereto as he may deem necessary, and he may, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, dispose of or lease to any person or persons such right, title, and interest as the United States may have acquired under this

act in such pipe line, or in any land or interest in land, including easements or rights-of-way.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike out "3" and insert "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Maryland: Page 5, line 19, after "may", insert "operate and maintain such pipe line and."

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to carry into effect the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], which the committee accepted, and which was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, because, as was pointed out by Mr. Perley, of the Legislative Counsel Service, it seems this language is appropriate in this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Any pipe line with respect to which an advance is made or the right of eminent domain is exercised, under authority of this act, shall be constructed, extended, or completed, and operated and maintained, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe as necessary for national-defense purposes.

(b) Nothing in this act shall operate to relieve any person operating any pipe line from any duty or liability to which such person may be subject under the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, or the Natural Gas Act, except that the President is authorized to relieve any person, operating any pipe line with respect to which an advance is made or the right of eminent domain is exercised, under authority of this act, from any duty or liability under either of such acts to such extent as he may deem advisable for national-defense purposes.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 6, line 8, strike out the words "as amended" and insert "including all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 15, add the following new section:

"SEC. 9. The policy of Congress is declared to be that any pipe line constructed under the authority of this act shall be a common carrier for the benefit of all shippers and consignees and free from the combination, control, and profit of any such shippers or consignees of petroleum products.

"It shall be unlawful for the owner, lessee, or operator of any pipe line with respect to which an advance is made or the right of eminent domain is exercised, under authority of this act, to transport any petroleum or the products thereof, produced, purchased, manufactured, or refined—

"(a) By it or under its authority, directly or indirectly;

"(b) By any person, firm, or corporation subject to its control;

"(c) By any person, firm, or corporation to whose control it is subject through stock ownership or otherwise;

"(d) By any corporation or association which has the same controlling shareholders or members or is otherwise subject to the same control.

"Provided that nothing herein shall prevent the Government of the United States from transporting its own petroleum or the products thereof for its own use, over any pipe line owned, leased, or operated by it.

"Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not to exceed $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court. A violation by a corporation shall be deemed to be also a violation by the individual directors, officers, receivers, trustees, or agents of such corporation who shall have authorized, ordered, or done any of the acts constituting the violation in whole or in part."

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple divorcement amendment to prevent the ownership of pipe lines by oil companies. That is all it is. I think it is effectively drawn. It would apply only to pipe lines constructed under the terms of this act and not to other pipe lines, but it would say that insofar as Government funds or Government assistance in the construction of pipe lines are going to be employed, that such pipe lines are going to be really common carriers and that they are not going to be owned by one group of oil companies to the exclusion of their use by others.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard this afternoon several speeches in defense of private operation of industry. Over and over again in the House I have heard people plead for the rights of small business. I call to your attention the fact that all such speeches and all such appeals are meaningless if the means of transportation of a product from the place of production to the commodity market is controlled by one producer or group of producers. Indeed, I will go so far as to say, because I believe it, that some form of common ownership of pipeline transportation of oil would promote rather than reduce true private enterprise in such an industry.

We have a situation in California that California understands too well, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has previously said. California turned down by a majority of more than 2 to 1, legislation which would have applied restrictions against the production of oil and regulated those restrictions in such a manner, in our opinion, as would have benefited the major companies.

I am not going into a long harangue about the present situation, except to say that it is a bit strange that only a week or so after we have been told that there is a necessity for restriction on oil production we should be confronted with a serious shortage of oil products. I agree with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has said and, perhaps, the first thing we might look into is the export of oil, especially to hostile nations.

Nevertheless we all know that the things necessary for national defense must be pushed forward and my contention is that the adoption of this amendment will satisfy everybody. It will mean that the Members of the House know they are doing something for national defense and that they are not, in taking such action with respect to national defense, giving any unfair advantage to any special group in this country.

I believe it will mean a great deal to the people of America if they can be shown that in the midst of this serious situation Congress can act not only with speed, but also with concern about the very fundamental principles of the protection of the people and the opportunity of small business as against monopoly for which our country contends today. So, I hope the House will look with favor on this amendment and that it will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment, as the gentleman from California states, is for the purpose of divorcing transportation from other activities. Special legislation on this subject is pending before the Congress at this time. I think the gentleman will agree that hearings are expected to be held in the Senate on a measure seeking to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Of course, if the gentleman could tell me he thought that bill was going to be passed in the near future I might feel differently about the amendment.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I may say to the gentleman that I have an open mind on the subject of whether such a divorcement should take place. I do know, as does the gentleman, that the President of the United States at one time wrote a letter on the subject. If he still feels that way, he is given the right, under this bill, to do that very thing in constructing these lines, but I hope the gentleman will not insist upon writing into this bill at the present time an extremely controversial matter, one that he knows is before both the Senate and the House and has been referred to our Committee. I hope the Committee will give consideration to it, and as I have assured the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] and one or two others, including the gentleman from Ohio, who have bills seeking to do this very thing, the Committee hopes to hold hearings when it becomes advisable to do so. At this time the purpose of the Committee is to express confidence, in the Interstate Commerce Commission and the other departments of this Government in seeking to put the mechanics of this bill into operation.

I hold no grief for the corporate structure of our great petroleum industry as it is constituted today. Maybe in some respects it should be revamped and reorganized, but I do know that at this time our country, in the midst of the greatest defense effort it has ever faced, in building a highly mechanized outfit for the use of our armed forces, which is so much dependent upon petroleum and its products, and furthermore, with the huge in-

dustrial activities of this country being geared constantly to produce more and more toward the successful program we have presented to the administrative branch of this Government for execution, that it is fortunate to find our petroleum resources, the production thereof, the refining and transportation facilities in such good condition. The gentleman should be one of the first to applaud the fact that this industry is ready to meet almost any reasonable requirement placed upon it by our Government today or tomorrow, I care not how aggravated the future situation might become. In my opinion, the existence of this subcommittee has done much toward encouraging this situation, and I want to publicly acknowledge the fine and hard work which has been done by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], who have served with me on the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not fair to say that the primary object back of this legislation is to expedite the national defense by the construction of oil pipe lines; and that it is also hoped that the money to do that will be put up by private interests rather than that it will have to be put up by the Government; and is it not also fair to say that if this amendment should be adopted, the probability of the entrance of private capital into this operation would be lessened rather than increased? Is it not also fair to say that after the pipe line is built, and by whatever means it may be built, the whole proposition of the so-called commodity clause, which seeks to divorce manufacturing and production from transportation and all sorts of distribution, can be acted on by Congress in due time?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The gentleman is correct. In addition to what the gentleman from Indiana has said, let me further stress the fact, in the final stages of the consideration of this bill, as I said earlier in the day, that the bill as presented, has, and I hold them in my hand, the strongest endorsements that I have ever seen of any legislation in the interest of the national-defense program, from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Production Management, and the Interior Department. I state with all of the emphasis at my command that there is no matter which in my opinion will impede the progress of this bill at the other end of the Capitol more than the amendment which the gentleman from California offers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is correct, what he means is that private capital will go into it only if it can go into it under conditions where a few of the major companies will control these pipe lines. If that be true, I think it is better for the Government to build them.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I say to the gentleman that if that be true, then I expect the Government to build the lines. I think the supervision over this entire operation is going to be such that the thing the gentleman has in mind will not occur.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Then would not the adoption of my amendment be a good thing?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I do not think the entire divorcement principle should be injected into this legislation at the present time. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is sound in the views he has expressed.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. I do not want the gentleman to give the impression to the House or to the country that we who are offering these amendments are against national defense.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I do not mean to do any such thing. I have real respect for the gentleman and his admitted patriotism.

Mr. IZAC. Because if we do not have the tankers and the ships to haul this oil, naturally the only thing that we can do to distribute the oil is to build more pipe lines. We are not against the building of pipe lines, but we do not like to see the great oil monopoly gain control of whatever it is the Government is going to build at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 29, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Section 8, page 5, at the end of line 15, add new paragraphs (c) and (d), as follows:

"(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit, restrict, prorate, or control the production of crude oil within any State.

"(d) No pipe line with respect to which an advance is made, or the right of eminent domain is exercised, under authority of this act, shall be used to limit, restrict, prorate or control the production of crude oil within any State."

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a limiting amendment which provides that the act shall not be construed as limiting or restricting, prorating or controlling the production of crude oil within any State. In other words, the independent oil people and independent oil marketers of the United States and national consumers' organizations have requested the introduction of this amendment on the ground that they fear some sections of the bill may be construed as extending the Connally Hot Oil Act to other States where it is not now in operation, such as the State of California, which, as the gentleman from California said, had defeated the Atkinson bill, designed to apply the proration of oil to the second largest oil-producing State.

You may recall that a year ago we had a considerable fight on the Connally Hot Oil Act extension. That bill has been on the statute books since about 1935. It has been extended on an average of 2 to 3 years each time it came up in Congress. It is a continuation of section 7 of the N. R. A. Act, which enabled the Federal Government to prevent shipment in interstate commerce of allegedly hot oil, which was produced in excess of State quotas imposed by State acts.

This section merely says that nothing in the act shall be construed as limiting the production of oil in a State. For instance, the State of California does not feel that it should have imposed upon it any artificial quota or proration of its own resource, concerning which the people have spoken.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think that the railroads with their tank cars and the truck lines are capable of meeting this emergency and moving oil domestically in the United States?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The Railroad Executives Association has announced several times that they were capable of transporting all the necessary oil needed in the 48 States of the Union. The 21 standard railroad brotherhoods have expressed themselves as in opposition to the bill. Competing forms of transportation, such as the trucking interests, are in opposition to the bill. They feel likewise that they are in a position, through their tank car fleets, on public highways, to be able to take care of the necessary shipments of oil in interstate commerce.

It may be interesting in connection with what the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. POAGE], so eloquently said a while ago, to investigate the use to which tank ships are being put, which were transferred to foreign registry in addition to and beyond the 50 which were turned over to Great Britain. I think the gentleman is eminently correct when he so emphatically says "Let us find out how far we are going to go in turning these ships over to Great Britain or any other friend in whose destiny we have a great interest." We have a domestic crisis to solve at home. This is a very vital resource and it is necessary to distribute it equitably to every section of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, are there not thousands of railroad tank cars standing idle in the yards of the country?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. They are waiting use in the railroad yards of the country.

Mr. WHITE. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that down along the Columbia River between Portland, Oreg., and Astoria there are thousands of tank cars standing there rusting out, waiting to be used. You will find them in Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and everywhere, standing idle today.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I think it is significant that the 21 major oil companies with total resources of over $14,000,000,000 have been endeavoring sedulously to get such a bill as this passed for the past half century, but they have never had the temerity to propose it or have it successfully entertained until the national-defense emergency came along, and under the guise and impact of that we have had this thrust upon us.

Perhaps you gentlemen have not noticed that there has been a carefully built up series of statements designed to augment the fear of an oil shortage. Daily we have pronouncements emanating from the executives of the major oil companies and some Federal officials, designed to inculcate in the minds of the people the apprehension that there will not be sufficient oil for fuel and auto purposes. All of those things dovetail together in this proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] knows, his amendment injects into this bill the very broad and important question of conservation. It attempts to say that under no conditions, under the exercise of the power that this bill confers, shall there be any attempt to prorate or conserve this great resource. The gentleman can stand in that position if he desires to, but I doubt very much if he will have a very comfortable group associated with him in this Congress.

The policy of the producing States of this country, with the exception—as far as statute is concerned—of California and Illinois is to very definitely conserve this resource, important as it is and irreplaceable as it is.

The gentleman well knows that while I do not approve of the action by the State of California in turning down the proration statute, the producers there have nevertheless taken the other alternative and made a fairly creditable showing with their independent organization, trying to prorate and operate the fields in a way that will permit the life of this great national resource to be extended in a far greater fashion than would otherwise be the case.

I still hope California will pass a proper conservation statute and the people of that great State will not again by referendum vote to reject such a decision by its legislature. With our present policy to have a two-ocean Navy it becomes all the more important, in my judgment, that such be the future policy of California, because the western part of this country will be dependent almost entirely for its petroleum supply on the fields of California.

The State of Illinois, which is without any conservation statute, is now considering in its legislature a bill which, I am advised by many, should receive favorable consideration of that body. It has, I am told, the support of the present distinguished Governor of that State. So you see that the States are anxious to conserve this great resource rather than permit the production thereof in the helter-skelter way in which it would be done if the policy favored by the gentleman from Washington was in effect.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I just wondered how the gentleman from Maryland would reconcile this desire for conservation with the fact that we are now shipping out of the United States 800,000 barrels, each containing 42 gallons of gasoline, to Japan every month? Why not place an embargo upon the exportation of this exhaustible resource in order to be consistent?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Let me say to the gentleman from Washington that when he says 800,000 barrels of gasoline are shipped to Japan each month I am not so sure that his figures should not be higher. I am opposed, as the gentleman from Washington is, to shipping huge quantities to Japan.

When our committee was in California taking testimony and the Governor of the State was before us, it was disclosed that the Japanese were getting approximately 30,000 a day, all of which was being consumed each day. In other words, not a drop was supposed to go into storage or be available to be diverted to other sources. I join with the gentleman in expressing the hope that if this policy is being violated the quantity will be reduced. I believe if the State Department would explain the reasons supporting the present policy the people of our country would appreciate their position.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of conservation. Would the gentleman be in favor of prohibiting the consumption of crude oil containing gasoline in generating steam power?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I know what the gentleman is referring to. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that I can conceive of situations in which such a prohibition would impose terrific hardships.

Mr. WHITE. Millions and millions of barrels of crude oil are being consumed to generate steam.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I do not have definite figures available here on that.

Mr. WHITE. That is not conservation, is it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. After June 30, 1943, neither the President, any department or agency of the Government, nor any person shall exercise any of the powers conferred by section 2, 3, 4, or 6 of this act.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 6, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and in no case shall any pipe line constructed, extended, or completed under authority of section 4 be operated or maintained by or under the direction or control of the President or any department or agency of the Government after the expiration of 1 year after the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed in the proclamation issued by the President of the United States on May 27, 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee that had this bill under consideration I am certainly in sympathy with its fundamental purpose. It has to do with the needs of national defense. Except for that, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for me to go along with it. Something has been said about the shortage of oil and a denial that there is a shortage. The shortage of oil and petroleum products is not at the wells. The shortage is in the East and might become a very serious matter.

It is the hope of the committee, and I take it the hope of practically all of us, that private capital will do the job that here needs to be done. That is the American way to do it, that is the way our transportation system was built—by private capital and by private enterprise. But if private capital is not available to do the job, then this bill provides that the Government may step in and construct the pipe line because of the needs of national defense.

I think it is clearly the view of the Congress and I am sure of the committee that we shall not declare a policy today by which it should be understood that after the emergency is over the Government shall continue in the business of transporting petroleum and petroleum products in competition with the private carriers of the country.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I prefer not to yield; I have but 5 minutes.

Much has been said about what we on the Interstate Commerce Committee know as the "commodity clause" proposition. It is that doctrine which holds that the manufacturers should be divorced from transportation. The proponents of this doctrine often go so far even as to say that the producers of movies in California should not be permitted to own their retail outlets, that tire and rubber companies should not be permitted to have retail stores.

I suppose it might be pursued to the extent of saying that a farmer who raises

some vegetables should not be permitted to haul them into town in his own truck and peddle them out. I do not know how far it should go, but the point I want to make is that that is a broad and fundamental proposition of American life and related to our economy. It has come before the Congress many times in different ways and places. It will continue to come before us. If it is a proposition that has to be met then I say let us meet it head-on and deal with it. I do not believe the way to meet such an evil, if there is an evil, is to put the Government in business in competition with private enterprise in transportation or anything else.

My amendment simply provides that 1 year after the emergency is over some disposition, some arrangement shall be made about the operation of the pipe lines if they are built by the Government. Section 7, I believe it is, invests permissive authority in the President or the governmental agency to dispose of the lines. It recognizes in some degree the principle for which I am contending.

Something has been said about the attitude of railroad labor on this proposal. I never understood that labor was against this, at least insofar as it has to do with the necessities of national defense. I happen to know, however, from some very recent conversations I have had that railroad labor is not interested in having this line operated indefinitely by the Government in competition with their jobs and in such manner as might likely be calculated to diminish their jobs and employment.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was kind enough to submit his amendment yesterday to the committee when the members met and considered it. As far as the committee is concerned, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4816), to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Maynard Goss; and

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4590) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also anounced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1438) entitled "An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes."

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 1438.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF PAYMENT BY FINLAND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 184, to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, does this bill have the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. DINGELL. As near as I can recall, Mr. Speaker, it was unanimously reported. There was some difference in the committee as to which bill should be reported, but it was finally agreed that we report the House bill.

Mr. MICHENER. What does the gentleman mean? Were there two bills?

Mr. DINGELL. There was a Senate bill introduced by Senator VANDENBERG, and there was the House bill. The Vandenberg bill and the House bill are identical. It is my purpose to ask substitution of the Vandenberg bill for the Hook bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly have no objection to the intent and purpose of this legislation, but I notice in the report it does not state that this bill has the approval of the Treasury, nor does it state that we have a letter from the Treasury. Will the gentleman advise the House as to that?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will read the report, it states clearly in the last two lines that this legislation has the approval of both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CARLSON. I was in error in checking that particular section. It is customary in reports of the Committee on Ways and Means to submit with the report a letter from the Treasury.

Mr. DINGELL. I would not argue with the gentleman as to that, because I do not know what the custom has been. I do know it has been customary in our committee to report a House bill if it is at all possible. Both bills, incidentally, are identical. I have talked to the ranking minority member of the committee over the telephone a few moments ago, and he stated very clearly that he had no objection to the course being followed by the committee in this instance.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I am not opposed to it, but I think it is a violation of our usual procedure, because we ordinarily submit a letter from the Treasury in regard to any legislation of this kind. I am not going to object.

Mr. DINGELL. I may say to the gentleman that, so far as furnishing the letter is concerned, that may be an oversight, but it certainly has no bearing upon the matter before the House, because there is no argument about the bill. I may say that the letter specifically covers the legislation. However, it does not refer to this particular bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the bill had passed the Senate?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. That bill is on the Speaker's table?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And the gentleman wants to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right. Having acquired, with the consent of the House, the privilege of immediate consideration, I intend to ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senare joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) be considered in lieu of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. The bill simply postpones the payment for the period from January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, owed by the Republic of Finland to the United States, making it payable over a period of 20 years, in 40 equal installments, the first 2 of which will be paid in 1945.

Mr. RICH. If there is any nation we ought to help, I believe it would be Finland, but is this going to be the forerunner of our canceling all the debts of foreign countries that have in the past owed obligations to this country?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman says he is agreeable to the passage of the joint resolution. Senator VANDENBERG introduced a companion resolution in the Senate. Now the gentleman opens up the whole question.

Mr. RICH. If this is going to be the forerunner of the cancelation of the war debts, then I am going to oppose this.

Mr. McCORMACK. One has no relation at all to the other.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but I do not know what this administration is going to do. We do not know what is coming up here next. That is just the reason I am trying to do my duty as a sound American citizen to object to your doing the impossible things you do.

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. RICH. I do not care who introduced it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman does not care.

Mr. RICH. If a thing is right it is right, and if it is wrong it is wrong. I should like to know what the gentleman's attitude is as the majority leader on this legislation for the cancelation of debts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am for the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. RICH. I am for its passage, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Republic of Finland, at its option, may postpone the payments of amounts payable to the United States of America during the period from January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive, under the agreements between that Republic and the United States of America dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941. In the event of the exercise of the option granted in this section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make, on behalf of the United States of America, an agreement with the Republic of Finland for the payment of the postponed amounts in forty semiannual installments, the first two such installments to be paid during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1945, and two to be paid during each of the nineteen calendar years following: *Provided*, That the amounts postponed shall not bear any interest beyond the dates when such amounts first become payable under the above mentioned agreements.

SEC. 2. The agreement authorized in the first section of this joint resolution shall be in such form that payments thereunder shall, unless otherwise provided in such agreement, be in accordance with, and subject to the same terms and conditions as payments under, the agreement with the Republic of Finland dated May 1, 1923.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD two times, and in each extension include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to House Joint Resolution 184.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and pending that request, may I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking minority Member, that general debate run throughout the day.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, it will be satisfactory to me if general debate runs the balance of the day. If I have further requests for time, I believe the chairman and I should discuss the matter further. At the present time, I think the balance of the day will be sufficient.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the balance of the day and be confined to the bill, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and myself.

Mr. McLEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what the balance of the day will amount to?

Mr. SNYDER. As long as there is anybody here to talk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Until the Committee rises, and that is to be determined by the Committee.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a great personal interest in a matter in which the country is greatly interested. I have given notice that I shall make a few observations on the subject of daylight saving, and I should like to know if I shall be able to make these observations in daylight or after dark this afternoon.

Mr. POWERS. Does that not depend entirely on which time the gentleman is laboring under?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4965, with Mr. LANHAM in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. FADDIS. I am very sorry, I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it becomes my duty to call up for consideration the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year which begins less than a month hence.

It calls for a staggering outlay—roundly two hundred million less than $10,000,000,000.

I am advised that in point of money carried it is the largest appropriation measure but one is our Nation's history.

While I confess to being disturbed by its magnitude, and being disturbed by the enormity of the amounts we have been appropriating ever since we were admonished by the President early in January 1939 that we should look to the adequacy of our defenses, I am more disturbed, Mr. Chairman, about seeing that we provide beyond a doubt for everything essential for our defense in this emergency.

Of foremost importance at this time is the preservation of our liberties and of our way of life.

When these are secure, we then may turn our talents and our energies to reconstructing, to reordering our domestic affairs; and I have faith that though the way may be fraught with hardships for us all, a way will be worked out which will give to our people just cause to give thanks that they are privileged to be citizens of this great and glorious land.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, provides every dollar asked of the Congress through usual channels that our military advisers consider to be essential to the preparedness effort upon which we are engaged, and a gross of $652,741,334 besides, and there will be requests for more as the new fiscal year advances.

I think it may be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that the bill, in conjunction with prior grants, is in harmony with production schedules based upon productive capacity and with supply demands of trained manpower possible of development under existing law, as and when it becomes available. That is an important point, Mr. Chairman, as and when trained manpower becomes available.

We hear criticism—much criticism—from various quarters that we are not doing enough in this direction or in that direction. There is a persistent and insistent clamor for more and more matériel. I hope the House and I am sure the committee will not be guided or unduly influenced as to purely professional military matters, by self-constituted authorities, production experts, and others who have the temerity to press their lay views.

Military men will tell you that the first essential is to have productive capacity sufficient to cope with any conceivable emergency demands, and I wish to remind you that funds have been made available for the provision of productive facilities sufficient to equip and maintain on a combat status a force of 4,000,000 men.

The measure of utilization of productive capacity is a matter for determination by military men. Matériel augmentation is not a mere matter of keeping wheels of production turning to capacity. It must be synchronized with using forces, and be available as and when such forces become available, and not be piled up, beyond essential reserves, for forces which may never come into being. There is a kinship, Mr. Chairman, between men and matériel which cannot be brushed aside. One is no good without the other, and with productive capacity available or being made available, and with actual production daily gaining in momentum, it becomes a question of equal priority as between matériel and personnel, because it takes months to train men in the use of this highly technical equipment used in modern warfare. It is entirely logical that the two should go hand in hand.

Mr. Chairman, if we must buy matériel beyond that necessary to supply trained manpower that will become available under present programs in the immediate future, the only justifiable reason for so doing would be that there will be a need for more personnel to use such matériel, and, in that case, I submit we should be doing something about more manpower—more trained manpower. With industry geared up, it will take no longer to get matériel than it will to season and train manpower in its employment

It is a fallacy to maintain that our country is filled with youths ready for service with the donning of a uniform. Go to Lowry Field, to Chanute Field, to Scott Field, or to Fort Knox, or to the many other places where we are training technicians, as I have done, and you will see how utterly baseless is that contention. Visit our aircraft factories and other large industrial establishments and see the thousands of apprentices they are compelled to employ in order to build up skilled forces. In addition, let me remind you of the work the National Youth Administration is doing as further evidence of the paucity of men who would be ready for Army service in an emergency.

So, Mr. Chairman, our problem is not alone one of the provision of matériel. I want all of the matériel that our Chief of Staff feels that we should possess, as and when he feels that it should be available, but I want, also, to see, as I am sure he does, that there is a proper tie-in between matériel and forces ready to put it to use. There must be a balance between the two and as between the needs of organizations within the total personnel force in being and projected. I hope you will appreciate the relationship and will insist upon provision accordingly. We do not want to have it said as to either, that we, too, have been too late.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, as I have stated, carries roundly $9,800,000,000. Of that amount $3,300,160,924 is needed for the extinguishment of prior year contractual authority; for the payment of maturing commitments, in other words. Then, there is included $2,790,890,785 for further airplane augmentation. This proposal just reached the committee a few days ago and looks to the ultimate provision of a force of around 50,000 airplanes, Army and Navy, making allowance for wastage.

The amount I have stated will supply 12,856 airplanes for the Army and will gear our productive facilities up to a point where 50,000 airplanes may be maintained in operation, and possibly more.

Pay, subsistence, clothing, and travel of personnel account for $1,768,561,852 of the amount carried by the bill, and in that connection I call attention to the fact that we get the full year cost during 1942 of pay and subsistence for the expanded enlisted force.

These three factors, Mr. Chairman, settling for prior year contractual authority, additional airplanes, and personnel, account for $7,859,613,561 of the total amount carried by the bill.

The remainder, $1,966,895,931, is allocated to general objects, as follows:

Augmentation in the way of critical and essential items, and boats, motor vehicles, and barrage balloons	$490,000,000
Spare engines and spare parts for airplanes	245,000,000
Military post construction	276,000,000
Training	136,000,000
Seacoast defenses	92,000,000
Research and development	67,000,000
Maintenance and operation of plant and equipment	660,000,000

The number is few of the projects embraced by this enumeration which are not for rounding out programs heretofore launched.

Our action on the Budget estimates is itemized on pages 6, 7, and 8 of the report. As there shown, we have added a net amount of $648,158,934, and in doing that we merely have advanced by a few weeks or months Budget estimates for practically every item on the list to which I have called attention, and I may say to you that we did not begin to provide all of the additional funds which we were told would need to be provided to tide the Department over the current fiscal year, independently of any programs yet to be presented.

Details of the new construction projects are indicated either in the report or in the hearings at the places indicated in the report. One of them will be of interest to all of you who have camps, cantonments, or replacement centers in your districts; that is, properly surfacing roads and walks within the reservations. I have found conditions to be very bad wherever I have visited, and there is a crying need for early correction from a health standpoint and to save wear and tear on much costly wheeled equipment.

The much-talked-of German panzer divisions have demonstrated beyond a doubt that they must have a big place in any modern army, even though it is true that much of the German success with them has resulted from the lack of suitable and properly trained combative forces; in some cases, it might be said, the utter lack. Our Army is thoroughly alive to their value, and has been for many years, and is not marking time in providing for our needs—in keeping with development along balanced organizational lines. Productive capacity is being provided for our own needs and British nedes, and our ultimate needs, of course, are contingent upon many factors. Our objective right now is eight armored force divisions and a number of tank battalions and headquarters units. In matters of this kind we must rely upon the judgment of our military experts. While they are not advocating immediate expansion, the committee feels that it is wise to have it so that they may be free to expand as and when they deem that course to be advisable, and has written into the bill a provision making that course possible; and, Mr. Chairman, while on this subject, I invite attention of Members to the most illuminating statement presented to the committee on armored forces and our armored force by the commander of our armored force, Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee. I hope you will take the time to read every word of it.

Outside of continuing certain emergency provisions included in prior appropriation measures in consonance with the general policy of speeding up our defense program, this bill may be said to be free of new legislation, and I here and now, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, wish to acknowledge the fine way in which the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee have cooperated in expediting the accomplishment of our common objective.

We have modified and extended two limitations carried in the current appropriation Act so as to make our National Guard and Reserve forces genuine Reserve forces in every sence of the word; in other words, divorcing therefrom all but those who may be counted upon to perform active service in time of emergency.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the table on page 3 of our report and to the paragraph with respect thereto immediately following, both of which I shall incorporate as a part of my remarks. The table portrays defense outlays or commitments from July 1, 1940, down to the present time.

Following that matter, I shall also include in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, a table of Army and Navy appropriations and expenditures for the period 1918 to 1941. Thus there will be conveniently accessible information for which there is much demand, judging by the requests of the Committee on Appropriations.

Table as of May 28, 1941, showing appropriations, contract authorizations, and recommendations pertaining to the defense program for the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1942

	Army	Navy	Other agencies	Total
Fiscal year 1941:				
Appropriations and recommendations	[1] $8,480,594,270	$4,132,809,945	$1,395,440,803	$14,008,845,018
Contract authorizations	5,006,589,651	956,098,112	278,500,000	6,241,187,763
Subtotal	13,487,183,921	5,088,908,057	1,673,940,803	20,250,032,781
Deduct cash included to liquidate 1941 contract authorizations	203,626,456	28,560,000	75,000,000	307,186,456
Net total, 1941	13,283,557,465	5,060,348,057	1,598,940,803	19,942,846,325
Fiscal year 1942:				
Recommended appropriations, reflecting latest congressional action	9,826,509,492	3,415,665,522	684,716,750	13,926,891,764
Recommended contract authorizations reflecting latest congressional action	183,145,695	31,468,894	106,150,000	320,764,589
Subtotal	10,009,655,187	3,447,134,416	790,866,750	14,247,656,353
Deduct cash included to liquidate 1941 contract authorizations	3,300,160,924	670,790,612	104,500,000	4,075,451,536
Net total 1942	6,709,494,263	2,776,343,804	686,366,750	10,172,204,817
Net total, 1941 and 1942	19,993,051,728	7,836,691,861	2,285,307,553	30,115,051,142

[1] Excludes $19,607 transferred to Post Office Department.

The foregoing table includes the Army, Navy, and all other Federal agencies to the extent that funds and contractual authority have been made available to them in consequence of the defense-preparation effort. For the Army, it includes the appropriations and contractual authority proposed in the accompanying bill. For the Navy and other agencies it includes pending estimates as of May 28, 1941, amounting to $803,137,680. It does not include the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 contained in the Defense Aid Appropriation Act, it does not include R. F. C. loans properly chargeable to national defense, nor does it include the amount remaining to be appropriated for the accomplishment of the expanded Navy shipbuilding program, for which the Navy Department estimates there will need to be appropriated more than $6,000,000,000 after 1942. Excluding such factors, the grand total is $30,115,051,142. Including lease-lend and the amount the Navy estimates will be needed for the completion of ships, the grand total would be $43,115,051,142.

Statement showing appropriations and expenditures for the Military Establishment, fiscal years 1918–40, inclusive

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Expenditures
1918	$9,004,292,285	$5,598,659,388.08
1919	15,498,115,472	9,026,903,532.12
1920	795,164,668	1,034,671,908.49
1921	483,240,876	473,005,162.48
1922	355,437,334	329,748,364.75
1923	262,796,456	284,022,609.71
1924	251,544,581	250,228,991.08
1925	263,965,386	250,653,425.32
1926	263,862,031	265,817,448.77
1927	272,262,105	264,121,259.47
1928	305,131,118	292,081,593.99
1929	319,179,551	324,025,191.20
1930	332,114,899	325,266,708.86
1931	346,979,179	343,913,228.46
1932	358,920,916	343,940,982.23
1933	304,961,492	95,111,986.89
1934	277,666,381	237,263,871.67
1935	280,862,094	313,148,347.47
1936	355,538,204	317,576,664.48
1937	388,244,859	362,005,183.59
1938	417,985,029	405,970,206.37
1939	531,001,597	444,057,428.87
1940	851,618,610	667,138,363.59
1941	8,480,594,407	

Statement showing appropriations and expenditures for the Naval Establishment, fiscal years 1918–40, inclusive

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Expenditures
1918	$652,508,739.03	$1,169,447,554.83
1919	2,287,555,721.35	1,721,098,608.94
1920	633,023,946.51	838,485,567.99
1921	1,019,153,816.45	963,449,978.63
1922	536,914,874.76	485,583,028.12
1923	378,156,006.09	308,943,019.95
1924	339,712,441.55	316,716,719.31
1925	345,884,771.52	323,940,534.15
1926	311,702,753.11	317,495,316.32
1927	355,801,340.91	320,553,753.98
1928	357,699,866.61	336,441,214.24
1929	385,261,901.77	366,443,933.40
1930	370,244,956.47	375,291,828.11
1931	407,775,779.71	357,806,219.10
1932	359,642,104.35	353,628,362.38
1933	347,152,220.89	342,176,417.52
1934	324,755,726.68	266,581,699.68
1935	314,567,433.52	327,554,194.01
1936	496,572,848.78	404,702,348.42
1937	597,567,939.89	503,350,016.63
1938	535,172,626.98	575,453,311.07
1939	642,511,999.27	635,474,414.22
1940	1,148,982,937.91	870,234,603.62
1941	3,489,475,847.00	

I shall be glad, Mr. Chairman, to supply such information as to the details of this measure as I have at my command when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. It is a measure I believe, in the light of world conditions, that deserves 100-percent support, and I am confident that it will meet with that sort of treatment at your hands. [Applause.]

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. I think I understood the gentleman to say that we have 4,000,000 men under arms.

Mr. SNYDER. One million four hundred and eighteen thousand men.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Are they enough to defend the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. I would say to the gentlewoman from Montana that we just have to rely upon the military authorities to determine that for us.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Does the Military Establishment say to the committee that they would be enough to defend the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. No.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Was it the gentleman's impression that the military authorities thought that number would be enough?

Mr. SNYDER. No; what force we may need depends upon many factors, which I am sure the gentlewoman must realize.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. I wanted to ask the gentleman how many could be spared and still defend the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. I should say not a single one, but, on the contrary, more, if the gentlewoman's inquiry extends to our outlying possessions and island bases.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Does the gentleman feel that these men are adequately equipped and that they have all the necessary munitions and mechanized machinery to take care of the United States?

Mr. SNYDER. In that connection I think if the gentlewoman would visit the camps she would get a most favorable impression of how the soldiers are being taken care of. First of all, a soldier must have food and shelter and proper clothing, and if the gentlewoman will read the report she will find in it statements from such outstanding generals as Generals Martin and Reckord that never was an army so well cared for in those respects as is this army.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Then the gentleman means that if the soldier is well-fed, even if he has not got a gun, he is all right?

Mr. SNYDER. I had not finished. We have plenty of rifles, and the men are being equipped with the best rifle ever made, and I may say to the gentlewoman that tanks are coming along, and antiaircraft guns, and airplanes. The gentlewoman would have been surprised had she gone with me and the members of my committee—the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and others—to inspect manufacturing establishments and to have been able to see the speed with which they are making defense articles and turning them out, and she would be more proud of our industry in having thus learned first hand what they are accomplishing.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. I want enough to protect the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. You need have no doubt on that score.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4965, the military appropriation bill, 1942, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SABATH, by direction of the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 230), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, all points of order against any of the provisions of the bill are hereby waived.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech delivered by Alvin C. York, at Arlington, Memorial Day, May 30, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILITARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill H. R. 4965 be limited to 1 hour when it is taken up tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POWERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the time to be equally divided?

Mr. SNYDER. Equally divided between the gentleman from New Jersey and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LABOR

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip to my district in Tennessee, which represents as fair a cross section of American life as can be found in the country. I want to voice in this Chamber and put on record for what benefit it may be the universal sentiment prevailing there with respect to the present time of stress and crisis.

In the first place, our country cannot escape some responsibility for the present plight of Greece. Her magnificent and heroic defense was inspired, of course, by the patriotism of her liberty-loving people, but it was encouraged and stimulated, nevertheless, by our promises, implied and expressed, of timely material help in munitions and supplies, promises that we could not or did not fulfill. The same thing is true to lesser extent in the case of Yugoslavia.

We have promised abundant aid to China, but to date, as thousands of her helpless people are slaughtered daily, our help has been largely on paper, and a very small piece of paper at that. Our promise and its performance to China is best expressed after the Chinese fashion, "Plenty of noise on stairway, but nobody comes down steps." [Applause.]

As the vaunted arsenal for Great Britain, the munitions and supplies that have trickled through to her are comparatively meager, totally inadequate, and wholly unworthy of our capabilities. [Applause.]

The tanks, airplanes, and guns for our own troops are being supplied in such small quantities and with such delay that our whole training program is being retarded and hindered, to our possible peril in the very near future.

As a result of these things, unless the American people as a whole, labor especially, wake up, and begin the production of which we are capable, insure its delivery to the embattled nations to which we have promised all-out aid, either by convoys, more extensive patrols, or by whatever other means may be necessary, the democracies already on their knees will go to their death, and America, forever to be known in history as aider, abettor, and accessory before the fact thereto, will stand alone to defend herself as best she can, unready, untrained, and unprepared. [Applause.]

Our people recognize the fact that the labor unions, with countless and costly strikes in defense industries, with willing workers being denied the privilege of giving a fair day's work for a fair day's pay by picket lines or, what is as bad almost, the required prepayment of exorbitant union fees that would amount to extortion, are partly responsible for our failure to measure up to our potential industrial output of war and defense materials. And may I say that this fact is well known and much discussed in our military camps and may well affect the morale of our Army. We believe that the rank and file of American labor is loyal and patriotic, as much so as any other class of our people, but its unions have permitted selfish, disloyal, and unpatriotic leaders to worm their way into key positions where they are permitted to speak for labor, and the organizations as a whole must bear the consequences of their actions. [Applause.]

People everywhere are saying that the country calls your boy or mine from school or from gainful occupation for the term of military service at $21 a month, without benefit of social security or the wage-hour law or similar statute. At the same time, union leaders call their membership, already well paid, to strike in defense industries for higher, higher, and still higher wages, and refuse thereby to provide that boy with equipment with which to train and prepare for the defense of his country, and perhaps his own personal defense in time of war.

I say to you that our people have had as much of this as can be well endured and as they intend to endure. [Applause.] Labor has gained more under the present administration than in any other period of our history; but unless labor wakes up, drives some of its irresponsible, unreasonable—yes, traitor—leaders from power, and renews its loyalty and allegiance to flag and country, the demand of an enraged people, much more than a whisper now, will grow in ever-mounting volume until it compels the revision of labor laws and the sweeping away of much that labor has gained through the years, especially during the present administration. This will not be the fault of labor, but of some of its leaders; nevertheless, labor as a whole may suffer unless it disowns them now and forever.

My people believe that some of this trouble may be directly traced to the Labor Department as administered by its present Secretary, Madam Perkins. No one doubts her patriotism, her loyalty, her ability along many lines, but her training and executive experience do not qualify her to head a department that needs the most driving directing force of any department of our Government. She herself must realize that she is miscast for the part in this time of national emergency and peril. [Applause.]

Not speaking for myself, for mine would be but a voice crying in the wilderness, but the 220,000 people that I represent call upon her, in common with the overwhelming majority of the American people, to resign and let her place be filled by some dominant, driving, two-fisted man who can speak the language of labor and stand toe to toe with its leaders. [Applause.]

I know of nothing that would be more inspiring to the morale of the American people at this time than to know that the head of the Labor Department was of the type and personality that could call the union leaders in and where immediate arbitration failed and their case was unreasonable could send them back to the field with the unmistakable and abiding conviction that they were to let their people go back to work "or else." [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article that appeared in last night's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of March I introduced a bill, the purpose of which was to put daylight-saving time into effect throughout the country during the summer months. It would turn our clocks ahead throughout the Nation, so that 1 hour of daylight would be added to the ordinary hours of the day. It would seem no attention has been given that measure by the committee, and I have become very anxious about it. So I asked for this time this afternoon that I might press my views on this subject. However, not long ago

I received assurance from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the measure was really being very seriously considered; that the only reason why it had not been brought up for hearing was the fact that the committee had been very much engaged with other matters, but that the bill had been referred to the Defense Commission, to the Navy Department, and to other bureaus for consideration and report. So I am encouraged in the belief that the merits of putting daylight-saving time into effect throughout the United States, particularly at this time, will have the consideration of the House in the not far distant future. In view of that and the lateness of the hour, I shall not detain you with a discussion of my views at this time. Permit me, however, to refer to one important matter which has a bearing on the subject.

There is at this hour a conference being held in the city of Atlanta. That conference is attended by officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority, representatives of the public-utility companies of the Southeast, and Mr. Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Authority. The reason for the conference is the fact that there is threatened a scarcity of electric power in that section of the country, due to the drought and the possible failure of hydroelectric production facilities. Something will have to be done to provide the necessary power demands of the people of that neighborhood. They are now urging people not to use their electric irons, vacuum cleaners, and other electric gadgets as a means of conserving electric power.

I pointed out in a radio address recently what the saving would be in electric power if the electric lights ordinarily used were turned out 1 hour a day. That illustrates what savings would result if the American people were willing or were required to turn their clocks ahead and add 1 hour of daylight to their ordinary activities.

I am not so much interested in the suggestion for daylight saving as a national-defense measure as I am in the adjustment of the measure of time to modern conditions. Until 1884 there was no standard time in the United States. It mattered very little to the people in San Francisco what the people in New York were doing or what time they were following. The people of all the communities had their own time and followed their own pursuits according to their local time. It is said that in 1883 there were 77 different times kept by the railroads of the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I am much in sympathy with what the gentleman is saying. I think it would add much to the national-defense effort if we adopted throughout the Nation what we call fast time from the last Sunday in April until the last Sunday in September.

Mr. POWERS. If the gentleman will yield, I would not refer to it as fast time. It is just as fast or just as slow as any other time.

Mr. SNYDER. Out our way we call it fast time.

Mr. McLEAN. Until 1884 there was no reason for standard time because our various communities were more or less independent of each other. With the development of the railroads there came about the need of some standard of time. It became necessary for the people in Chicago to know what time the train from New York was going to arrive, and the people on the railroad train reaching Chicago wanted to know what time connecting trains were leaving. This condition led to an agreement between the railroads for a standard time, and our present standard of four zones throughout the country was established.

The demands created by improved methods of communication and transportation brought about the establishment of our standard time. The same influences are creating the necessity for readjustment of our time zones. The radio, the telephone, the airplane, the automobile, and more rapid communication by railroads have reduced the area of the standard time zones, and a widening of them is required by present-day conditions. The convenience of all would be served by extending the boundaries of our time zones, creating three instead of four as at present, because of the relationship all of the centers of population bear to one another. For example, all of the large centers east of the Mississippi River, including Chicago and St. Louis, have a relationship to New York, to Pittsburgh, and particularly, just at this time, to Washington; and it would be more convenient and serve the expedition of business if the great centers of population east of the Mississippi River were brought into closer relationship, were brought an hour closer to the eastern seaboard.

Likewise, San Francisco is not so far away from New York and Boston as it used to be. Their interests require that they be brought an hour's time nearer to each other. This can be done by a rearrangement of the time zones. However that may be, as a necessary present-day expedient we should adopt the system of daylight saving. It will improve the health of the Nation because of opportunity for recreation. It will increase production and it will conserve electrical energy, and that energy can go into our national-defense production. The extent of that conservation is indicated by the experience of the last war. The statistics show the saving of fuel during the daylight-saving period would be upward of 5 percent, which is an enormous amount in volume of materials and energy when the total consumption is considered.

I am further encouraged not to take any more time for this discussion, because only recently the Secretary of the Interior has indicated that not only does he favor the principle but that it was his purpose to urge and advance its adoption this time. I am very glad the Secretary takes this view and has seen the wisdom of the proposal. So I am sure that in course of time we shall have an opportunity to consider the bill I have introduced.

There seem to be only two objections. One comes from the producers of moving pictures and entertainment enterprises and the other from agricultural communities. The first we might say is actuated by self-interest from fear that the box office may suffer. However, I am sure that so long as the moving-picture houses produce proper entertainment they will have no difficulty in attracting the populace to their doors—they will come in the morning, the afternoon, or at night.

As to the agricultural interests, in my own State, New Jersey, we have had daylight saving ever since the World War. The experiment then proved its usefulness to such an extent that we have followed it since that time, as have 16 other States. New Jersey is a State of very diversified interests. We have large manufacturing enterprises and very large agriculture production. We have also our entertainment enterprises as attractive as any in the country. Our ocean frontage and sea beaches and very delightful mountain lakes attract thousands of visitors annually. The farmers of our State have had no difficulty in conforming to the necessary rearrangements under the daylight-saving program, and I am sure that every farmer in the country and the moving-picture interests, when they realize the importance of this matter and the need for conservation of electric energy and the benefits which will flow to the people generally, with additional opportunity for recreation, they will find a way to cooperate in the program.

Mr. Speaker, encouraged as I am by the chairman of the committee and other indications for early action, I shall not trespass further upon the time of the House, reserving fuller discussion for a more appropriate time. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SEIZURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR THE USE OF OR DISPOSITION BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the latest proposal of the administration for dictatorial power over the lives and property of the citizens of the United States, presented to Congress under cover of S. 1579 and H. R. 4949, so-called military bills, reveals finally and fully the lust for power which animates the administration.

The Nation has long wondered why the administration refused obstinately to take the action necessary to end the dangerous and disastrous strikes which were breaking out in every section of the national-defense industries.

The Nation has long wondered why the President did not take a forthright stand upon this question and call upon labor leaders to awaken to their responsibilities as patriotic citizens to lead labor willingly to their work benches in defense industries instead of away from them.

We now have the answer. Apparently the administration wanted the excuse of

these strikes to buttress the President's demand for unlimited power to commandeer property, both real and personal, at his discretion, under the name and excuse of necessities of the national defense.

In the first place, property means real estate, stocks, bonds, bank accounts, automobiles, jewelry; everything from fountain pens up. Any and all of these, including the savings accounts of the small depositors, the President could seize, if this bill passes the Congress, and he could hand the owners pieces of paper called Government bonds, payable at sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, not only is such a grant of power an unconscionable and inexcusable demand upon a country which is not at war, but the manner in which the bill is being brought to the Congress is itself deceptive and lacking in frankness or candor. The bill is routed to the Congress by way of the Secretary of War, to make it appear that the War Department and not the President wants the Chief Executive to have this superpower.

In support of the bill, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson tried to argue that it would merely subject property to the same national necessities to which men are already subject under the selective-service law. This contention is manifestly deceptive and untrue, and Judge Patterson is too good a lawyer not to know it.

The terms of the proposed act would give the President power to take over any property, real or personal, temporarily or permanently, to sell, give away, or otherwise dispose of as he might see fit.

He would fix the compensation to the denuded owners, and if they did not like the amount the President fixed, they could at some future time attempt to sue the Government, and battle its entire Department of Justice, and its courts loaded with New Deal appointees, in an effort to obtain some measure of justice.

The argument made by the Assistant Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, is unworthy of straightforward men. The bill, giving the President the right to commandeer property either temporarily or permanently is not comparable to the Selective Service Act at all. Such a comparison is entirely and deliberately fallacious. The Government does not conscript men for military service for life. It does not abolish all their rights as citizens and place them in uniforms in perpetuity. There is a limit to the length of their military service, and at the appropriate time they will return to civil life.

This proposed measure gives the President power to forever extinguish any or all rights of private ownership in any property he might choose. There is no provision for the return to the status quo at the end of the emergency. The Government could keep the commandeered property forever, or it could sell it to a competing firm, or it could destroy it in toto, or it could give it to some favored political henchman of the administration, and the rightful owner would have no recourse, except to try to recover in New Deal courts for property seized by a New Deal administration under a New Deal dictatorship.

Under the terms of this bill entire industries could, and would, be nationalized under such sweeping power, and our whole system of private ownership changed overnight. This is an attempt at a revolution. This is an attempt to set aside the American way of government and of life.

Such drastic authorization goes far beyond our needs. National safety requires that, under conditions such as exist today, the rights of private ownership must be subordinated to the national security temporarily until the emergency has passed, but it does not involve the powers and authority sought in this bill.

The very argument made by the proponents of the bill that it is designed to enable the Government to compel union labor to stop strikes in defense industries shows what the bill is designed to do. It would place in the hands of a few communistic, irresponsible, or racketeering labor leaders the power to compel, through calling strikes, the seizure of any industry in the United States, and its operation by the Federal Government. Who believes that under such circumstances, with men such as are now administering the powers already given this administration, that the operation of industry would be such as to contribute to the fulfillment of our national-defense program?

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of America had better become actively interested in what is going on down here and register their protest with Congress if they do not want to wake up some day and find their bank accounts taken and in return have handed to them some non-interest-bearing Government bonds. [Applause.]

[H. R. 4949, 77th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition certain property for the use of or disposition by the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That, during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the President, the President is authorized, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, (a) to requisition and take over, either temporarily or permanently, property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, or any part thereof, or any right or interest therein or with respect thereto, whether by virtue of contract, patent, license, or otherwise, which itself or through its exercise or control can be used or is adaptable for use directly or indirectly in any way for national defense or in the construction, manufacture, production, transportation, repair, testing, or storage of military or naval supplies or other articles, commodities, materials, machinery, or equipment for national defense; and (b) to use and, on such terms as he shall deem satisfactory, to sell or otherwise dispose of, either temporarily or permanently, any property, right, or interest requisitioned or taken over pursuant to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. Whenever the President shall requisition and take over any property pursuant to the provisions of this act, the person or persons having any right, title, or interest therein shall be paid as compensation therefor such sum as the President shall determine to be fair and just. If any such person or persons entitled to receive it are unwilling to accept as full and complete compensation for such property the sum so determined by the President, such person or persons shall be paid 75 percent of the sum so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States for such additional sum as when added to the sum already received shall be determined as fair and just compensation for such property in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41, par, 20, and sec. 250), but no recovery shall be allowed against the United States in any such action unless the action be brought within 2 years after the date on which notice shall have been given of the determination by the President of the amount to be paid as compensation.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available for the acquisition of property for national-defense purposes shall be available for the acquisition of such property under the provisions of this act; and any moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of any disposition of any property sold or disposed of pursuant hereto shall be deposited to the credit of the current appropriations corresponding to that out of which was paid the cost to the United States of the property thus disposed of, and the same shall immediately become available for expenditure during the fiscal year in which the disposition was effected and the fiscal year next following for the purposes named in such current appropriation.

SEC. 4. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations and is empowered to require such information as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act, and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this act through such department, agency, board, or officer as he shall direct or appoint.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall be effective notwithstanding the provisions of any other act: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not be construed as repealing, altering, or amending any provisions of acts authorizing the acquisition of property by the United States, but shall be construed and considered as an additional grant of authority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a copy of the bill in question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE, for 1 day, June 6, on account of important business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1050. An act relating to the status of retired judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 583. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States commissioners;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin;

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle and the Dauterive Hospital; and

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 6, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet Friday, June 6, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 353, Old House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 4854.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a further public hearing on the subject of royalty payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

597. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1941 in the amount of $44,000 (H. Doc. No. 244), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4643. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of $500 or less in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4965. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4972. A bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution providing that in the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, all points of order against any of the provisions of the bill shall be waived; without amendment (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3651) granting a pension to Jesse L. Fisher, and the same was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4966. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for a paid member of the Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 4968. A bill to increase the limit of cost for the acquisition of a site and construction of a post-office building in Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 4969. A bill to provide adequate markets and fair prices for agricultural commodities produced in the United States, to eliminate the necessity for mandatory reductions in crop production, to provide a method for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities for products of foreign countries on a basis mutually advantageous to agricultural and manufacturing interests in the United States and to such foreign countries, to promote foreign trade in the interest of friendly and peaceful relations among nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 4970. A bill to provide free use of the mail by members of the armed force during the national emergency; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4971. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 4972. A bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4973. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 4974. A bill designating Labor Day 1941 as National Labor Defense Day, and providing for its proper observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of California:

H. R. 4975. A bill to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4976. A bill to amend certain sections of the Federal Credit Union Act, approved June 26, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4977. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4978. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARNESS:

H. R. 4979. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Comptroller General to prepare and transmit to Congress a statement to the account of the United States with the Miami Tribe of Indians and the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Res. 228. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the advisability of creating a Department of Air Defense or of consolidating all defense establishments of the Government under a Department of National Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. Res. 229. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4845, a bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4980. A bill for the relief of Patrick H. Clifford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4981. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims against the United States of the Phoenix Construction Associates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:

H. R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Tsiang Hsi Tseng; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1288. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of the Washington Chapter, American Association of Social Work Students, Seattle, Wash., Charles Shireman, president, Arline D. English, secretary, alleging that arbitrary reductions in Work Projects Administration rolls force citizens over 45 years of age to depend upon public assistance; averring that State funds are insufficient to supply the needs of this group; pointing out that opportunities for vocational training are denied the senior citizen, and national-defense industries are concentrating upon younger and more plastic individuals; showing that unskilled workers are finding no place generally

in the defense set-up; insisting that there are whole communities in the State of Washington and elsewhere which are industrially stranded; and therefore recommending that Congress make an adequate appropriation to assure the continuance of a work program in the Work Projects Administration in such measure that needy citizens may be given respectable employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1289. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by the South Carolina Bottlers' Association, Greenville, S. C., that the bottled soft-drink industry in the State of South Carolina submits if there must be a tax on product sales it should be a general tax, levied upon a base sufficiently broad to distribute the burden equitably by taxing all, or substantially all, commodity sales at the same rate, thus giving each industry a chance of holding its own, producing the maximum revenue, and being the least disruptive of this and other industries in similar position; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1290. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition signed by numerous residents of Sedgwick County, Kans., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1291. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the City Council of Los Gatos, Calif., requesting that Congress take the necessary steps to secure immediate additional and adequate appropriations to provide for the development of strategic national-defense highways in the State of California, and particularly to that section most affected by national-defense projects, and that said defense highway development be made a definite part of the national-defense program financed in its entirety by national-defense funds; to the Committee on Roads.

1292. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of sundry citizens of Boundary and other towns in Stevens County, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bill 3852, which proposes to close all barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, irrespective of religious faith of the individuals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1293. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of L. A. Spring and other residents of Mount Vernon, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, identical bills, to regulate the day on which barber shops in the District of Columbia shall be closed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1294. Also, petition of J. D. Montgomery and other residents of Newark, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, identical bills, to regulate the day on which barber shops in the District of Columbia shall be closed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1295. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mr. Ed Ross and 16 other citizens of Lane County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1296. Also, petition signed by Paul R. Smith and 24 other citizens, of the State of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1297. Also, petition signed by John D. Winslow and 43 other citizens of the State of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1298. Also, petition signed by W. C. Christensen and 16 other citizens of Falls City, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1299. Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of Abe Winwood, of Butte, Mont., and 19 others, urging passage of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, including: (1) Demand that the unpublished hearings be printed; (2) sign the petition to bring the bill up for a roll-call vote; and (3) cast your vote for the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1300. Also, petition of George W. Buck, of Clancy, Mont., L. B. Mershon, of Helena, Mont., and 39 others, urging passage of House bill 4000, a bill to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on military or naval reservations or within a reasonable distance from such reservations, and to prevent taverns and vice districts in close proximity thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1301. Also, petition sponsored by the Women's Demonstration Club of Joplin, Mont., and signed by Mrs. H. D. Rolph and 74 others, addressed to the President of the United States, opposing war and urging the President to keep his campaign pledges to keep all our boys on this side of the Atlantic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1302. Also, petition of Mrs. F. R. Cunningham, of Lewistown, Mont., and 39 others, address to the President of the United States, opposing convoys and any move which will involve the United States in the wars in Europe, Asia, or Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1303. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Leslie A. Radtke, of Kalispell, Mont., and 65 others, urging passage of the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill, including: (1) Demand that the unpublished hearings be printed; (2) sign the petition to bring the bill up for a roll-call vote; and (3) cast your vote for the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1304. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 47, relative to memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to aid in furthering the development of Highway No. 20; to the Committee on Roads.

1305. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of sundry citizens of North Carolina and Tennessee, regarding House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1306. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of certain landowners and residents of Findlay, Sullivan, and Bethany, Ill., requesting that means other than the construction of dams in the Kaskaskia and Okaw Rivers be used for flood control, due to the fact that construction of dams in these rivers would flood their valuable farm land; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1307. Also, petition of certain landowners and residents of Findlay, Sullivan, and Bethany, Ill., requesting that means other than the construction of dams in the Kaskaskia and Okaw River be used for flood control, due to the fact that construction of dams in these rivers would flood their valuable farm land; to the Committee on Flood Control.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, in Thy holy name we bow our hearts in prayer and praise. Guard our lips from sin and be our shield and portion through the hours of this day. Though often disappointed by insecurity, disillusioned by failure, and dismayed by unrest, yet happy is he who finds the peace that no storm can subdue and the light that no darkness can dim. At Thy feet, blessed Lord, may we enter into the richer life; out of the things which limit, fetter, and suppress, may we pass into that realm of liberty which is the blessing of the sons of God. Forbid that we should neglect this divine gift which is life in its largest relations, deepening, widening like a stream as it flows toward the sea. We praise Thee that Thou art a path for the misled, bread for the hungry, and freedom for the bondmen. Thou Christ of God, come with us; Thou hast set the supreme example for all ages and the One in all the world who sincerely lived with perfect compassion and faith in the Almighty One. Thy words are the very acme of truth and Thou art the eternal example of goodness. Oh, let the mystery and the mission of Thy life break upon the children of men, dispelling the fogs, crowding back the foothills, and lifting the veil of fadeless dawn. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 127):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 913. An act to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 829. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) entitled "An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the former Postmaster General in connection with the Greater New York Fund appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LABOR AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of all that America stands for, we have been calling upon this country for a 100-percent economic effort to avoid war if possible, and in the event of war to avoid defeat. More than a year has passed since the President called for an all-out defense effort. The results to date have been puny in comparison with our possibilities. Last September an emergency was declared, this May a state of unlimited emergency has been declared. Yet today we find the strike situation worse than ever before. Vital airplane factories and vital shipyards are closed. No one denies labor the right to strike under certain circumstances and when wage and working conditions are unfair and unreasonable. But today defense industries should not be stopped from any cause whatsoever. A big majority of this Congress stands solidly behind the President's foreign policy and his defense program. We have gladly voted him every power requested and have appropriated to date more than $40,000,000,000 for defense. But insofar as strikes go the administration has not sought further legislation, contending rather that existing powers were sufficient. Wherever the responsibility lies, on Congress or on the administration, it is time for action. Mr. Roosevelt is a great man who may well live in history as a great human benefactor. However, tragic history reveals that most great men are destroyed by some small weakness. Woodrow Wilson was destroyed because of his inability to deal with politicians. Is Franklin Roosevelt to be destroyed because of his inability to deal with labor? Is labor to be the Achilles' heel of the Roosevelt administration? [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a story written by Charles Michelson, director of publicity of the Democratic National Committee, entitled "Dispelling the Fog."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune in connection with the so-called St. Lawrence waterway project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Dr. Clarence Poe appearing in the June issue of the Progressive Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a petition received from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rule I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD the extension of remarks requested yesterday, which includes an address by the Governor of Texas, which is over two pages in length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD regarding the bill H. R. 4886, regarding dormant accounts in banks, and to include therein an article from the American Banker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning in the President's message to the Congress, he stated:

> The enemies of democracy are developing every hydroelectric resource and every waterway from Norway to the Dardanelles.

To which he should have added, "And from New York City to San Francisco."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the Secretary of the Treasury last evening on defense savings bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

GASLESS SUNDAYS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two brief newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable John O'Connor on the subject The Rules Committee and Its Operation and a letter from the Columbia faculty on the subject; and second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the Gaelic American, New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with some remarks I expect to make later in the day and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE STRIKE PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the policy of this Congress and the Government at

the present time should be that this Nation shall not waste the labor of a single willing and able worker. I think the solution of this strike problem has got to be found. I also think it is wrong to cut off 514,000 jobs from the W. P. A. as the bill which will come before the House next Monday will, I understand, provide. It seems to me that for the first important sacrifice to come out of some of the poorest people is wrong and, furthermore, I believe we need these people to build our airports, our roads, and other necessary things as they have been doing the past year. I will insert in the RECORD later today a longer speech in which I include a portion of an editorial by David Lawrence, where he points out that although defense employment is going to go up, employment in industries producing civilian goods is likely to decline for that very reason.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE COWS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this one-half minute to announce to the House of Representatives that out of the 2,400,000 cows in the State of Wisconsin there was pulled 13,000,000,000 pounds of milk in 1940, the largest production of milk in any State in the history of the world; and the amount of poundage for each dairy farm was 323, which is an increase of 65 pounds to the farm in 1 year. This is attributed to the fact that Wisconsin, outstanding among all the States, has green grass, plenty of rains, running streams, and many cows. [Laughter and applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address recently made by Assistant Secretary of State Berle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Allen, Ill.	Andresen, August H.	Barden
Andersen, H. Carl	Baldwin	Bates, Mass.
Beam	Gilchrist	O'Day
Bender	Granger	O'Leary
Boykin	Grant, Ala.	Osmers
Bradley, Pa.	Green	O'Toole
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Leonard W.	Peterson, Fla.
Buck	Hare	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	Pheiffer, William T.
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Ploeser
Byrne	Healey	Rivers
Camp	Hendricks	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Hinshaw	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Mo.	Hobbs	Romjue
Capozzoli	Howell	Sacks
Celler	Jarrett	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Jenks, N. H.	Schuetz
Cluett	Jennings	Scott
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shannon
Colmer	Keefe	Sheridan
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Short
Costello	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Pa.
Creal	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Kleberg	Sumner, Ill.
Culkin	Kopplemann	Tarver
Cullen	Kramer	Tenerowicz
D'Alesandro	Larrabee	Thill
Dickstein	Lesinski	Thom
Dies	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	McArdle	Thomason
Disney	McGehee	Tibbott
Douglas	McLean	Tolan
Englebright	Maas	Traynor
Fellows	Maciejewski	Wadsworth
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Weiss
Gale	Murray	Young
Gamble	Nichols	Youngdahl
Gavagan	Norton	
Gerlach		
Geyer, Calif.		
Gibson		

The SPEAKER. On this call 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON H. R. 4965

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 230, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, all points of order against any of the provisions of the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later on, after consuming 7 or 8 minutes, yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

I fully appreciate that only a few days ago I made a statement on the floor that the Committee on Rules would hesitate in the future to grant rules to appropriation committees to include in their bills any new legislation or appropriations not authorized by law. However, yesterday a special request was made of the Rules Committee on this important bill now before us, the bill H. R. 4965, the military appropriation bill, 1942, reported unanimously by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and after hearing the need for immediate action, the Committee on Rules granted once more a special rule waiving points of order that could be sustained against the bill. Before that rule was granted the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], appeared before the Rules Committee and requested a rule on the bill H. R. 4476, which authorizes the appropriations that would be subject to the point of order in the bill before us, H. R. 4965. Unfortunately it was not possible to act upon that rule and obtain unanimous consent of the Committee to grant a rule on H. R. 4476.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs appeared before the Committee on Rules and said that the bill which the gentleman has just mentioned, H. R. 4476, contains all of the subject matter that is contained in the legislative provisions of the appropriation bill, H. R. 4965, the Military Establishment, now before the House?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; that would be subject to the point of order.

Mr. FADDIS. Then I inform the gentleman that there is a mistake somewhere along the line, because that bill does not contain the subject matter of these legislative provisions which are subject to a point of order in the appropriation bill.

Mr. SABATH. That was the information that we obtained from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FADDIS. Did the Committee on Rules make any attempt to inform itself whether that is true?

Mr. SABATH. Later on.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. With pleasure.

Mr. COX. The Rules Committee went to what it thought was the best source of information, and that is the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs itself.

Mr. SABATH. As a rule, the Committee on Rules endeavors to obtain information from the chairmen of such committees reporting legislation upon which special rules are requested. We had every reason to believe that nearly, if not all, the provisions subject to a point of order, as I suggested, had been and are included in the bill, H. R. 4476, introduced April 22 and reported May 20. Unfortunately the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], stated it was impossible for him to obtain consideration of that bill before the Committee on Appropriations reported its bill, and at the last minute, of course, it was impossible for the Rules Committee to act on H. R. 4476 because the meeting was specially called for the consideration of the rule on H. R. 4965, so that we would not delay this needed and important legislation now pending before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might also say that it was thought that, in view of the

fact that the bill reported out of the Military Affairs Committee had a number of sections which are very desirable and necessary, that debate, or reasonable opportunity for debate, it was thought, should be afforded Members rather than that it should be taken up under unanimous consent. As far as I was concerned, it could be taken up under unanimous consent, but understanding the fact that Members wanted to discuss it and have it explained, therefore a rule is necessary, and the Committee on Rules has been doing everything it can in cooperation with Members on both sides of the aisle.

It was impossible to bring this up until a rule was reported. The Rules Committee has been doing everything it can, and when a rule is reported, I shall bring it up for consideration in the House as quickly as possible. It seems to me that for all practical purposes that meets the situation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Certainly no more cooperation can be given, no more assurance can be given than that. We have an appropriation bill that has to be passed.

Mr. SNYDER and Mr. FADDIS rose.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SNYDER. If you will give me your attention I think this statement will answer the gentleman in an understanding way. In the hearings at page 188, during the statement made by Col. F. W. Browne, Assistant Budget Officer, I said to Colonel Browne:

> Colonel Browne, I believe you are the one to whom we look to see that there is proper and adequate legislative support for the appropriations which are included in the regular annual appropriation bill.
>
> Up to this time, a great deal of your emergency authority has been granted in supplemental appropriation measures and does not extend beyond the current fiscal year. That course was pursued with the implied, if not the expressed, sanction of the Military Affairs Committee in the interest of expedition The Naval Affairs Committee likewise has cooperated with this committee in a fine spirit to get the various phases of the defense program under way.
>
> However, I noticed the other day that Chairman MAY, of the Military Affairs Committee, introduced a bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment. Is that measure designed to care for authority of limited duration which has been included heretofore in appropriation measures?
>
> Colonel BROWNE. It is; yes, sir.
>
> Mr. SNYDER. In your judgment, does it care for everything in the bill at this stage which needs legislative authorization?
>
> Colonel BROWNE. Yes, sir. It was intended to so provide.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for this information. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as one member of the Rules Committee, I am absolutely opposed to the Appropriations Committee usurping the functions of legislative committees and bringing in legislation that should be considered by a legislative committee. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] as far as that is concerned.

In this particular instance I voted for this rule because this legislation, we were told by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs had had the consideration of the legislative committee and was unanimously reported favorably by the committee and is now on the calendar. The next step is that we are in the midst of the consideration of an appropriation bill carrying $10,000,000,000, a part of which should be made available, the sooner the better, for the national defense of the country, and everybody recognizes that fact. In view of the fact that we were confronted with that condition and that the Committee on Military Affairs had considered these measures, I felt it my duty, in an emergency, to vote for this emergency rule and send this bill on its way, because had the Rules Committee refused this rule it would have delayed this $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill anywhere from 10 days to 3 weeks before authority could be given by legislative action.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield to tell us where it would have delayed the bill that much?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield to the gentleman later on.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am sure the gentleman is prepared to tell the House that the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] reflects very accurately the attitude of his committee.

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I just want to say that the gentleman from Michigan, as has been stated by the gentleman from Georgia, another member of the committee, reflects the view of the Rules Committee. We are all of the same accord that the Appropriations Committee should not usurp the power of legislative committees. Our intentions are good, and, of course, we all are familiar with the saying that "hell is paved with good intentions," but you are also familiar with another quotation that "man proposes but God disposes." We are all of one accord in this—but we are and should be of one accord, to do our duty and safeguard the rights and interests of our Nation against the threatening dangers of Hitlerism. He and his zealots and nonbelievers maintain that God is on their side. This is unbelievable. I actually feel that the Almighty has brought upon Europe the Hitler plague to halt in the future fighting and discord between the various peoples of Europe, and has selected the God-fearing American people to put an end to this dastardly, blighting Nazi scourge. Under that belief we should not fail to do our duty to bring not only to beloved America but to the whole world peace, understanding, tolerance, fair dealing, and more brotherly love, which are so sadly lacking in many parts of the world. So that is that.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules hopes that in the future these appropriations committees will restrict themselves to appropriating in accordance with the rules of the House and will not ask in the future that special rules be granted against points of order which will lie, so that they will not again come before the Committee on Rules for the purpose of making these provisions in order. However, there is certain justification today, because the provisions in this bill had been acted upon by the legislative committee, and here is the bill, H. R. 4476, reported unanimously. I say to the House that there was a unanimous vote in the Rules Committee on this rule.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Just as a matter of information, I understand it is very important that this bill (H. R. 4476) be considered. Why could not a rule have been given making in order the provisions of this bill, rather than a wide-open rule where anything can be tacked on?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. HOOK. I just wanted information on that matter.

Mr. SABATH. This rule only provides that points of order against the provisions of the bill are to be waived. That means that should an attempt be made to offer an amendment in the nature of legislation to any other provision in the bill this rule does not make it in order. Have I made myself clear?

Mr. HOOK. Yes; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has stated, the rule was unanimously agreed to, and I want to compliment him and in this instance every member of the Rules Committee on the Republican side for their cooperation. I am indeed gratified with the desire on the part of the minority to cooperate with the majority. I feel it is high time that we recognized the danger that confronts America. I hope that henceforth those who have not realized the danger will realize it and desist in their efforts to create dissension in our land. These are trying days. I fear there are some men in this country—not willingly, not deliberately, but nevertheless they do emulate men like Starnberg and Seyss-Inquart in Austria, like Henlein in the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia, and like Dr. Joseph Tiso and the Reverend Hlinka in Slovakia of Czechoslovakia, and subsequently men like Vidkun Quisling in Norway, and all the other Quislings in the other countries which have been conquered by Hitler. Hitler used these men, without their intention in some instances, to penetrate and deprive their countries of their freedom and liberty, and many of them have been rewarded by appointments as Hitler's stooges in their countries. They were the men who began to create misunderstanding, confusion, and doubt which prevented adequate preparation for national defense, so that some countries were conquered without the firing of a shot.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say that anyone in America would stoop so low as these men did. Unfortunately, there are men in this country, I know, who are being misled and whose activities are tantamount to the services of those I have mentioned, which brought about disunion and discord in the countries now under Hitler's heel. It is to be hoped

that the few Nazi misled Americans will not continue in their activities and thereby weaken America. Notwithstanding the statements of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and others that we are not in danger, I feel that every well informed man today must recognize that we are not only in danger, but in great danger. The gentleman from New York still harps that it is impossible and unthinkable that Hitler could attack America, but on the other hand he advocates these tremendous appropriations for defense. If his contention is correct that we are not in danger and cannot be attacked, why did all of us vote for all these billions for this purpose. Regardless of the statement of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Lindbergh, or of anyone else, we know of the Axis' aims—that if they should bring about the defeat of Great Britain, they would immediately gain the nearby French bases from which they can easily operate against South and Central American countries, the Panama Canal, and the United States, and, in fact, would again use, as I have said before, the same methods in these countries and our own to weaken their and our resistance as they did in the subjugated countries. The fact that Hitler agents have already expended millions upon millions of dollars in those countries, as well as in our own, for propaganda purposes is well known and cannot be justly denied by anyone. Therefore, it is to be hoped that every real, loyal American having the interest of his country at heart will join hands for the protection and preservation of our country and its democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, we are in danger. This legislation is necessary and we have no time to waste. For this reason I hope the rule will be adopted.

I shall conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with the request that I may have the privilege of revising and extending; and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee by a unanimous vote reported this resolution to waive all points of order on the appropriation bill. I think it is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee is writing legislation into their bills. I believe all Members of Congress agree that fundamentally it is wrong. Whether the Appropriations Committee is to blame in this instance is another matter. Possibly the blame rests with the Committee on Military Affairs for not calling up their legislation some weeks or months ago, which they could have done had they not given all their time to investigations.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I want to inform the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Military Affairs long ago reported a bill, H. R. 4476, in which every single request made by the Chief of Staff was included.

Mr. FISH. All I want to say to that is that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee appeared only yesterday asking for a rule. If we gave him the rule, it would take at least 2 or 3 weeks to enact the bill into law. In this emergency—and everybody admits we are in one, Republicans and Democrats alike admit we are in an emergency and on the verge of war, and I thoroughly agree with the President that we are in an emergency—I am supporting this rule. Every Member of Congress should support it on one basis and one basis alone, that is that we recognize an emergency to exist and that this appropriation bill is necessary for our defense. The funds should be made available immediately. This is the only reason for the rule.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I want to explain something to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman can get plenty of time from his own side. The only thing we are now discussing is whether there is an emergency. Most of us admit there is. This is a national-defense bill. For these reasons we reported the rule. We do not for a minute approve of the Appropriations Committee legislating as they have done in this instance, but we are voting for the rule because we believe it is in the interest of the country and national defense at this time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. In behalf of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the subcommittee acted in good faith and in the right spirit when they asked, as I read a minute ago, Colonel Browne, representing the Bureau of the Budget, whether all these provisions were included in the bill that the Military Affairs Committee had reported out. He assured us they were. In this case I believe, therefore, the effort to legislate would be no reflection on this committee, because we felt we were acting in the spirit in which we were supposed to.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is quite correct, as I understand, that the bill reported favorably by the Military Committee contains the necessary authority for these appropriations were it passed by the House.

Mr. FISH. The Rules Committee so understood at the time they acted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman from New York even intimate that the Military Affairs Committee has not been perfectly frank and fair about this thing and has not wanted to treat the Appropriations Committee with proper respect?

Mr. FISH. I think the Military Affairs Committee has been very fair in the matter. Furthermore, the Military Affairs Committee today is one of the hardest working committees in the House. It is doing its very best to get the national-defense legislation reported and to conduct an investigation at the same time, which is a pretty hard and difficult problem to solve. I find fault with no one so far as this legislation is concerned. If you believe that we are in an emergency and that this is necessary for our national defense then you ought to support the rule and vote for the bill afterward.

Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and colleague from Illinois, my distinguished and beloved chairman, after finishing a discussion of the merits of the proposition now before us, began to talk about his old namesake, Adolf Hitler, and he informed us—whether there is anything in names or not, I do not know—that unless we pass this bill Adolf Hitler will immediately invade the United States. I assume he means that Adolf will take an airplane from Dakar to Brazil, then fly from the impenetrable jungles of Brazil to Washington and take over the Capital.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield. I would not want to misquote the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Although he is my namesake, I wish to assure the gentleman that I do not agree with him. In fact, I resent him and everything which he has done. There were men in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and in the other countries, who also believed that there was no danger. He assured them time and time again that there was nothing to fear. Therefore, I hope that the gentleman from New York is correct that there is no danger, but I feel in my own heart that there is a danger, because I judge people by their past actions.

Mr. FISH. I would suggest to my chairman, in the first place, it is very easy to change one's name, at least temporarily, during a war, and I suggest he might change his first name to Franklin Delano, just for the time being, during the war emergency and war hysteria.

Mr. SABATH. I would not be ashamed to do that, I assure the gentleman, and how proud I would be.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the old argument of Hitler's invading the United States is shopworn. I thought the Members of Congress at least, and even the public, had given that up many months ago that America was in the same position as Austria, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, alongside Germany with the mightiest army in the world. We are still 3,000 miles away, and I do not believe that any Member of Congress thinks that Hitler can successfully attack us by airplanes or land troops in America when we have an army of one and a half million, as well as the greatest Navy in the world, and are in the process of building up a huge air force.

What is the bill before us? If what the gentleman from Illinois has just told you is true, the American people ought to look under their beds every night to see if Hitler is there, or they should leave the city of Washington and other cities and sleep out in the country for fear of being bombed by Nazi planes. Why every time an automobile backfires the people of

Washington should envision the panzer divisions marching up Pennsylvania Avenue.

There is no one in authority in Germany or America who does not know that we have the greatest and best Navy in the world. We have an Army of a million and a half that in 6 months will be properly armed and we are now building the greatest air force in the world.

What is this bill we are discussing? It provides $5,000,000,000, or one-half the total sum for our air force. This is the greatest single appropriation bill in peacetime, and with one exception the greatest in wartime, that has ever been passed by Congress.

I do not ask you to take my word about the defensive power of an air force but I will quote from the opening remarks of Colonel Lindbergh when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, which I think very briefly explains the great advantage of airplanes as a defensive weapon:

Colonel LINDBERGH. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:

I understand that I have been asked to appear before this committee to discuss the effect of aviation upon America's position in time of war. I believe that this effect can be summed up briefly by saying that our position is greatly strengthened for defense and greatly weakened for attack.

I base this statement upon two facts. First, that an invading army and its supplies must still be transported by sea. Second, that aviation makes it more difficult than ever before for a navy to approach a hostile shore.

In support of these facts, I cite, for the first, the minute carrying capacity of aircraft in relation to the weight of equipment and supplies required for a major expeditionary force; and for the second, the experience of the British Navy off the Norwegian coast and in the North Sea.

I do not believe there is any danger of an invasion of this continent, either by sea or by air, as long as we maintain an army, navy, and air force of reasonable size and in modern condition, and provided we establish the bases essential for defense.

How large our air force should be in actual numbers depends, of course, upon conditions in other parts of the world. Because of the existing European crisis, I should say that we would be wise to construct as rapidly as possible a total air force of about 10,000 thoroughly modern fighting planes plus reserves.

I understand the reserves are just twice that number.

Colonel Lindbergh goes on:

This number would, I believe, be adequate to insure American security regardless of the outcome of the present European war. Whether our air force should be increased or decreased in the more distant future will be decided by circumstances which we cannot now foresee. But an industry capable of building and maintaining a 10,000-plane air force would, I believe, have adequate flexibility to meet any emergency with which we might be confronted in this hemisphere.

Then he went on and advocated the taking over and acquiring of various islands on the northern coast of South America for use as air bases. I hope the administration will take immediate steps to carry out this program.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the fact the gentleman has read Mr. Lindbergh's testimony, will it not show that he himself is in favor of preparing for a defense which this bill aims to do, and provides money for that purpose?

Mr. FISH. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. SABATH. If there were no danger, why do we need any of this defense? Why do we need this preparation?

Mr. FISH. Because we are building for defense and our own national defense in a war-mad world. I did not assume the gentleman was voting for this bill with the thought that it might take us into war. This bill is a defense measure to safeguard America.

Mr. SABATH. Correct.

Mr. FISH. We have already provided for a two-ocean Navy. We are providing in this bill for the greatest air force in the world, for one reason and one reason alone, for the defense of the United States and to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, which would likewise mean defending Canada, Mexico, and the rest of North and South America. That is the reason for such a huge force, to make us invincible in the air. I believe everybody realizes that if we have this air force no nation or combination of nations with their navies can get anywhere near America. That is the object and the sole object of the bill—to keep war out of and away from America.

I am sorry, in view of what happened in Crete, that the administration has refused to go along with those of us who are advocating the expenditure of a few millions—not billions, but a few millions of dollars—to promote instruction of gliding in America. So far the administration has refused to endorse the bills we have introduced. However, since the attack on Crete, where gliders were used in large quantities, I am hopeful that it will reconsider and that the next Army appropriation bill will carry an appropriation for the training of glider pilots, particularly among the youth of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article by Al Williams, the well-known aviator, on the necessity for the training of glider pilots in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

SILLY REASONING

(By Al Williams)

If this is an unlimited national emergency, then this is the time to lay some real foundation stones for real American air power.

The United States today is in a position where whether we plan for real American air power will decide whether or not we have that air power in a year or two years.

There are men in this country who have untold air experience and who know this air business from top to bottom. But those men seldom reach positions of authority where their judgment can be used for the safety of the country.

Everywhere we look in the high-up air authority at Washington, we find what are known as World War pilots. They are in trouble unless their World War flying experience has been brought right up to date by constant cockpit experience, for modern aviation is to the first World War stuff as a flying fortress is to a kite.

I was astounded to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Secretaries of War and Navy had turned down civilian-glider training programs with the glib opinion, "It is not necessary," and "Flight training in gliders and sailplanes as a preliminary step in power-plane training is of doubtful value."

This must be challenged. Of course, Gen. Ernst Udet, who is largely responsible for the German air force, may not know much about air power, but he says, and has said many times, that the best German fighting pilots are those among the 250,000 and 300,000 young Germans who received their basic flight training in gliders and sailplanes.

Speaking as a practical airman, I assert flatly that a man trained in glider and sailplane, required to know atmospheric conditions and to coax his craft's performance from nature by scientific air knowledge and accurate handling, is the finest material in the world for making a finished pilot for high-powered warplanes.

These modern, high-speed war planes cannot be kicked around in the air like the low-powered jobs of the last war. They require finesse. And there's no place for acquiring flight finesse like the cockpit of an engineless glider or sail plane. Glider training, as recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, should have been pushed through Congress whether the Army or Navy liked it or not.

It is a remarkably cheap method for building a true air generation. Modified gliders are suitable for youngsters of 14 to 16. They can be pulled by hand to teach novices the feel of the controls. They can be launched from small or high hills.

In 1936, I saw thousands of young Germans, from 13 to 15, enthusiastically launching and flying modified gliders. The skill, enthusiasm, and casual manner of these boys brought me up short. And, as youngsters progress there are advanced gliders and then sailplanes in which it is possible to sail for hours at a time.

Youngsters who learn early in life to handle a rowboat make good amateur yachtsmen—and still later, good naval recruits. Cowboys make good cavalrymen.

We Americans are on the wrong foot with our dream plans for real American air power. We believe we can have anything for which we have the money. We think in terms of factory production, but we must think in terms of experienced manpower to fly the planes.

The way to real American air power—now that we are aware that air power will dominate any future war—is to start now building air generations of youngsters who begin flying as soon as it is practicable to get them into the air in any sort of suitable air vehicle.

We must plan, not only for this present emergency, but for the all-time air protection of America, and the real air strength of a nation is not in its military and naval airmen. It is in an air-educated, air-wise civilian population.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman is advocating glider training. Gliders are purely an offensive weapon.

Mr. FISH. The gliders I am talking about are for training pilots so that they will understand the air currents. What we want and need are not only more airplanes but the best pilots in the world, and the way to have the best pilots is to give them glider training when they are youngsters so they can learn about and make use of air currents. You cannot use gliders to fight in, you cannot fly

gliders from here to Germany. Gliders may be good for flights of a few hundred miles or less, from Greece into Crete, but certainly not for a flight of 3,000 miles to Europe.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand correctly, gliders are used when you are making conquests, when you are attacking a country.

Mr. FISH. No. I am speaking of training young pilots on gliders.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do we need gliders when we are fighting a defensive war?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is putting the cart before the horse. All I am asking is that the youth of America have the same opportunity to train on gliders as foreign nations have provided for their youth. Major Williams is one of the greatest experts on aviation in America, and he says that the best pilots in the world are those who have been trained on gliders. They learn to operate gliders, which have no motors, and that gives them a knowledge of air currents and the handling of airplanes which is invaluable. It would also provide a large reservoir of young Americans who are air-minded and who would make fine pilots.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. I am wondering if the gentleman's committee has ever had under consideration the placing of the United States air force under a Cabinet head, in view of the success of Hitler on the isle of Crete.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman mean he is in favor of a unified air force?

Mr. BEITER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I am not an expert, and my opinion may not be worth much, but I believe we should do that because it seems to work out pretty well in other countries. As a military man, I believe in taking advantage of the experience of other countries where it has been successful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, so the Members can read it, if they care to, the line-up for the soft-ball game tomorrow and the list of umpires, trainers, and officials for the game.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The following is the revised line-up of the Statesmen softball team, which will play Lowell Thomas' Nine Old Men at Griffith Stadium, Saturday afternoon, June 7, at 2 p. m.:

Senator Mead, New York, third base.
Speaker Rayburn or Joe Martin, shortstop.
Senator Wallgren, Washington, second base.
Representative Fish, New York, first base.
Representative Allen, Illinois, pitcher.
Representative Shanley, Connecticut, catcher.
Vice President Wallace or Senator O'Mahoney, Wyoming, short field.
Senator Taft, Ohio, or Senator Lucas, Illinois, left field.
Senator Davis, Pennsylvania, or Senator Brooks, Illinois, center field.
Senator La Follette, Wisconsin, or Senator Clark, Missouri, right field.

Substitutes: Pitchers: Representatives Richards, Hill, Wilson. Catchers: Representatives O'Toole, Kefauver, Thomas, Springer. Shortstop: Representatives Lambertson, Hancock, Keough, McGregor. First base: Representatives Sparkman, Worley, Howell, Elliott. Second base: Representatives O'Neal, Van Zandt, Arends, Bishop. Third base: Representatives Magnuson, Merritt, O'Brien. Outfielders: Representatives Barnes, Harrington, Stratton, Gamble, Canfield, Leonard W. Hall, Edwin A. Hall, Wright, Connery, Scanlon, Fogarty, Boggs, Kunkel, Hook.

Protocol, entertainment, and constitution: Representative Sol Bloom, New York.

Coaches: Senators Barkley, McNary, Wheeler; Representatives McCormack, Vinson, Crowther, Reed, and Woodruff.

Umpires: Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy; Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce; Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission; and John J. Dempsey, Commissioner, Maritime Commission

Trainers: Senators Glass and Capper; Representatives Edward Taylor, Robert Doughton, and Treadway.

Rules: Representatives Sabath, Cox, Michener, and Halleck.

Official scorers: Senator Smith; Representatives Sumners, Jenkins, and Wolfenden.

Base-line coaches: Senators George and Byrnes; Representatives Tinkham, Knutson, Rankin, Taber, Ditter, and Patrick.

Bat boys: Representatives Martin J. Kennedy and Clare Hoffman.

Water boy: Fishbait Miller.

Marine Band will start playing at 1:30 p. m. Official ceremonies get under way at 1:45 p. m., over radio.

Tickets available at all Peoples Drug Stores, prominent hotels, and at the Sergeant at Arms of the House and Senate. Prices: $1 for grandstand, 50 cents for bleachers; children half price. All proceeds to charity.

Lowell Thomas' Nine Old Men include well-known radio commentators and entertainers, columnists, cartoonists, sports writers, and other nationally known figures. Patronesses include Mrs. Roosevelt, the wives of Cabinet officers, and others.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Protocol, Entertainment, and Constitution Committee is composed of Representative SOL BLOOM. The coaches are Senators BARKLEY, MCNARY, and WHEELER, and Representatives MCCORMACK, VINSON, CROWTHER, REED, and WOODRUFF.

Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed by me to the people in my congressional district regarding an informal ballot I propose to have taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

To the People of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District:

We are on the brink of war. Congress alone, under the Constitution, may declare war. An undeclared war is an invention and creation of totalitarian nations, and a negation of democratic processes and of our constitutional form of government.

The issue of war or peace is clearcut. It should be discussed and debated throughout the Nation. It is the greatest issue with which the American people have been confronted since the birth of the Republic. It transcends all political, social, and family affiliations.

I have no quarrel with any American citizen who wants to go in or stay out of the war. That is his or her right as a free sovereign American.

As your Representative in Congress, I want to be guided by the thoughtful opinion of my constituents. I am conducting a poll or referendum to the enrolled voters of my district to find out the sentiment of the people on this greatest of all issues and would appreciate your cooperation by returning the enclosed postcard ballot to me within 3 days after you receive it.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

P. S.—All that is necessary is to mark and mail the enclosed card. You do not have to sign the ballot; sign only if you wish.

BALLOT

The United States should—
Enter the war ☐
Stay out of the war ☐
(Signature optional)

Name_____
Address_____

Please return this ballot within 3 days of receipt.

HAMILTON FISH.

The reverse side of the ballot is a 1-cent postal card, prepaid and addressed back to me.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish now to refer to a statement made by a distinguished Senator yesterday in Helena, Mont. He said that the time is fast coming when no man can be disloyal to the President without being disloyal to America. That certainly is a very un-American doctrine. We Members of Congress take an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. All of us are behind the President in supporting legislation that promotes our national defense in this emergency, but we would not be with the President, for example, if the President determined to take us into war against the express provisions of the Constitution, which places the sole power to declare war in the Congress, or against the will of 80 percent of the American people. I do not believe in setting up what we might call a leader or fuehrer in America. That is the totalitarian system and is thoroughly un-American. We owe our allegiance to the Constitution and to constitutional government, Democrats and Republicans alike. We owe no personal allegiance to the President of the United States, or to any one man in America. We take our oath of office here to uphold and defend the Constitution, and I am opposed to trying to set up an American fuehrer or to establish the idea that we owe loyalty to any one man, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, and I hope this un-American argument will not be carried any further in the United States in order to destroy our free institutions and constitutional form of Government. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNE). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

THE U. S. S. "SOUTH DAKOTA"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute to speak briefly out of order and to announce that tomorrow, at 11:45 eastern standard time, or whatever is high tide at the Camden Shipyard, the U. S. S. *South Dakota* will be launched, the newest of Uncle Sam's new fighting ships, 4 months ahead of schedule. [Applause.] This is to be the most modern and the best of the battleships afloat. There will be brief ceremonies. The Governor of South Dakota will be present. The battleship will be christened by his wife, Mrs. Harlan J. Bushfield.

I am sorry I cannot invite you all to be present, because the space is limited and reservations have exhausted the space. However, we are to have there the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., junior band of 75 pieces. They come from the metropolis in the district of my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and this fine band is coming on from the launching to the Capitol to play in the plaza at 5 o'clock Sunday afternoon, and you are all invited to hear it here. I wish you could all be present at the launching. I hope some day you can all see the *South Dakota*. You will all be welcome and I hope you all can be present to enjoy the band concert here at the Capitol Sunday afternoon at 5 o'clock. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an article from the Post of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the bill that we are presently considering is the biggest peacetime War Department appropriation measure that the country has ever seen. I sometimes marvel at the ease with which the Congress of the United States appropriates money. It seems to be easy to appropriate it, and I know we can get the money. We can get part of it by taxation, and we will get the rest of it by borrowing.

The appropriation of the money is one thing; the translation of that money into the guns and the tanks and the ammunition and the airplanes that we need for defense is quite another thing. That job is a job of production. It is a job which must be done primarily by the great system of private enterprise or productive enterprise of this country. That enterprise is carried on by the joint efforts of capital and management on one side and labor on the other.

Throughout all of our history we have had struggles between capital and labor over a fair division of the profits of the joint enterprise, and as long as we have a system of private enterprise we will continue to have these struggles. But I think, in this time when production is so necessary, we ought to do everything possible, every one of us in the Government and out, to see to it that the processes of production are carried on continuously and without unnecessary or undue stoppage.

We have heard a lot of talk about strikes in defense industries. I, for one, have felt that there is a responsibility on the Congress to do certain things. As to what to do, I might say that I would be most reluctant to vote for legislation to outlaw all strikes, in peacetime particularly. I have felt I would not support such legislation.

But outside of Congress I think there is one place where there is a definite responsibility. I think there is a definite responsibility that can be discharged without destroying our system of private enterprise, without wrongfully or unnecessarily interfering with the rights of either capital or labor, and that power is in the hands of the President of the United States and the administrators around him and with him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein parts of an editorial appearing recently in the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I refer to this editorial that appeared recently in the Baltimore Sun. Without regard to whether you or I agree with every statement contained in it, it is one of the most forceful presentations of the responsibilities of Mr. Roosevelt, our President, I have read. I shall read parts of it for you to consider in determining just what that responsibility is. The editorial is entitled "Mr. Roosevelt Can Stop Strikes," and it appeared on the front page of the Baltimore Sun on June 3 of this year:

> Within the last week the question of labor in defense has been brought appreciably nearer to downright treatment. Mr. Roosevelt, in his last broadcast, spoke more plainly than ever before against stoppages. Later, the American Federation of Labor called for exhaustion of all means of conciliation before the ordering of a strike. Still later, a small rank-and-file group of the C. I. O. declared war on subversive strike leaders.
>
> This is a gain in comparison with the attitude which has generally prevailed in Washington and in labor circles. For months those who have urged self-discipline upon labor have been regarded with suspicion. What though they also urged sacrifice upon others. What though they stood for severe taxation of industry and of the well-to-do classes. What though they stood for subordination of private production in industry to production for defense. No matter. When they spoke of labor's duties, they were treated as enemies of "social gains." Only a short time ago Mrs. Roosevelt, who wields large influence in Washington and in the country, spoke condoningly of strikes.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Leadership against this condition, leadership which will translate the words spoken within the last week into actions, rests in the hands of one man. That man is Mr. Roosevelt. This leadership rests in his hands because he is the President. It also rests in his hands because he is the idol of labor in this country and has far more influence over the masses of the workers than Mr. Lewis or Mr. Green. Mr. Roosevelt can bring the labor situation under control by doing three things:
>
> First. He can use his official power and his personal power with labor to drive disloyal and subversive men out of positions of influence among industrial workers. A line must be drawn between tolerance and weakness. Communists are entitled to their civil rights. If they wish to appear in the open and to speak or write in support of their convictions, they should be permitted to do so. Fair discussion will dispose of their arguments. But they must not be permitted to conceal their identities, to conceal their policies, to conceal their objects, and, in a cloak of lies, to incite trouble and disorder in the defense industries of the land. To permit them to continue the manufacture of strikes is not tolerance. It is fumbling, muddle-headed weakness.
>
> Second. Mr. Roosevelt can use his official power to introduce common sense into the heads of a considerable number of his subordinates. His administration embraces a large element of pseudo-intellectuals who arrived in Washington with their heads full of such slogans as, "Production for use and not for profit." They, too, are entitled to their opinions and their civil rights. But it has always been doubtful that men and women of such views are the best of servants in an administration which professes faith in private enterprise. Today many of them argue that the country is not worth saving if social gains must be curtailed. Mr. Roosevelt should make all his subordinates realize that nothing is more important than the Nation's safety.
>
> Third. He can use his personal leadership to array the vast majority of patriotic workers against subversive and shirking elements; against abuse of this national emergency to force any change in labor relationships by way of strikes or lock-outs; against reckless demands from the best paid labor ever on this earth for wage increases that will embarrass the Government in its financing and will set off the inflationary spiral. This patriotic majority of labor is sending its sons into the Army camps and is standing ready to bear its share of taxation. It can be made the most powerful of all correctives of labor evils if Mr. Roosevelt will assert his moral leadership.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. Roosevelt should use the powers which are in his hands. He knows that industry is being brought under discipline. He knows that, in procurement of materials, industry is being subjected to priorities in favor of production for defense—as it should be. He knows that, in distribution and sales, industry is being subjected step by step to price ceilings—as it should be. He knows that, in the pending tax bill, industry is being subjected to an enormous increase in its tax payments—as it should be. He must know that all these and similar sacrifices may be unavailing if strikes continue and are permitted to grow in number and in their effects upon production. He has described, none more movingly, the peril in which this Nation lives. He must know that this peril is brought closer to the people by every strike.
>
> Let Mr. Roosevelt act. Let him root out the subversive elements in labor. Let him beat common sense into the heads of the pseudo-intellectuals in his own administration. Let him array the great mass of patriotic workers against production-killing disorders. The power is in Mr. Roosevelt's hands. Let Mr. Roosevelt use it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I will not yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think that the labor legislation of this administration has been constructive or

subversive? I would like to have an answer to that question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this habit of legislating on appropriation bills is a practice that every Member of the House knows to be unfair to the legislative committees concerned.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. No.

Mr. WHITE. I just want to ask a question——

Mr. FADDIS. I decline to yield. In the matter under controversy today I rise to make this explanation to the membership of the House. Some time ago, knowing there was likelihood of a great deal of legislation being written into this appropriation bill, I approached the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], and talked to him about these matters. The gentleman assured me that there would be no legislation written into this appropriation bill that had not been heretofore authorized. On the strength of that, and on the strength of requests of the Chief of Staff, the House Committee on Military Affairs took up every request that the Chief of Staff made to that committee and embodied it in a bill, H. R. 4476, and, after due consideration, reported out that bill unanimously.

Mr. SNYDER rose.

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry, but I cannot yield. The gentleman may reply to this in his own time, of which he has plenty. Yesterday when I came to the floor of the House and asked for a committee report on this bill I found that there were still three items of legislation included in the bill. I was at that time informed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] that he intended to reserve all points of order, which would have given me an opportunity to make a point of order against the legislation included in this bill. Later on I learned that the Rules Committee had been approached and had been requested for a rule on this bill waiving all points of order. I submit in all fairness, How is a member of a legislative committee to protect himself and his committee under procedure of that kind?

A statement was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] also about the urgency of this legislation, of the legislative items written into this appropriation bill. I hereby challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], the chairman of this subcommittee, in his own time, to get up on the floor of this House and explain to the Committee just wherein these items are so pressing, and why they are so pressing that they should not receive due and deliberate consideration before the Committee on Military Affairs of this House. There is not an item in this bill that is so pressing that it should not come before the legislative committee having jurisdiction of it, and I am sure the House will concede this much, at least, to me: That there is no man in the House of Representatives who has done more to expedite preparation for national defense in all matters under all possible circumstances than I. The reason I am objecting to this is because this practice is growing prevalent in appropriation bills and because matters are put into appropriation bills which should come before the House Committee on Military Affairs.

After the whole thing is over, frequently we are compelled to go to work and hold investigations and do a lot of work to rectify the mistakes made which, if the matters had been properly presented to the proper committee, that work would have been obviated in the first place. Therefore I appeal to the House here today to vote down this rule and let the consideration of this bill proceed as is customary with appropriation bills, without a gag rule of this kind, in order that a member of a standing committee may avail himself of the right which he ordinarily has as a Member of this House, to make a point of order against items in the appropriation bill which are legislative in character.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman point out specifically wherein the bill brought in by the Committee on Appropriations is at variance with the general consensus of opinion of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. FADDIS. I thank the gentleman. The statement has also been made, and inference has been left, that the subject matter contained in H. R. 4476 covers the language I am questioning in this bill. Such is not the case. The subject matter covered in H. R. 4476 does not have anything to do with the legislative provisions written into this bill. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McGRANERY. Not entirely. What I wanted to know was just wherein does this bill brought in by the Appropriations Committee vary from the general consensus of opinion of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. FADDIS. That is something I cannot tell the gentleman, because the legislative items in this bill have never been presented to the Committee on Military Affairs. I have no doubt if they were, the Committee on Military Affairs would give them expeditious consideration and would accord them all the consideration that it habitually accords any legislation which is placed before it at the request of the War Department.

Mr. McGRANERY. How does the gentleman feel about the statement placed in the record by Colonel Browne?

Mr. FADDIS. Well, Colonel Browne is not a member of any legislative body and has no legislative responsibility. Whatever he may have to say on this subject is entirely valueless, in my opinion, when placed before a legislative body charged with legislative responsibility under the customary procedure of the House of Representatives, which is to refer legislative matters to the proper legislative committee of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I take it that the gentleman is making a plea for orderly legislative procedure?

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman protests against the Appropriations Committee invading the province of other committees of the House.

Mr. FADDIS. I thank the gentleman. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee I want to say that almost every day of our lives we refuse to put in legislative matters on appropriation bills. But when the chairman and members of a legislative committee come before one of our subcommittees and says that certain emergency provisions have been discussed and that they are substantially every one of them approved by the legislative committee, and it is a matter of tremendous emergency, we sometimes put them in, and so advise the full Appropriations Committee and the House. We do so in the public interest, with no thought of any reflection of the legislative committee. All official Washington and the entire country are today saying "For our country's sake speed up." We have got a race against time. We know that if these matters are left to take the regular course of the legislative committee it will delay vitally important matters 3 or 4 weeks to be passed by both branches. We know, and this House knows, that every day is important in the defense of our country. That is the only reason these few items were included in this bill, with the approval, as we thought, of the legislative committee. There was no intention at any time on the part of the Appropriations Committee to encroach upon the rights or duties of the legislative committee. We are very, very careful about doing that. Whenever we do we always confer with the legislative committee, and if we do not have their approval it does not go into the bill. Nothing could be more fair or more in the interest of expeditious enactment of vitally urgent legislation.

I just want that generally understood as the policy of the Appropriations Committee. I have been a member of that committee now for 20 years and this is my fifth year as chairman. We are very careful not to encroach upon the rights, duties, and prerogatives of the legislative committees, and we have not done so at all in this case. I feel that substantially everything we have put in here is already included in the legislative bill that should have been passed long before this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, again I call to the attention of the House the statement that I read to you earlier. In

reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], I made it clear to him that there would not be any legislation in this bill that was not approved by his committee, and I maintain that this bill conforms with that assurance. That is borne out by the assurance of Colonel Browne, as contained in the statement that I read to you a while ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is not a gag rule. This rules gives the membership of the House the right to vote on any of the provisions in the bill. If they are opposed to them they can vote them down. They can offer amendments that are germane.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was calling upon the President in the interest of national defense to call upon labor for the elimination of strikes. I say to him and to all of you that for over 4 years the President has been urging national defense and no one in this country has done more and tried more to bring about cooperation and proper defense than President Roosevelt. Notwithstanding the hue and cry about strikes, notwithstanding the number of men that went out yesterday, today there are only 52,000 out of about 8,000,000 men who are temporarily out of employment. I hope that within a day or two there will be none out on strike. I feel that this House should be fair, not only to the President, but also to labor, that has strived, as Mr. Murray and Mr. Green have, to enforce upon the various local unions not to strike, but to give everything they have for the Nation and for the national defense.

In this connection, I desire to insert a letter I received from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, dated May 22, 1941. His letter was in response to one which I addressed to him on May 18, 1941, wherein I had urged that every effort should be made to preclude strikes in the future. I also requested that he give me a résumé of the number of strikes, their causes, and the hours lost. The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1941.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SABATH: I am very appreciative of your letter of May 18. I want to express my appreciation of your continuous good work in opposition to the Vinson bill.

The most complete list of strikes which have affected national defense is that prepared by the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management. That list, which covers the period from the beginning of the defense program in June 1940 to the end of April 1941, recognizes 55 strikes in defense industries. In these strikes there were approximately 2,213,250 man-days of stoppage.

Twenty-five of these 55 strikes occurred in plants which had no union agreements prior to the strike. The fact that they had no agreement prior to the strike indicates that no collective-bargaining relationship had been established. In most of these cases this is due to the refusal of the company to recognize the collective-bargaining rights of their workers.

Seventy-three percent of the days of stoppage, or 1,614,195, occurred in the plants of 4 companies. Three of the companies—the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, International Harvester, and Ford—have a long record of refusal to comply with the rights of collective bargaining. In the case of Bethlehem, several decisions have been issued by the National Labor Relations Board covering 17 plants of the corporation, citing the corporation for interfering with the rights of collective bargaining of its employees. A test case in this matter has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court.

The Ford Co. has one of the blackest records in the annals of the National Labor Relations Board. There have been 11 cases against the company, several of which have already been upheld in the highest Court.

In the Allis-Chalmers Co. a large part of the stoppage was due to the refusal of the company to comply with a peace formula offered by Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hillman and accepted by the union.

The National Labor Relations Board has issued an order against the International Harvester Co., charging the company with maintenance of company unions and ordering their disestablishment.

These four companies, therefore, have been in violation of Government orders and of the right of collective bargaining. Their violations caused 73 percent of the stoppages.

Another way of classifying these strikes is by causes as listed by the O. P. M. Twenty-nine of the strikes were caused mainly by union relations, 12 by wages, 8 so-called jurisdictional, and 8 miscellaneous. The 29 stoppages caused by union relations, which usually means refusal of the company to bargain or to recognize the union in good faith, were responsible for 1,895,594 days out of the total of 2,213,250.

It should be pointed out that these figures do not include the coal stoppage. That stoppage was not classified as a stoppage in defense industry by the O. P. M.

Less than 0.2 of the man-days worked in all American industry, including defense, was lost in strikes during the first 4 months of 1941.

I trust that this information will be of use to you.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, C. I. O.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. FADDIS)—ayes 89, noes 38.

So the resolution was agreed to.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965), the Military Establishment appropriation bill, 1942, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state for the information of the Committee that general debate has been limited to 1 hour today, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I assume the gentleman is going to talk on the bill, for debate has been confined to the bill.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I am.

Mr. SNYDER. I hope the gentleman will pardon my interruption.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, on Monday, June 2, I introduced H. R. 4933, a bill to establish a Department of National Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy and a Department of Aviation. The purpose of introducing this bill is to create a separate department in our national defense for our air force and to give the secretary of such department a place in the President's Cabinet.

The present World War has demonstrated that the tactics of the first World War and much of the equipment of the first World War are obsolete and that supremacy in the air is absolutely essential for any great modern power, because, unless it has supremacy in the air, neither its naval forces nor its military forces are of much service.

Germany is demonstrating today that the great British Navy has lost its effectiveness, and, while Germany practically has no navy, nevertheless her superiority in the air since this war began has made Great Britain call upon the United States for help. Wherever Germany and Great Britain have clashed, whether on the western coast of Europe, in the Scandinavian countries, in the battle of the Balkans, or in the battle of Crete, Germany's supremacy in the air has won the victory. To date Great Britain has not won a single major military victory. These facts are indisputable and clearly point out one thing—the necessity for high-powered, high-armored, and high-geared air forces.

The average layman, like myself, who knows nothing about aviation or military or naval affairs, is shocked at the lack of preparation in the air by France and Britain, and, if he familiarizes himself with the fact, is thoroughly shocked with our own inadequacy in that respect. I cannot personally speak with any authority on this subject, but I can call as witnesses to my aid certain men whose knowledge of aviation cannot be questioned.

Fifteen years ago a citizen from my own State of Wisconsin, Gen. William Mitchell, came out with the truth about air power. In July 1926 General Mitchell wrote an article for Aero Digest, in which he outlined the simple machinery for adequate defense for America. For his strong, direct, and courageous words General Mitchell was court-martialed and dismissed from the service. I quote General Mitchell:

In international war surface navies are practically useless. The submarine is now the main instrument of maritime warfare.

Air power has taken its place as the dominating instrument in international war. Today a country weak in air power courts disaster.

How prophetic are the words of General Mitchell today. England with the greatest navy in the world is calling upon the United States for bombers, pursuit planes, and every other type of air weapon. To do what? Destroy the submarine, which to date has sent to the bottom about half of the tonnage of Great Britain. That is not all. This added strength in the air is needed by Britain to combat the air might of Hitler, bomb his bases, his factories, and his cities and prevent his crossing the Channel to invade England. Let us quote General Mitchell again in his effort to prescribe the cure:

We will not have air power adequate for national defense in this country until the matter is taken out of the hands of the Regular Army and Navy, who have established and maintained an interlocking directorate to suppress all modern means of defense.

For this Billy Mitchell was broken and dismissed and it is a pity that he did not live to see each one of the things that he prophesied verified by historical events, events which have honored the name of Billy Mitchell and dishonored the men who tried him and condemned him.

Mr. J. Reagen McCrary, chief editorial writer of the New York Daily Mirror, stated that editors and publishers who backed Billy Mitchell "felt the knives of his character assassins"—Frank Tichenor, who was editor of the Aero Digest, lost all his advertising.

Mr. McCrary shows that as part of the New York Mirror's campaign for air power, he flew to England in an American bomber to study the stirring work of the youngsters in the Royal Air Force, who saved England and of whom Winston Churchill said:

Never in the field of human conflict has so much been owed by so many to so few.

In an address by Mr. McCrary delivered Sunday, May 18, 1941, he asked these questions and I have not yet seen any of them answered satisfactorily:

1. Why is the United States Army Air Force today built around a type of fighter plane that is called a "pansy plane" in England and relegated by the R. A. F. to reserve or army co-op status?

2. Why is the United States Air Force just now learning that a fighter needs at least eight guns, plus defensive armor?

3. And why has America had to revise its plane production schedules three times—each time downward, from boasts to reality?

4. And why must America, the country that invented aviation and also mass production, why must America wait until September 1942 for a rate of aircraft production that will equal what Hitler has now?

Mr. McCrary goes on to say that our American boys have the courage but they lack the planes to defend this Nation—as the boys in the R. A. F. defended an England that got no protection from a Maginot Line or from the British Navy.

One of those who is thoroughly grounded in aviation—inventor, aviator, and airplane designer—is Maj. Alexander de Seversky. I regret that I have not the opportunity here to go into the many views expressed by Major de Seversky about the present World War but it is amazing with what accuracy he pointed cut the objectives of the German military power and how they would be accomplished. His forecast as to the importance of Crete and the great struggle that would take place for it is truly prophetic and, as he pointed out, it was done via the air. Britain's great fleet was not of much help in combating Germany's superior air force in the struggle for Crete. In fact, we read that four British cruisers were sunk in that struggle by the German Air Force. Planes transported tanks and men for the successful occupation of Crete and the British Navy could not prevent it.

I would not for one moment attempt to take one iota of credit from the British Navy, nor would I for one instant want to belittle the R. A. F. On the contrary, I think that everyone in this country, as well as all over the world, has been amazed at the wonderful courage and spirit shown by the youngsters in the R. A. F., whose magnificent defense of England was the only thing that saved her from invasion and perhaps conquest a year ago. It is my hope and belief that as the R. A. F. becomes stronger and stronger with the help of the United States, Hitler's supremacy in the air will be wiped out and Hitler will be defeated. The point that I want to make is that it will not be the British Navy that will in the end conquer Hitler. It will be Britain's air force, with, of course, proper support on sea and on land.

May I also point out that up to the present time the British Navy has had control in the Mediterranean, but Britain is likely to lose the Mediterranean, not because Hitler has a superior fleet but because Hitler has a superior air force. No doubt Hitler's next move after Crete will be on the island of Cyprus, and Britain realizes fully the necessity for a real air force if she is to meet Hitler's forces on even terms.

It should also be noted that, in spite of the superiority of Britain's Navy in the Mediterranean, Germany has succeeded in transporting large numbers of troops with tanks and other heavy equipment into North Africa under the protection of German aircraft.

If Cyprus is taken by Hitler and his North African forces are successful in moving eastward, Britain will find herself caught in a pincer movement and lose the Suez Canal. Hitler is depending on the superiority of his air force to take the island of Cyprus in spite of the British Fleet, to augment his forces in Africa in spite of the British Fleet, and to move forward from both places, with the Suez as his objective.

Now let us look at the Atlantic Ocean, where British sea power holds overwhelming superiority, and yet she is crying to us for help because of the destruction of merchant vessels in the Atlantic and the threatening of her life line. As Major de Seversky has said:

The world's strongest sea-power nation is in danger of being strangled by a nation virtually without sea power.

If we have learned any lesson from this second World War, it is this: Neither sea power nor land power is effective without a powerful air force.

To quote Major de Seversky again:

A separate air power, independent of the older military services, is indispensable in this day and age. Our air power must no longer be kept back by outmoded ideas and the jurisdictional disputes between the Army and Navy. It must take its rightful place as an equal service, commanded by airmen with the vision and the audacity, the training and the knowledge, to achieve domination of the skies for American security.

The Washington Daily News on Monday, June 2, came out with an excellent editorial in favor of a separate air force; also, in the same issue, there was an article in favor of a single air force by Al Williams; and let it be said to the credit of Mr. Williams that he has fought for this principle vigorously and well and must be given credit, not only for his zeal in this cause but also for his efforts to acquaint the public with the facts. I herewith quote part of the editorial:

STEPCHILD

It was German air power that made Britain eat dirt at Munich. Later it was the same instrument that pulverized the defenses of Poland, rid the Skagerrak of British sea power while Norway was invaded, broke the backs of Holland, Belgium, and France, and turned British cities into stoneyards.

It was air power again that bullied and bombed the Balkans into submission. It is air power—this time air power alone and unassisted—which has cleared the British out of Crete, and which threatens to clear them out of the Mediterranean and the middle east.

It is the threat of German air power to the Western Hemisphere that runs like a refrain through President Roosevelt's speeches. Time and time again he has tolled off the shortening count of bomber hours from Africa and the far Atlantic islands to South America, from South America to the Canal, from the Canal to the heart of the United States.

It is a puzzle to many of us why we remain indifferent to the necessity for a distinct air division and a place in the Cabinet for its representative. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on aviation, turning out the finest kind of latest developments in that field. We have trained splendid young men all over the country to be flyers. We are giving every possible aid and encouragement to air power, and yet we relegate it to a subordinate position. If you stop to think that a first-class battleship takes 4 years to build, that it can travel only about 30 to 35 knots an hour, that it is clumsy and unwieldly in its maneuverability, and that one hit properly located can sink it, as in the case of the *Hood*, or a torpedo dropped from an airship can render it helpless, as in the case of the *Bismarck*, while, on the other hand, a modern airship can be built in 8 to 10 months, it can travel 300 to 400 miles per hour, it can be maneuvered in any direction with the speed of lightning, and it can be built at a cost of $500,000, while the battleship will cost approximately $70,000,000, you wonder why we do not build less battleships and more air bombers.

We are rapidly speeding up our production of all types of aircraft. Military

planes produced in April were three times as many as in June 1940, and Emergency Management estimates that the number of military planes will be quadrupled within a few months. The output of all types of military planes for the last 11 months was 9,000, and Emergency Management estimates that by the end of May the number will run up to 10,500 Both the Army and Navy refuse to give out the different types of planes now being produced, the length of time required for each, and the cost. However, we know in general terms that light planes can be manufactured for $150,000, while the heavy bombers run up to $500,000. Many planes midway between these two types are being made at a cost of $300,000.

It is important to reflect on the fact that we can make 140 heavy bombers at the same cost as 1 first-class battleship, and that we can make the entire 140 in 25 percent of the time that it takes to make the battleship. Why, then, do we push the air force into the background and still cling to a system that is outmoded, outmaneuvered, outfought, and displaced by a swift-moving, death-dealing power that nothing can stop except a superior force in the same element?

I wish I might adequately give prominence and emphasis to the words of Al Williams in his fight for a single air force. Neither time nor space permits, but I shall give one quotation, which speaks for itself:

> Now ordinary Americans are becoming restless about the known and suspected inadequacy of our fighting power in the air. They haven't forgotten Gen. Billy Mitchell. They know far more than is suspected about the stubborn, selfish resistance of the current leaders in both services to anything like a self-determining air force, legally authorized to work out the destiny of real American air power, without interference and under leaders who have won their leadership from the cockpit.
>
> And what are we getting? Promises.
>
> Next July—next fall—something or other is going to happen. Thousands of planes will be rolling off the production lines. Always in the future.

I have but touched the high spots in only a few places, but enough, I think, to demonstrate that there is a real issue here, and that the American people should wake up to it. I am satisfied that neither of the old services will ever give the air force its proper place in modern warfare. Naturally men who know nothing about flying, who know nothing about the construction or designing of aircraft, whose entire training and experience has been in a different field, are not going to wax enthusiastic about a subject concerning which they have no knowledge. It stands to reason that all of us believe in the thing in which we are well grounded and are suspicious of that of which we are ignorant.

In order to give our air force its proper place in modern warfare, it will be necessary, then, to free it from the shackles of the Army and Navy and give it a place of its own where it can develop and attain the proportions that it ought to, because in the end, when the time comes, this country will be depending upon its air force for its defense.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have consumed 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to notify the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the situation disclosed by the morning press to the effect that more men are now out on strike in defense projects than at any previous period.

The War Department advises that, since January 1, 2,253,216 man-days of production on Army contracts have been lost. The Navy tells us that the time lost on its orders, had it been used, would have built 8 or 10 submarines, 6 or 8 destroyers, or 2 cruisers.

We learn that the strike situation has grown steadily worse since President Roosevelt, 10 days ago, told us that the defense program must proceed "without stoppage of work." Yesterday the press advised, on information from the Government, that more than 52,000 men who have agreed to work on defense projects were out on strike. Some of these strikes have been condemned by the president of the C. I. O., by leaders in the A. F. of L. Nevertheless, they continue to hold up national-defense production. They are a direct threat to the sovereignty of our Government.

To get away from generalizations, let me call your attention to the strike which has existed since the 7th day of May in some of the plants of the Detroit Steel Products Co. at Detroit, Mich. On the 27th day of May, 20 days later, the company and both unions, the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., agreed that there should be an election. The company asked that the men go back to work pending the result of the election. They refused. Last Tuesday a strike was called in another branch of the company.

This company has on hand $3,000,000 worth of material that is to be used in the construction of $300,000,000 worth of work for the War and Navy Departments. The branch where the strike was called last Tuesday makes 80 percent—now, get this—makes 80 percent of the springs used by the Army in its trucks. This company will be out of springs next Tuesday, but the strike still continues.

There is no dispute between the company and the union, or between the company and any of its employees, except one as to whether or not there shall be a closed shop. Representatives of the company are here in Washington trying to get some relief through the Labor Department. They cannot get any. The Labor Department has failed to assist.

The War Department and the Navy Department want this material; they must have it if their program is to go forward. Some of their officers state that this particular strike is affecting the defense program as seriously, as injuriously, as any previous strike up to this time.

There are in this branch plant, which was struck last Tuesday, 250 employees who want to go back to work. In the State of Michigan we have a law which makes it a criminal offense for anyone to prevent any person, who desires to go to work, going to work. Notwithstanding this statute, there are pickets massed around this plant armed with clubs on which are nailed placards with the spikes going through the stick, a 2 by 2. These pickets are preventing the 250 loyal employees from going ahead and working on these springs which the Army needs for its trucks.

This C. I. O. union is doing the work of Hitler just as certainly, just as effectively, in fact, more effectively, than if its members were enrolled in his armed forces. They are betraying their country, and the law-enforcing agencies of State and Nation permit their treasonable activities.

The Governor of the State of Michigan in a letter to me denied that in the Detroit strike at the Ford plant any person had been beaten while the State police were present. Some time when opportunity offers, I will produce the pictures and the sworn testimony before you, showing that men were beaten in the presence of between 15 and 20 of the State police until they were unconscious. This morning, I wired the Governor and asked him to explain, if he would, so that I might tell the Members of the House why it was that in Michigan, with a statute of that kind, and when he knows, as we all do, that this defense program is being interfered with and delayed by these men, the State police do not give protection.

I want to ask the Members of the House why it is that the President has failed to enforce the Federal statutes—and I have in mind Revised Statutes 5299—as it is his duty to do, to put down riots and to end domestic strife, and why it is that we continue here to fail to take some action.

That section, which is section 203 of title 50 of the Code, reads as follows:

> Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any State so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such State are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such State of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States; and in all such cases, or whenever any such insurrection, violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, opposes or obstructs the laws of the United States, or the due execution thereof, or impedes or obstructs the due course of justice under the same, it shall be lawful for the President, and it shall be his duty, to take such measures by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necesary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence, or combinations.

Not only is it the duty of the Governor of the State of Michigan, but it is the sworn duty of the President of the United States to prevent this denial of civil liberties; to give to these men who want to work "equality of opportunity."

The telegram which I sent the Governor this morning reads as follows:

Will you tell me why it is that you and the State police permit Dodge C. I. O. men armed with clubs to prevent employees of Detroit Steel Products Co. from going to work at Detroit plant? Their conduct is a direct violation of the Michigan law and is holding up $3,000,000 worth of material in the plant, which prevents work on $300,000,000 worth of construction for the Army and Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman will agree with me when I say that the Michigan State police is one of the finest bodies of men in the country, but they have to act under orders from the Governor, do they not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not criticizing the individual members of the State Police of Michigan. As the gentleman states, they are a fine body of men. They compare favorably with the State Police of Pennsylvania and Ohio, members of which we have seen on the highways as we drive through. The Michigan State police are all right, but the man at the head, the Governor, and I might say also, the Attorney General, stand idly by and not only ignore their own duty but prevent the State police performing their duty—at least the Governor does. There is no politics about this either. The Governor is a Democrat and the Attorney General is a Republican. One is commander of the State police and neither of those gentlemen aids the State police in giving protection.

In fact, it was reported to me this morning by a man who was present on the spot that one of the Detroit city police told a man who wanted to get to work: "You must not annoy the pickets by trying to get through the picket line."

Mr. Chairman, we do not need a bill prohibiting strikes. I would not vote for a bill prohibiting strikes. But as the gentleman from Texas has said many, many times, we need law enforcement. All right. I wish the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a gentleman who has so much influence in this House, would translate his words, his good advice, into action. It is all very well for him to make a wonderful speech on the floor, as he so often does, but words without action are of no avail at this time.

There is no use of a Republican introducing a resolution, though that I have done. I wish the gentleman from Texas would introduce a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to comply with the terms of the Federal statute which makes it his duty to use the armed forces of the Army and Navy to put down these riots and insurrections.

I will call attention in a few days to a situation in Detroit where the Communists on a public highway beat a man until he was unconscious and this in the presence of the State police.

If the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], who is present, will come out with a resolution or with legislation, I am almost certain that there will not be a single dissenting vote on the minority side, and we will get somewhere, and our efforts in appropriating these billions of dollars will not be rendered futile. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

UNCLE SAM GETS A BIG STICK—HE SHOULD NOW DEMAND A DECENT PEACE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some years ago a wise man said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick and you will go far."

This bill, Mr. Chairman, puts the big stick in Uncle Sam's hands. It is the stick that will guide the mightiest, most powerful fleet of bombing airplanes the world has ever seen. It will be an air fleet fitting to a nation that is symbolized by the eagle, king of birds.

Hand in hand with the passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, the United States should speak. It should say to the nations at war, "This madness has gone far enough. Some day you will make peace. Do it now. Do it before you have completely destroyed yourselves. Do it before you create conditions which mean anarchy, chaos, and the ruin of civilization."

COMMITTEE'S ATTITUDE WELL KNOWN

Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee's subcommittee for the War Department long ago passed the debating stage on the subject of air power. Before I was a member, when the committee was presenting the annual War Department supply bill, on March 25, 1938, I engaged in the following colloquy on this floor with the gentleman from Arkansas:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was repeatedly brought out in the debate on the new Navy bill that the $70,000,000 battleships would cost from eighty to one hundred millions by the time they are commissioned. I merely want to add in comment that I think it is the belief of most of the people that I know that they have more confidence in the defensive ability of either the Air Corps in the Army or the air forces of the Navy than they have in the addition of one battleship; and, as far as I am concerned, and as most of the people in my part of the country are concerned, they would rather see the air forces extended than to see a supercruiser built.

I am struck also by the concluding sentence in the committee report relating to the Air Corps, which reads as follows:

"There is evidence in the possession of the committee that we greatly excel any power in the world in naval aviation, and that, from the standpoint of project airplanes on hand, on order, and remaining to be ordered under funds heretofore made available, both Army and Navy, we are only excelled by the British Empire."

Mr. TERRY. I understand that that is correct. At the present time, of course, our Army air force contemplates a program of 2,320 project planes to be completed by June 1940, but, of course, in the meantime the situation of the other nations may have changed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me what these new planes cost, such as were recently used in the trip to Argentina, those flying fortresses?

Mr. TERRY. I understand that Army planes of the type of the flying fortresses under the command of Col. Robert Olds, that went to South America and made the wonderful trip back here in about 11 hours, cost about $250,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per plane?

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaking for one, I feel if the Army will build a few more of those planes, we will not need to build so many $70,000,000 battleships. Which means more defense—1 of those ships or 280 flying fortresses? I endorse the suggestion of the gentleman for some sort of a committee that will give us a picture of our combined strength in planes, Marine Corps, Army, and Navy, and hope the information will be made available to the country and to the Congress. I think it would be very valuable.

Mr. TERRY. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

About a year ago, during the hearings on airplane items, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] evidenced the concern and convictions of the committee when he asked General Brett about the 100 big bombing planes for which funds were being asked at that time and the gentleman from New Jersey asked whether or not they were intended for us or whether they were going to England. General Brett replied that we needed them very badly ourselves and he did not know why the British were not ordering them.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, the committee today could not overlook and has not overlooked the plain lessons of what has happened overseas.

AIR POWER IN THIS WAR

Poland, it has been generally said, was a victim to panzer divisions—armored motorized troops. That is true, but ahead of the panzer was the Luftwaffe. Poland had a large army but it was stopped in its tracks before it could assemble. Lightning air attacks grounded Poland's air forces and destroyed their airdromes before Poland realized the war had started. Then Germany's air forces struck at transportation facilities and troop concentration points. Poland was never able to start because Germany's air forces never gave her a chance to move.

Every stage of the war since has added force to that lesson.

Leland Stowe's articles that shocked the world on what was happening in Norway quoted British soldiers asking bitterly why there was no air force to protect them from the rain of overhead attacks.

The battle of Belgium was a battle for the Belgian air bases and when Germany had them, Belgium was out of the war, France was doomed, and all England was brought under a short-range attack from the German Luftwaffe, based in Belgium.

Dunkerque? Dunkerque only told the story of air in another way. The British achieved temporary air supremacy in the local area over Dunkerque and the evacuation, called miraculous, was made possible.

The Battle of Britain has been a battle of air power. In that battle both sides have demonstrated what Lindbergh said in 1936, that the development of aviation had destroyed defensive warfare. London has had to take it in night bombing. Berlin has had to take it in night bombing. Some defense has been achieved, but it has had to be largely a

counterattack built around interceptors and pursuit ships, and parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us provides interceptors and pursuit ships as well as bombers.

The Battle of the Atlantic—ah, that was to be a regular war, it was to demonstrate again that he who controlled the seas could not be beaten. If it has demonstrated that, it has been in a different way than anticipated. It has demonstrated that he who controls the seas must control the air over the seas. Where there was no air force, the *Bismarck* got the *Hood*, but before that naval triumph was cold, air power found, caught, and reduced the *Bismarck*, biggest ship afloat, to a helpless, drifting, blinded derelict.

The Battle of the Mediterranean—it is too fresh in everyone's minds to need amplification of my point. The localized battle of Crete will go down in history as one of the epochal battles of all time because, from start to finish, it was a triumph of air tactics. Troops that had been entrenched for 7 months on an island, hundreds of miles from enemy bases, were blasted out of their positions, scattered and driven to surrender by an effort that saw attack, invasion, supply, and reenforcement all achieved by air power.

It is hardly any wonder then that Maj. Alexander Seversky speaks today of the "twilight of sea power" and expresses the fear that our two-ocean Navy will be completed in time to be scrapped.

THE ARITHMETIC OF AIR POWER

In his article on that subject in the American Mercury for June 1941, Major Seversky says:

> There will be no longer any warrant in common sense for carrying striking power across the ocean to an enemy slowly, by battleship, when it can be carried faster, more cheaply, and more effectively by battleplane. In any case, the battleship would be unable to perform this strategic errand unless air power cleared the skies over the ocean of enemy planes and maintained a canopy of overhead protection for the fleet. The latest capital ships being built by our Navy cost about $100,000,000 each—a sum that could pay for the construction of 250 bombers capable of flying to a European target, dropping their explosive loads, and returning. Since each of the 250 could carry at least 20 tons of explosives—as much as 40 German Stuka dive bombers now deliver—their striking power would be equal to 10,000 Stukas. Since the raid on Coventry or the worst single raid on London involved only some 500 bombers, this in turn is roughly equivalent to nearly a month of such raids. Such, in simple arithmetic, is the economic equivalent in air power of a single capital ship.

Personally I may not go that far, for I recognize that a Navy will be useful in supply and in maintaining command and in occupation, just as I believe that infantry is still necessary in the Army, but I do make the point that the nation that controls the air today is the nation that carries the big stick.

And this bill, Mr. Chairman, provides the funds to give us air power. It is based on the program of 50,000 planes, 30,000 pilots, and 100,000 mechanics, but it is not limited to those figures in the productive capacity that is being created. And when America gears her industry into any job there is no country that can exceed her production.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that this bill, taken with the other parts of the preparedness program, puts the United States in a position to speak to the nations at war and ask them to stop this madness. This belief is fortified by recent statements that have been made by our own Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, and the President in the conditions they have voiced as the desirable economic and social foundations for a better world order.

EDEN'S STATEMENT POINTS THE WAY

The possibility of peace is advanced, moreover, by the fact that England's Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, a week ago for the first time in the war set forth England's war aims. I quote:

> A lasting settlement and internal peace of the continent as a whole is our only aim.

And in expansion of that he said—

> It is obvious that we have no motive of self-interest prompting us to economic exploitation either of Germany or of the rest of Europe. * * * No escape can be found from the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country.

Those principles are not far from the bases which should appeal to a sufficiently large number of the German people to form the basis for negotiations. Indeed, repeated and insistent reports suggest that Germany today would stop the war with England, withdraw from Norway and the Low Countries, make a peace with Belgium and France within the terms of the armistice, let Greece and Italy settle their own difference, and submit the questions of Poland and Yugoslavia to the conference table.

Some of those reports come from quarters that cannot be dismissed as idle rumors. They should be fully explored. There is an easy way to test them. Ask for guaranties of performance on both sides. What can be achieved today should be measured against the cost and gamble of getting better terms tomorrow. Put these reports to the test.

WILL LEADERS NOT TRY?

No statement of aims or terms that censorship will permit to have any semblance of authenticity will be wholly acceptable at first glance. Neither side can admit officially that it seeks peace lest that be regarded as an admission of a weakening position. But the leaders of the nations of the earth in this critical time in the world's history can never escape the verdict of history if they fail to do what they can to bring order out of today's madness.

For it is madness. Is it sense that the highest creative and productive resources of our generation should be poured into an effort to achieve the greatest possible destruction of human treasures and human life? No; it is madness. It is not civilization; it is barbarism gone mad.

I have said that this bill before us gives Uncle Sam the big stick. It does. It gives him power and it gives him responsibility. I do not like to forgive—I cannot forget what has happened in this conflict, the bombing of civilians, the ruin of the finest buildings our age has produced. But, if anything approaching a reasonable basis of peace can be found for a starting point, will it prove our civilization or our madness to deliberately prolong a contest of frightfulness, horror, and destruction?

The combatants have been caught in the grip of a relentless monster they can neither control nor direct—total war. Somebody else must take the initiative to stop it. Our program gives us the power and the responsibility.

TEST OF OUR FITNESS TO SERVE

Will it be honor or failure for us to become the most effective agency of slaughter and destruction the world has ever seen? The test of democracy, we are told, is the test of the ability of people to govern themselves. Then surely the test of our fitness to serve in these times is our ability not only to make the United States a mighty nation but to lead the world to peace, to lead other nations into the art of living together.

President Roosevelt spoke for this vision of a vital democracy at the Woodrow Wilson birthday anniversary in 1933, when he said:

> Through all the centuries and down to the world conflict of 1914–18 wars were made by governments. Woodrow Wilson challenged that necessity. That challenge made the people who create and who change governments think. They wondered, with Woodrow Wilson, whether the people themselves could not some day prevent governments from making war.

And he further said:

> We could get a world accord on world peace immediately if the people of the world spoke for themselves.

Who is there among us that wants to fail the faith of the people in such a time as this?

Our part cannot stop with a suggestion. We cannot say simply, "Stop, or else." Our leadership must be a positive thing. We must be willing to play our part in a world order where trade can flow on a mutually profitable basis. We should be willing to loan some of our gold stock to the Bank of International Settlements or to set up some other international clearing house so that the restrictive practice of barter can be done away with. We should use some of our gold to buy the island bases and deficiency strategic minerals that we need. We should spread the ownership of gold by buying what we need so that nations can trade again. Only poor people barter. Nations do not barter, taking things they do not want if trading balances can be cleared so that each nation can turn in its production and receive what it needs. The United States will have to play its part in world economy if peace is to come—but the alternative is war, bankruptcy, and economic ruin for our generation.

As Mr. Eden said:

> No escape can be found from the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill places the big stick in the hands of this Government, the power of the eagle. The Sioux Indi-

ans in my country regard the eagle as the greatest of symbols. They can give a man no higher honor than to name him "Wanblee," meaning "Eagle." This bill gives to this Government the responsibility of playing a full part in today's world. Each of us has a part of that responsibility; each of us must share in determining whether we help to bring the four freedoms to humanity, including the people of the United States, or whether we prolong the riding of the four horsemen of war, famine, pestilence, and death upon the world, including ourselves.

When Lincoln was asked whether he thought the Lord was on the Union side, you will recall that he replied he was not concerned on that point as much as whether he was on the Lord's side. Men must always find it difficult to ask the blessing of God on the business of killing and destroying, but they can always ask a blessing on the making of wars to cease.

The leadership and this Congress will be remembered for the presentation and passage of this $10,000,000,000 largest peacetime bill in history. May the leadership and may the membership of the Seventy-seventh Congress also be remembered for what they do to bring sanity and peace to a world gone mad. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the committee, in considering this bill, had the benefit of years of experience of some of its own membership and the advice and counsel of the Chief of Staff and the chief of branches of our service. It had the advice and the counsel of the Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, and of Mr. Knudsen, who is commonly recognized as the outstanding production expert in this country.

The picture of the cost of our Military Establishment begins to unfold to the American people. We are providing for the first time what we hope to be the complete expense account of our Military Establishment of 1,418,000 men. We have met with trials and tribulations as a nation and as an army in providing this defense force. I call your attention to the fact that less than a year ago we had probably a quarter of a million men under arms in this country. Today we have 1,350,000 men under arms. I call your attention to the fact that we had no place at that time in which to house these men. Today we have a score or more of sizable cities, with all of the plumbing, sanitary facilities, and other appurtenances that are necessary to a city of that size—hospitals, roads both within our camps and access roads leading to these camps.

Today we have an army of almost one million and a half men, composed of the Regular Army expanded to more than one-half million at this time, several hundred thousand selectees, and probably a quarter of a million National Guard men. All of these men are serving with the most magnificent spirit of sacrifice and devotion any group of men have served this country in peace. I think it is a tribute to young America that the Chief of Staff, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and division commanders who were called before our committee stated that never in all the history of the country, and certainly not within the range of their lifetime, had they seen a higher esprit de corps exhibited by any group of men than is being exhibited now by the men under arms at the present time.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], has traveled several hundred thousand miles during his tenure of service. I have accompanied him on many of his trips by air and by other methods of transportation in visiting numerous Army posts. Together we have visited 150 to 200 Army posts in this country and our possessions. We have checked, as laymen can check, the progress of this defense program during the past 4 years. I can tell you the progress has been remarkable, and I commend the chairman for his interest, his service, and his devotion to the cause of national defense. To the Members of the House who are laymen on this subject, as most of us are, I commend to your most careful reading and attention the comprehensive report of the committee, which was written by Mr. Pugh, the clerk of this committee. It is the best written, the most understandable, and the most comprehensive committee report, in my judgment, that has been filed in the House of Representatives in the past 7 years.

We are seeking to build a balanced force, an all-purpose force. Events which have transpired on the European continent and in north Africa within the past 12 months have been spectacular, and in the the spectacular achievements of the air forces and of the mechanized forces, both of Adolf Hitler and of Britain, in these respective theaters of war, I am afraid we have overlooked the necessity of this country having a balanced, all-purpose force.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. To what extent does this appropriation bill reflect what we have learned as a result of this European war? Are we still carrying large appropriations in this bill for horses and mules and so forth, or are we providing for a mechanized force which has proved to be so advantageous to the Nazi forces abroad?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. I think the attitude of the committee is reflected in this bill when I say that of the $10,000,000,000 which is being appropriated, approximately $5,000,000,000 is going to the air force alone and that a couple or more billions of dollars is going to the ordnance department, which, of course, as you know, is charged with the responsibility of providing tanks, automatic weapons, and munitions of war. So, therefore, the horse and buggy era in our Army is definitely a thing of the past. We have today 27 infantry divisions in training, 4 mechanized divisions, and 2½ cavalry divisions, and 5 general headquarters tank battalions. Ten more tank battalions will be activated after June 1, and immediate plans of the War Department provide for the creation of 4 more armored divisions.

Our best information is that the German Army has approximately 260 divisions and over 4,000,000 men under arms. They have only 20 mechanized divisions. So even now we have a greater proportion of mechanized divisions in our Army than has the German Army.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be more advantageous if we had 27 mechanized divisions and 4 infantry divisions, rather than 27 infantry divisions and 4 mechanized divisions?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; we must have a balanced force, and may I say this to the gentleman: We are providing in this bill funds for additional mechanized divisions, and we have given the Chief of Staff authority to create new mechanized divisions as quickly as possible.

The gentleman must remember this, that the mechanized division is a striking force only, and you must have infantry and artillery forces for support when it fails to accomplish a break through or to exploit its gains when it succeeds in breaking through. When Germany's 10 mechanized divisions broke through at Sedan last year, they were followed by more than a hundred infantry divisions to exploit the openings made by the mechanized force, supported by the German Luftwaffe.

Mr. COCHRAN. From the standpoint of numbers of divisions of Germany and the United States, how do they compare? Are they equal?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. From the standpoint of numbers, the German divisions are slightly larger than ours.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman mean that the German division is larger than a division of this country?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes. The streamlined infantry division has something like 12,000 men, while the German has 16,000. Of course, we have 2 types of divisions, the old square division of the World War, which had at that time 28,000 men and at present has 18,000 men, and the modern, streamlined division of 12,000 men. The streamlined division has greater firing power and greater mobility, because we have taken advantage of automatic weapons and modern methods and means of transportation. It has a greater striking power than the infantry division of any other country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is speaking of a mechanized division with reference to the Army. I find here contract K–55 under naval ordnance. It is the contract of that company to which I just referred, the Detroit Steel Products Co. They are not getting that stuff. These divisions are not mechanized and equipped with trucks and things. How are we going to get them?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The gentleman has heard from me and knows my views, and I tell him now that I propose to offer an amendment to this bill when we consider it under the 5-minute rule, which I hope the gentleman and gentlemen on his side of the aisle will support and help put through. If my amendment prevails, I hope it will insure uninterrupted production. We must win this battle of production if we are to succeed in providing national security. We have a democratic army, democratic in its concept, which is responsible to public opinion and responsible to public support. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] delivered a splendid address a few moments ago and asked some very penetrating questions. He wanted to know why it is that we have belatedly undertaken a tremendous expansion program in the air and on the ground and in every branch of the service. I can tell him why. It is because for more than two decades we were engaged in making money, we were engaged in pursuits of peace, and public opinion would not support the Congress of the United States in providing an adequate air force or an adequate national defense.

We have not had in the last two decades an adequate national defense. It is not the fault of the War Department nor of the Chief of Staff that throughout the past 20 years we have failed to provide an adequate defense and are now confronted with a serious situation. It is the fault of the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States in failing to provide the necessary funds to maintain and equip an army adequate for the defense of this Nation. I shall ask in an extension of remarks to include the cash appropriations which the Congress of the United States has made for the support of the Army, the sum total each year in cash from 1921 to 1941, and I shall further include in that statement figures showing the amount appropriated in each of those years for the air force and ordnance. (See table marked No. 1 attached thereto.) I shall further include a statement which will show the number of enlisted men, warrant officers, and officers in the United States Army from 1921 to 1941. (See table No. 2 attached thereto.) Those figures and those statistics will tell you in a more eloquent and convincing manner than any Member of this House could why it is necessary for us in this world crisis to spend billions of dollars to make up for our lack of foresight during the past 20 years.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman knows, undoubtedly, that when General Mitchell made his recommendations he encountered the opposition of both the Army and the Navy, and that when we as a group, here some 3 or 4 years ago—and it was not a political group—put up a hard fight to get a bill creating a separate air force, we never could, because of the opposition of the Army and the Navy. They have never been in favor of it and are not today. They are not here asking for it. They are here time and again opposing it.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In response to the statement of the gentleman, I want to call attention to the fact that when the Army of the United States asked for 5,500 planes 2 years ago there was a great deal of opposition to the request on the floor of the House, and throughout the country.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I asked about a separate air force.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; but the gentleman made the statement that the Army opposed the enlargement of this plane program and that it was being forced upon them. I am calling his attention to the fact that the Army asked for 5,500 planes 2 years ago, and there was congressional opposition and opposition throughout the country to that program. I am calling his attention to the fact that the Army is now asking for the greatest plane program in the history of the world.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I concede what the gentleman said with reference to the appropriations made by Congress is correct and I plead guilty, together with the rest of us, because I was here during most of the period to which the gentleman refers. However, we generally appropriated at least what the Budget recommended.

But what I do say is that the Army was at fault in not having its plans ready and specifications prepared for the Army camps that we now find necessary to build and they should not only have had the plans and specifications ready, but they should have had the sites selected. What were they doing all that time? They were on the pay roll.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I think that that criticism is justified. I made the same criticism to the Chief of Staff and to the Quartermaster General in our hearings. They called our attention to the fact, however, that they had no money with which to carry on such survey.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman knows it is an admitted fact that for the past 10 years the Congress has always given the War Department all that it asked, and more, for matériel.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi in that respect.

Mr. COLLINS. The record discloses that. The record discloses the fact that throughout the last 10 years the Congress has given to the War Department more for matériel than they have asked for.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No. I cannot agree with the gentleman and the record will not disclose that fact.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Would it not be better if we all admitted that we had not been doing quite what we should have done and tackle the job at hand now?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Now, I must get along with my statement and I do not yield further at this time, Mr. Chairman.

At this time we have the best-housed and the best-fed Army in the history of this country, and within a short period of time, if this Congress—again I am placing the responsibility upon this Congress to a certain extent—will meet its responsibility and see that we have uninterrupted production, we will have the best-equipped Army in the history of this Nation, or in the history of the world.

The two striking deficiencies of our armed forces were in the air and in ordnance, both of which cost tremendous sums of money, and as late as 1933 and 1934 we were giving $25,000,000 to the air force for all purposes and $10,000,000 to the Ordnance Department for all purposes.

There has been some criticism of our air force. Some of it is undoubtedly justified, but I think we are overlooking the magnificent accomplishments of our air force when we dwell only in the realm of criticism. The Air Corps of the United States Army pioneered and developed the long-range heavy bomber, in the face of indifference of other governments to this type of aircraft. Recent developments have proven that this type is of the utmost value and is more in demand at the present time than any other type of aircraft. That fact justifies the considered judgment and position of the leaders of the War Department in the Air Corps.

The Air Corps further pioneered and developed the turbo-engine supercharger, which gives engine power at high altitudes, superior to that of any other known device. Other developments of the Air Corps of the United States Army are the tricycle landing gear and several important developments in the armament for airplanes. All of our airplanes of the latest design have incorporated in them all of the lessons that we have learned in research and experimentation, and all the lessons learned in the present world conflict. Today, in the Air Corps of the United States, we have more officers and men than we had in the Regular Army of the United States in all branches of the service from 1922 down through 1939. We in the United States today must recognize the fact that over 90 percent of all the equipment we purchase for our Army is bought from private sources. We are taxing their facilities to the utmost to meet those demands, and it takes time and patience and money and effort to accomplish these things.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Taking the field of ordnance during the past fiscal year, the Ordnance Department placed orders for $2,600,000,000, of which $1,700,000,000 has gone to industry on 3,000 prime contracts and $900,000,000 to arsenals and new ordnance facilities.

We have developed in the United States the most effective infantry weapon in the world, the Garand rifle; and today in our arsenals and with the aid of private industry we are turning out a sufficient number to equip an infantry regiment per day.

We are developing artillery and antiaircraft guns which are the superior of any other nation's. Our equipment in ordnance and antiaircraft in the field tests or in battle has proven its worth; and our ships, our planes, and our guns are equal to or superior to those of any other nation today.

I want to pay tribute at this time to the present Chief of Staff of the United States. He is a product of democratic America. He is a democratic war chieftain. Gen. George Marshall is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute. He is recognized in the Army and out of the Army as probably the ablest Chief of Staff in the history of this Republic. The Nation is indeed fortunate in having this man of integrity, ability, and capacity for service as the head of its armed forces in this critical hour. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, table No. 1 herewith shows the cash appropriations for the Military Establishment in the first column. The appropriations for the same year for the Air Corps and the Ordnance Department are shown in the second and third columns. The table covers the fiscal years 1921 through 1941, inclusive.

TABLE 1.—*Statement of appropriations for Military Establishment, fiscal years 1921–41*

Fiscal years	Appropriations for Military Establishment	Appropriations for Air Corps	Appropriations for Ordnance Department
1921	$483,240,876	$33,000,000	$10,648,855
1922	355,437,334	19,200,000	7,255,000
1923	262,796,456	12,700,000	5,187,250
1924	251,544,581	12,436,000	5,666,700
1925	263,965,286	12,580,000	7,586,000
1926	263,862,031	14,700,000	7,384,150
1927	272,262,105	15,050,000	9,410,057
1928	305,134,118	20,396,300	9,842,856
1929	319,179,551	24,630,268	10,835,625
1930	332,114,899	34,090,785	9,542,213
1931	346,979,179	38,093,877	11,738,399
1932	338,920,916	31,479,635	10,444,865
1933	304,961,492	25,439,131	10,837,396
1934	277,066,381	23,321,185	10,310,997
1935	280,862,694	27,396,453	9,846,167
1936	355,538,204	45,383,400	16,332,173
1937	388,244,859	59,397,714	17,305,389
1938	417,985,029	58,618,406	23,257,115
1939	531,001,197	70,856,972	94,558,086
1940	851,618,610	186,252,294	67,492,823
1941	8,480,594,407	2,173,090,961	1,070,797,424

Table No. 2 shows the number of officers, warrant officers, enlisted men, and the total for each fiscal year from 1921 to 1941, inclusive.

TABLE 2.—*Regular Army actual strength, 1921–24 (includes Philippine Scouts)*

	Officers	War rant officers	Enlisted men	Total
June 30—				
1921	12,866	1,150	213,250	227,275
1922	12,880	1,151	131,994	146,025
1923	11,589	1,085	118,282	130,956
1924	11,436	1,063	128,143	140,642
1925	11,880	1,028	121,715	134,623
1926	11,779	1,325	119,928	133,032

TABLE 2.—*Regular Army actual strength, 1921–24 (includes Philippine Scouts)*—Con.

	Officers	War rant officers	Enlisted men	Total
June 30—				
1927	11,913	1,262	119,904	133,079
1928	11,966	1,208	121,157	134,331
1929	12,030	1,138	124,192	137,360
1930	12,106	1,089	124,277	137,472
1931	12,188	1,028	125,443	138,659
1932	12,180	973	119,889	133,042
1933	12,297	926	121,788	135,011
1934	12,278	869	123,823	136,970
1935	12,037	825	125,098	137,960
1936	12,118	784	153,212	166,114
1937	12,314	794	164,993	178,101
1938	12,514	782	170,151	183,447
1939	13,032	775	174,079	187,886
1940	13,831	763	249,441	264,035
May 15, 1941	[1]13,910	[1]722	482,691	[1]497,323
June 30, 1941	[1]14,300	[1]720	[1]500,000	[1]515,020
Total active Army strength on June 30, 1941	[1]94,100	900	[1]1,418,000	[1]1,513,000

[1] Estimate.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, on account of the shortness of time and the limitation on debate, and the further fact that my colleagues, the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], have developed the subject and gone fully into the details, I shall not take much of the time of the Committee; but I do want to say that it has been with an unhappy feeling that I have listened to the War Department hearings being developed this year, necessitating bringing to this Committee the largest so-called peacetime bill and the second largest bill in the history of the country. I am informed that one larger bill was reported to the House after war was declared in 1917.

It is with the deepest regret that I find our own country, from the necessities of the case, caught in the maelstrom of armament spending that will bankrupt the whole world if continued for any length of time. I am frank to say that when figures get into the hundreds of millions and billions they leave me stunned and bewildered by their astronomical proportions, and, to some extent, they lose their appalling significance.

Adding the amount of this bill to the other defense appropriations for 1941 and 1942 for our naval and military forces, we will have appropriated and authorized over $30,000,000,000, and the end is not yet in sight for this year, as we have been warned that more is to follow.

And yet we cannot do otherwise than appropriate the money that our naval and military experts warn us is necessary to provide a reasonable defense for our own country in these most unusual times.

It seems to me that the appalling size of our armament expenditures for 1941–42 has been at least a beacon which points out to us our clear path of duty in the interest of our own national defense. We cannot go on very long appropriating these frightful sums to protect our land from the dangers of a foreign foe. We must make the great decision and then pursue it resolutely to the end. We cannot carry on our present American way of life with two-thirds of the world dominated by the Nazis under their so-called new world order. We cannot long survive as a democracy if the Nazis are successful in their effort to strangle what is left of democracy.

We must by the action of our united country make all such necessary appropriations and dispositions as will bring about the defeat of Hitlerism, so that peace may again be restored and such enormous expenditures as now contemplated be brought to an end.

I think we are most fortunate to have at this time as our Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall, a fine soldier, a hard worker, and one who brings to his great task a brilliant mind, great military experience, and an honest and conscientious desire to do what is best for the good of our country. All the members of our committee, and, for that matter, the entire membership of Congress have implicit confidence and faith in his honesty, integrity, and ability.

On page 56 of the hearings I had the following colloquy with General Marshall in reference to cost of maintenance of planes:

General MARSHALL. * * * The most difficult problem is the determination of how to maintain essential air power without bankrupting the country. At the present time we are building for a definite situation. It will be quite a different matter when we are not focused on a particular situation. Still, air power will have to be maintained. That is going to require most expert handling. Air power will depend on the skill with which we arrange for obsolescence.

Mr. TERRY. If I may interrupt for just a second, when we were talking about that program of 5,500 planes a couple of years ago, 3,300 in the first line, active, and 2,200 rotating reserve, they said they estimated the cost to maintain them was $230,000,000 a year.

Mr. ENGEL. $50,000 per plane per year.

General MARSHALL. As you increase the size of the plane, you increase the cost.

Mr. TERRY. As I say, that was $230,000,000 a year as the best estimate of what it took to maintain that program.

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir; and, of course, it is getting worse today.

Mr. TERRY. Of course, now the planes are larger, and in addition to the increased number you would have the increase in cost of maintaining the plane?

General MARSHALL. Very much so; yes, sir.

Mr. TERRY. Now, no one has tried to figure out at this time what the program we are now embarking upon will cost for annual maintenance?

General MARSHALL. They have a rough idea, but it can only be a rough idea. It is so vast that it makes one sick in contemplation.

Mr. ENGEL. Well, 50,000 planes, at $50,000 a plane, would be $2,500,000,000?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Much has been said about the need of a larger mechanized force. In this connection it is interesting to know that on June 10, 1940, the so-called armored resources of the country amounted to 400 more or less obsolete tanks, 7,000 enlisted men and a few hundred other armored vehicles of various kinds. On that day, by War Department direction, the armored resources of the United States

Army were pooled for a test as an armored force.

Today the armored force consists of four armored divisions, the first and second divisions having about 50 percent of their armored equipment, and the third and fourth divisions having about 20 percent of their equipment—barely enough for training purposes.

In addition, there are 15 G. H. Q. reserve tank battalions, one of which has about 75 percent of its equipment, the remaining battalions having only about 10 percent of their equipment. Two additional armored divisions are now contemplated when matériel can be had.

The critical shortages are tanks, armored half-tracks, and guns. In the armored force we have approximately 400 modern light tanks. In addition, there are now approximately 440 obsolescent light tanks and 66 usable medium tanks not of the latest type. The latest type medium tank is now in production and deliveries will probably commence in July. Today we have in the armored force approximately 50,000 officers and men, and every prospect of this being increased considerably within the next few months.

In order to handle this tremendous expansion with the limited experienced personnel available, there has been established at Fort Knox the Armored Force School with a capacity of over 5,000 students. This school operates on a two-shift basis—one shift from 6 to 12 and the other from 1 to 7. By doing this the physical plant required is cut in half. The main courses taught in this school are radio communications, radio maintenance, tank maintenance, wheeled-vehicle maintenance, field engineering, and tactics. The entire plant—the instructional personnel and the equipment—has been assembled and is now in operation and has been for some months since last July 10. This year the Armored Force School will graduate some 21,000 enlisted specialists and some 1,800 officer specialists. An officers-candidate course will be added in July for enlisted men of the armored force.

At Fort Knox there is the Armored Force Replacement Center where replacements are trained for all units in the armored force, which includes engineer, medical, quartermaster, ordnance, and signal personnel. This course is so designed that at the end of 12 weeks' training a replacement ordered to a combat unit can take his place with the combat team without further instruction in the organization. During the final 2 weeks they are put through a tactical exercise in which is reproduced as nearly as possible the actual conditions found on the modern battlefield, even to include noise.

The Army and Navy are doing a good job under all the circumstances. Let us in civil life do our full part. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the position that everything the Army has done is wrong. I believe the Army has done a great many fine things and have a great deal of fine equipment. I do, however, want to say a few words regarding the plane program in order to keep the record straight.

My good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] referred to the 5,500-plane program which came up in the House I believe in 1939. Here is the record: On January 5, 1939, Major General Arnold, then Chief of the Air Corps, testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that the Army had contract authorization and cash to build 905 planes. He testified further that the Army had had that contract authorization and cash for from 17 to 19 months, which meant they had had contract authorization or cash to build the 905 planes back as far as 1937. He gave as his reason why he did not build them that he was waiting for modern developments; in other words, he did not want to build obsolete planes.

General Arnold testified that we were from 3 to 5 years behind Germany in research and development. He emphasized the fact that the policy of the Army at that time was quality first and then quantity. Several months later Colonel Lindbergh testified before our committee, brought there by General Arnold, and in the presence of General Arnold he emphasized quality first, then quantity.

Later the bill came before the House providing for a 5,500-plane program; when it came before the subcommittee I recalled to General Arnold's mind the testimony he had given. He reversed himself, and he said, "Yes; at that time we wanted quality first, then quantity. Now we want quantity regardless of quality."

The bill came to the floor of the House providing for 5,500 planes, 3,300 in the air and 2,200 in reserve. My colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and I opposed placing 1,250 of these planes in reserve. We did not object to the 3,300 planes in the air, we did not object to the normal reserves, but we did object to building obsolete planes and putting obsolete planes in reserve. My colleagues and I advocated more research and development and educational orders in committee and on the floor of the House. We carried the amendment in the Committee of the Whole, but on the roll call the House defeated the amendment and adopted the entire 5,500-plane program.

To show you how right we were, at a certain meeting held in this city, in the presence of Army officers and the Secretary of War, I made the statement that the entire French air force, including every American plane in that air force, was wiped out by the German force during the first 10 days of the battle for Belgium. I asked the Army at that time to give me the number of these planes that had self-sealing gasoline tanks, how many had armored pilot seats, and how many were modern and up to date. I have not received the information up to this time. No one answered my challenge. The fact of the matter is—and subsequent events have proven—that not one of these 5,500 planes was delivered to the Army, and if they were, they were obsolete and not up to date. We were right in opposing that program and we were right in objecting to the building of these obsolete planes and putting them in reserve. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, while I have permission, I do not believe I will be proceeding out of order in what I am about to say. There are a few things I hope I may assist the House in getting straight on. At least I have studied them, and with your permission I would like to give you the benefit of my investigation for whatever it may be worth.

I do not mean this to be a lecture, but in the first place, may I say it does not seem to me that we are going to get very much profit out of consuming our time by saying, "I told you so." I could do a good deal of that myself. For twenty-odd years I have been trying to direct the attention of the Congress and the country to the inevitable consequences of our policy but we have real business to attend to, and I could say, "I told you so," also.

This seems to be about the situation that confronts us, and this seems to me to be the reason for it, if there is a sensible reason. After the World War we took a nose dive and probably went to the lowest level of governmental and general efficiency in our so-called democracies, in the history of the world. Until the last 5 or 6 years people only listened to what they wanted to hear, and the desire to please so dominated the utterances of public men that about all that was said to them was what they wanted to hear.

This is a very interesting fact, and it was true all over the country. It is a practical fact we have got to consider now. Until the last few months the people were told by their governmental leaders there was no necessity to sacrifice even though we were moving with tremendous rapidity toward contact with this World War. Here is another interesting fact. I believe everybody who has studied free government knows there is but one possible guide for free government, and that is public opinion.

We have not been contributing that guidance to free government in the world during the past 15 or 20 years. Those of you who have examined public opinion know that it is made up of the opinions that are true, that people sug-

gest. It is a good deal like the gold that comes out of low-grade ore. The dross is separated in the heat of discussion, in the processes of consideration. It is nature's arrangement for free government. There can be no other.

Our particular Government is a democracy, which has outgrown itself, and we are here because all the people cannot come. We are their Representatives. We may be candid insofar as we are concerned in this country; this Government has not had the benefit, except in a very modified sense, of an independent legislative body for a good many years. We all know where the important bills have come from. We know, speaking generally, that matters of policy of major importance are not fashioned by the policy-fixing agency of the Government. Members of Congress are consulted at times, it is true, but rather with reference to putting through policy determined somewhere else rather than with reference to what ought to be the governmental policy. Speaking generally, and the exceptions are rare, important legislation cannot be put through which the President does not want. I do not say this in criticism. I am merely stating the fact. The RECORD discloses it. Prominent Members of the House state here as a thing to be proud of—and again I am not criticizing—that they are for whatever the President wants. It is in the RECORD. They could not be important people in this House unless that were true. That is that part of the picture.

There is a certain reason for that, too, and it is very interesting. I am talking about a few important facts and a few fundamental things that have to be considered in dealing with the present difficult dangerous situation.

This is an important thing also. People who are trying to operate our sort of Government when there comes great crises, at least our people instinctively seem to be able to sense them, and thus far, and I speak of Anglo-Saxon government, not racially but governmentally, we have been able to concentrate emergency power in the Executive to deal with an emergency situation to release the power to control its exercise and to redistribute it when the emergency is over. Should we leave that emergency power in the Executive so long that we lose the ability, we lose the will, to take back these powers which we have concentrated, or should the Executive be unwilling to surrender them and strong enough to hold them, the character of the Government changes, it becomes one of the nondemocratic sort. It may be one of the types of dictatorships or a great centralized bureaucracy where many people have an interest in perpetuating themselves in power. In this natural tendency lies the gravest sort of danger to our own democracy, especially since we are now coming into another one of those periods which will call for additional concentration of governmental power in the Executive, not only the normal powers of the Federal Government but the abnormal powers which have been brought up here from the States.

There is not a bit of doubt in the world that the country now and the Congress now—the legislation shows it—is concentrating dictatorial powers, extraordinary powers, in the Chief Executive to deal with what we consider to be this emergency, and our legislation will have to be in the light of that fact. At the same time, the situation that obtains in this country, it seems to me, is such that the President and the country, through this particular emergency, will need the benefit, the honest contributions of an independent legislative branch of the Government.

With these statements, and I think when you examine them you will find them to be the fact, we come now to this immediate situation. Some observation has been made with reference to the strikes that are taking place in this country. There is nobody who has any sense who does not know that some of these strikes are promoted by those who do not want this country to win through whatever is in front of it. There is nobody who has any sense who does not come to that conclusion.

Now, let me see if I can get across with this idea, and I submit it for your consideration and for the consideration of the loyal persons who are engaged in these strikes. Most of these strikes, at least many of these strikes, in which Government agencies have participated in settlement, have demanded increased compensation, and have gotten it. That result, in a sense, has put a premium on strikes because, as a result of strikes, they got more money than they were getting before they struck, and the only way, probably, they could get it was to strike, and by striking they got it. Now, here is the difficulty about that general policy, and I want to get it across and I hope I will not be misunderstood. That is the wrong direction in which to move because other prices go up and gains are absorbed in increased cost, but the thing of greatest importance is that these pyramided expenses head into and press their weight down upon the structure of the Federal credit. There is a limit on how much money this country can borrow unless we become ourselves Communists. We are appropriating today $10,000,000,000. Do you know how much money that is? It is twice the value of all the farm lands in the 13 States—the Original Colonies. You cannot think in billions, but you can think in terms of that sort. The $30,000,000,000 that is practically in sight, in round figures is equal to the value of all the farm lands in the United States as of 1935. The $65,000,000,000, our present limit, and it is known we are going to exceed it, is twice the value of all the farm lands in the United States now.

What does that suggest to anybody that has any practical sense? That is that we ought to hold values down and cost down. If these manufacturers or these industrialists are making the profits which my friend from New York mentioned, they ought to be cut down, cut to the bone. We have got to hold them down because when you put up the earnings of any important group, then you have to lift the earnings of the other groups in order to preserve uninterruption in the economic circulatory system of the whole country. We failed to bring up the price of agricultural commodities when other commodities were up during the Hoover administration. The result was a paralysis of the buying power of the farmers. They could not buy the commodities from the cities, and that paralysis extended up through the whole economic structure. We should hold these wages and these profits down, everybody. They really do nobody any good in the long run, but they head most of them into the Federal Treasury because these millions of people must be fed and armed and clothed by drafts on the Federal credit.

We have got to watch this, in order to avoid the possibility of putting out an issue of Government securities that the country will not take.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to emphasize this. I do not speak as a Democrat or consider you as a Republican. I do not look at you as Democrats or Republicans. We are sitting today in the council chamber of this great Nation facing the greatest crisis in its history and we have got to measure up, and I think we are going to measure up. I like the spirit in which this debate has been carried on, taken as a whole. We have extended the credit of this country as much as we can; besides, I am convinced, from my examination of facts, that no people who would gouge their Government facing such a crisis, such a danger, as we face are fit to win or can win. That is not sentiment; that is judgment based on facts. The extravagance with which we are carrying on the business of this country is inexcusable; I think it is due to the fact—and I want to get this across—that the people of this country are not conscious of their danger. It is difficult for the people of the United States as they come and go, day by day, to realize that they are moving right up to the facing of the greatest fighting organization there ever was on the earth. I mean it is pretty difficult for the people to realize as we come and go to our parties and to our homes in this beautiful land that we are next on call, that we have been declaring ourselves to be the arsenal in this world war of that group of nations that one by one are being conquered, and that there is the definite possibility we will face standing alone the greatest fighting organization that ever existed on the earth. We do not seem to realize that we have but one business in America that is worthy of being considered, and that is to make ourselves as secure as we can. If we could realize it and get the solidifying influence of the consciousness of a common danger, public opinion would bring such pressure on the executive branch of the Government and on the loyal people involved in these strikes that these strikes would stop. We would use a better method of settling these disputes

than imperiling the security of the country.

I am not in favor of enacting a lot of laws dealing with these strikes. Why? For two reasons: One is they have all the power they need in the executive branch of the Government, so they say. I am not in favor of Congress declaring by a lot of legislation that the power does not exist. It does exist. If it does not exist in full measure or if there is any difficulty about it, insofar as the Committee on the Judiciary is concerned, we have had letters pending in each one of the executive agencies of the Government connected with defense preparation since December, telling them we would report out immediately any additional legislation that is needed.

I do not criticize the Executive now. I do not know what his problems are. I do not know what he is trying to do, but I do know that it is something that he has got to handle. We cannot handle it. We merely legislate here. His is the executive job. We have given him the money and the men. It is an executive job. I do not want to get into a controversy with my friends who are introducing these bills. When this amendment of my good friend here comes up I would like to have a word to say about it. I do not question the motives of my friends.

I have talked too long. These are serious times. We see these industries stopping and these boys that we are sending to the front are putting on their uniforms; and we know that we ought to fill the sky with planes, a continuation of the manufacture of which and the operation of which are necessary to protect those boys and give them a fair chance to defend their country; and we know as people of horse sense that we have but one chance in this world to avoid being attacked, and that is to be so well equipped that nobody will dare attack us; and we know that we have but one chance to win if we are attacked, and that is to be so well equipped that we can win. How any man in the United States can face his neighbors while preventing the operation of these industries which are necessary to put guns into the hands of these boys who have the uniform on their bodies I cannot understand. We have provided the men; we have voted the money. We will provide any further power he may need to keep these plants in operation so that our boys may have the best chance which a country fit for them to be willing to die for can give. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including pay and travel of temporary employees and officers and enlisted men of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, not otherwise provided for, allowances for enlisted men for quarters and rations, troop movements and travel of personnel of the Regular Army, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, use or repair of private property, and any other requisite supplies and services, and for settlement of claims (not exceeding $500 each) for damages to or loss of private property resulting from such exercises that have accrued or may hereafter accrue, when payment thereof will be accepted by the owners of the property in full satisfaction of such damages, and each claim is substantiated in such manner as the Secretary of War may prescribe by regulations and is approved by the Secretary of War, or by such other officer or officers as he may designate, whose action thereon shall be conclusive, $28,587,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1941 is extended and made available until June 30, 1942.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is my purpose at the appropriate point in the bill to offer an amendment relative to the strikes now prevalent in our defense industries. A great many Members have been talking about this subject for a good many days. I think the time has come to do something about it, and I want to test whether it is the purpose of this House to do something about it or to continue futile talk about it. We have been told that they do not amount to anything, that the strikes are not serious, but the situation gets worse every day, and everyone knows it. It is not worth while to consume your time in repeating the things that you read on the front pages of your newspapers every day.

Here is what I propose to offer as an amendment. I propose to offer an amendment to restore to the American citizen his right to work without paying tribute to anybody. I have offered that amendment repeatedly before and as you know it has been repeatedly defeated. I am going to offer it again. In addition to that this amendment will contain a provision that when a labor union has pursued its rights under the National Labor Relations Act and has made a contract that is binding upon the employer, that contract shall also be binding upon that union, and if the union violates it, then it can no longer work in defense industries. I propose also in that amendment that no person shall engage in these defense industries who is guilty of violence or of intimidation of other employees, or who seeks in any way to retard or prevent the continuance of our defense-industry production.

I have offered the amendment which I first spoke of, to restore to American citizens their right to work, on a number of appropriation bills. The situation then was not so serious as it is now, but there is no Member of the House who is so ignorant of public opinion, who is so ignorant of conditions in this country, who does not know today that the most serious thing confronting this country is the question of whether labor leaders are going to permit you and your Government to prepare for defense or are going to say to your Government, "You can only prepare for defense at the expense of meeting the terms which we shall dictate."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield. The time has come when the American people are demanding something shall be done about this matter. There is no use in our further sticking our heads in the sand and trying to make believe that there is nothing important about this matter. I could read the statement of John Steelman before a committee of this House within the past week, showing that owing to these strikes 5,000,000 man-days, not hours, days, have been lost of vitally needed time.

I could read from a statement given last week by the Department of Commerce that last month for the first time since this defense program began, owing to strikes in defense industries, our production had begun to taper off and get lower instead of higher, as it had in previous months. That is an ominous sign. When your production of defense industries begins to go down as it did last month instead of going up as it should, it is time not only to stop, look, and listen, but to do something about it.

I dislike to take issue with the gentleman who preceded me, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that we do not need any law on this subject. I think it is the duty of this body to make laws. That is what we are here for. I do not think we can abdicate because somebody else thinks that somebody else has the power to do something. I would like to know where there is any law on the statute books that gives the President or anybody else the right to prohibit strikes. There is not any such law. The sole question I am presenting in this amendment is, Are you going to do something about it or are we still going to stick our heads in the sand until it is too late? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I rise simply to make the observation that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in describing what his amendment would contain, made no mention of the most fundamental causes of labor disputes today; that is, the amount of profits and the refusal of firms that are earning those huge profits to give a fair wage to the workers who are responsible for the earning of those huge profits by their employers. The gentleman from Virginia has not told us what he will do with regard to employers who have been making tremendous profits, whose profits have been continuously increasing, and who refuse arbitrarily to pay an American wage to workers, and who are taking advantage of the hysteria which is being created here to fetter and shackle labor so that labor will have no rights and will have no opporunity to seek an American wage which will match the increasing high cost of living from employers who have been increasing their profits daily.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McGRANERY. I was interested in hearing the gentleman say something about the United States Chamber of Commerce. I wonder if the gentleman is

familiar with the report filed with the national chamber of commerce by the committee appointed to study the question and advisability of antistrike legislation. The national chamber of commerce is on record opposed to antistrike legislation; that likewise the Minister for Defense of Canada, even though Canada is now at war, has likewise recommended to the Parliament that they not enact antistrike legislation. It might be worth while for the membership to read the letter of Mr. Philip Murray, addressed to the head of the union out on the west coast, telling that man to get back to work, and addressing him in real, fine, good, old-fashioned American style. There is no antistrike legislation needed in America. The heart of American labor is good, and just as good as any industrialist that we may have in our land. There is no distinction. It is not a question of legislation. It is a question of fair dealing, and the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] would be to say that if 400,000 coal miners in America were unfairly treated and go out on strike, that then they will thereafterward be deprived of the right to work in defense industries, and industry would lose the service in that case of 400,000 ablebodied workmen.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his observation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of the Army of the United States, including pay of Reserve officers and officers of the National Guard of the United States ordered to active duty under the provisions of section 37a and the fourth paragraph of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended, and not more than 900,000 selective trainees under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and including pay of commissioned officers, $207,783,661; pay of warrant officers, $1,655,976; aviation increase to commissioned and warrant officers, $14,188,834, none of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers at a rate in excess of $720 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such officers, and such nonflying officers shall be entitled to such rate of increase by performing three or more flights within each 90-day period, pursuant to orders of competent authority, without regard to the duration of such flight or flights; additional pay to officers for length of service, $20,902,751; pay of enlisted men of the line and staff, not including the Philippine Scouts, $746,593,994; Regular Army Reserve, $280,000; aviation increase to enlisted men, $10,161,990; pay of enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, $1,027,647; additional pay for length of service to enlisted men, $25,639,186; pay of commissioned officers on the retired list, $13,327,453; pay of retired warrant officers and retired members of the Army Nurse Corps, $1,560,425; increased pay to retired military personnel, and enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, on active duty, $856,620; pay of retired enlisted men, $14,045,745; pay of civilian employees at military headquarters, not to exceed $1,337,684; pay and allowances of contract surgeons, $86,784; pay of nurses, $5,750,820; rental allowances, including allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, $104,363,780; subsistence allowances, $38,227,611; interest on soldiers' deposits, $104,500; payment of exchange by officers serving in foreign countries and when specially authorized by the Secretary of War, by officers disbursing funds pertaining to the War Department, when serving in Alaska, and all foreign money received shall be charged to and paid out by disbursing officers of the Army at the legal valuation fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, $100; in all, $1,207,895,561, of which amount $1,000,000 shall be available immediately; and the money herein appropriated for "Pay of the Army" shall be accounted for as one fund: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, no officer of the Army shall be entitled to receive an addition to his pay in consequence of the provisions of the act approved May 11, 1908 (10 U. S. C. 803): *Provided further*, That the appropriations contained in this act shall not be subject to any limitations as to the strength of any branch of the Army, as to the enlisted strength of the Army, as to the number of flying cadets in the Army Air Corps, as to the number of assistant superintendents of the Army Nurse Corps, and as to the number and grade of Reserve officers who may be ordered to extended active duty with the Air Corps: *Provided further*, That exclusive of officers of the Army Air Corps, including those assigned thereto for training, the number of officers of the Army who may be required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights during the fiscal year 1942 shall not exceed 5 percent of the total authorized commissioned strength of the Army, notwithstanding the provisions of section 20, act of June 10, 1922, as amended (10 U. S. C. 292): *Provided further*, That the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), is further amended by striking ou the words "one-half of 1 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "2 percent": *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay of any person, civil or military, not a citizen of the United States, unless in the employ of the Government or in a pay status on July 1, 1937, under appropriations for the War Department, nor for the pay of any such person beyond the period of enlistment or termination of employment, but nothing herein shall be construed as applying to instructors of foreign languages at the Military Academy, to selective trainees, or to Filipinos in the Army Transport Service, or to persons employed outside of the continental limits of the United States except enlisted men of the Regular Army, other than Philippine Scouts, upon expiration of enlistment, and this provision shall be subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the protection of certain enlisted men of the Army," approved August 19, 1937, as amended by the act approved August 16, 1940: *Provided further*, That, without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Army on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations and retirement deductions, may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are giving consideration to a bill that provides for the expenditure of the huge sum of $10,000,000,000 to be used for the purpose of increasing the facilities of our armed forces, including men and various kinds of equipment, especially airplanes and bombers.

I rise at this time, however, to call your particular attention to a problem that I think is of vital concern to the people of this country and is most important in connection with the question of national defense. It is that of providing proper safeguards for the morals and the physical well-being of the boys who have been called from their homes to serve in Army and Navy camps.

I call your particular attention at this time to a measure I have introduced in Congress—a measure that provides for the regulation and sale of intoxicating liquors to members of our armed forces. It prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors within zones to be prescribed by the President and prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors to men in uniform.

Mr. Chairman, I say this is most important right now, first, for the protection of the soldier, the sailor, the draftee who has been taken from his home and has been placed under extraordinary conditions and circumstances. He is entitled to this protection, and his father and mother, his wife, and his family are entitled to know that he will be protected at least to this extent.

Just last week a convention was held in this city where the question of nutrition was carefully and thoroughly discussed by people familiar with the question. Among those who talked were representatives and officers of our armed forces. They called attention to the fact that many of our boys had been disqualified because they had not had proper food or had not received balanced rations. Can it be said by anyone that to permit these boys to have intoxicating liquors would help the situation? Certainly not.

Mr. Chairman, if this Government is going to be responsible, and it should be responsible for the care of these young men while they are giving their time and energy and are offering their lives if necessary for this country, then is it not fitting and proper that so far as possible these men should be returned to their homes in as good physical and mental condition as when they were taken into service? To do anything less is to do them wrong.

Mr. Chairman, the service for which these men are called requires them to be just as physically and mentally alert as it is posible for them to be. This is an age of mechanization. Many of these men will be required to handle, and be responsible for the most intricate and technical kinds of mechanical equipment under most dangerous and trying conditions. Certainly no one contends that the use of intoxicating liquors would be helpful to them in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I have called attention to a measure which I introduced in the House several months ago. I propose to offer this measure as an amendment to this bill, provided and unless I am overruled because of its not being germane to this measure. This bill simply reenacts the law covering this problem that was in effect during the first World War. If it worked then, and it did, then why would it not work now?

Who is it that opposes this legislation? Certainly not the thousands of fathers and mothers and sisters and brothers of these draftees. They do not complain that such a law will take away the liberty of their boys. It is not the church organizations that are opposing it. Neither is it the Rotary Clubs, the Lions, or Kiwanis, or organizations of that kind that are flooding the mails asking you to oppose this measure. Neither does it come from the universities and schools of this country. It comes from one source, and that source is composed of the selfish liquor interests of this country. Their ground and excuse are that it seems to take away some of the freedom that belongs to these boys. They seem to forget that in order to carry on in this emergency it has already become necessary to take away most of their freedom. They are not complaining about that. Their further and most important complaint seems to be that such a step might lead to national prohibition.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot about sabotage these days. One of the big contributions of sabotage to national defense would be to allow these boys to injure their health, their bodies, and their minds because of temptations with which we would permit them to be surrounded.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. Does the gentleman propose to do away with the sale of beer in post exchanges?

Mr. REES of Kansas. So far as I am personally concerned, I would do away with the sale of beer in Army and Navy posts. I am particularly interested in stopping the sale of intoxicating liquor that is now going on by the wholesale just outside our Army and Navy camps. The difficulty with the sale of beer inside camps, as I see it, is that it helps to create a desire for stronger liquor. Furthermore, I am informed, most of it contains a sufficient amount of alcohol that, if used to excess, is intoxicating. It just does not do the fellow any good.

Mr. POWERS. I am not arguing with the gentleman; I am only asking the gentleman a question. I certainly would oppose any proposition that would take beer from the post exchanges, and I believe the gentleman will find that Army officers who command posts are of the same opinion, for the simple reason that if beer is sold in post exchanges the thing can be controlled, the boys will remain on the post and drink moderately.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am opposed to the sale of beer in Army posts for the reasons I have mentioned. I am opposed to the sale of any kind of intoxicating liquor to men in uniform. I think we would have a more efficient Army in this country if we kept the men away from the use of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that we cannot legislate sobriety?

Mr. REES. Certainly, but I believe we can relieve the situation a lot if we have the courage to try it.

Mr. Chairman, in this critical hour, when our people are called upon to sacrifice on behalf of their country, it just seems to me that it does not come with very good grace for selfish interests to insist on increasing their business at the expense of the health and happiness of the youth of our country as well as the efficiency that is so much needed in this time of stress.

And so I say to you that for the welfare of the boys who are called to service and are asked to make the supreme sacrifice if necessary, and in respect to their mothers and fathers, their wives and sweethearts, they are entitled to this protection. For the sake of their country which they are called upon to serve we should provide them with proper safeguards in this hour of peril.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. Coming as he does from a State supposed to be dry, I do not blame him for making the suggestion he does, nor do I challenge his sincerity. That is his way of thinking; but, from actual experience, my thoughts are in the opposite direction. You take away from the men in the Army and Navy 3.2-percent beer and they will be looking for something stronger. I think we are protecting the members of the armed forces when we permit by law, as we do, the sale of 3.2-percent beer. Now, remember, the sale of liquor is not permitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was in the Army in 1918. I know of no such rule in force at that time. The rule was as stated by the gentleman from Kansas. I myself have been refused. It was considered a success then.

Mr. COCHRAN. My friend refers to what happened during the World War. Well, if the gentleman had any experience during the World War he will know that around every Army camp and shore station you could find dozens and dozens of bootleggers selling liquor that would make a mule drunk, not speaking of what it would do to the human beings that bought and consumed it.

It is hard enough on the men to take them from their homes and require them to serve in the Army and Navy without depriving them of some little pleasure.

The House passed a bill that is now on the Senate Calendar dealing with prostitution. What happened in the Senate? A Senate bill had been reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. It was introduced by the late Senator Sheppard, father of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution. After his death the committee of which he was chairman reported the bill. The first three sections prohibited the sale of beer, ale, wines, and liquor in or within a reasonable distance of any camp or shore station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place.

When Senate bill 860 was reached on the calendar in the Senate, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, who happened to be presiding, objected to its consideration. Later the bill passed by the House, H. R. 2475, which had also been reported by the Senate committee, was reached, and the Senator from Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON, who had reported the Senate bill, moved that all after the enacting clause in the House bill be stricken out and the language carried in the Senate bill substituted. This was done, but immediately following the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate language was substituted for the House language. The House bill, as I said, dealt solely with prostitution, and there was no objection to that either in the House or the Senate or the War or Navy Departments.

The War Department, in a report to the Senate committee, strongly opposed that part of the Senate bill prohibiting the sale of beer, and so forth. Both measures are still before the Senate.

Now, what did the War Department say? I quote, in part:

> The War Department fully realizes that from the viewpoint of efficiency and moral standards an army in which drunkenness is nonexisting is highly desirable. However, knowing the frailties of human nature and realizing that habits of temperance or intemperance are developed long before the individual becomes a soldier, the War Department is convinced that temperance cannot be attained by prohibition applied to its personnel any more than it can be attained by prohibition applied to the Nation at large, and experience has proven that the problem can only be solved by the application of practicable and tolerant measures applied in a logical manner. Fortunately, our presently existing laws provide an ideal framework for such control. Briefly stated, these laws forbid the sale of or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations, but permit the sale of beer and light wine of not more than 3.2 percent alcohol content by weight. Under these laws, announced War Department policy and regulations prohibit the sale or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations, but permit the sale of soft drinks, including beer and light wines containing not more than 3.2 percent alcohol by weight on those reservations located in States whose laws permit such sales at such places. Such sales are not permitted, however, on reservations located within any State, Territory, or District whose laws do not permit such sales within its borders. This policy has caused a degree of temperance among Army personnel which is not approachable in civil communities now, nor was as high a degree of temperance attained either in or out of the Army during the days of national prohibition. Under this policy, military personnel are encouraged to remain on the reservation (their home) and enjoy refreshment under conditions conducive of temperance.
>
> As the matter now stands, members of the military forces not on military reservations are subject to the same laws, both Federal and State, that govern the conduct of other citizens. They are also subject to the ever-present restriction that they must at no time do anything that will bring discredit upon the service. The War Department believes that it would be harmful to the men in the service, as well as unnecessary, to direct a prohibition against them that did not apply to other citizens.
>
> Experience has proven that the present policy of the Department is the most effective way to insure temperance, and it would be regrettable indeed should the Congress, in its effort to assist in the matter of attaining temperance among military personnel, enact legislation which would destroy the advancements made and return to the Department the difficult problem of combating bootleg operations.

The War Department is firmly of the opinion that the armed forces need no such prohibition as provided in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this proposed legislation. It has its own and more effective methods of attaining temperance and of dealing with those who, through intemperance, bring discredit upon the service. It is firmly convinced that such legislation would not be in the interest of temperance in respect to the armed forces, but would be used as a stepping stone for a movement leading to Nation-wide prohibition, a method of control once tried and later repealed by majority vote of the electorate of the Nation.

Carefully analyzed, the provisions of the Senate bill would create complete disorder throughout the country, not only around the camps and shore stations, but in the large cities. For instance, recruiting offices are located generally in post offices or Federal buildings. The area in the vicinity would be subject to the provisions of the bill, while those a few miles away would not. During these times you do not have to go far in any direction in any part of the country where you would not find some kind of an Army or naval establishment. Large hotels, clubs, as well as other places where liquor can now be legally sold would be required to stop.

This legislation by no means would achieve the end desired by the gentleman from Kansas.

Aside from that, Mr. Chairman, I think we owe something to those who have either answered the call voluntarily or been required to respond under the Selective Service System.

Mr. Chairman, with our present method of transportation, what does a few miles mean? I feel we should follow the advice of the War Department and put this legislation in the wastebasket. Let the Senate pass the bill already passed by the House, and not try to add such obnoxious amendments.

So far as I am concerned, I will never vote to deprive a man in the Army or Navy of anything that I can get on the outside. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say a few words about the pay of enlisted men and about the general conditions among the troops in our military training camps.

We have authorized nearly $44,000,000,000, according to the latest figure, including the lease-lend appropriation, and will without doubt be called upon to authorize many billions more. I heard a prognostication the other day that before this program is over with we will have appropriated about $200,000,000,000.

I rise at this time, Mr. Chairman, to say that if the cost of this vast preparation is to be paid by the American taxpayers it is only logical to demand that these billions be distributed to a certain extent equitably among all classes of people of the United States. I for one do not favor the possibility of extensive profits in industry. Furthermore, there has been evidence presented on the floor of this House that at least a quarter of a billion dollars has been wasted in the construction of cantonments and other military establishments. I wish to go on record as deploring such dishonest profiteering and deliberate waste as might exist by the testimony which has been borne out by men who have made a complete study of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the point of my entire observation. I feel that a million and a half of the most splendid manhood that has ever volunteered in the service of its country is being woefully underpaid. Twenty-one dollars a month base pay to the enlisted men of the United States Army is woefully inadequate, and if it were in order at this time, I would propose here and now that this base pay be raised from $21 a month to $42 a month. At the same time may I say that those young men who have left lucrative positions, who have gone away from their homes and their families, who have left in many cases dependent parents and relatives, who have regulated their living to the point of going away for 1 year for 24 hours' service a day, do not grumble. You do not hear any complaint from those men. You do not hear them say that they are being underpaid, that they are the goats in this crisis. Yet everywhere else you hear a great deal of complaint, to the end that certain groups in the country today are being imposed upon, that they are being curtailed, that their rights are being usurped. Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the Congress of the United States give consideration to this inarticulate body of men, who have made as great a sacrifice, and greater in many cases, than anybody connected with our national-defense program. It is high time that we give consideration, and it is my hope that these men will be given consideration.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As I understand it, a selectee gets about 70 cents a day. Is that right?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. If he pays 20 cents a day for laundry, 20 cents a day for insurance, and 20 cents a day for cigarettes, he has 10 cents left for Coca-Colas, beer, and so forth?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman. I hope that something will be done to improve the lot of the enlisted man of the United States Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS F. FORD, of California: Page 7, before the semicolon in line 10, insert the following: "*Provided*, That upon the retirement of Benjamin O. Davis, brigadier general, United States Army, the President is requested, pursuant to the power vested in him by Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, to order the said Benjamin O. Davis to active duty and to retain him in an active status during the continuance of his present excellent health and vigor."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to suggest to the President that when Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis reaches the age of retirement on July 1, 1941, that he be recalled to active service.

I am reliably informed that General Davis is in excellent health and fully capable of rendering the same type of distinguished service that has marked his splendid military career.

As an outstanding member of his race, it would be a source of pride and pleasure to his people if he were accorded the further mark of distinction in recognition of his splendid services to his country.

With reference to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, this does not limit, it does not expand, and it does not direct. It seems to me it is entirely in order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask some questions of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], a question with reference to comments on page 9 of the committee report as follows:

The Budget and bill are predicated upon the assumption that the National Guard will be demobilized as and when increments complete their year of Federal service.

Can the gentleman inform us whether or not insofar as he knows from the testimony submitted that it is the plan to demobilize those guards who were inducted into service last September when their first year of service expires?

Mr. SNYDER. Any and all information obtained by the committee during the hearings would lead one to believe that is the intention.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There has not been legislation introduced for the purpose of continuing the guard beyond the first year of service?

Mr. SNYDER. None that we know of.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have reference to the Federal status.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD], being neither an appropriation nor a limitation upon an appropriation, but rather a direction to the President, is clearly legislation and therefore not in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

No appropriation for the pay of the Army shall be available for the pay of any officer or enlisted man on the active list of the Army who is engaged in any manner with any publication which is or may be issued by or for any branch or organization of the Army or military association in which officers or enlisted men have membership

and which carries paid advertising of firms doing business with the War Department: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit officers from writing or disseminating articles in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of War.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss RANKIN of Montana: On page 10, line 17, after the word "Department", insert *"Provided, however,* That no appropriation in this act for the pay of the Army shall be used to send our Army or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, and our insular possessions except in case of attack, but this prohibition shall not exclude money paid to our military observers or intelligence or diplomatic forces used in foreign countries."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, you recognize that this is a limitation on the appropriation bill. I hope the Democrats recognize it as the platform of the Democratic Party. I have only added the words "our insular possessions" and added also that the prohibition shall not exclude money paid to our military observers or intelligence or diplomatic forces used in foreign countries.

The Democratic platform reads as follows:

We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Navy, or air force to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.

Some Members believe this bill is a defense measure, that it does not provide for an expeditionary force; also that it includes these words in spirit, but it is a safeguard to put them in the bill itself. I know no one here expects our men to be taken to foreign countries, and this amendment would give a great deal of consolation to many people if they knew that this part of the military appropriations does not include money to take men to foreign countries.

I appreciate the difficulties involved in writing military legislation, because under the present circumstances it is very difficult to state our military policy. Our military policy must necessarily be based on our national policy. When the Executive expresses sentiments that are contrary to the commonly accepted traditions of national policy, it is very difficult for committees to write legislation dealing with our military policy.

In 1935 a bill was introduced in the Congress to state our military policy and to make it conform with our national policy as expressed in the Constitution, and by the treaties ratified by the Senate. You will recall that in 1929 the Senate ratified a treaty saying that we renounce war as an instrument of national policy for settling international disputes. The Monroe Doctrine sought to prevent our involvement in European disputes.

I may reintroduce that bill because it offers a basis for discussion out of which may come the answer to the question that is in the minds of a great many people as to the policy of our military establishments.

The most difficult problem in building a military establishment is to know how it is to be used. This amendment seeks to clarify the policy—to limit the functions of the Army to defense. Military science advances as rapidly as all other sciences. A member of the Committee today said we were no longer in the horse-and-buggy age. Neither are we in the same age we were in before the Germans started this war. The Germans had a splendid opportunity to build a new military establishment to conform with modern science and modern inventions, and for their own depraved purposes. For years they were denied a conscript army and were forced to destroy their old military equipment. They built a military organization for a definite purpose. We should learn from the experience of the last 18 months, and it may be necessary for us not only to add new departments, but to reorganize the whole Military Establishment into one unified department, defining the purpose and establishing the military policy on the basis of public opinion as it exists today. Public opinion demands everything necessary to protect our shores from invasion. Public opinion demands security against attack, and at the same time insists that we refrain from fighting foreign wars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Montana may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the lady is to be congratulated for calling attention to the pledge that the Democrats gave to the country in the Democratic platform with reference to not sending our boys into foreign wars, and so forth. I hope the gentlewoman will likewise call the attention of the Republicans of the House to the pledge that the Republicans gave to the country on the same subject.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Oh, I think all Democrats recognize that the Republicans gave the same pledge and the Republicans in Congress are doing all in their power to fulfill that pledge. The people are almost unanimous, at least as indicated by 95 percent of my mail. They are in favor of protecting our shores and not going to other countries to fight. [Applause.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and rise in opposition to the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, everyone realizes that the gentlewoman from Montana is a sincere and ardent advocate of peace and that she follows her conscience in that respect, and we pay tribute to her for her earnestness and sincerity. However, I as a Democrat object to a Republican attempting to write a plank of the Democratic Party platform into an appropriation bill of the House. [Laughter.] Speaking seriously, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the gentlewoman's amendment would interfere with the implementation of the various activities provided in the bill. It would prevent our sending troops to any Latin American country which might be threatened by a foreign foe. It would seriously interfere with the good relations which now exist between the republics of this hemisphere and would also interfere with the present discussions going on in reference to a concert of political and economic action for mutual benefit in this hemisphere, and for the defense of the hemisphere. Further, it would undoubtedly interfere with the duties of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the adoption of an amendment of this kind would be for all practical purposes a repudiation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Undoubtedly it would. That is the point I was trying to make, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Montana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss RANKIN of Montana and Mr. O'CONNOR) there were—ayes 39, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction and installation of buildings, flying fields, and appurtenances thereto, including interior facilities, fixed equipment, necessary services, roads, connections to water, sewer, gas, and electric mains, purchase and installation of telephone and radio equipment, and similar improvements, and procurement of transportation incident thereto, including the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, and including the acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof, without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 255; 31 U. S. C. 529); general overhead expenses of transportation, engineering, supplies, inspection and supervision, and such services as may be necessary in the office of the Quartermaster General, $276,378,424, to remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $79,620,368 shall be for payments under contracts for the purposes authorized under this head in the appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1939, 1940, and 1941: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War may, with respect to contracts for public work for the Military Establishment, whether or not for construction at military posts, entered into upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis out of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 or authorized to be entered into prior to July 1, 1942, waive the require-

ments as to performance and payment bonds of the act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793; 40 U. S. C. 270a): *Provided further*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract for public works entered into on or after September 9, 1940, for the construction and installation of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of War.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: Page 24, line 4, before the word "that", insert the following: "That engineering and overhead expenses shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of any project: *And provided further*.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the RECORD, the Army now takes out 11 percent of the construction money for overhead and engineering costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants, for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships and transports, for laundry work for enlisted men and Army nurses while patients in a hospital, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone; for the purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment of patients, including supernumeraries, not otherwise provided for, including care and subsistence in private hospitals of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, of applicants for enlistment, and of prisoners of war and other persons in military custody or confinement, when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to officers and enlisted men who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furloughs or leaves of absence in excess of 24 hours; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for for bedding and clothing injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the care of insane Filipino soldiers in conformity with the act of Congress approved May 11, 1908 (24 U. S. C. 198); for the pay of male and female nurses, not including the Army Nurse Corps, and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the pay of interns at not to exceed $720 per annum each; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the enlisted force of the Medical Department; for the supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, $60,865,000, of which amount not to exceed $6,526,819 shall be for payment of obligations incurred under contract authorizations under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: Page 35, line 15, after the word "war", insert the following: "including such additional sum as the Surgeon General may determine to be necessary for assisting financially civilian schools on account of student nurses undergoing training therein for duty in Army hospitals and for assisting such student nurses."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio. No one wants to oppose an amendment that would offer adequate nursing facilities for the boys in the Army. So I accept the amendment.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment to make a statement for the RECORD?

The situation in the nursing field is such that the Congress should be thoroughly aware of it. In 1918 the Red Cross had been asked for 20,000 nurses. During the last weeks of the war 100 nurses a day were asked for. We could not meet such demands now, nor are we yet started on adequate preparation to do so.

We are now graduating from the 1,300 schools of this country approximately twenty-four or twenty-five thousand girls each year. This just about balances the nurses who leave professional life annually, either through marriage or disability. The 4-percent increase in enrollment in the schools of nursing is not quite keeping even with the needs of the country, and already the hospitals are having difficulty in providing adequate nursing staffs. The necessary increase of student enrollment to keep abreast of what we anticipate will be the demand for nurses throughout the country is a 14-percent increase as a minimum.

The sum of money allocated for this purpose will implement the careful plans that have been made for the enrollment and training of these dramatically needed additional students in nursing. The country will have reason to rejoice when it finds the Congress has become aware and has acted with promptness and understanding. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS: On page 35, line 15, after the word "internes", insert "who are graduates or have successfully completed at least 4 years' professional training in reputable schools of medicine or osteopathy."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the chairman of the committee has accepted this amendment. However, for the purpose of the RECORD and the information of the House, I want briefly to explain the purpose and effect of my amendment.

There are some medical schools in the country that graduate medical students after 4 years of study and training. Other medical schools require 4 years of study and training and 1 year of interneship before graduation. This amendment, therefore, eliminates the possibility of discrimination against certain medical-school graduates and gives permissive authority to the War Department to take graduates of osteopathic schools after 4 years of study and training. This, of course, is a just recognition of a very important and worthy profession. The amendment was unanimously adopted by my Committee on Military Affairs and reported favorably in the so-called omnibus bill, which is now pending on the calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material, together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; for supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Department, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; to provide for training and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; for instruction purposes, other than tuition; for the purchase, completely equipped, of plant vehicles, including trucks, ambulances, and station wagons, and for maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn freight and passenger-carrying vehicles; for ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; for services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; for publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office, including subscriptions to periodicals; not to exceed $150,000 for services of such consultants as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, at rates of pay to be fixed by him not to exceed $50 per day and for their necessary traveling expenses; in all, $1,339,390,595, of which $76,085,595 shall be immediately available, and not to exceed $1,103,925,950 shall be available for payments under contracts for the procurement or production of ordnance matériel, machinery, and supplies under authorizations under this head contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1940 and 1941; also, in addition, the Chief of Ordnance, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1942, for the procurement or production of ordnance matériel, machinery, and supplies to an amount not in excess of $57,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided*, That the period of the contract authorization of $831,065,751 under this head in the Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, is extended to July 1, 1942: *Provided further*, That the Chief of Ordnance and the chiefs of any other branches concerned shall enter into contracts

prior to July 1, 1942, for the procurement of such equipment, spare parts, and accessories as may be required for such additional Armored Force divisions and/or other units of such Armored Force as may be directed by the Chief of Staff: *Provided further*, That pay and allowances of Ordnance Reserve Officers and Specialist Reserve Officers assigned to the Ordnance Department to active duty to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, while so assigned, shall be charged to this appropriation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am doing this primarily because I think it is a matter of justice.

On the 25th of March the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] made a speech concerning a witness who had been heard by the Dies committee. This witness was an Italian by the name of Goffredo Pantaleoni. It happens that I was one of the Members who heard his testimony, and I was deeply impressed by the man's sincerity and earnestness. Needless to say, some investigation had been made beforehand, and we were assured that he was a man who had important information and who was sincere in his devotion to the welfare of this Nation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] made certain charges against this witness in his speech. Among other things, he said that Pantaleoni was dismissed from the service of the Italian Tourist Information Office because of an alleged charge of misappropriation of $13,000. Then a little later the gentleman said:

> His (Pantaleoni's) handling or mishandling of the funds of this agency proved that he was a cheater and a crook.

I have here, and I have already asked permission to insert in the RECORD, two letters about this matter which speak for themselves. The first is a letter signed by the head of the Italian Tourist Information Service, Mr. Lugi L. Palladini, and reads as follows:

[Translation]

ITALIAN TOURIST INFORMATION OFFICE,
New York City, May 27, 1940.

Reference No. 10322-I.

CAV. GOFFREDO PANTALEONI,
10 West Sixty-fifth Street,
New York City.

DEAR MR. PANTALEONI: Following the order received by the Royal Consul General of New York, Commander Gaetano Vecchiotti, with letter May 18, No. 27912, copy of which is already in your hands, I state to have today taken full charge of the entire office of New York as per inventory existing in the files, besides the new material which has been posted after inventory's date, and more precisely:

1. The furniture, all office machinery, as typewriters, adding machine, etc.
2. Publicity material still in distribution.
3. Files and library.
4. Movie apparatuses, still and films, projectors, and all photos in existence.

I declare furthermore to have received from you the following amount of money: $4,165.36, which are at the Chase National Bank, including in this amount check No. 518; $121.14 with the Manufacturers Trust Co.; $1,500 in the office safe.

I have also received all the bookkeeping posted up to May 20. Insofar as your liquidation is concerned, it remains established what has been agreed between you and the Royal Consul General, Commander Vecchiotti, who has given to me full discharge with his letter, photostatic copy of which is enclosed with this one, and dated May 27, No. 29591. It has been also agreed between you, the Enit office, the Italian Tourist Information Office, and the Italian Line that all parties concerned, that is, among all the abovementioned organizations and you, there is no more reason of debit and credit or parties concerned acknowledging in full to be satisfied by this agreement.

Your acceptance at the bottom of this page will signify the acceptance of what has been agreed to our and your satisfaction.

LUGI G. PALLADINI.

The other letter is from the Italian consul general, which I will read. The letter from the consul general says:

[Translation]

CONSULATE GENERAL D'ITALIA,
New York, May 27, 1940.

MY DEAR FRIEND PALADINI: Following my communication No. 27912 of May 18 of this year, you are authorized to take full charge of the E. N. I. T. and Italian Tourist Information Office from Cav. Uff. Goffredo Pantaleoni, leaving to him from the amount of the office cash $13,841.56, in full payment of all what is due him from E. N. I. T., Italian Tourist Information Office, and the Italian Line.

VECCHIOTTI,
Consul General.

Att. LUIGI PALADINI,
E. N. I. T., New York.

Anybody who takes the trouble to examine those letters will see that Mr. Pantaleoni resigned his position and was paid certain sums of money which were due him from the agency in the proper and regular way. It is certainly impossible to draw the conclusion that he was dishonest.

The reason I am interested in this is not only because I think it is a matter of justice to this man, but also because it happens that some of his testimony was a matter of great importance, it seemed to me, including, for example, descriptions of the methods used to get American dollars out of the United States and into Axis hands by bringing pressure on people of Italian ancestry and in order to get those people to pay American dollars for certain services or the purchase of Italian securities and then not be able to get their money back out of Italy again.

I shall not go into detail about this matter, because it will be made a matter of record by the committee in the course of time.

Another important thing brought out by this witness was to show the pressure brought to bear against businessmen of Italian descent in this country by Fascist consular agents.

The main thing I want to do in this short speech, however, is to make it clear that the man that was heard as a witness by us was not a cheater, not a crook, nor can he be accused of having expropriated funds. I call your attention to some of his testimony which was the fact that one man in Chicago, the editor of an anti-Fascist Italian journal, had his life taken not very long ago. Some auto workers who came to Washington to testify regarding Communist influence in their union in southern California have suffered violence. I am told Pantaleoni's life has been threatened. Pantaleoni made no secret of the fact that he has belonged to Fascist organizations in the past. He told, and in my judgment convincingly, of his complete break with them and of his desire to serve America.

I believe when we find people who are doing the hardest part of the job of protecting democracy against movements that would destroy it they deserve our help and, so far as we can give it, our protection. In this particular case I thought it was a matter of duty for me to at least make this record as straight as I could in the short time I have had to do it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Cadets: For pay of cadets, $1,375,920, of which amount $10,000 shall be available immediately: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, no officer of the Army shall be entitled to receive any increase in pay or allowances because of detail or assignment to duty in any capacity at the Military Academy: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian of the United States Military Academy may be performed by an officer of the Regular Army retired from active service under the provisions of section 1251, Revised Statutes, and detailed on active duty for that purpose.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question. Can the chairman of the subcommittee inform us whether or not the bill contains any provision for the appointment of additional cadets to the academy?

Mr. SNYDER. It does not.

Mr. THOMASON. May I ask further whether there is anything in contemplation—and I assume there is nothing in the legislation to that effect—looking to a reduction in the course from 4 years to 3 years?

Mr. SNYDER. It is not contemplated, and there is no provision of that kind in the bill.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the committee think the course should be reduced to 3 years?

Mr. SNYDER. Nothing to that effect was said by the superintendent of the West Point Academy when he appeared before the committee, and he is not advocating it. He is opposed to it, in other words.

Mr. THOMASON. It is not contemplated, then, to ask for a reduction in the course from 4 years to 3?

Mr. SNYDER. No; and I may say for the committee—and I believe I speak for the committee—that the committee wants West Point to stay on a 4-year basis instead of a 3-year basis.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the pay and allowances of such additional officers and nurses of the Medical Reserve Corps as are required to supplement the like officers and nurses of the Regular Army in the care of beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Administration treated in Army hospitals may be paid from the funds allotted to the War Department by that Administration under existing law.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, very shortly we shall vote on this War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942. I merely want to take these brief 5 minutes to say that the amount of money contained in this bill is astonishing and I may say somewhat frightening but I further wish to say there is not a single item in this bill that has not been defended by every chief of bureau, by the Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and all responsible and high-ranking officers of the Army.

I believe that if you will turn to page 761 of the hearings where I closed my examination of Mr. Knudsen, you will find a summing up of the reasons why there can be very little if any argument against this enormous appropriation. I read the following from the hearings:

Mr. POWERS. Then, to sum this whole thing up, it has first, the unqualified support of the President?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POWERS. Second, it has the unqualified support of O. P. M.?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Third, it has the unqualified support of the Secretary and the Under Secretary of War?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POWERS. Then it has the unqualified support of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the unqualified support of the Chief of the Air Corps; is that correct?

Mr. KNUDSEN. Yes, sir.

That holds, Mr. Chairman, for every item in this bill. The committee certainly did not want to bring a bill in here any larger than was absolutely necessary, but we feel and sincerely feel that this appropriation, particularly in view of the unlimited emergency that has been declared, is necessary and vital. I hope that very shortly the bill will be passed unanimously by the House.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the words of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in which he spoke of the figures in this bill as astonishing. I agree wholeheartedly in what he says. I believe he even suggested they were figures that might create fear. Astonishing and alarming as these figures may be, it seems to me the bill which was introduced in the House this week is even more astonishing and more alarming. I am referring to the bill known as the private property seizure bill. Skillful craftsmen have certainly tested their ability in putting together the most complete and comprehensive combination of words and phrases that could possibly be imagined in describing the kind of property the President is privileged to confiscate. I quote from the bill:

Property of any kind or character, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, or any part thereof, or any right or interest therein or with respect thereto.

That means anything that can be owned can be confiscated, and this confiscation is dependent solely upon one thing, the discretion of the President.

We have heard a number of pleas for unity and loyalty. The fear I have is that the bill to which I now refer is a most disturbing factor in that hoped-for unity and loyalty.

I hesitate to say this, but I am rather persuaded it is true. There is a great deal of suspicion in the minds and in the hearts of many American people as to what the motives and the purposes of the administration are. I think there is a deep distrust. God grant that it were not so, but I believe there is a distrust on the part of a great many American people, patriots, not copperheads, who are suspicious and distrustful. They cannot be charged with any subversive inclinations or actions. They are extremely disturbed at moves such as this property-seizure bill. That suspicion and distrust comes naturally because of the lust for power which we have experienced in the past. Since 1933 bids for power by the President have not been uncommon. Attempted usurpations have been the rule rather than the exception. Constitutional limitations have been brushed aside as outmoded deterrents.

Our memory still recalls the threat which was made against the independence of the Supreme Court when the interpretations of that Court were barriers in the way of the exercise of an arbitrary authority. I have quoted the phrase before; I repeat it today—those words of Justice Cardozo in which he referred to the authority which was attempted to be exercised by the President as "unconfined and vagrant." Here we have another example of an unconfined and vagrant power seeking to reach into the homes, the holdings, the possessions of the American people and seize them. If this bill were enacted, every vestige of private property rights would be destroyed. Under the terms of this bill the President's authority to seize everything owned or controlled by a private citizen would be absolute and supreme.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I repeat this bill would permit the President to reach into the homes and the holdings of the most humble citizen. This arbitrary authority would depend solely upon the whim and will of one man. Instead of a powerful parliamentary body such as this Congress should be, there would be substituted the overreaching ambition for power of one man. I believe it is high time that those of us who have any sense of responsibility to a free people—to a people which, I believe, still cherish the substance as well as the form of their freedom—it is high time that we set ourselves to the task of discharging this responsibility to those people who love their freedom and cherish their liberty. It cannot be done if a measure like this, labeled as it is as an administration measure with brutal boldness, is thrust under our nose as a measure to be enacted by the Congress of a free people.

I have the greatest regard, and I honor the membership of this House. I believe that each man here seeks to discharge as he sees it his responsibility with fidelity. In that spirit of confidence in each of you, I plead with you to reject this latest bid for power, this most recent threat to the liberties of our people.

I read in the paper this morning, and I believe the press, as it usually does, quotes high officialdom correctly, that the Secretary of War at a press conference said the so-called property-seizure bill was one of the most important before the Congress and ought to be passed with as little delay as possible. I say to you that bill should be defeated. It should be rejected. It should be denounced as an iniquitous effort to confiscate the property of every individual citizen. It deserves not commendation but the scorn and the rebuke of every citizen who despises the tyranny of oppression and who cherishes the right of freemen to be secure in their possessions.

Read this bill. You are appropriating today $10,000,000,000 for our armed forces, yet under the terms of this bill to which I have referred, the funds you are appropriating for a specific purpose in the bill now before you can be diverted by the President under the terms of this latest bid for power.

Appropriations available for the acquisition of property for national-defense purposes shall be available for the acquisition of such property.

Those are the words of the bill—the bill to confiscate property.

What does that mean? It means that the dollars you are appropriating today for the Army the President can take, and as he sees fit buy this plant, take that plant, confiscate that plant, and reach into every one of the resources and possessions of a free people and use such property for governmental purposes. This is not condemnation. No patriotic fervor can be put behind this program. It far exceeds anything that was even suggested when war had been declared in 1917. It is unprecedented. It is the most alarming innovation ever attempted.

I plead with you today to reassert the independence of the House in its commitments to a free people. A revival of our faith in the integrity of our institutions of government is imperative. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point where I offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly after May 1, 1941, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however,* (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of the approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this act (a) shall normally be employed not more than 40 hours per week; (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further,* That the President may suspend compliance with this section in time of war or national emergency if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note that a limitation which some might expect to find in this portion of the bill generally dealing with limitations appears at page 17, under the heading of Quartermaster Corps, to which it particularly applies. Inasmuch, however, as the limitation is one which applies to all appropriations throughout the bill, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point and read into my remarks the proviso which appears at page 17.

The limitation is the one generally called the Buy American rule and is identical with the one that appears in the fifth supplemental defense and Navy appropriation bills. The proviso follows:

Provided further, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of War shall determine that articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured of satisfactory quality and in sufficient quantities and at reasonable prices as and when needed, and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. The provisions of section 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, are hereby continued in effect and made applicable to moneys appropriated for the War Department for national-defense purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: On page 70, line 17, before the period, insert the following: "except that no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for pay of any obligations incurred in pursuance thereof under an original contract on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis for the construction of buildings, utilities, or appurtenances thereto, any other provision in this act to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains approximately $278,000,000 for various types of Army construction. We often have heard it said that our national credit is our first line of defense. We hear much said about our resources and I sometimes wonder just what is going to happen before this emergency is over. I have not opposed, and I am not now opposing, any expenditure for national defense. However, I am trying to do what I can to see that the taxpayers and the Government receive a dollar's worth of value for every dollar that we spend or as near a dollar's worth as we can obtain.

It is amazing when we consider how the money is being passed out. According to the report of the Graham committee, which investigated the expenditures of the World War, all the cantonments and facilities where 4,000,000 men were housed and trained during the World War cost $206,000,000. The Graham committee brought back a report stating that of the $206,000,000 representing the cost of the World War cantonments, $78,000,000 was wasted.

I made a talk last Monday, which will be found in the RECORD of Tuesday, giving my views on that matter and I do not wish to repeat them now. However, we had spent, before this bill came up, over $800,000,000 in building cantonments to train 1,400,000 men. I made a comparison last Monday between three cost-plus-a-fixed-fee jobs and a competitive-bid job. The competitive-bid job at Camp Dix cost $652 per man, while Camps Devens, Edwards, and Meade, built on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, ranged in cost from $890 to $1,035 per man for practically the same amount of work.

The fixed-fee plan has been responsible for a great deal of this waste. At Camp Dix, where we had 14 contractors on an advertised competitive bidding project, the premium for overtime was $233,000 for the 14 contractors. This overtime came not out of the taxpayers or the Government, but out of the lump-sum bid of the contractors.

At Camp Edwards the premium for overtime was $1,000,000, and at Camp Devens it was $1,350,000, and at Camp Meade it was $1,800,000. At these projects this overtime came out of the taxpayers.

The question has been advanced whether we could let these jobs on an advertised competitive-bid basis without loss of too much time. I have before me the weekly report of Camp Dix, giving the day when every contract was let, the day it was advertised, and all the other information. Some of these contracts were advertised and let and the job under way within 2 weeks.

With respect to the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, you have contracts aggregating a final cost of from $23,000,000 to $29,000,000, and the contractor had to advance as much as $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. The result is only the large contractors can get the jobs. At Camp Dix we had 14 contractors with contracts ranging from $5,000,000 down to a few hundred thousand dollars. The competitive-bid system gives the small contractor a chance.

When they tell you that you cannot let these jobs on a competitive-bid basis, my answer is that it has been done, and has been done at a greatly reduced cost over a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract. It was done at Camp Dix, N. J., and it was done at Camp Jackson, S. C. At Camp Jackson, S. C., they took the first job at $3,000,000 on a unit basis, or at so much for barracks, so much for mess hall, and so forth. He took other similar contracts on a negotiated basis, which my amendment does not prohibit.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the chairman of the subcommittee that is investigating the construction contracts, and I rise to say, in line with what the gentleman from Michigan has just said, that only this morning there was testimony from a representative of the War Department who said that in a comparative study of the cost of a lump-sum contract at Bennings, Ga., and one at Camp Polk, La., taken on the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, that provided for 42,000 men in a development at Fort Bennings under a lump-sum system, and the number of men at Camp Polk, La., was 13,000 to 14,000; and yet under the lump-sum system at Fort Bennings, done by the Army itself, the cost was $2,000,000 less than it was at Camp Polk, La., which I think is substantial evidence that the gentleman from Michigan is right when he says that, as a general rule, the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is absolutely indefensible, except where the matter of time is important.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his contribution, and I want to say that his com-

mittee, with which I am collaborating, is doing splendidly. At Camp Dix a 63-man barracks cost $9,800 on a competitive-bid job, while at Camp Meade the same barracks cost $17,364 on a cost-plus-fixed-fee job, and they are in the same zone. If you will read the speech which I made last Monday, you will find that at Camp Dix they had 5,600 men, while at Camp Meade they had 19,990 men at the peak. At Camp Dix, where they had a competitive bid, advertised job, the progress sheet shows that they were ahead of Meade at all times for the same type of a project, with practically the same number of buildings. Construction at Fort Dix was ahead of Meade despite the fact that Meade had nearly 4 times the number of men that Dix had. If there ever was an excuse for a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system, that time has passed. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in addition to the 10 minutes already granted to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very unfortunate if this amendment were adopted. I do not believe I have to defend my record for economy on the floor of this House before this body, and if the objective today in passing this bill were to save money to build facilities that had to be built for the defense program as cheaply as possible, undoubtedly it will be a wise provision, either to put it in the bill or administratively to go back to the lump-sum contract. If we were going to New York this afternoon and wanted to get there as cheaply as possible, we would take a day coach on the Pennsylvania train and occupy 4 hours in going there. But if we had to go there quickly, we would go over and take an airplane and pay the extra fare for it. That is the whole thing. Economy, desirable and necessary and vital as it is, is not the objective at this moment. The object at this moment is to build as quickly as possible, and to manufacture as quickly as possible, the vital things of this defense program, and, believe it or not, the need for doing it is daily getting closer in and tighter and tighter upon the Republic.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has spent a great deal of time and has done very splendid work for which he is entitled to the thanks of the Congress and of the country in inquiring into these costs. There is not any doubt about that. I have great respect for the industry and persistence with which he has pursued this matter. It is well for him to tell us about this.

When we first started this rapid mushroom expansion of the Army, especially in the Army because the same criticism was not directed at the Navy—undoubtedly there was lost motion, lost efficiency, inefficiency, and increased cost of many of these facilities. Frequently we had figures presented to us that the original estimate for camp so-and-so was $25,000,000 when before the Military Affairs Committee, but here we find that we have actually spent $40,000,000 on it. Therefore, the cost of it has increased $15,000,000. That is not true at all. There might have been some extra costs there because of rushing the program, working at night, paying overtime for labor, some increase in cost of materials, but in almost all of those instances the large increase in cost was because of a change in plans and greatly expanded facilities.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to proceed if the gentleman will permit me.

In many, many of these cases where the Army came before the Appropriations Committee for their original estimates for building these camps they had not yet even located the site of the camp; yet they had to come before the Appropriations Committee and make blind estimates, wild guesses in most instances. Afterward they went out to locate the camps. The original estimates had been based on old World War experiences, and they immediately found out that those experiences had to go into the scrap heap. Why? Because of the age of mechanization. They had to have concrete highways. They had to have shelter for mechanized troops and a thousand and one instances of changes, which naturally brought about this increased cost which we had to endure.

Now there has been reorganization. Under the present set-up in the War Department under General Somervell, as it is going now, I believe we are getting splendid value for every dollar expended by the Government. General Somervell, representing the Quartermaster General, came before our committee when we had the lease-lend bill. We went into this matter very carefully. Members of the Deficiency Committee, having with us members of the military affairs subcommittee and the naval affairs subcommittee, went into this question. We questioned the Quartermaster General, General Somervell, and we suggested that it might be better to try to get back to the lump-sum contract instead of the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. He agreed he was going to try to do that; that he thought it was desirable where it could be done; and that perhaps the period where great haste was necessary had passed and perhaps they could get back to them. But what happened? This picture has changed almost daily. An army that was sufficient yesterday we have to enlarge tomorrow. I am told today that the Secretary of War has called upon the Quartermaster General for certain facilities that must be completed by January 1 to house elements of the Army that are being mobilized for depots and for storage facilities. They must be completed. Now, what have you got to do when you advertise to build a depot or a camp? You have to have completed plans. You have to advertise. Bids must come in, and people must bid on them. With the uncertain condition of the labor market, the uncertain condition of prices, we are told that it is almost impossible to get good bids on these things. What do we do with the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis? This Board goes out and it takes a man who has had experience doing construction work for the Government, men who have established reputations. The size of the project is determined, and the fee is fixed on the basis of that project, not on the basis of what it will ultimately cost.

There is a popular understanding sometimes that it is to the interest of the contractor to increase the cost of a project because he will get a larger fee. That is not true at all. If he is to build a certain facility for a million dollars, and in actual experience it costs $1,500,000, he only gets his fee on the million dollars. It is not to his interest to increase the cost. The fee is fixed on the basis of the cost of that facility. But now, when speed is the word, and when every day counts, when we are told by those in authority that it is absolutely necessary to complete these facilities, coupled with the fact that I believe the gentleman from Michigan himself would say that under the present regime and the present set-up we are not having experiences such as he has detailed to us today, I believe it would be a mistake to tie the hands of the authorities so that they could not go out where they knew they had a reliable contractor who could do the job and do it right and do it quickly and save time for the Government. I do not believe it would be advisable to tie their hands and say that they had to go through the formality of advertising for bids.

I regret to have trespassed upon your time to this extent, but our committee has gone through this thing carefully. General Somervell called up the other day and he said the situation has changed since he talked to the deficiency subcommittee on the lease-lend bill. It looks as if it was in the interest of time and expedition, and we believe it would be to the Government's interest to negotiate some part of these contracts. General Somervell came back and appeared before the committee reporting this bill. As a result the committee has given him the authority, as I understand it, in this bill to negotiate contracts where in the interest of saving time and money for the Government it is proper to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. If agreeable to the gentlemen who are to use the remaining 20 minutes the Chair will recognize them for 4 minutes each in the following order: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] for 4 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 4 minutes because after having had the very fine presentation made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, I feel any further argument on my side of this question is unnecessary. The gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the deficiency subcommittee, had this matter before his committee and it was gone into thoroughly with General Somervell. I want to say of General Somervell that I think he is one of the most brilliant men in the Army. Everyone in Congress who has come in contact with him has been thoroughly impressed with his honesty, his competence, and his desire to give America the most for her dollars.

Last fall we did have some trouble and extra expense as has been related by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]; and in passing permit me to pay a tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], because he has spent many many weary hours in going into these matters and ferreting them out for the benefit of the American people. I think he deserves a vote of thanks for having done so; but I feel that time is of the essence. If we had plenty of time there is no question but what competitive bids—lump-sum competitive bids, would be the best system; but we cannot call for competitive bids at this time, we cannot take time to make all the specifications and blueprints and do the other things necessary to get competitive bids. It is my information that within the next few weeks, by the 1st of July, we shall have to let probably a billion dollars' worth of contracts in order to get certain desperately needed facilities ready as speedily as possible. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. While under ordinary circumstances his suggestion would be eminently correct, yet under the extreme emergency of the conditions that face the American people today we cannot afford to take the chance of delaying the program of the Quartermaster's Department by adopting an amendment the consequences of which we cannot foretell at this time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes for 4 minutes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if time is of the essence, then by all means we should eliminate these delaying cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. This is the type of contract that is causing delay. It causes delay because the various elements that enter into the construction of a cantonment, or whatever it may be, know that if delay and expense come they do not come out of the pocket of the contractor. Let me give you a concrete illustration—the experience of a contractor who was in the office of a Member of this House; his experience with two types of contracts in California, one on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, the other under a lump sum.

On the lump-sum contract he was up to schedule; he had no labor trouble; he was delivering the job as it was wanted. On the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract he found he had delay after delay; that racketeers, whether strike leaders or supply men, holding up deliveries that spelled delay and expense, retorted to him that it was no skin off his nose if it did cost money. The result was that the contract on the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis was the one that was behind time and was running ahead of cost.

I know of another example on a small military post. Two types of contracts have been used. Under the one, a lump-sum contract, temporary barracks were constructed estimated originally to cost $300,000, but under the lump-sum contract they were constructed for $121,000 and were completed in winter ahead of schedule. A defense-housing contract was let there on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. It will cost the original estimate, and it will not be finished as much ahead of schedule, weather considered.

I was down in Panama recently. I talked to the construction quartermaster general there, General Danielson He told me he refused to have anything to do with a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract in the work under his jurisdiction because he believed such contracts resulted in delay and because he knew the cost would be excessive. I saw his completion schedules, and he was making a remarkable record in completions. Surely if anywhere in the world contractors would want cost-plus contracts, it would be there. He is not using them, and he is getting results—speed and costs within estimates.

If these facts be true, then the thing which is cited here as the essence of this matter argues in favor of the fixed amount, lump-sum contract rather than the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract.

On the fourth supplemental defense bill, which the gentleman from Virginia knows about because he presided, details were presented by the construction quartermaster to show the types of the contracts let and the relative costs. Examination of 48 contracts let under the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis shows a total estimated original cost of $293,000,000. But the amount found necessary up to January 9, 1941, to complete those jobs was $543,000,000—$543,000,000 against $293,000,000 estimate, or an overage of 81 percent.

At the same time figures were submitted showing a survey of the 93 projects which were being accomplished by fixed-cost, lump-sum contracts. The original estimates were $122,000,000. On January 9 it was found their cost would be $185,000,000, an overage of only 50 percent, explained by changes, expansions, and so forth. The contrast is striking—85 percent overage on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and only 50 percent overage on the lump-sum contracts. Talk about saving a billion dollars in nondefense spending—you can save a lot of it in defense spending and get greater speed. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has estimated that $250,000,000—a quarter of the billion—could have been saved on $800,000,000 worth of contracts let on the cost-plus basis, had they been let on fixed-amount contracts.

It should be noted that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan does not rule out negotiated contracts, and remember, also, you have to make these blueprints anyway whichever way the proposition is built. I urge you on the basis of speed and on the basis of economy, when we are trying hard to reduce the tax bill, to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] for 4 minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency and also in view of certain commitments of the War Department, I am going to vote against the pending amendment at the present time; but I want to go on record as being unqualifiedly in favor of it in principle.

The Committee on Appropriations is not the only committee that has been going into this matter. About a month ago you instructed the Committee on Military Affairs to make an exhaustive investigation of the entire construction and real-estate problem. For the last 3 weeks a subcommittee of which I happen to be a member and chairman has been going into that matter very fully. I share in the fine things some of the Members said about General Somervell, and I also would add Colonel Groves, who testified before the committee this morning, that under the circumstances they have been doing a fine job. They are both able and honorable men who have the best interest of the country at heart.

I undertake to say, however, that a cost-plus or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract is almost an indefensible thing. I do not care whether it is in municipal government or State government or Federal Government, a cost-plus contract, as we knew it in World War No. 1, is almost invariably an invitation to favoritism and profiteering. I have been mayor of a small city and had some experience with the subject. I have been fighting the principle for years. I think you are going to be amazed when you see the detailed report that the Committee on Military Affairs will make later in the year to this House on some of the excessive profits that have already been made out on many of these contracts.

I am not speaking about the building of an ordnance plant or something that is highly technical, where you have to go out and get some experts and negotiate for a bid. I am talking about these average cantonments that you find all over the country, that do not require any high-power contractor or architect either. I undertake to say there is not a single one of the ordinary frame cantonments that has been built where the profits to the contractor have not ranged from $200,000 to $600,000, absolutely net to him, where he did not gamble one penny; and in addition to that, in many cases he got two, three, or five times as much for the use of his equipment as he was entitled to. In addition to all that, there are cases where the foremen would immediately have their salaries doubled just as soon as they went on the Govern-

ment pay roll. The contractor has nothing to lose. He is a sure winner, and it matters little to him what the project costs. He has no incentive to save or economize.

Not only that, but getting into this question of architect engineers, may I say that only yesterday afternoon the committee of which I am chairman heard evidence that a man down in Louisiana, a Reserve officer who had been a small W. P. A. employee in a southern State, had been awarded the contract as architect engineer to build two small cantonments of ordinary frame construction, which most any reasonably good architect could build, yet the net fee to himself personally was $70,000 for 9 months' work. I just do not see how that can be defended.

I grant there is an emergency. I share in the view expressed here by the very able gentleman from Virginia and likewise the gentleman from Arkansas that time is of the essence, but only this morning from Colonel Groves, who is General Somervell's assistant, figures and facts were produced to show that at Fort Benning, Ga., they had built a cantonment under a lump-sum contract to house 42,000 men, and they built it for $2,000,000 less than they did a cantonment built under a cost-plus fixed-fee contract to house 13,000 men at Camp Polk, La.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see somebody defend that in principle. I hope when this committee of which I am a member has completed its investigation it will bring in some general legislation to take care of the situation. I want a good army and I want it quick. The War Department has no better friend than I. I have great confidence in them. With men like General Marshall, General Somervell, and many others I might mention, at the head of the War Department, we have nothing to worry about. But they admit my position is sound in principle—and I think can be made so in practice, in spite of the element of time and speed. I just wanted to say a few kind words for the poor old taxpayer. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the position taken by the gentleman from Texas should reflect the viewpoint of the committee. The gentleman has made a very powerful argument, showing that general legislation considered by the proper committee should be drafter and presented to the House. I am sure the committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas is a member, will see fit in the very near future to present such legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask if the gentleman is not afraid that the situation will be like somebody said about German funds in this country—the barn will be empty if we wait too long?

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect my friend too much to make a sharp retort to that unnecessary injection.

We have a situation confronting us, and something has got to be done by July 1. Most of the criticism of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Texas, I am sure, came under the leadership of the gentleman who preceded General Somervell, and I am not criticizing him, because he had a tough job to do. We have had in the last 3 or 4 months a new officer in charge down there, and every member of the Military Affairs Committee and every member of the Appropriations Committee connected with appropriations for the War Department that I have spoken to has expressed to me in very complimentary terms their regard and their respect for the able leadership of General Somervell.

There are going to be contracts let in the sum of about $1,000,000,000 between now and July 1. I talked with General Somervell earlier in the afternoon and he told me it will take from 3 to 6 months to prepare the plans for the same. He has received instructions to make contracts between now and July 1 in the sum of between $900,000,000 and $1,000,000,000. I think the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is a clear and a consistent one. We want to criticize properly any excesses or any waste, and the gentleman from Michigan is entitled to credit for his work; but, on the other hand, we are confronted with an immediate situation. We have leadership in the War Department now that has received compliments from members of both parties, a man who is doing a remarkable piece of work, in the person of General Somervell. We all know that under his leadership, without in any way intending my words to be construed as a criticism of the gentleman who preceded him, he will continue the great job he has been doing for the past several months.

The amendment should be defeated at this time because of the emergency involved, and we should leave it to the legislative committee, which is the Committee on Military Affairs, to continue its investigation. I favored the investigation which is now being made by the Military Affairs Committee, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] knows, and I also favored the investigation of the Navy being made by the Naval Affairs Committee. They are both legislative committees, and from these committees I am sure will come legislation recommended to this body as a result of the investigations they will make. The gentleman from Texas has said that general legislation should meet this situation, and I think we should follow the statesmanlike leadership he has evidenced by the remarks he has made on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose anything that my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] or my friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] might offer, but it was my privilege to sit in the deficiency subcommittee during the consideration of all the supplemental estimates that were considered by that committee, as well as to sit in my own committee and hear the evidence submitted to it.

What the gentleman from Michigan has said I know is true in all respects, and I know that in some instances there have been exorbitant and extravagant prices paid, but, on the other hand, as has been stated by the gentleman from Texas, we are up against it in the present situation.

I want to say this, however: This work is now under the supervision of General Somervell, and he is a man of outstanding ability and may be absolutely relied upon to administer his job solely from the standpoint of the public interest. I am confident that he will not use the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract unless he is satisfied that the public interest will best be served by so doing.

While I do not like the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract, we may have no other alternative than to resort to it in this emergency, and I feel, therefore, that the thing for us to do is to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL) there were—ayes 82, noes 75.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SNYDER and Mr. ENGEL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES: On page 71, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 11. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person by whomsoever employed who, while employed directly or indirectly, in the manufacture or production of any defense article, as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, shall hereafter stop work for a period in excess of 10 days by reason of being a voluntary participant in any strike called in any

plant manufacturing or producing defense articles."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is clearly legislation and that the limitation is not negative in character.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say with reference to the point of order is that it is clearly a limitation and negative in its character and is not legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is clearly a limitation, and the Chair overrules the point of order, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. O'CONNOR. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that no part of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person by whomsoever employed, who, while employed directly or indirectly in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act No. 11, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved March 11, 1941, shall hereafter stop work for a period in excess of 10 days by reason of being a voluntary participant in any strike. The amendment is simple; it is understandable, and it is hoped that it will be adopted as an expression of the will of the House of Representatives, and as a deterrent against unwarranted and unnecessary strikes which have had the effect of sabotaging our national-defense program. It is offered wholly and solely for that purpose.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have stated that I could not yield, and I do not want to be interrupted. This amendment would operate as a bar against any man who voluntarily participated in a strike in the manufacture of defense articles for a period of more than 10 days. This 10-day provision is to act as a cooling period and to permit the Defense Mediation Board to intervene. I know there wil be many professions of sympathy on the part of some with the objectives sought to be achieved by this amendment and I know there will be some of you, however, who will attempt to "but" it to death. You will "but" it with the General Accounting Division, and with this provision and that provision, and you will "but " it with an effort to call on the proper legislative committee of the House to handle legislation which will accomplish the objectives sought to be obtained by this amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I said that I could not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I think the gentleman from Georgia is able to understand the language I have used. Mr. Chairman, this country of ours is faced with a crisis. You and I have been called to enact legislation unprecedented in the peacetime history of this country. You and I are being called upon to appropriate sums for defense unprecedented in the peacetime history of this country. This bill now being presently considered is the largest single peacetime appropriation in the history of the American Republic. There is a request upon the part of the Chief Executive that we consider legislation which would give him the power to take over all business and industry in this country, if necessary, in order to achieve our purpose of national security. Yet in the fact of these facts we have today more men on strike in industries engaged in fulfilling national-defense contracts than we have had since this emergency arose. Over two and a half million man-days have been lost by the Army, in fact, since the first of the year—enough to build thousands of antiaircraft guns, make thousands of Garand rifles, and hundreds of pieces of artillery—enough to build hundreds of bombers for defense.

So far as the Navy is concerned, there have been sufficient man-days lost to build 10 submarines, 6 to 8 cruisers, or 2 battle cruisers. Who has been benefited by these strikes? No one except Adolf Hitler and his associates. This country is now on the way to defeat by reason of these strikes, and will be lost unless they are stopped. Unless they are stopped it will be impossible for this country to defend itself. Are we to sink to the depths of defeat and degradaton by clinging, clinging to certain concepts of "business as usual," and "maintaining and improving upon our social gains"—concepts which have already proven fatal and destructive in the face of this present threat? Mr. Chairman, this is a serious hour, and I say now to the President of the United States and to the leadership of this House, I think it is folly for the President to ask for additional powers to take over business unless he is going to meet this challenge to the very safety of the Government of the United States. [Applause.] And I say to you Members of the House who will say that we have a Labor Committee to handle this question that you will get no action from that committee if we are to judge from what has gone on before. I, for one, will no longer withhold my voice. I voted for every piece of labor legislation that any so-called liberal has voted for in the past 7 years. This includes the Wagner Act and the wage-and-hour bill. My record in this respect is as good as yours. I challenge anyone to point to an unfriendly vote or speech I have made. Time and again I have voted to regulate certain business groups in order to further the public welfare.

While I am opposed to repealing any labor legislation, I am ready and willing to vote to regulate organized labor in order to further the public welfare and to insure uninterrupted production for national security.

To date no sacrifices have been made by industry or labor. The only sacrifices made thus far have been made by our sons and our brothers who are under arms. We are not keeping faith with them when we fail to do all in our power to provide them with food, clothing, and equipment. They must not be thrown against tanks and planes without proper equipment.

Before Almighty God, the time has come, if we are facing such a crisis as our leaders tell us we are, for somebody to make a sacrifice in the ranks of labor and in the ranks of industry in order to provide security. [Applause.] I am talking to you men and issuing to you a challenge—who time and again have fought against any just and reasonable restriction in the public interest, public safety, and public security when it hampered labor. What will you do? Will you try to appease and buy off the Communist leaders? Will you play with the safety and security of this country? What is your answer? I challenge you to give an answer.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman asks for an answer. I will answer him.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Oh, my friends, I feel this more deeply than I have ever felt any situation since I have been a Member of this distinguished body. I think that the public interest, the public welfare, and the national security is paramount to the claim and grievance, either fancied or real, of any segment of our social or economic order. Labor today is being paid the highest wages that have even been paid in the history of the world, right in the United States of America. The weekly wage today of the workingman is greater than it was in 1929. No one is attempting to take from labor any of its basic rights, but we are appealing to the loyal, courageous, and patriotic men in the ranks of organized labor to throw off communistic leadership, throw off self-seeking leadership, and serve this country in this hour of need. Let us, you and I, give them some concrete expression of our desire to do so by adopting an amendment of this type and character.

What do we face today? One-half billion dollars' worth of shipbuilding for

defense tied up by a strike on the Pacific coast in utter defiance of labor leadership and the appeal of the President. The lumber industry on the Pacific coast, tied up by a strike led by a Communist who defies and vilifies the Defense Mediation Board and the Government of the United States, and his own chief, Philip Murray. It may be true that Philip Murray gave him a verbal dressing down, but the strike still continues. Today, led by a known Communist, there is a strike in the great airplane plant of the North American Co. that is shutting down the production of $200,000,000 worth of bombers and other planes vital and essential for the defense of this hemisphere.

What is your answer? The time has come when we should cease making pious expressions. The time has come when we should act. The people of America are demanding of us that we should take some action. We are imposing taxes upon them and drafting their sons while we permit subversive groups and racketeers to lead strikes which threaten our very existence as a Nation. For God's sake, let us have production, let us have national unity, let us have security. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, an examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] will disclose that its purpose is to deprive any of the funds appropriated under this bill to any worker who has been engaged in a strike for a period of 10 days or more. I wonder what provision the gentleman makes for any worker who has been in a strike for 9 days and 23 hours. Just where does he draw the line? In what respect does he deprive workers of the right to work, when they have been engaged in a strike for 10 days and does not deprive workers who have been engaged in a strike for 9 days and 23 hours? I mention this to disclose how silly this amendment is.

Carrying out this amendment to its ridiculous and inescapable conclusion will cause in the United States exactly what he, the gentleman from Alabama, says he seeks to prevent. It will cause the entire disruption and cessation, not because of any action on the part of the workers, but as a result of the provision of his amendment, of practically every important industry engaged in so-called defense contracts. It will lead to a situation where workers cannot be obtained to do the work, even though they would be more than willing to do the work, simply because the law which this amendment enacts will prohibit them from participating in the manufacture and production of any defense article.

With labor needed, the gentleman says that he seeks to aid production by providing that workers shall be prohibited from working in defense plants. Not only is the amendment most reactionary, but it is manifestly absurd. The punishment that he seeks to inflict is not only punishment on the workers, but it also brings about a sabotaging, by his proposed legislation, of that so-called defense production that he says he seeks to defend.

Now, the gentleman has spoken about "admitted Communist leaders." All we get from the gentleman is the term "admitted Communist leaders." He referred to one of those leaders, Mr. O. M. Orton, president of the International Woodworkers of America, as an "admitted Communist leader." I have made a thorough search of the hearings before his committee, the Dies committee, and what do I find? The only reference made to him is made by a witness known as Harper Knowles, whose testimony appears on page 1795 of the hearings before the Dies committee.

There we find in the same sentence of the same paragraph in which this Harper Knowles accuses this leader of being a Communist, that he refers to many other names, including such names as John Brophy, as being a Communist; yet on this testimony before his committee the gentleman stands in this Well and seeks to work up a hysteria against labor and labor leaders and denounces them as "admitted Communists." Harper Knowles was the witness who appeared before this committee under false pretenses, saying to the committee he was sent as a representative of the American Legion. He was repudiated by the American Legion as not representing the American Legion, as having had no authority to speak for the American Legion. It is, I repeat, on the basis of the testimony of this type of witness that the gentleman stands here and labels leaders of labor whose unions happen to be engaged in strikes as "admitted Communists." The Dies committee is being used as a propaganda jumping-off base for aggression against American labor.

Let us deal with the real issue involved in these strikes—hours, wages, and working conditions—and not with the politics of labor leaders. Their political affiliations do not cause strikes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly no Member of this House with any degree of responsibility can state that these strikes have been caused because of communism or any other political philosophy. Nor can anyone with any degree of responsibility say that these American workers are going on strike to sabotage the national-defense program. Nobody can say that these American workers go on strike because they like strikes. There must be a reason. The reason is the refusal of employers to give workers wages which will meet the increasing cost of living and recognize their rights to organize and bargain collectively. Instead of putting in ridiculous, silly, and absurd amendments, such as this, and instead of waving the flag and "red" baiting on the floor of the House, why does not this Congress deal with the real reasons for these strikes?

The reason is not communism, the reason is not politics, the reason is not so-called un-Americanism on the part of American workers. The reason is a question of bread, butter, wages and hours, labor's rights; and until you gentlemen make up your minds to deal with the question of bread, butter, wages, and hours you will never solve this problem, you will never solve this question of strikes. [Applause.] You will only be making the exploitation of labor worse than it is and you will be forcing American workers into a condition of civil war simply because you stand here and under the influence of hysteria you seek to protect the employers who are making millions, and millions, and millions of dollars of profits, protect them against righteous action by workers whose dollar of yesterday no longer matches the living costs of today.

Curtail the right to strike and you force American labor into a condition of compulsory labor. Compulsory labor means nazi-ism. You talk about defending democracy on the one hand, but you are shoving nazi-ism on the American people on the other hand. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak in defense of communism or to speak in defense of any foreign "ism," but to speak in defense of ordinary Americanism. I do not care whether these strikes are carried on by Communists or somebody else, as charged by the speaker who just preceded me, they are strikes, they are hampering the defense of America, they are stopping production, and no stoppage of production can be allowed at this time. This amendment would apply to any man engaged in any practice that held up defense production in this country regardless of whether he was a Communist or was not. To my mind it is utterly immaterial to what political party or what foreign "ism" a man belongs, if he is not willing to contribute to the support of America at a time when America is in need.

If these men who have been so ardently defended by the last speaker are not Communists, all well and good, but if they are standing in the way of defense production let us do something about it now other than just talk. For a long year we have talked about increasing American production, yet it has been held up by strike after strike. Why should we tolerate any further delay? Why not take action now?

I do not like the wording of the amendment. I remember that gentleman who offered it said, "Members are going to undertake to 'but' it to death." I realize that there are defects in this amendment, but I am going to vote for it because it is the only thing that is before me at this time. I am going to vote for it because it gives me an opportunity to do something, to take some action in behalf of those boys who are carrying the guns.

We are called upon here today to vote $10,000,000,000 to arm America, but the voting of this money will be an absolutely

useless and foolish thing if we do not keep those factories running that are necessary to turn out the goods. You cannot stop tanks with silver dollars. You cannot shoot down airplanes with greenbacks. You have got to convert those dollars and greenbacks into the instrumentalities of defense. This bill does nothing more than provide the money, Mr. Chairman, and the money is not worth a thing in stopping an invader unless it is changed into the implements of war, the tools of defense. You cannot convert raw materials into defense articles if your plants are idle.

No matter how meritorious the cause which prompted an act, if the act interferes with the greatest good in a time of dire emergency it cannot be condoned. We do not ask when a boy goes into a training camp why he went A. W. O. L., we ask whether he went A. W. O. L., and in time of war we shoot him as a deserter. If somebody has a complaint, let him exercise his right to complain, but let the work continue. I do not believe the Members of this House quite realize how desperately serious the situation in this Nation is. We are treading the path that France trod, we are doing the same things France did, we are going down the same desperate road France followed. Why do we not awaken?

Have we not seen in this last year of war, this last year of agony in Europe, how desperately necessary it is for every man and woman in this Nation to put in every day, to work every hour that they can work? You cannot stop Hitler by working part time, you cannot stop Hitler unless you put in every hour, every day, with every man doing his duty.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to read a headline to indicate that many employees on defense projects realize how necessary it is that progress in making defense materials be not interrupted, I wish to read a headline from the June 3, 1941, issue of the Dallas Morning News. The headline reads: "Bricklayers Bar Strikes on Defense Work at Dallas, Tex."

Mr. POAGE. That is fine where they actually bar strikes, but unfortunately labor leaders all over the country are saying they are barring them, but they do not get results. Although I am sure they act in good faith, the strikes go on. This Congress has go to act. Apparently no one else will. We have to have results. Talking is not getting results. Although this amendment is doubtless hastily drawn and may need rewriting, we have an opportunity now to vote for something—an opportunity to act instead of talking. Just a minute ago we took away the greatest complaint that the strikers could have when we took the steal out of letting these contracts, when we passed an amendment here that I hope this House will keep in the bill, requiring honest, open, competitive bids on contracts. These strikers now will have no reason to complain that the contractors are making unconscionable profits in which labor seeks to share. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, let us try and get down on earth and see whether or not this Committee should adopt the pending amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama made a very plausible argument, based on a hypothesis that is not in this amendment. He said that we must stop unwarranted strikes. The word "unwarranted" is not used in this amendment.

This amendment strikes at all strikes, whether warranted or unwarranted, whether just or unjust. As a rule, there are three sides to nearly every strike. The Mediation Board has been established to find the third side which theoretically is the right side. The only weapon in the hands of the laboring man is the right to strike to enforce his rights. You take away from the laboring man of this country the right to strike in peacetime, or any other time, and you take away his last right, his only remedy to settle disputes. Remember, we are still at peace. This country is not at war. What would we do without the laboring men? They build what is necessary, such as ships, guns, tanks, bombers, and so forth. Capital is impotent without labor. Labor is not impotent without capital. Hitler found a way of getting along without what we call capital. We must not be too hard on labor.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of living are mounting from day to day. These men are entitled to a living the same as anybody else.

I say to the Members of the House that I defy anyone to show a more patriotic group of people than the heart of labor. The laboring men are just as patriotic as any class of people on the face of God's earth. Of course, you have your radicals among them. You have radicals among all groups, but the 99 percent should not be punished for the acts of the few. Years ago, Mr. Chairman, we used to have what was known as the I. W. W. In Montana we dubbed them the "I Won't Work." But they did not represent labor. They were an offshoot of labor's radicals who would not work even if they could get work. They went out of the picture. You do not hear of them by that name any more.

Mr. Chairman, let us be careful, too, about calling people Communists. It is easy to accuse, but it is hard to defend. It is easy for me to say somebody is a Communist. During the other war 25 years ago if we did not like somebody we called them a pro-German. If they disagreed with us we called them pro-German. Today we call them a Communist or pro-Nazi because we find them in disagreement with us. I heard a man the other day called a Communist, and he does not need to yield to anyone so far as Americanism is concerned. I refer to Reed Robinson, the head of the Mill and Smelter Workers Union of America.

Let us take it easy. The heart of labor is sound. The man who is at the head of the lumber organization on the west coast is an enemy of labor. Just about as Murray pointed out this morning in the headlines, the strike must be settled. His kind does labor no good. It does it harm, but Murray, head of the C. I. O., will straighten it out.

Let us not this afternoon hit in the face with a club or stick, or use force, because law is defined as a rule of action, this great body of patriotic American citizens. We can by a majority vote here this afternoon do more harm to our defense program than all that has been done to retard progress by both employers and employees. We must defeat this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, we should give very careful consideration to matters of this kind. As one Member of this House, I realize the extreme danger of the labor troubles we are experiencing throughout this Nation today, and as a member of one of the committees of the House which has been investigating this matter I believe I realize more fully than a great many others do just what damage these strikes are really doing to our national-defense programs. As much as I agree with my friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], and as much as I admire his sincerity, I feel I must endeavor to call the attention of the members of the Committee this afternoon to one point in regard to the proposed amendment.

In my opinion, this amendment will assist in promoting the subversive program afoot in this Nation today more than any other thing we could do, and for this reason: Under the terms of his amendment if a communistic leader, and there are many of them fomenting strikes in this Nation today, should succeed in pulling off a strike of 10 days' duration in any industry connected with national defense, then he will have the assistance of the law of the United States itself in keeping those workers out of circulation from that day on.

I would like to go along on some legislation that would bring about a solution of this most serious problem which we are facing today, but while I am willing to go along on legislation of that character I am not willing to allow myself to be so carried away in my enthusiasm as to support something which will result in doing more harm than it will good. I firmly believe that nothing we could do here today would be more welcome to the subversive elements trying to weaken our defense program by pulling off strikes throughout the United States than to enact a provision of law of this kind, because I want to say again that if this amendment is enacted into law these subversive elements will have the help of the laws of the United States in keeping those workers out of circulation from that day on. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 50 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE of Washington) there were—ayes 89, noes 42.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the debate on this amendment will proceed in a very temperate manner and that the arguments for and against it will be presented from that angle.

My purpose in rising is to call to the attention of the Committee some very practical aspects that, as legislators, we have got to consider in connection with this amendment.

Let me read the amendment:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act—

To begin with, this does not apply to the naval appropriation bill and it does not apply to the lease-lend appropriation. The amendment does not apply to defense workers who go on strike in connection with funds we have already appropriated. These are all matters that we have got to consider as legislators.

Let me go a little further and call your attention to something which I think is more serious. The amendment states—

Any man who voluntarily goes on a strike for a period of 10 days or more.

After the 10-day period, who is going to determine whether the man went on strike voluntarily or not? Who is going to have the power to determine that?

Suppose a man goes on strike for 11 days and it may be involuntary, so far as he is concerned; but when he goes back, who is going to determine whether the man went out voluntarily or not? Such a man may be barred forever, so far as appropriations in this bill are concerned, from any other work and cannot go to any other employer and get employment if this amendment is agreed to. I do not think that is what anyone intends to do.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I would like to make the observation that in the event a strike was called and lasted for more than 10 days, at the end of the 10 days every man in the plant, whether it was a coal mine or a factory, working 18,000 men, would be ineligible for reemployment, and they would have to shut down.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct. I was just coming to that. Take the case of a plant where there are 5,000 or 10,000 men on strike, and you must remember that all strikes are not the blame of those who are working. There are unscrupulous employers, as well as unscrupulous labor leaders. There are employers in this country who are trying to exploit labor. We condemn men of both of these types. We cannot indict labor 100 percent for what a small percentage does. We may have to legislate if that small percentage does not behave itself. Suppose we undertook to indict employers 100 percent——

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman said we may have to legislate. Does not the gentleman think we should legislate?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am addressing myself to this amendment.

Let me go a step farther. Ten thousand men go out on a strike and the strike continues for 11 days and then the strike is settled. Under this amendment those 10,000 men cannot go back to work even if the strike is settled between the employer and the representatives of the employees. And, in addition to that, they cannot go back to work with that employer, and if this amendment is adopted they cannot go to work for anybody else who has a contract with the Federal Government which is paid for out of funds appropriated by this bill. Now, is this what you want to do? I am sure the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] does not want to do this, but it is what his amendment does.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman answer this question? If a man goes out on a strike and is out for over 10 days and then is drafted and goes into the Army as a private, is he eligible to receive the pay of a private under this amendment? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCORMACK. I think under this amendment he would not be.

There are unscrupulous businessmen and under this amendment they would have the power to bring about conditions that would result in a strike, they could bring on a strike deliberately, keep it on for 10 days, as a result of which employees would be barred from any employment whatsoever by any firm having a Government contract which is paid out of funds appropriated in this bill.

The approach to a proper solution of this question is not from this angle. I am simply calling to the attention of the House some of the results that will flow if this amendment is adopted, and each and every one of us have got to think out what this amendment will do. The amendment would be fatal to the national-defense program. The amendment would result in outlawing the right of labor to bargain collectively and to use proper methods to attain ends which they are entitled to attain. I do not believe any of us want to go to that extent. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states to Members that there are 45 minutes remaining of debate under the order just made by the Committee. The Chair has a list of names of those who rose. There are 19 or 20 names, which will mean about 2½ minutes each, and without objection the Chair will recognize them in the order in which the names are put down by the time clerk.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, very much is being said about Communists, and about the horrible example of France. If we want to make Communists in this country, this amendment is proceeding in the right direction. If you want to create dissatisfaction and make Communists out of good hard-fisted hard-working American men, you can do it if you pass this amendment.

Let me tell you something about France. Do you recall that when the railroad unions of France called a strike most of the employees were reservists; they had the military organization there and the Government simply called the strikers to the colors; and this call for reservists brought enough of those railroad men to the colors. The men were ordered to man the railroads and put to work as a military organization to break the strike. You recall also that at that time the French franc, the unit of value equivalent to the unit of value here, the dollar, was worth at that time about 20 cents. They gradually devalued that franc until it got to be of value of about 3 cents, and they paid those people wages in 3-cent francs, and made a capital levy on top of that. Some of this talk about France is all nonsense. We are told that we must avoid the example of France. I think that we should recall something that happened at Verdun, when the French soldiers saved the British Empire by keeping the Boches from passing. France is a patriotic country made up of patriotic people. I am opposed to this amendment, and I say to you Members of the House that if you want to make Communists in this country, and create a situation that breeds them, this is the way to do it. The labor legislation of this administration has been constructive, and I call the attention of the members of the committee to what was said here this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas, the eminent chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. SUMNERS]. Our Government has all the legislative machinery required now to settle strikes, adjust wages fairly and equitably which can be used to prevent delays.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to be compelled to differ with my warm friend from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], for whom I entertain great affection and regard, but his amendment is tantamount to an indictment of all labor. I refuse to impugn the masses of organized labor in America, or to stigmatize labor under the charge of communism because we may disagree with the judgment of a few zealous labor leaders. Such an act would be analogous to burning down a hotel of 1,000 rooms because there were discovered a few bedbugs in 2 of the rooms. By passing this amendment we would be announcing the fact that we have no faith in the skilled workers on whom we must depend to carry out the defense program. If we want to create communism, pass such an amendment as this. If you want to thrust into the arms of this misguided handful of alleged Communist leaders the good, tried, and true rank and file of American citizens, the patriotic workers of America, then pass this amendment. [Applause.]

Let us examine France for a moment. I have heard for the past 2 years repeated charges that France fell because of strikes on the part of workers. What happened? In March 1939, the French Government became a dictatorship under Daladier, and that was 6 months before war began. What happened under him? He put down all strikes ruthlessly, and he put

all workers under the direct control of the Government. He lengthened the hours of work and cut the wages, and he reduced the workers to the status of repressed Government slaves. That was the primary reason for the demoralization and fall of France, not because it had strikes, but because they oppressed and distrusted labor. [Applause.]

Has anything been said here about employers in this crisis? We are always being inflicted with blanket assertions that labor is holding up national defense. Don't you recall that for nearly 6 months the Ways and Means Committee of this House was asked by industrialists as to whether or not they would get concessions from the Treasury and don't you recall that a large number demanded their pound of flesh in advance before cooperating on defense contracts? Let us think about those things for a moment.

Munitions manufacturers were vying with each other in the summer and early fall of 1940 in their demands that Uncle Sam grant them all kinds of concessions as a condition precedent to their acceptance of the taxpayers' money to embark upon a program of building equipment for the armed services. But the press of the Nation, with remarkable indulgence and sympathy, refrained from advising the public concerning the "paytriotism" of some of these distinguished conservative gentlemen. These men who want labor to be satisfied with frozen wages and hours do not set a very inspiring example for the workers to emulate. Many of the employing contractors joined hands in insisting that our Government eliminate all requirements for competitive bidding in certain classes of business; they vigorously demanded the repeal of the Vinson-Trammell Act, by the terms of which for many years contractors dealing with the Navy Department were limited in the profits they could secure at the expense of Uncle Sam. In other words, these men who are now in the front ranks of those who would deprive labor of its basic rights, wanted the sky to be the limit when it came to their own wages and hours, their profits, fees, emoluments, honoraria, remunerations, and recompenses, not to overlook such fashionable designations as pecuniary returns and earned increment on invested capital. No matter by what polysyllabic terminology they may wish to designate their "wages," nevertheless it remains an emphatic fact that the industrialist was militantly determined to secure, and did obtain in advance, his profits. Nor did the contractor overlook the little item of taxes. The manufacturers and others who last year flooded into the sumptuous chambers of the Ways and Means Committee made it plain that though they believed in national defense, and wanted to cooperate they, however, must know beforehand that their taxes would be materially reduced. They spoke ponderously and pontifically of amortization. They aggressively pointed out that to underwrite plant extensions and capital improvements they must be guaranteed exemption from depreciation charges for 15 years. The committee capitulated and now we find this crowd of employers enjoying the right to charge off depreciation on their plant additions at the rate of 20 percent a year instead of the former rate of 5 percent a year so that they are in effect given a 15-year tax bonus by this roundabout method. The American people were not frankly told about this favor. They are, for the most part, in the dark. They have been misled by certain business groups into believing that munitions manufacturers and contractors were making great sacrifices for national defense. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The public was carefully not informed about these early demands for concessions and the concessions granted, as between our Government and the business crowd which is now so wrathful in its references to labor unions who have sought to secure a modicum of the profits being made. Most of the increases sought and obtained by labor are offset by the rising cost of living, especially in industrial centers.

I categorically oppose this anomalous amendment. It should be decisively defeated. In effect, this amendment, following the blistering speech of its sponsor, would malign all of labor in America. It is an insult to their patriotism. It questions their loyalty to their country. It asperses their character. By ostracizing skilled labor from defense plants we would sabotage national defense and destroy the very program, and deny the very objectives, sought by all. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised that the debate on this important amendment was limited to 45 minutes in spite of the fact that this amendment means life or death to organized labor. All the efforts and gains of labor during the past 25 years would definitely be destroyed through this amendment.

I realize and appreciate the fact that it is very unpopular to stand on the floor of this House and try to protect labor. I realize that. I saw in this House this afternoon men who were applauding the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and all others who attacked labor. Yet when election time comes around on both sides of this House, Democrats and Republicans, they do not fail to come around and ask "Bill, do you know Green or Hushing? See if you can get me a letter of endorsement, because I have always been a friend of labor."

Yet we have witnessed here on the floor of this House this afternoon a most bitter and violent attack on labor, and they have seen fit to applaud those who attacked the man and woman who find it necessary to work for a living. I am awfully sorry to see them take this attitude, as certainly the road of the workingman has been a rough one all through his life. The only protection the workingman has against the unscrupulous manufacturer or shipowner who wants to browbeat labor and deny them a living wage is through the stoppage of work. Now, this amendment seeks to take that away from them. There is not a man in this House who detests an illegal strike or a Communist leader more than I do.

I will not tolerate them at any time. They have no business being in the ranks of labor, in the universities, in any business organization or operating any business in the United States, because of their damaging influences. However, labor is now being criticized because of the action of four or five leaders who have been termed "Communists." If they are Communists, this is unfortunate, as it affords ammunition to the enemies of organized labor. But I have the utmost confidence in the American citizens who are members of various unions that they will purge their own ranks of these most undesirable persons, the Communists.

This fight to eliminate organized labor or labor unions has been carried on by the enemies of labor for a long time. In fact, it started when labor was finally coming into its own, when the Wagner Labor Relations Act was passed. This act alone, as we all know, has given the workingman more protection than he ever had in the history of this Nation. It is true that a great many manufacturers have violated the Wagner Act, and strikes have taken place because of the tactics used. Then, we heard a great deal about strikes. The first real defense strike took place about 5 months ago, and that was brought about by big business when the manufacturers refused to carry on until they were sure that they were going to be guaranteed a huge profit from this defense program. I am sure that every Member remembers that for 5 months they refused to turn a wheel on any defense work. Evidently that strike was justified according to those who are today trying to chastise labor because of its attitude. In fact, there was only one man in this House who had the intestinal fortitude to get up on this floor and chastise big business because of its inactivity. Where were these men then? They do not hate big business, but they certainly hate labor.

I hope, and my prayer is, that the membership of this House will not be misled by the hysteria displayed here this afternoon, and that you will vote down this amendment, the most vicious and the most disasterly in opposition to labor since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is not an overabundance of time to discuss a vital right, a right that labor has been working for a hundred years to obtain. Now for the first time it is challenged in our constitutional halls. It is threatened, and yet we have the spectacle of Congressmen being limited to 2 minutes.

I am not speaking in support of those who have gone on strike, but I want to speak for labor that has not been on strike. The A. F. of L. has not struck. There has not been a single A. F. of L. strike, yet they are against this deprivation of their rights. Who else is in favor of it? Mr. Knudsen says he opposes any attempt at antistrike legislation. Every man of substance, every man who can keep his head when all about him are losing theirs, is against this. It can do no good but make indigent servants of American labor, filling them with a feel-

ing of resentment and hostility against a government that should have them behind it 100 percent.

My friends, you do yourselves, your country, and your constituents that you serve no good service in supporting this hasty, ill-timed, emotional piece of legislation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my position is somewhat embarrassing, and I would not speak if I did not recognize the seriousness of the situation which might develop from the adoption of this proposed amendment. Now, let us see what we are dealing with. We all know that carrying on this war, whatever it may become, from this time on is Executive responsibility. Keeping these factories open, whatever is done about it, is the responsibility of the President. I believe he has got the power now to do whatever is necessary. If he has not, Congress stands ready to give it to him. Congress would be doing a dangerous thing, in my judgment—and I appreciate I am embarrassing some of my friends—but that does not count in a situation like this. We are doing a dangerous thing to inject a piece of legislation of this sort into this labor problem when Green and Murray and other people are apparently trying to straighten this thing out. You are not proposing to send anybody to jail by this amendment. You are not doing anything to anybody who strikes, except you say that anybody who strikes, from that time on as far as the policy of the Government is as expressed in this bill, cannot be employed on any defense work.

The position of the Congress up to this time is a hundred percent right, I believe. We have provided the men; we have provided the money. We have offered to give any additional legislation, if needed, to keep these factories in operation; keeping them in operation is an executive job, assuming that the executive agencies have all the power they need and they say they have. I do not want to embarrass the President. I do not want to hurt the public interest. I do not want to get the Congress in a jam either. Suppose you do put this amendment through, and there is unfavorable reaction and unseen administrative difficulties develop, then the House bears the burden without an opportunity to do anything about it because it has no administrative or executive powers. I regret exceedingly that I feel compelled by these considerations to oppose the amendment of my good friend from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is my first appearance in the Well of this House. I could not refrain from getting up here this afternoon and speaking against this amendment.

On yesterday afternoon I introduced in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Bricklayers' International Union of the United States of America from the president emeritus, William J. Bowen.

He ended his letter with the following sentence:

Let there be no strikes on defense contracts.

In the same extension I included a record of a conference that was held in the building and construction trades department offices on May 26, 1941, at which the following building and construction trades organizations were represented: The asbestos workers, the bricklayers, electrical workers, engineers, iron workers, laborers, marble polishers, painters, plasterers, plumbers, sheet metal workers, and teamsters. They agreed to expressions of Mr. Sidney Hillman, of the United States Defense Commission, and Mr. Keenan, that they, the organizations I have named, go on record to complete all defense jobs on which contracts had been awarded prior to an increase in wages becoming effective at the old rate of wages. Further, they will use every effort to adjust any disputes that may arise on any building and construction defense project without any stoppage of work.

I put that letter in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I believe in unions. I know that the advice of their great President will be followed as it has been in the past. I never knew what it was to have a dime handed to me. I earned every dime I ever received.

I belong to this great international union; I carry a paid-up card and am proud of it. I was president of the subordinate union in Providence, R. I., for the past 3 years.

I am not a preacher. I have worked as a member of organized labor and realize the benefits we have received and the difficulties we have had to contend with. And I know the contribution organized labor has made to the defense program. If it were not for organized labor these cantonments and naval and air bases would not be built or turned out in the record time they are being turned out today. I have one of the largest bases in the country in my district, at Quonset Point. It was to have been completed in July. It was estimated to take 3 years to complete. They started work in the month of November, a time when construction was being stopped because of weather, and they finished it 2 years ahead of time. This is a sample of cooperation organized labor has given.

If the gentleman from Alabama insists on this amendment, then he will make of his committee a tool to stir up the soil of communism rather than an instrumentality to drive communism out of this country, because it gives to communism an additional weapon. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is to be regretted that Members of this distinguished body, on a very important matter, will come into the Well of the House and say, "I do not care what is behind this strike, I do not care whether it is because of low wages, I do not care whether it is because of long hours; I want to outlaw strikes." I say to you, it is our business to find out. As the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, you could not, under this bill, pay a soldier inducted in the Service from this appropriation for the fiscal year if he had been on strike from some defense industry.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGRANERY. Of course, I yield to the distinguished Whip of the House.

Mr. BOLAND. I am rather disturbed about some features of the amendment. Assuming, for the sake of the argument, that a communistic labor leader, of the type we hear so much about, were to call a strike in one of these airplane factories and the strike ended in 11 days. Under this amendment those men could not be employed on Government work. Just how would we get production going again in that factory? This is a matter that disturbs me.

Mr. MCGRANERY. I thank the distinguished gentleman for pointing out this glaring defect and, in my opinion, under this amendment they would have to go out and employ an entirely new set-up, for no one who had been previously employed in that factory and went on strike could go back or could work in any other defense industry and that is another ridiculous feature of the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that more attention has not been paid to the mechanics of this amendment. The amendment provides that if a worker remains on strike 10 days he is barred from future employment under the appropriations of this act. The employer therefore, if selfishly inclined, may prolong the negotiations for settlement of a strike more than 10 days and by so doing destroy the right of the worker to continue in employment. This would mean that the employees would be compelled to accept any offer of settlement made by the employer within 10 days, or forfeit their jobs. This is not collective bargaining; it is just the reverse; it is the imposition upon the worker of the terms of the employer. It is a species of trickery that I hardly believe the proponents could intend.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOM. No; I cannot yield.

Another suggestion: What is a voluntary participant in a strike? It would take all the lawyers employed in the Bureau of Accounting to determine what a voluntary participant is. To take one example, suppose a union man goes to the ballot box and votes against the strike, but because he is democratically inclined and believes in majority rule he goes out on strike. He thereby forfeits his job if the strike lasts more than 10 days. You therefore penalize the man who throws his weight on the side of conservatism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure everybody appreciates that within 2 minutes one cannot properly treat so fundamental a principle as is done violence by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama. It obviously strikes at not only the recognized

civil right of those who toil but reaches even deeper than that into the very moral foundation of the rights of labor. If I had the time, I would like to have discussed that fundamental moral right in a philosophical manner, but I know of no better way to indicate my opposition to this awkwardly and hastily drawn and un-American amendment striking at the very fundamental right of American citizenship than to direct the attention of the gentleman from Alabama and those like he who subscribe to his philosophy as reflected by this amendment for the adoption of which he has so eloquently appealed to the House today, to the performance of the distinguished young Member from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, who proudly, and justifiably so, in the 2 minutes allotted to him this afternoon, indicated that he is an officer of a labor organization, and typifies, whether the gentleman from Alabama appreciates it or not, the fundamental, sound Americanism that 99.99 percent of those who toil in the great field of labor can come to this or any other Congress and proudly proclaim as its record a sound Americanism that is not even equaled and surely not exceeded by any other group of citizens in this great, free Republic, which labor, God willing, and if permitted, will continue by its constructive contribution to maintain. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have another example here in this attempt to wreck labor of what I have frequently termed as legislative marauding and petty chicken stealing on this hilltop, indulged in by the Appropriations Committee. Sooner or later the House is going to stop this practice once and for all. This committee will voluntarily cease this practice of invading the province specifically reserved to legislative committees having jurisdiction, or the committee will be liquidated by the power of an enraged Membership.

We are going to consider important measures, and proposals of this kind only after they have been passed upon by the proper legislative committee, and not hurriedly in connection with an appropriation bill. My distinguished and able friend from Alabama certainly is capable of bringing forth something a little more wholesome and appealing than this abortive amendment. When we talk about abuses, why not bring in a bill covering a sane solution of the problems affecting strikes and defense production? The House will pass such a bill if it is fair and equitable to both sides.

It is needless for me to tell you how I stand on the Starnes proposal. I am absolutely and uncompromisingly opposed to it, for I hold it is dangerous, un-American and, paradoxically enough, it will wreck the defense program, and I say, moreover, that those of us who are interested in defeating this amendment are numerous enough and are going to force a roll call. You are not going to settle this in the Committee of the Whole, without a record vote. We are going to have a roll call, and we are going to count noses. There will be a separation of the sheep from the goats. We want to record those who are the friends of labor and those who, as its enemies, want to destroy labor.

My argument need not go beyond the expressions thus far made. The amendment cannot be justified and should be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make this one expression. The gentleman referred to me as though I am not in favor of labor because I moved to limit debate on the pending amendment to 50 minutes. Of course, I only made that motion, because I am expected by the leadership to get this bill through today. If the Committee wants to extend the time, it will be perfectly agreeable to me. I am a consistent supporter of labor and I am against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4965, making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. BOEHNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 4158) to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code, and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rept. No. 755), which was read a first and second time, and, with accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss the St. Lawrence seaway here today, because it is my considered opinion that no single Government undertaking would have a more deleterious effect upon the general economy of our country.

Because of recent press and radio comments, most of us have a general understanding of the project. I have studied this subject dating back to a time prior to 1933 when the United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty then pending between the United States and Canada. These studies have convinced me that no single Government construction project would have a more pernicious effect upon the general economy of our country.

The bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, is now before us for consideration. If there was any question in my mind as to the necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway for the defense of this country, I would not make a single statement in opposition to the undertaking or expense. I would be right up in front demanding construction of the seaway. All of us who believe in the democratic way of life are more than willing to assume greater financial burdens in order to prepare this country for any eventuality and we are ever ready to make personal and business sacrifices toward this end. But there is no question regarding the relationship between the St. Lawrence project and national defense. That project would hinder, not aid, the rearming of our country. All of the skills and labor, and all kinds of materials, contracting organizations, and equipment necessary to carry on such a mammoth construction enterprise, are now sorely needed in the expansion of our emergency defense program. Needless to say, the same thing applies to the tremendous sum of money which would be required for the seaway. The diversion of this manpower, materials, and equipment, and huge sums of money from our defense efforts might so hamper the rearming of our country and Canada's aid to the British Empire as to actually jeopardize our national security.

In the International Rapids section alone—and this is in accordance with the latest estimates provided by the Government—some 92,000,000 tons of excavation, over 7,000,000 tons of concrete, and huge quantities of earth fill, steel, equipment, and so forth, would be required. If the work was evenly distributed over a 7-year period, it would require at least 43,000 men both at the site of the work and behind the lines furnishing labor, materials, and equipment to carry on the undertaking. There is no doubt that during the period of peak construction this number would materially exceed 60,000 men. In order to complete the outlet from the Great Lakes to the sea in 7 years as claimed by proponents, the entire

project would have to be carried on at one time. On that basis at least 100,000 men would be required every day for the 7-year period. It does not take much mental calculation to instantly and easily discover that such a diversion of materials and personnel from our own national-defense effort and from Canada's aid to the British Empire would certainly hinder, rather than aid, national defense. Yet the project is persistently misrepresented as one necessary for the defense of this country. What we need now is to keep all of our men and materials concentrated on the absolute necessities of the defense program if we are to succeed in building up our defenses from within. No time, labor, men, or materials should be spared in building up our defenses in all parts of the country. No matter how long it has been under consideration, no matter what the expense or time involved, no project which is not immediately essential to our defense program should be given priority over those defense measures which may prove our very life and continuity as a free Nation during this terrible crisis.

The Assistant Secretary of State, in discussing the St. Lawrence project recently publicly stated:

> There is no shortage of materials required and there is an abundance of the type of labor needed.

I wonder if he knows how difficult it is for contractors to secure good construction superintendents? Does he know that the tremendous shortage existing in mechanical-equipment operators, dragline operators, steam-shovel operators, roller operators, bulldozer operators, compressor and drill men, dynamite men, tractor operators, railroad men, engineers, operators for the huge concrete mixers and elevators, pipefitters, and electricians is occasioned by the present employment of these skilled men in the defense program and by the selective service? Of course, the Assistant Secretary of State must know that these men and equipment and materials are necessary in our national-defense program and at the same time he must know that it would be impossible to carry on the St. Lawrence project without them. It would be just as much a diversion from our defense program to take these men and materials for the construction of the St. Lawrence project as it would to take men and materials out of munitions factories or shipyards or arsenals. These are the men and materials that are building the arsenals, building the powder works, building the shipyards, the aircraft factories in which to actually produce the machines of war.

Right now the United States Government is expending huge sums for bombproofing and defending the Panama Canal. A bill was recently introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House, which is designed to create a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama. Many justify this project on the grounds that it is impossible to adequately and effectively guard the locks of Panama from aerial attack and sabotage. If the bombproofed and well-defended locks at Panama are vulnerable, what about the locks in the St. Lawrence River? The length of the Panama Canal is 40 miles, and it contains only two sets of locks. In the words of N. R. Danielian, the director of the St. Lawrence seaway, conducted by the United States Department of Commerce, "the St. Lawrence seaway will have 67 miles of canals with 17 locks." I say the St. Lawrence seaway would be even closer to the Nazis. We are constantly reminded of the range of modern aircraft. If the huge sums of money spent on defending the Panama Canal are not reliable, what about the proposed St. Lawrence? It could not be made impregnable.

In the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, only a little over 200 miles from the seacoast, a great dam would be located—a dam especially vulnerable—which, if destroyed, would trap all the naval and other deeper traffic vessels lying within or being constructed within the Great Lakes area for the duration of any war. It might even cause grave flood damage to the port of Montreal and other vital areas between there and the dam.

In addition to this, 25 to 30 percent of the industrial output in the State of New York would be dependent upon one dam; that is, when the demand for power in the State increases to the point where it could absorb the entire St. Lawrence output. This has the effect of concentrating a tremendous block of essential industries within one small vulnerable area. From a defense standpoint the dangers inherent in such a plan are apparent. It is false pretense to classify the St. Lawrence project as one strategically designed to aid in the defense of our country. But this is what proponents of the project are claiming.

Nor would the St. Lawrence seaway represent good, long-range national-defense planning. Vital sections of the canal and power works are exceedingly vulnerable, and because of this use of the seaway and power project during war periods would dangerously concentrate defense industry and national production. Each of the eight locks in the Welland Canal and the nine in the St. Lawrence River would be vulnerable to aerial attack and sabotage. If any one of them was destroyed, it would close the Great Lakes to the sea for an indeterminate period of time.

I do not want you to take my word for it that these locks would be highly vulnerable. Let me inform you what the United States Army engineers have to say about the possibility of aerial attack on locks in our Great Lakes system. The Secretary of War has just transmitted to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member, a report recommending that a new lock be constructed in the St. Marys River. Let me quote from this report—and, mind you, the St. Marys River connects Lakes Superior and Huron way in the interior of our country. I quote:

> The specific benefits that are expected to accrue from provision of the improvement considered herein include provision against possible interruption of all deep-draft vessel passages by sabotage or enemy attack from the air by constructing the proposed new lock as far as possible away from the existing Davis and Fourth locks; thus minimizing the possibility of all major locks being put out of commission by a single large-caliber bomb; and by provision for better protection of machinery, gates, and other vital parts of the proposed new lock from sabotage and attack.

No one realizes any more than I do the gravity of the international situation. Doubtless, this country is now confronted by the gravest peril from without in all of its history. Subservient dictator nations have bullied and conquered their smaller neighbors. They have ruthlessly swarmed through other nations whose doors are thrown wide open by treacherous agents from within. These despotic governments have avowed they will rule a new order in Europe and dominate the entire world. I am conscious of the fact that only the armed resistance of the British Empire and its military allies prevents the concentration of the dictator nations' full military and economic forces on the New World. An overwhelming majority of the citizens of this country recognize the perils from without and are anxious and willing to shoulder every burden and do everything within their power to accelerate their national-defense program. But by the same token, I believe an overwhelming majority of the people of this country will not stand for any diddling along the way. We mean business, and we are not going to stand for any sidetracking of our defense program for projects not necessary to our national defense, be they great or small.

As I said before, the legislation presented to us on June 2 states it is "to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes." I believe you readily concur with me that it is not a defense project at all—it is primarily a waterway undertaking, for it is proposed to create a 27-foot navigable channel through the St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Lake Ontario, and through the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, and it is not so simple a matter as my colleague from Minnesota stated here on May 29. In order to build this channel, many natural barriers must be overcome, especially in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River lying between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, and in the Soulanges and Lachine sections of the river lying wholly within Canada. In this stretch of 97 miles, nine huge locks would be required, besides the construction of side canals and great dams, not just "a few miles to be deepened and one or two more locks to be constructed," as claimed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

In the international section, that portion of the river extending from Lake Ontario to the northern boundary of the State of New York, the river drops approximately 92 feet. One-third of this occurs in the first 18 miles and the remaining two-thirds below that point. In order to overcome this difference in elevation, it is necessary to construct great dams and levees in the vicinity of Massena, N. Y. Since this type of construction is required, it is proposed to utilize the difference in elevation created by the dams to generate hydroelectric energy.

Therefore, in reality, the St. Lawrence seaway project combines power with the navigation features.

All competent authorities agree that the power portion of the project could not be completed within 5 years and the navigation portion of the works within 6 to 8 years. That fact alone is enough to strip the guise of national defense from the project—it would be impossible to complete it in time to be of any use in the present world crisis.

Regardless of the word pictures which have been made of this project in an effort to disguise its real purpose; regardless of the stress which has been put upon the need for the additional power which might be produced through the development of the St. Lawrence, when we lift the thin veil of propaganda which has been thrown around this stupid, stupendous scheme, the navigation feature of the project is revealed as its original and prime purpose.

Fancied and fanciful savings have dangled before the eyes of the western farmer and industrialists as a panacea for low prices of the past. But nothing could be further from the fact. As my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] pointed out to you in a very learned addres from the floor last Thursday, the American farmer would suffer rather than gain should the seaway become an actuality. The same would apply to industry and business generally in the Great Lakes area through destruction of their currently protected market.

If there be any advantage to the residents of upper New York State through the installation of the proposed power plants along the St. Lawrence, it is overwhelmingly absorbed in the losses which would accrue to present American transportation, port, and terminal facilities all over this country.

Proponents now, however, sidetrack the seaway feature and eagerly grasp at the national-defense label as the only possible bait through which they could gain enough interest from the American public and votes in the Congress to ratify the agreement now pending between this country and Canada. Let us not be misguided by this misnomer. The claim of national defense is simply too ridiculous to stand inspection.

A famous countryman once said, "The American public enjoy being humbugged"; that was his business, and he saw to it that they were humbugged to their heart's content. But that is not our business as Representatives of the great American public; we are here to see that they are not humbugged by certain misguided private interests and Government bureaus forcing the seaway issue. Our job right now is to refuse to ratify this agreement with Canada, which she is accepting against her will like a child taking a nasty dose. We must—we shall—keep all of our country's resources focused upon production of what we know will be necessary to defend our country. Let us not be lured into daydreaming over the possibilities of a visionary construction scheme.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the majority leader state what the program is for next week, insofar as he knows?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day, and I understand they have a small-loans bill that will be called up, and perhaps some other measures. Then there will be a continuation of the consideration of the pending appropriation bill, and then we will take up the W. P. A. appropriation measure. I do not know what the understanding is with respect to time on the W. P. A. appropriation bill; but whatever the Members agree upon, of course, is always satisfactory to me.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will permit, the understanding we had on the floor was that the consideration of that bill would begin Monday, and, as I understand it, its consideration is expected to be concluded by Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Calendar Wednesday business will be considered next week, and I understand the crop-insurance bill will be called up. Then, if the consideration of the W. P. A. bill is not concluded, of course, that will continue on Thursday, and then the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be taken up. If we are through with these bills by Thursday, I am unable now to state what the program will be for next Friday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I made in general debate today by including certain tables to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include an article taken from the current issue of Coronet entitled "Is America Flying Blind."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Times-Mirror, of Los Angeles, entitled "Is It Necessary," pertaining to oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any previous special order, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 913. An act to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 829. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers;

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss;

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon; and

S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, June 9, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a further public hearing on the subject of royalty payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

598. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Capt. Alex Papana, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 166. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports; with amendment (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 874. An act relating to allowances for rental quarters of certain naval officers stationed in the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1544. An act to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4854. A bill to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4338. A bill to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939; with amendment (Rept. No. 753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4973. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); with amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOEHNE: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4158. A bill to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 347. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue the Navy Expeditionary Medal to certain Army and civilian personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4983 (by departmental request). A bill to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4984. A bill to provide a temporary haven from the dangers or effects of war for European children under the age of 16; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 4985. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Redstone Creek and Dunlap Creek and their tributaries, Fayette County, in the State of Pennsylvania, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4986. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4987. A bill to create an Aeronautics Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4988. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4989. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 4990. A bill to prohibit exportation of petroleum and petroleum products except to countries whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4991. A bill to authorize the payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the selective-service system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4992. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4993. A bill to extend the time for commencing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 4994. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at Bridge Street in Plymouth Borough, between Plymouth and Hanover Townships, in the county of Luzerne, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 4995. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in reference to legislation on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power treaty; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in reference to their 201, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in 1941; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to their Joint Resolution 12; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States opposing the passage of any legislation with regard to the shipping of oil from Venezuela; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the extension of the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that Great Britain be given all aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 4996. A bill granting a pension to Mariam L. Yapp; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Thomas L. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Lt. Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., successor to the Columbia Barge Co., organized January 12, 1933; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5000. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Ferd W. Meile; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:
H. R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Runner; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1308. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the Iowa State Highway Commission, protesting against an increased Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1309. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution adopted at the Michigan Congress of Industrial Organizations' convention, urging continuation of Federal work projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1310. Also, resolution adopted by Michigan Congress of Industrial Organizations' convention, favoring additional appropriations for defense housing projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1311. Also, resolution adopted at Michigan Congress of Industrial Organizations' convention, opposing convoys and participation by United States in European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1312. By Mr. SIKES: Petition of the Florida State Legislature, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10, relating to the preservation of moral conditions in the vicinity of Army and naval camps and plants erected and maintained by the Federal Government in providing for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1313. By Mr. ROLPH: Memorial of the State of California, asking consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 24, relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General with respect to the assertion of any pretended Federal claim to the submerged lands of the State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

1314. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of G. S. Blockhus and 62 other residents of northeastern Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1315. Also, resolution of the Iowa State Highway Commission, alleging that any increase in the Federal tax on gasoline would be a sales tax and not a road-use tax, and opposing the enactment of legislation which would levy such additional tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1316. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of a group of residents of Idaho, including 1,058 signatures, with regard to bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1317. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Mary A. Zumwalt and others of Granger, Wash., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, regulating the opening and closing hours of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1318. Also, petition of Mrs. G. R. Soper and others, of College Place, Wash., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, regulating the opening and closing hours of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1319. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of a number of citizens of the Fourteenth District of Illinois, protesting against House bill 3852 and Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1320. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of Alice B. Day, of Fortine, Mont., and 34 others, urging support of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on military or naval reservations or within a reasonable distance from such reservations, and to prevent prostitution and keeping of bawdy houses within a reasonable distance from such reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1321. Also, petition of the Sarsfield Social Club, of Butte, and the Phil Sheridan Club, of Anaconda, Mont., in joint meeting, addressed to the President of the United States, and signed by M. J. Mullane, M. J. Hartnett, and Patrick McGivern for the Butte Club and Michael Lacey, Thomas Astel, and Michael Shearin for the Anaconda Club, opposing convoys, and petitioning the President to be mindful of his campaign promises that no American boy would ever be sent across the Atlantic to fight on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1322. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of the Butte (Mont.) Teachers' Union, Local No. 332, Mary Mullins, secretary, urging an investigation of labor policies of industries engaged in defense work before curtailing the freedom of labor, an investigation of money being spent by manufacturers on anti-labor propaganda and that results of these investigations be made public; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1941

(Legislative day of Monday, May 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God of all power and might, who hast created us in Thine own image to walk with Thee: We beseech Thee to send us more and more the sense of Thy companionship, that we may learn of Thee, and daily increase in the strength of Thy Holy Spirit. Sustain us with Thy grace that in honesty of purpose and uprightness of life we may serve Thy people, never forgetting that we are answerable to them and to Thee for the decisions we make in the guidance of our Nation.

Save us from vain love of power and motives of personal gain, that we may know the power of thy humility and selfless devotion. Bless us in our labors with an ever broader vision of truth, an ever deeper sense of righteousness, that through us the life of our people may be guided by wise policies, and lifted to loftier ideals, and nobler achievements, and that through our Nation the world may realize the promises Thou hast made to mankind, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 5, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 6, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 578. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to release certain interests in certain land which adjoins the Shark River Coast Guard Station, in Monmouth County, N. J.; and

S. 1311. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, as amended, with respect to the location of the nautical school at the port of San Francisco.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1300) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4816. An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce; and

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 583. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States commissioners;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin;

S. 829. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers;

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle and the Dauterive Hospital;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss;

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon; and

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	McNary
Aiken	Danaher	Maloney
Andrews	Davis	Murdock
Bailey	Downey	Norris
Ball	Ellender	Nye
Bankhead	George	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Gillette	Overton
Bilbo	Glass	Pepper
Bone	Green	Radcliffe
Brewster	Guffey	Rosier
Brooks	Gurney	Shipstead
Brown	Hayden	Smith
Bulow	Herring	Spencer
Bunker	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Johnson, Calif.	Tunnell
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Caraway	Kilgore	Van Nuys
Chandler	La Follette	Wallgren
Chavez	Lucas	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	White
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 5th instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on June 6, 1941, he affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1438) to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CALENDAR-YEAR BASIS FOR REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to place the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency on a calendar-year basis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PLEDGING OF ASSETS OF NATIONAL BANKS TO SECURE DEPOSITS OF FUNDS IN OFFICIAL CUSTODY, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 90), to authorize national banks to pledge assets to secure deposits of funds in official custody of public officers of a State or political subdivision thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

QUINQUENNIAL CENSUS OF INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a quinquennial census of industry and business and for the collection of current statistics by the Bureau of the Census (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

A letter from the secretary of Hawaii (through the Governor of Hawaii and the Interior Department) transmitting certified copy of an act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (requiring ratification by Congress) to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission to contract with the Molokai Water Commission for the furnishing of water for Hawaiian Homes Commission Lessees and to guarantee to the Molokai Water Commission an annual gross income of $150,000 for a period of 10 years, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

CONTROL OF INDUSTRY BY INVESTMENT COMPANIES (H. DOC. NO. 246)

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, chapter I of part 4 of the Commission's over-all report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies, dealing with the control of industry by investment companies and their economic significance (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (3), War, Post Office, Navy, Agriculture, and of Labor, the Social Security Board, and the Work Projects Administration Federal Works Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution to oppose the authorization of a flood-control project at Sugar Hill

"Whereas a new flood-control bill is being considered in the United States Congress which would substitute authorization of a dam at Sugar Hill, in the town of Lisbon, N. H., for one previously authorized at Bethlehem Junction; and

"Whereas this general court gave its consent to the Bethlehem Junction project by an act adopted May 31, 1939, known as chapter 149, Laws of 1939; and

"Whereas citizens of Lisbon, Littleton, and other Ammonoosuc Valley towns have voted unanimously at a mass protest meeting their opposition to the Sugar Hill Dam project and have requested that this general court go on record in opposition to any Federal authorization for building a flood-control dam at said Sugar Hill, but reaffirming approval of the Bethlehem Junction Dam site as already authorized; and

"Whereas the new proposed project would entail considerable loss to the towns of Lisbon and Littleton and disrupt the economic relations between the towns in said area; and

"Whereas no protest has been voiced by the citizens of Bethlehem to the Bethlehem Junction project already approved by Federal authorities and consented to by this State: Now, therefore,

"*The house of representatives in general court convened (the senate concurring) hereby resolves*, That this general court records its opposition to Federal authorization for building a flood-control dam at Sugar Hill in the town of Lisbon and directs the Governor of the State to forward forthwith copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, the President of the Senate of said body, the chairman of the congressional Flood Control Committee, and to each of the Representatives and Senators of this State in the United States Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 94

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell

"Whereas the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell enlisted in 1898, at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, as a private in the First Wisconsin Infantry and saw active service in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; then served on the Mexican border in 1912; and was repeatedly decorated during the World War by Congress and by several of our Allies for repeated gallantry and giving exceptional example to his fellow soldiers; and

"Whereas he rose from the ranks during 28 years of spectacular achievement, having been the first American officer to fly over the trenches during the World War, the first American to scout troop movements by plane, commanded the largest concentration of airplanes in the then history of aviation; and

"Whereas he continued to pioneer aviation progress by proving the feasibility of transcontinental flight, as a result of which our air-mail system was instituted; and

"Whereas from 1920 to 1924 he served as Assistant to the Chief of the Army Air Service, in charge of operations and technical development, in which position he contributed invaluably to the development of military and civil aeronautics; and

"Whereas he strove to impress his superior officers with the shortcomings and deficiencies in the Army and Navy flying units, only to

be rebuffed and demoted; and thereafter the crash of the dirigible *Shenandoah* and failure of Navy's flight by plane to Hawaii prompted him to charge incompetency on the part of his superiors and criminal neglect of national defense; and

"Whereas, although a separate inquiry substantiated the truth of his accusations, he was tried by a court martial for violating the ninety-sixth article of war, found guilty of a breach of discipline, and suspended from the service for 5 years without pay, but still subject to call; and

"Whereas the practical effect of this decision was that the pride and dignity of military officials must be protected at all costs, even at the risk of jeopardizing the effectiveness of national defense; and

"Whereas General Mitchell's fearless adherence to principle resulted in his sacrificing his personal ambitions in an effort to arouse the Nation to a knowledge of its military helplessness; and

"Whereas developments arising from the present European conflict demonstrate incontrovertibly that General Mitchell was possessed of prescience which placed him many years ahead of his colleagues; and

"Whereas the stigma upon his memory should be officially eradicated: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such official action as may be necessary to clear the name of this soldier and patriot, to the end that he who stood his ground, though persecuted, may be completely and forever cleared; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the National Pension League, signed by Dudley M. Barr, secretary, of Los Angeles, Calif., enclosing a draft of proposed legislation to provide a pension for all aged people of the United States of America who have passed their sixtieth birthday, to be effective for so long as they may live, and praying for the enactment of such legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress in enacting legislation affecting the Territory of Hawaii to recognize the right of the Territory to equality of treatment with the States of the Union; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the College Point (N. Y.) Community Council, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change or amend the Sugar Act of 1937; to the table.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Helen Virginia Wright, of Canton, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. STEWART:

A petition of sundry citizens of Belvidere and Winchester, Tenn., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Memorials of sundry citizens of Eldorado, Hillsboro, Ramona, Durham, and Tampa, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Valley Center and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the use of American ships for convoy purposes, and also against the sending of American soldiers to fight on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Ellinwood and Tonganoxie, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

DEVALUATION OF THE DOLLAR—RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter embodying a short but important resolution of the New Jersey Republican State Committee, transmitted to me by Hon. Claton E. Freeman, chairman, requesting that Congress should not on June 30 renew the power previously given to the President to devalue the dollar further.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN
STATE COMMITTEE,
May 29, 1941.

Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARBOUR: The members of the New Jersey Republican State Committee, meeting in Trenton on Tuesday, May 27, expressed themselves as deeply concerned over two of the important problems confronting the national administration.

The committee went on record as requesting that Congress should not, on June 30, renew the power previously given to the President to devalue the dollar further.

The committee also felt that Congress should make every effort, while supporting adequately national defense, to reduce appropriations for civilian purposes.

Therefore the committee adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas this Nation is now engaged in an all-out effort to adequately prepare our national defense against the continued inroads and arms expansion of aggressor nations; and

"Whereas such preparation involves expenditure of vast sums of money, time, and materials, all of which must be paid for by drastic taxation; and

"Whereas the present administration at Washington has promised reduction in nondefense expenditures, but thus far there have been no indications such promises will be kept, but, on the contrary, many proposals have been put forth as defense measures which have no relation to defense; and

"Whereas such proposals as the nationalization of education at an additional cost of upward of $300,000,000, thereby denying to the States the right to reduce their own expenditures in this field, if they so desire, abridgment of the rights of the States to regulate their own educational system, the proposed construction of the St. Lawrence waterway project at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, further socialization of industry typify these nondefense activities; and

"Whereas this spending as usual on such grandiose projects will mean the day of reckoning will bring an economic depression far more perilous than the one through which we have just passed: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the New Jersey Republican State Committee urges the Republican Members of Congress to firmly oppose the granting of funds for political luxuries, experiments in State socialism, and a top-heavy bureaucracy in this time of national emergency."

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON E. FREEMAN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 799. A bill to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval property, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 390).

By Mr. WALLGREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1110. A bill to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony; with an amendment (Rept. No. 391).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1568. A bill for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band; without amendment (Rept. No. 392).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1524. A bill to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 393);

H. R. 2279. A bill to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act, approved June 10, 1922, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 412);

S. 173. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of extending to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone the permission to organize military units not a part of the National Guard which was granted to the States by the amendment made to such section by the act of October 21, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 405); and

S. 1397. A bill to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 394).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Jack Y. Upham; without amendment (Rept. No. 395);

H. R. 2742. A bill for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt; without amendment (Rept. No. 396);

H. R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Roy Gard; without amendment (Rept. No. 397); and

H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept No. 398).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 4545. A bill to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; with amendments (Rept. No. 408).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 3810. A bill for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; without amendment (Rept. No. 410).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Homer J. Swope and John W. White; with amendments (Rept. No. 399); and

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Otis Thompson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 400).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.; without amendment (Rept. No. 402);

H. R. 2861. A bill for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 403); and

H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of John Klasek; without amendment (Rept. No. 404).

By Mr. BROWN (for Mr. SCHWARTZ), from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Vernon Atkison; without amendment (Rept. No. 401).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 334. A bill for the relief of James C. Dyson; with amendments (Rept. No. 407); and

H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse; without amendment (Rept. No. 406).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1512. A bill to amend the Alien Registration Act, 1940, by making it a criminal offense to reproduce alien registration receipt cards; with amendments (Rept. No. 409).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On June 5, 1941:

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry.

On June 6, 1941:

S 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1606. A bill to require the publication of certain information and the preservation of certain records in connection with polls of public opinion; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1607. An act to provide for the monthly distribution to warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of 15 penalty-type envelopes to be used for the free transmission in the mail of their personal correspondence; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of the Neal Storage Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1609. A bill for the relief of Capt. Alex Papana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1610. A bill for the relief of Ethel F. O'Connor; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1611. A bill for the relief of Lester B. McAllister, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1612. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution for the relief of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution declaring February 12 a legal public holiday to be known as Abraham Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4816. An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE HIGHWAY FACILITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1580) to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

On motion of Mr. MALONEY, the bill (S. 756) for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGES—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in February of this year I introduced a bill which bears the number S. 812, to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridges at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg. I desire to make a modification of the bill, and therefore I request unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, to which the bill was referred, be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be recalled, so that I may introduce another bill on the same subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The committee will be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

THE PRICE OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BAILEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, the Price of Peace, delivered by Senator BAILEY at the commencement exercises at Wake Forest College on June 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY ON THE NATIONAY EMERGENCY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the national emergency, delivered by Senator MURRAY at Butte, Mont., on June 4, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE ON AGRICULTURAL MIGRATION

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of agricultural migration, delivered by him before the Committee on Interstate Migration at the National Conference of Social Work, held at Atlantic City, N. J., on June 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION—ADDRESS BY DR. WILL W. ALEXANDER

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of industrial migration prepared by Dr. Will W. Alexander, of the Office of Production Management, and read in his absence before the National Conference of Social Work held at Atlantic City, N. J., on June 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLATFORM ON INTERSTATE MIGRATION, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform on interstate migration prepared by the Special Committee on Interstate Migration of the National Conference of Social Work for discussion at meetings sponsored by the committee at Atlantic City, June 2 and 3, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ROGER B. McWHORTER AT MIDWEST POWER CONFERENCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Roger B. McWhorter, chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission, at the Midwest Power Conference held at Chicago, Ill., on April 9 and 10, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITION OF NATIONAL GUARDSMEN AND TRAINEES IN LOUISIANA

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Alexandria, La., Daily Town Talk, with reference to the condition of National Guardsmen and trainees quartered in Louisiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEIZURE OF PLANTS IN CASE OF STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 9, 1941, under the heading "The wrong solution," relative to the proposal to seize plants producing defense articles when a strike occurs, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1300) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out the word "and" and insert "any."

Mr. BILBO. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4693, to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. I think we discussed taking up the bill last week. Did we agree upon today or tomorrow for taking it up? What date did we agree upon?

Mr. BANKHEAD. On last Thursday, as I recall, it was agreed to let the bill go over until today.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I wanted to check on. I have forgotten whether it was agreed that the bill should be taken up on Monday or Tuesday. I know I conferred with the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He did not want it to come up Thursday, as he was working on an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to taking up the bill today.

Mr. McNARY. It was Thursday last when the matter came up.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On Thursday last the Senator from Oregon suggested that the bill go over.

Mr. McNARY. It is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio and agreeable to me that the bill be considered, and I shall make no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Banking and Currency Committee with amendments.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I can explain to the Senate very briefly the amendments which are contained in the pending bill. They relate to the Federal Housing Administration. I will explain the part of the bill which relates to the ordinary and regular F. H. A. operation.

There is an amendment which was proposed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is the chairman of the subcommittee, relating to the farm-tenancy problem; and when the time comes the Senator from Alabama will explain that part of the bill as reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The first amendment raises the salary of the Administrator from $10,000 to $12,000 per year.

The second amendment extends the operations of title I of the act for 2 years, to July 1, 1943, and increases the amount of money in the insurance fund from $100,000,000 to $165,000,000. It changes very slightly the type of houses that may be insured under title I of the Federal Housing Act, as follows:

Under the present law new structures may be insured if they do not cost in excess of $2,500. This is increased to $3,000. Under the amendment which the committee proposes existing structures for a single family may be insured up to $2,500, as is the case under the present law; but since a great many old houses may be required because of the present emergency and the necessity for housing, it was decided to permit the insurance of loans for the rebuilding of houses and the repairing of houses and the alteration of houses up to $5,000 in value, provided they accommodate more than one family.

The other amendments to the portion of the bill which relates to the ordinary activities of the F. H. A. are mainly for the purpose of simplifying the methods by which the Administrator may handle property when foreclosure takes place. There is no change whatsoever in policy.

I may say briefly that the Federal Housing Administration, during the years of its operation from 1934 down to the present time, has written insurance to the amount of $4,345,000,000; 3,150,000 loans have been insured. Upon loans under title I there has been some loss to the Government. I think it was due to the fact that we provided no insurance premium until July 1, 1939. Since 1939, when we provided for the collection of one-half of 1 percent insurance premium, the title I loans—that is, those made under that division of the Federal housing insurance—have been self-supporting.

I think it was agreed before the subcommittee that the operations have been highly successful and have greatly aided housing in the United States.

In title II the principal change is to increase the amount which may be insured from $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. The additional $1,000,000,000 is placed under control of the President of the United States and may not be used by the Housing Administration unless the President finds that it is necessary. That is the same as the present law, except that the original outside amount which might be insured was $3,000,000,000, and authority was given to the President to raise it to $4,000,000,000. The $4,000,000,000 has about been used up, and authority is granted to increase the amount to $5,000,000,000.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will explain the portion of the amendments which relates to the farm-tenancy program. He has much greater familiarity with it than have I, but I shall be very glad now to answer any questions Senators may desire to ask relative to the portion of the bill which I have in charge.

I ask that the amendments relative to the first portion of the bill, down to the portion in italics, be passed upon by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after "July 1", to strike out "1944" and insert "1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 2, line 5, after the word "exceeds", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500 (or in the case of the alteration, repair, or improvement of an existing dwelling designed or to be designed for more than one family, exceeds $5,000)"; in line 9, after "$3,000", to strike out "(2) striking out 'three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five', and (3)" and inserting "and (2)"; and in line 15, after the word "prescribed", to insert "but in no event for an additional amount or term in excess of the maximum provided for in this subsection", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "exceeds $2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500 (or in the case of the alteration, repair, or improvement of an existing dwelling designed or to be designed for more than one family, exceeds $5,000), or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000;", and (2) striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting ": *Provided*, That any obligation with respect to which insurance is granted under this section on or after July 1, 1939, may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe, but in no event for an additional amount or term in excess of the maximum provided for in this subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 2, line 23, after "(2)", to strike out "Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power", and insert "The Administrator is authorized and empowered"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "discretion", to insert "and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable"; in line 6, after the words "conveyed to", to insert "or otherwise acquired by"; and on page 4, line 4, after the word "any", to strike out "officer, agent, or employee" and insert "officer or agent", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) inserting after the letter "(c)" the figure "(1)", (2) inserting before the word "property" the word "personal", and (3) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Administrator is authorized and empowered (a) to deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, or sell for cash or credit, in his discretion, and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Administrator shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this title and (b) to pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against mortgagors assigned by mortgagees to the Administrator in connection with such real property by way of deficiency or otherwise: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of such property if the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Administrator or by any Assistant Administrator appointed by him without the execution of any express delegation of power

or power of attorney: *Provided*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney, in his discretion, to any officer or agent he may appoint."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 5, line 19, after the words "July 1", to strike out "1944" and insert "1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, on page 5, line 22, after the words "July 1", to strike out "1944" and insert "1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Alabama undertakes to explain the farm-tenant amendment, I desire to ask the Senator from Michigan if he will explain a little further the changes in section 3, which, as I undertand, increases the limitation from $2,500 to $5,000, and apparently extends the power of the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans for the improvement of existing structures.

Mr. BROWN. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that, under existing law, the insurance of loans on both new houses—which, of course, are very small, $2,500 houses—and the alteration of existing houses is limited in amount to $2,500. On new houses, because of the general increase in building costs, we raised that limit to $3,000. As to existing houses which will accommodate but one family, we leave the figure at $2,500; but the Administrator felt that because there was considerable demand, as evidenced by the applications which came to him, for the alteration and improvement of fairly large-sized houses in cities where the necessities because of the defense program are great, it was desirable to permit the insurance of loans up to $5,000 on houses that would accommodate more than one family. That is the change which is herein provided. The idea is that it will apply to two- and three-family flats.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the response of the Senator. Now may I ask whether the amendments make any change at all with respect to the application of this law to homes in agricultural areas outside the urban centers?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is familiar with the fact that under Federal housing—and I am not talking now about the Bankhead amendment——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not.

Mr. BROWN. But under Federal housing last year, by an amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], we extended Federal housing loans to farm homes. The provision to which I refer reads as follows:

(d) The Administrator is authorized to insure, pursuant to the provisions of this section, any mortgage which (A) covers a farm upon which a farm house or other farm buildings are to be constructed or repaired, and (B) otherwise would be eligible for insurance under the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the construction and repairs to be undertaken on such farm shall involve the expenditure for materials and labor of an amount not less than 15 percent of the total principal obligation of said mortgage.

This section refers to title II, which covers houses costing from $5,400 to $16,000.

Under the amendment which the senior Senator from Alabama will explain, we go quite fully into the farm-tenancy problem. That is covered by the amendment. Further than what I have stated, there is nothing under Federal Housing that is of particular benefit to farmers living in suburban sections. That is the reason for the Bankhead amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the amendment known as title II has, on a former occasion, been passed by the Senate as an independent bill. The amendment covers in substance the bill which was sponsored originally by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and 51 other Senators, who joined him originally in the introduction of the bill on March 16, 1939. So that the RECORD may really show the sponsors of the bill, although their names do not appear on the bill now before us, I send to the desk and ask to have the clerk read the names of the Senators who joined in the introduction of the bill originally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lee (for himself, Mr. Bilbo, Mr. Chavez, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Thomas of Utah, Mr. Logan, Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. Truman, Mr. Minton, Mr. Guffey, Mrs. Caraway, Mr. Russell, Mr. McKellar, Mr Bankhead, Mr Capper, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Miller, Mr Hill, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Andrews, Mr. La Follette, Mr. Lundeen, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hatch, Mr. George, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Overton, Mr. Mead, Mr. Downey, Mr Burke, Mr. Neely, Mr. Murray, Mr. Gillette, Mr. Brown, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Connally, Mr. Bulow, Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Clark of Idaho, Mr. Bone, Mr. McCarran, Mr. O'Mahoney, Mr. Wagner, Mr. Nye, Mr. Schwellenbach, Mr Wiley, Mr. Sheppard, Mr. Herring, and Mr. Wheeler)

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, during the year 1939 the bill was fully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. It was referred to a subcommittee of seven members; hearings were had; a favorable report was made to the full committee; the full committee considered the bill and reported it to the Senate. It came up for action in the Senate, not on the Consent Calendar, but it was brought up in the Senate on motion, and after some discussion it was passed and went to the House. I have thought it well to go into the history of the legislation for the information of those who were not here at the time or who have not kept in close touch with it.

The Committee on Agriculture in the House, having jurisdiction, considered the bill and reported it to the House, in exactly what form I do not recall, and I would not undertake to say that it was in the literal language of the bill now before us, but full hearings were held on the bill and it was reported to the House with the fundamentals of the measure we are now considering contained in it. While on the calendar in the House the bill never reached the stage of being put upon passage. Of course, we all know that at that time important emergency legislation became necessary. At any rate, the bill was not brought up for action, and when the session ended, of course, the bill died.

At the beginning of the present session the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] reintroduced the bill, and the names of one or two of us were put on it, but after so many Senators had joined in introducing the bill originally, and after it had had the degree of consideration in the Senate I have stated and received the approval of the Senate, it was not thought necessary to have it sponsored by all those who had originally been its sponsors.

I shall now state why the amendment is presented at this session. The Federal Housing Administration will be ended by law on the 1st of July, less than 30 days hence, unless the power of that organization is extended. The House has passed the original of the measure now before us, extending the life of the Federal Housing Administration and increasing its authorized power to insure mortgages on urban homes, increasing the amount from $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000.

I think most of us are in accord with that legislation. I think most of us feel that it has been tremendously helpful in aiding many people in the towns and the cities to establish homes of their own and to secure financing for the needed repair of their homes. It is based upon the principle, as we all know, of the insurance by the Government of mortgages given upon town homes to provide funds for acquisition or repair. In addition to that, at the inception of the program, a large part of the fund originally authorized was used not for the purpose of building homes but to refinance mortgages which then existed upon town homes which were being foreclosed as a result of the depression and reduction in the earning power of the owners of the homes.

As I have stated, the bill passed the House, and it was referred in the Senate to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction of all legislation relating to the Federal Housing Administration.

In view of the fact that the farm-tenancy program has received the approval of this body since 1934, it was felt, at least by some of us, that we were justified in placing the Lee bill, which had already passed the Senate, on the pending measure, so as to assure a vote in the House upon the farm tenancy section of the bill.

This program is built upon the principle of the Federal Housing Administration. Nearly all of us supported the legislation back of that. There have been no city blocs, there have been no farm blocs, there have been no blocs at all involved in this legislation. The legislation has been helpful; it has been humane; it has been economic; it has not been wasteful and has not involved the Government in the expenditure of large amounts which may be lost. We all approve it, and, probably without opposition, regardless of political lines, regardless of other lines of thought, I am sure we will vote as the House has voted, to continue the mortgage insurance of homes in the towns to the extent of another billion dollars.

We propose here in a very simple way, in a very modest way, to add to the appropriations which have been made in relatively small amounts for farm tenancy home acquisition only $350,000,000, to be used over a period of 3 years in insuring mortgages given for farm-tenant purchases upon the same principle and under the same rules on which we have been conducting the program for the acquisition of homes by urban residents.

The amount stated received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and of the President when a similar bill was previously under consideration. So we are not seeking legislation which has not been fully considered by various branches of the Government, including the White House.

This measure has received the approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture, and now has received the approval of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. The Committee on Banking and Currency is composed of able and thoughtful men. In my judgment, it is one of the strong committees of the Senate. It considered this amendment for a period of 1 full day. Discussion of the details of the amendment was had in the full committee, after the subcommittee had held hearings on it, had made some amendments to it, and made its report to the full committee. The full committee, as I said, stayed in session all day, and the able men on that committee considered the matter fully. On it are my friends the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who have very few farm-tenant constituents. These Senators, with manifestations of sympathy for the farm tenancy in this country, went over the amendment section by section, word by word; and, after the adoption of certain amendments to it, which brought it squarely and fully in line with the insurance program contained in the Federal Housing Administration Act, they agreed to report it.

In view of the consideration which has been given the subject for a number of years here, and the thorough consideration given the subject recently by these committees, as well as the previous approval of the proposal by an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate, I feel that it is unnecessary to go into a detailed discussion of the provisions of the amendment. It has been fully considered by your committee. Unless Senators desire to ask me some questions, I am willing that the matter be submitted to a vote.

First, I shall offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated. I have submitted it to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. They have no objection to the amendment. They were active members of the committee in the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment, on page 25, after line 3, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 22. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title XII, sec. 1020 (d)), is amended by inserting after the word "bonds", where said word first appears, the following: "and to purchase and make loans upon mortgages insured under title I-A of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to have printed as part of my remarks a statement containing an explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 4693 (AS REPORTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON JUNE 5, 1941, BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY) AND EXPLANATION THEREOF

Amend H. R. 4693, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency, by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 22. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 12, sec. 1020 (d)), is amended by inserting after the word 'bonds', where said word first appears, the following: 'and to purchase and make loans upon mortgages insured under title I A of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'"

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The effect of this amendment would be to permit the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to purchase and sell mortgages insured under title I A of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in the same manner as the Corporation is now authorized to purchase consolidated farm-loan bonds of the Federal land banks. Section 4 (b) as it now stands, with the proposed amendment in italic, is as follows:

"The Corporation is further authorized to purchase from time to time for cash such consolidated farm-loan bonds *and to purchase and make loans upon mortgages insured under title I A of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act*, at such prices and upon such terms as may be approved by the board of directors of the Corporation * * *."

The purpose of this amendment is to provide a secondary market for insured mortgages similar to the secondary market which is provided for mortgages insured under the National Housing Act through the Federal National Mortgage Association established under the provisions of title III of the National housing act. The proposed amendment, therefore, will not represent any innovation. To the contrary, it merely incorporates one of the features found desirable and useful in the field of urban housing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

The organization of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and its usefulness in providing a secondary market for mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administrator, is described on pages 34 to 36 of the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administrator, dated April 27, 1939, and on pages 24 and 25 of the Sixth Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administrator, dated May 20, 1940. The following is a summary of the activities of the Association:

The Association was incorporated on February 4, 1938, under the provisions of title III of the National Housing Act. The Association is owned and operated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which furnished its paid-in capital and surplus. The Association, in other words, is a Government corporation similar to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The Association has an authorized capitalization of $50,000,000 and is empowered to acquire mortgage loans to an amount not exceeding 20 times such paid-in capital or a total of $1,000,000,000 It is authorized to purchase insured mortgages and also to make advance firm commitments to purchase pending mortgages, subject to their consummation and insurance by the Federal Housing Administration.

As stated on page 36 of the Fifth Annual Report, this Association has been extremely useful. Through its purchase of mortgages, "a dependable secondary market for insured mortgages has been maintained. The existence of this market has "added to the desirable qualities of insured mortgages as an investment and played an essential part in assuring the general availability of insured mortgages under the amended legislation. This was particularly important in a number of States where capital for home mortgage lending purposes is relatively scarce."

The proposed amendment to the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is designed to provide a similar secondary market for insured farm mortgages as is provided through the Federal National Mortgage Association in the field of urban insured mortgages particularly in those States where capital for farm mortgage lending purposes is relatively scarce, or where State legislation has not yet been enacted authorizing State banks to invest in mortgages insured under title I (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

The original bill, S. 1836, as it passed the Senate, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to issue debentures, instead of insuring mortgages in order to take care of situations where the mortgage market would not absorb the insured mortgages. This debenture provision has been eliminated by the committee. The present amendment does not revive that debenture provision but instead, attempts to meet the problem in the same manner as it is met under the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4693) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said: I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to House bill 4693, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, out of order, from the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, Senate bill 1524 to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of

1940, which has just been favorably reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, is, of course, not on the printed calendar. I ask unanimous consent, however, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the bill is not on the calendar, may it be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not have a copy of the bill. I should like to have the bill read from the desk for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may upon finding that it is in the national interest terminate, by age group, the deferment of any or all of the men so deferred."

Mr. McNARY. This bill was ordered to be reported favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs last Friday. In the absence of an agreement to take up the bill, without regard to the rule which requires that it be received and lie over for a day, the bill is now presented, and a request is made for immediate consideration. I understand that the Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill unanimously. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it is my understanding that it was reported unanimously with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; also coupled with amendments, which met with some stern opposition. The bill, as amended, also might be considered in connection with the bills offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. I am curious to know if, in connection with the bill as amended, it is proposed to consider the bills which have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, to which I have just made reference.

Mr. BYRNES. My information is that if the bill is taken up for consideration, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will offer as an amendment thereto the bill which he introduced on last Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. Has that bill, which would be offered as an amendment, been printed?

Mr. BYRNES. It was printed in the RECORD in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Texas, and I am certain it has been printed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. May I send to the desk for reading the bill as it was agreed to and reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I think that would be well. I have a copy of it and had intended at the conclusion of the inquiries which are being made in respect to the matter to ask that that be done.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to have it done now?

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the bill be read, including the amendments which were adopted by a majority of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the understanding of the Chair that the bill has just been reported from the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. The bill has now been reported from the committee but is not on the calendar. It is not in order to take it up for consideration now, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then, Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that, of course, it would have to be done by unanimous consent. Before the Senator from Wisconsin makes his objection, or before I make an objection, I should like to have the RECORD disclose the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "deferment", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "by age group", and on line 10, after the words "United States", to strike out "of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may upon finding that it is in the national interest terminate, by age group, the deferment of any or all of the men so deferred", and insert: "The men who (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) attain their twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth prior to their induction for such training and service."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read as it would appear with my amendment, so that there may be a complete understanding of the entire matter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what I wanted to do was to have the bill read as reported from the committee. It has been read. It is not on the calendar, and unanimous consent is required to consider it.

Following the reading of the bill, I should like to have read the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota. I understand also that an amendment is to be offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], which I should also like to have read, in order to have a complete record of the legislative proposal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, there is no opposition to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. In fact, the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota has proposed is really a committee amendment. The amendment simply carries out exactly what General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service Administration, said he would do if Congress should pass the bill. So I understand there is no opposition to the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. McNARY. I will yield in a moment.

In order to complete the record of the proposed legislation, let me say that I am advised by the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] that he intends to offer an amendment to the bill, in addition to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if I may make a brief statement, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] intends to offer an amendment to attain the same objective. In view of that fact the Senator from South Carolina will not offer an amendment. I send to the desk the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Texas and ask that it be read.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before that is done, I should like to make a statement. I interposed objection to the consideration of the bill because I am opposed to Congress giving blanket authority, as provided in the bill, a copy of which I have before me, to the President of the United States, at his own discretion, to fix the age limits of those who will be subjected to compulsory military service. I think Congress should retain that authority. Unless the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota accomplishes that purpose, I shall continue to object to consideration of the bill. From the reading of the amendments by the clerk, indicating various amendments scattered through the bill, I could not understand the real purport of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the bill, as reported by the committee, including my amendment, be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill as reported from the committee, including the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from

training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of the men who (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) attain the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth prior to their induction for such training and service."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following:

That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided (1) to any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith, and (2) to any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials. Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. To the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] it is proposed to add the following:

Whereas the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and

Whereas numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States; and

Whereas such strikes are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it would appear from the reading of the several amendments that the legislative situation is becoming very complex. I think the amendments should be printed and lie on the table until tomorrow. I therefore object to consideration of the bill today, so that the matter may go over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard to the present consideration of the bill. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], so that the RECORD may show, whether the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] was acted upon and agreed to by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota was acted upon favorably by the committee, and those who opposed the motion to approve it withdrew their objection. So, as a matter of fact, I think it has the unanimous support of the entire committee.

In that connection, let me say that the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the perfecting amendment to be offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were not before the Military Affairs Committee at any time.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The last point is what I particularly sought to establish.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the committee may not have considered the amendment of the Senator from Texas, but certainly it was before the committee.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement from the War Department as to the strikes existing and threatened on June 7 in defense industries, and likewise a statement from the Navy Department as to the number of strikes existing on June 7 in defense industries having Navy contracts. I further ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Backstop Needed in Mediation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statements and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters referred to are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
LABOR SECTION,
June 7, 1941.

Subject: Strikes and labor disputes affecting War Department procurement.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of War.

Friday, June 6, 1941: Number of strikes, 30.

New strikes reported June 6, 1941: Antrim Iron Co., Mancelona, Mich.; Gager Lime Co., Sherwood, Tenn.; Ethyl Gas Plant, Baton Rouge, La.; Karp Metal Products, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Cases where men have returned to work: Metals Disintegrating Co. (exact date of return not reported).

Cases to be omitted: Hercules Powder Co., Radford, Va. (construction is progressing satisfactorily).

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.:

Strike: March 19, 1941, of 1,000 mine, mill, and smelter workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 23, 1941. National Defense Mediation Board relinquished jurisdiction June 6, 1941.

Interest: Borax and boric acid for Kimball Glass Co. and Corning Glass Works. Medical Corps contracts far behind schedule.

Antrim Iron Co., Mancelona, Mich.:

Strike: May 29, 1941 of 450 United Mine Workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Alleged discriminatory discharge of one employee.

Status: Commissioner is conducting conferences.

Interest: Supplies charcoal, pig iron, and methanol for various defense projects.

Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 950 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Ward and Office Production Management labor consultant on case. Joint conference held June 5, 1941.

Interest: Sheet steel for A. M. C. Steel Co. for Quartermaster Corps cabinets. Hot-rolled steel for Motor Generator Co. for ordnance contracts. Motor Generator will have to cut production by one-half on July 15, 1941, if steel is not shipped from Apollo on June 30, 1941.

Black Hosiery Mills, York, Pa.:

Strike: April 11, 1941, of 100 C. I. O. workers.

Issues: Wage increases and representation.

Status: National Labor Relations Board election to be held prior to June 21, 1941.

Interest: Socks for Quartermaster Corps. Some are being shipped without hindrance.

Clay City Products Co., Uhrichsville, Ohio:

Strike: May 31, 1941, of unknown number of brick and clay workers.

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: Commissioner Fuller assigned June 3, 1941. Meetings being held.

Interest: Clay pipes for use at island air bases.

Cleveland Brass Co., Cleveland, Ohio:

Strike: Of 150 diecasters (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Harris on case. Meetings being arranged.

Interest: Indirect source of supply for Ordnance.

Crescent Tool Co., Jamestown, N. Y.:

Strike: May 12, 1941, of 500 machinists (A. F. of L.).

Issue: Alleged discriminatory discharge of one union employee.

Status: Commissioner Goldsmith on case. Deadlock in negotiations.

Interest: Pliers and wrenches for Air Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Signal Corps.

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.

Strike: May 7, 1941, of 1,000 U. S. W. (C. I. O.) in main plant. Spring plant struck June 2, 1941.

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner and Office of Production Management labor consultant on case. National Labor Relations Board election being arranged.

Interest: Steel screens for Lake City ordnance plant—urgently needed. Also supplies machine-tool plants at Springfield and Windsor in Vermont and Fort Ethan Allen and Plattsburg Barracks.

Ethyl Gas Plant, Baton Rouge, La.:

Strike: Of unascertained number of building trades.

Issue: Closed shop.

Status: Report of strike just received. Strike in construction of plant addition.

Interest: Plant owned by Standard Oil. One of the largest aviation-gasoline plants in the country.

Fuld & Hatch Knitting Co., Cohoes, N. Y.:

Strike: June 2, 1941, of 240 U. T. W. A. (A. F. of L.) in knitting and spinning departments.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Commissioner holding meetings.

Interest: Undershirts and drawers for Quartermaster Corps.

Gager Lime Manufacturing Co., Sherwood, Tenn.:

Strike: June 5, 1941, of 185 cement, lime, and gypsum workers (A. F. of L.).

Issue: New contract terms.

Status: Report of strike received June 5, 1941.

Interest: Source of supply for lime to many large defense contractors including: Aluminum Co. of America, Mobile, Ala.; Tennessee Corporation; Reynolds Metal Co., Lister, Ala.; Republic Steel Co.; Atlantic Steel Co.; South Chemical & Cotton Co. Alternate source of supply for lime is available but has not been obtained at this time.

General Ceramics Co., Keasbey, N. J.:

Strike: May 30, 1941, of unascertained number of independent workers.

Issue: Closed shop.

Status: Union to vote on proposed agreement June 6, 1941.

Interest: Insulators for Signal Corps.

Karp Metal Products, Brooklyn N. Y.:

Strike: June 5, 1941, of 35 U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.).

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Only 35 of the 185 shop employees are on strike. Production is interfered with to some extent.

Interest: Metal boxes and containers for ordnance; boxes and binding posts for Signal Corps.

LaFayette Worsted & Spinning Co., Woonsocket, R. I.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 315 independent textile workers.

Issue: Closed shop.

Status: Commissioner Weinstock on case; meetings continuing.

Interest: Yarns for Princeton Worsted Mills and Verdun Manufacturing Co., both having Quartermaster Corps contracts for cloth.

Louisville Tin & Stove Co., Louisville, Ky.:

Strike: May 21, 1941, of 225 A. F. of L. workers.

Issues: Wages and closed shop.

Status: Negotiations deadlocked.

Interest: Miscellaneous cooking equipment for Quartermaster Corps.

Lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest area, State of Washington:

Strikes: May 10, 1941, and May 16, 1941, of about 16,000 woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and contract terms.

Status: Twin district council, Seattle, Wash. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board on May 9, 1941. President Murray, of the C. I. O., has requested the men to return to work.

Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills, Raymond, Wash. It is believed that the union here is awaiting the outcome of the National Defense Mediation Board negotiations on the twin district council case.

Interest: Lumber for construction projects and for airplane production.

Madison Woolen Co., Madison, Maine:

Strike: May 12, 1941, of 410 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Contract terms.

Status: Company asking for 5-year agreement; conferences being held.

Interest: Subcontractor for suiting cloth on large Quartermaster Corps contracts.

Maisel Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 33 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner on the case.

Interest: Quartermaster Corps contract for 65,000 pillows.

Marlin Rockwell Corporation, Plainville, Conn.:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of 1,000 U. A. W. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and grievance machinery.

Status: Commissioner on the case. State board conference June 6, 1941.

Interest: This company is one of the largest manufacturers of ball and roller bearings in the country. Priority rating, A–1–a. Continental Motors will have to stop production on eight tank engines by June 11 because of failure to receive bearings.

New Jersey Galvanizing Co., Newark, N. J.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 35 S. W. O. C. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and union shop.

Status: Commissioner on the case.

Interest: Holding up iron frames necessary to complete Fort Monmouth project.

North American Aviation Corporation, Inglewood, Calif.:

Strike: June 5, 1941, of 11,000 U. A. W. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and union shop.

Status: Report of strike; this in defiance of the N. D. M. B., which has had the case since May 22.

Interest: One of the most important sources for aircraft; manufactures trainers and bombers; British also have contracts.

Picker X-Ray Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio:

Strike: June 2, 1941, of 200 U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, hours, seniority, and closed shop.

Status: Commissioner Neblitt on the case. Conferences with O. P. M. labor and industry consultant attending.

Interest: Company is one of the largest manufacturers of X-ray machines and equipment.

Pittsburgh truckers, Pittsburgh, Pa. (176 companies involved):

Strike: June 2, 1941, of 1,500 A. F. of L. teamsters, chauffeurs, and warehousemen.

Issue: Wages.

Status: 50 of the 176 companies have already signed contract. Commissioner on the case. O. P. M. labor consultant attending meetings.

Interest: Tying up deliveries from freight terminals as well as deliveries between mills in the Pittsburgh area. Many Air Corps contracts are affected. Slowing down delivery of Curtiss-Wright propeller blades.

Reliance Manufacturing Co., Michigan City, Columbus, and Washington, Ind.:

Strike: April 28, 1941, of 1,200 A. C. W. (C. I. O.).

Issue: Union status.

Status: Commissioner Cofer reports case deadlocked.

Interest: 100,000 pairs cotton drawers for Quartermaster Corps at Michigan City plant; 90,000 cotton duck trousers at Columbus plant.

Republic Stamping & Enameling Co., Canton, Ohio:

Strike: May 26, 1941, of 470 A. F. of L.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Commissioner on the case. Conference held June 4.

Interest: Supplies steel sheets for roofing of Weldon Springs building. These sheets are needed June 9.

St. Louis Steel Fabricating Cos., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: Approximately 200 ironworkers (A. F. of L.) between May 19 and May 24, involving 13 companies.

Issues: Closed shop and signed agreement.

Status: O. P. M. labor consultant is investigating. Commissioner William F. White on the case, and joint conferences were held June 4 to consider Mr. White's proposal.

Interest: Delaying 41 tons of structural steel for oil-storage building at Curtiss-Wright, St. Louis, Mo.; 10 tons of structural steel for boiler building at Weldon Springs ordnance plant. Subcontractor for Navy gun mounts; also manifold piping for Weldon Springs. Delaying Venice, Ill., generating plant, which furnishes power for St. Louis ordnance plant and Weldon Springs.

Shampaine Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 20, 1941 of 131 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issue: New contract.

Status: Commissioner on the case. Union considering company wage proposal, June 5, 1941.

Interest: Hospital equipment for Medical Corps.

Sivyer Steel Castings Co., Chicago, Ill.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 250 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, closed shop, and vacations with pay.

Status: Commissioner holding meetings; next one for June 5, 1941. Attempts being made to remove castings for gun carriages to Milwaukee plant.

Interest: Castings for International Harvester for limber and gun carriages for 155-millimeter high-speed adapters. Harvester deliveries will be delayed proportionate to the length of this strike (critical). Castings for Allis-Chalmers, who make crawler tractors for ordnance. Important subcontractors for Navy. Delaying production of trailers at Athey Truss Wheel Co.

Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.:

Strike: May 28, 1941, of 2,800 I. L. G. W. (A. F. of L.).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner Deal assigned. No change in status.

Interest: Undershirts and drawers for Quartermaster Corps. Deliveries up to schedule.

Wilson Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.:

Strike: May 15, 1941, of 1,200 bookbinders at the two plants (C. I. O.).

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: Commissioner Scheck conducting meetings, June 4, 1941.

Interest: Posting trays, stands, and guides for Quartermaster Corps for laundries in 37 camps, posts, and stations.

THREATENED STRIKES

Most immediate danger

Aluminum Co. of America, Cleveland, Ohio (five plants): Aluminum for ordnance and Air Corps. Strike postponed indefinitely pending results of Mediation Board action. Hearings for Monday, June 9, 1941.

American Brass, Waterbury, Conn.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts amounting to $7,000,000; manufactures brass for Frankford Arsenal for small-arms ammunition; also major suppliers of raw and finished brass products. Strike vote taken May 28, 1941. Negotiations deadlocked on wages. Joint conference June 5, 1941.

Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: Manufactures aluminum molds, castings, and bearings; ordnance prime and subcontracts; Air Corps subcontractor for Curtiss-Wright, Vultee, and Pratt & Whitney companies; company is 80 percent defense production. Union threatening to strike June 9, 1941, if company fails to start negotiations. Commissioner Dewey assigned. Joint conference recessed pending return of company officer from Washington. Company contends existing contract is bar to union request for wage increase.

Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif.: Large and important contractor for Air Corps, Navy, England, Netherlands,

and Canada. Negotiating new contract and terms run parallel with those being asked at North American Aviation. Union will take strike vote next Tuesday, June 10.

Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.: Manufactures magnesium; leading plant in the country of this critical item; strike threatens on issue of union recognition. National Labor Relations Board started hearings May 26, 1941; hearings completed but no decision rendered. Election to be held some time in June.

Over-the-road truckers (in 11 States): Trucking in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and other States; Teamsters Union, American Federation of Labor; deadline postponed until mediation June 6, 1941. Office of Production Management labor consultant and Commissioner Connor on the case.

Soft coal: John L. Lewis threatens to call out 300,000 to 400,000 soft-coal miners again unless satisfactory wage agreement with Southern operators is obtained. National Defense Mediation Board handling case since May 23; is drawing up public findings and recommendations. Southern operators and United Mine Workers were called to meeting on June 4 to hear the Board's recommendations for settlement of their wage controversy. Recommendations are to be made public after they have been submitted to participants in the controversy. Conferences will be continued until June 5.

OTHER SERIOUS THREATS (THREATENED STRIKES)

American Aluminum Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Aluminum metal for Air Corps. Awaiting outcome of National Labor Relations Board election held April 30, 1941.

American Bobbinet Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: Manufacturing mosquito netting for Quartermaster Corps. Wage controversy; strike threatening. Company states they cannot grant wage increase. Conference on June 5. Commissioner Post assigned.

E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Prime contractor for Ordnance for presses and small-arms ammunition machinery ($10,000,000) for Lake City, Denver, and St. Louis Ordnance plants; Navy and British also have contracts. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 22, 1941; strike threatened for May 28, 1941; postponed indefinitely. Negotiations to continue before the Board in an effort to settle new minimum wage-rate dispute. Board is preparing findings and recommendations.

Electro Metallurgical Co., Alloy, W. Va.: Supplies steel companies with ferromanganese; manufactures 75 percent of total tonnage of alloys for the entire country. Congress of Industrial Organizations and company negotiating contract. National Labor Relations Board dismissed A. F. of L. petition for hearings to contest the C. I. O. victory at recent election.

Gar Wood Industries, Inc., Detroit, Mich.: Manufactures 75-mm. howitzers and carriages for Ordnance. Wage controversy; union filed notice of intent to strike on June 5, 1941.

Reynolds Metal Products Co., Louisville, Ky.: Manufactures $4,000,000 worth of Army and Navy contracts. May 29, 1941, workers voted 95 percent to strike. Negotiations for new contract in progress. Commissioner Smith on case. Conference on June 5, 1941.

Scullen Steel Co., St. Louis, Mo.: British order for 50,000 bombs through Ordnance; also 100 steel bodies. Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) threatening to strike within a few days unless recognition is granted by the company. Negotiations are deadlocked. Steel Workers Organizing Committee and independent union have agreed to Commissioner's proposal for joint conference of committees.

Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.: Manufactures pistons and rings for Air Corps, Ordnance, and Quartermaster Corps. Strike vote taken; no date set. Union and management agreed to submit the company's financial report to Muskegon bank officials. Thirty-day-notice period expired June 5, 1941.

United States Rubber Co., Detroit, Mich.: Prime and subcontractor for Ordnance, manufacturing tires and tubes; numerous prime contracts with Quartermaster Corps for raincoats and boots. Wage controversy; union took strike vote June 4, 1941. Commissioner Rye on case.

Vanadium Corporation of America, Bridgeville, Pa.: Ordnance contracts; company one of the most important suppliers of ferrovanadium in United States. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board March 27, 1941. Union may call strike now, as company has refused to entertain grievances growing out of a strike that was recently settled.

Wright Propeller Division, Caldwell and Clifton, N. J.: Manufactures propellers for Air Corps. Strike vote was taken May 26. Union insists upon deadline for June 9 unless consent election for Caldwell plant agreed to. National Labor Relations Board endeavoring to arrange for disposal of issue by action on election petition.

JOSEPH F. BATTLEY,
Major, United States Army,
Chief, Labor Section.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, June 7, 1941.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Strikes on Naval Defense Contracts.

There are listed below strikes which were in effect during the week ending June 7, 1941, in plants having naval-defense contracts. More complete information may be obtained from the Shore Establishments Division, Room 2026, Branch 812, where information as to discrepancies noticed, or as to urgency of contracts in the plants listed, should be sent.

Man-days lost on national-defense work in plants at which naval-defense contracts have been involved, have accumulated in the first 5 months of 1941 to a total of between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000. This lost time is equivalent to the time necessary to build at least 8 submarines, or at least 6 destroyers, or 2 cruisers, or nearly 1,000 fighter planes, or 500 patrol planes. The total lost man-days has been increased during the past week by approximately 52,000.

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.: Began March 19, 1941. Status, 1,000 workers involved. This strike is preventing placement of Navy Department orders for urgently needed potash. Referred to Mediation Board April 23, 1941.

Apollo Steel Co., Apollo, Pa.: Began May 19, 1941. Status, 1,600 men involved. Strike is not seriously interfering with naval-defense material as yet. Under negotiation. No settlement in sight.

Atlantic Metal Products Co., Long Island, N. Y.: Began May 13, 1941. Status, 165 men involved. Jurisdictional dispute. Completed material being shipped but new production has been stopped.

Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engine Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 21, 1941. Status, 75 men involved. A. F. L. jurisdictional row over installation of machinery in plant extensions. Machine-tool installation proceeded with on June 2 with metal trades workers, which has caused withdrawal by building trades union of all affiliated workers on plant-extension work.

Carborundum Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Began May 26, 1941; ended May 28, 1941.

Crescent Tool Co., Jamestown, N. Y.: Began May 12, 1941. Status: 500 machinists involved. So far negotiations unsuccessful.

Curtis Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 7, 1941; ended May 31, 1941.

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.: Began May 7, 1941. Status: 750 men involved. Issue is union recognition. N. L. R. B. election agreed to. Efforts to have employees return to work pending election so far unsuccessful. Possible 3 weeks' further delay involved.

Fedders Manufacturing Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: Began May 22, 1941. Status: An increase in wages demanded. Efforts are under way to arbitrate.

General Ceramic Corporation, Keasbey, N. J.: Began May 31, 1941. Status: 460 employees involved. Company came to agreement with independent union, which will be presented to union membership Friday night, June 6, for ratification.

C. G. Hussey Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: Began May 20, 1941; ended May 30, 1941.

Kennedy Valve Manufacturing Co., Elmira, N. Y.: Began May 15, 1941. Status: 500 involved. The A. F. of L. unions involved are willing to cooperate in shipping national-defense materials.

Lone Star Cement Co., Birmingham, Ala.: Began May 29, 1941. Status: Strike not expected to be of long duration. Cement for Navy defense contract may be secured from other plants in vicinity.

Lumber Mills, Tacoma, Wash.: Began May 10, 1941. Status: Situation active with National Defense Mediation Board.

Marathon Electric Manufacturing Corporation, Wausau, Wis.: Began May 26, 1941. Status: 500 employees involved. Entire plant walked out on May 26. Union and company refuse compromise on issue of discharged employees. No negotiations possible before June 9.

Marlin Rockwell Co., Plainville, Conn.: Began May 27, 1941. Status: 700 employees involved. Joint conferences being held.

Monsanto Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 16, 1941; ended May 28, 1941.

Morgan Bros. Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.: Began June 2, 1941. Status: Strike not sanctioned by union.

North American Aviation Corporation, Inglewood, Calif.: Began June 5, 1941. Status: This is an attempt made by C. I. O. to strike for union recognition. Some expectation that possible majority of A. F. of L. employees may continue production.

Phoenix Iron works, Phoenixville, Pa.: Began May 14, 1941; ended May 31, 1941.

Plymouth Rubber Co., Canton, Mass.: Began June 2, 1941. Status: Company now negotiating with A. F. of L., the union involved.

San Francisco Shipyards, San Francisco, Calif.: Began March 3, 1941. Status: 2,000 union members involved. Violation of stabilization conference agreement. All metal-trade crafts except machinists have returned to work.

Sawyer Foundry & Machine Co., Oswego, N. Y.: Began May 8, 1941. Status: 11 men involved out of total number of 22 employees.

Schurk Iron Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began May 22, 1941. Status: 30 involved. Case before N. L. R. B.

Sivyer Steel Castings Co., Chicago, Ill.: Began May 23, 1941. Status: 254 workers affected. Plant practically shut down. Conciliation commissioner has secured cooperation of union and company in releasing material.

Superior Lime & Hydrate Co., Pelham, Ala.: Began April 9, 1941. Status: 37 men involved. One source of supply of lime and limestone for steel manufacture.

Trumble Electric Co., San Francisco, Calif.: Began May 14, 1941; ended May 19, 1941.

Washington Motor Coach Co., Seattle, Wash.: Began May 29, 1941. Status: 212 involved. Strike affects to some extent transportation of employees to plants engaged in national-defense work. No direct Navy contracts involved. Negotiations unsuccessful. Situation not hopeful.

Wilson Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.: Began May 15, 1941. Status: 1,200 affected. Company agreed to wage increase at joint conference.

Woodstock Flag Co., Birmingham, Ala.: Began May 2, 1941. Status: 50 employees involved. Plant shut down.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Indiana Harbor, Ind.: Began June 2, 1941. Status: 625 involved. This is a renewal of a strike which ended after agreement between company and union on May 26. New negotiations proceeding.

Listed below are companies in which strikes are pending but information relative to naval defense contracts not yet available:

Clay City Products Co., Uhrichsville, Ohio, May 31, 1941.

Ethyl Gas Plant, Baton Rouge, La., June 3, 1941.

Metals Disintegrating Co., Townley, N. J., May 28, 1941.

Nelson, C., Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., June 5, 1941.

New Jersey Galvanizing & Tinning Co., Newark, N. J., June 3, 1941.

Picker X-Ray Co., Cleveland, Ohio, June 2, 1941.

Republic Stamping & Enameling Co., Canton, Ohio, May 26, 1941.

Spring Products Co., Trenton, N. J., June 2, 1941.

Tri-Boro Transit Co., Binghamton, N. Y., June 2, 1941.

[From the Washington Star of June 6, 1941]

BACKSTOP NEEDED IN MEDIATION—ROOSEVELT MAY HAVE TO PUT OWN POWER BEHIND BOARD

(By David Lawrence)

The National Defense Mediation Board thus far has had only the strength of an aroused public opinion to support its insistence that the parties to labor disputes accept the findings of the board and end work stoppages. But it begins to look as if President Roosevelt will find it necessary to back up the Board with the broad range of his discretionary authority under many different statutes.

What did President Wilson do in the first World War when confronted with a similiar situation? Representative SATTERFIELD, Democrat, of Virgina, has called the attention of Mr. Roosevelt to a remarkable letter written by President Wilson on September 13, 1918, which was addressed to a local union of the International Association of Machinists at Bridgeport, Conn. It reads as follows:

"GENTLEMEN: I am in receipt of your resolutions of September 6 announcing that you have begun a strike against your employers in Bridgeport, Conn. You are members of the Bridgeport branches of the International Union of Machinists. As such, and with the approval of the national officers of your union, you signed an agreement to submit the questions as to terms of your employment to the National War Labor Board and to abide by the award which, in accordance with the rules of procedure approved by me, might be made.

BREACH OF FAITH

"The members of the Board were not able to reach a unanimous conclusion on all the issues presented, and as provided in the Constitution, the questions upon which they did not agree were carried before an arbitrator, the unanimous choice of the Board.

"The arbitrator thus chosen has made an award which more than 90 percent of the workers affected accept. You who constitute less than 10 percent refuse to abide by the award, although you are the best paid of the whole body of workers affected, and are, therefore, least entitled to press a further increase of wages because of the high cost of living. But whatever the merits of the issue, it is closed by the award. Your strike against it is a breach of faith calculated to reflect on the sincerity of national organized labor in proclaiming its acceptance of the principles and the machinery of the National War Labor Board.

"If such disregard of the solemn adjudication of a tribunal to which both parties submitted their claims be temporized with, agreements become mere scraps of paper. If errors creep into awards, the proper remedy is submission to the award with an application for a rehearing to the tribunal. But to strike against the award is disloyalty and dishonor.

SHOE FITS BOTH FEET

"The Smith & Wesson Co., of Springfield, Mass., engaged in Government work, has refused to accept the mediation of the National War Labor Board and has flouted its rules of decision approved by Presidential proclamation. With my consent, the War Department has taken over the plant and business of the company to secure continuity in production and to prevent industrial disturbance.

"It is of the highest importance to secure compliance with reasonable rules and procedure for the settlement of industrial disputes. Having exercised a drastic remedy with recalcitrant employers, it is my duty to use means equally well adapted to the end with the lawless and faithless employees.

"Therefore, I desire that you return to work and abide by the award. If you refuse, each of you will be barred from employment in any war industry in the community in which the strike occurs for a period of 1 year. During that time the United States Employment Service will decline to obtain employment for you in any war industry elsewhere in the United States, as well as under the War and Navy Departments, the Shipping Board, the Railroad Administration, and all other Government agencies, and the draft boards will be instructed to reject any claim of exemption based on your alleged usefulness in war production.

"Sincerely yours,

"WOODROW WILSON."

The same drastic steps referred to in Mr. Wilson's letter have been suggested in Washington many times this year, but the soft pedal has been put on them in the belief by the administration that the strikes would soon quiet down and be eliminated.

HELPLESS UNLESS BACKED

The National Defense Mediation Board is doing a constructive job under trying circumstances, but it will be helpless if it isn't backed up by the President. Incidentally, it is gratifying to be able to announce that Vice Chairman Davis of the Mediation Board states positively that any alleged spokesmen for the Board in the Middle West who are endeavoring to predict either his views or those of other members of the Board with reference to cases not yet brought before the Board are misrepresenting the work of the Board.

The Mediation Board's prestige will rise or fall in accordance as it is held to be an impartial body.

PRESSURE TO FORCE INVOLVEMENT IN WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr President, I desire to call attention to an article appearing in the Washington Post which refers to a speech made by Budget Director Harold Smith in a Nation-wide broadcast. In this talk the Budget Director simply echoed what a number of other persons have been saying, to the effect that we here in the United States shall be enslaved if England does not win. I quote the newspaper article, which states:

SMITH SPEAKS IN KANSAS

Smith, in a nationally broadcast (National Broadcasting Co.) address at seventy-fifth anniversary ceremonies of the University of Kansas at Lawrence, Kans., warned that a German triumph would provoke a vast upheaval that would bring economic enslavement to the world.

This statement has been repeated so many times by columnists and a few others who are anxious for war that I desire to call attention to another article. It appeared in the Wall Street Journal, and is based on an interview with Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. No one can contend that Mr Baruch is anything but a loyal American citizen. No one can call him an appeaser, or a "fifth columnist," or a Nazi. The article in the Wall Street Journal, including the headline, reads:

UNITED STATES CAN UNDERSELL TOTALITARIANS IN WORLD MARKETS, SAYS BARUCH—GERMANY WOULD BE "ON SPOT" ECONOMICALLY EVEN IF SHE WON WAR, HE ASSERTS—WOULD CURB PRICE ADVANCES

(By Robert Laffan)

The United States can undersell totalitarian countries in world trade, according to Bernard M. Baruch, formerly chairman of Woodrow Wilson's War Industries Board, now a national-defense consultant to the Roosevelt administration.

In an exclusive interview with the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Baruch pointed out that Germany, not the United States, would be "on the spot" economically if Germany were to win control of the European continent.

"What will she do? Where can she sell her products or those of the countries she has conquered?" the veteran of another all-out war asked this reporter.

The United States market will be cut off from European countries that formerly sold here, according to Mr. Baruch. Under proper economic policy the United States should be able to drive Germany out of any desired neutral market, he believes.

A PROGRAM FOR THE UNITED STATES

According to Mr. Baruch this country must:

1. Maintain a low price structure throughout this war.

2. Develop quality and economy in mass-production industries.

3. Build military defenses.

Fears concerning Germany's economic prowess and cheap labor are exaggerated, according to Mr. Baruch.

He cited evidence he had just received from a large American company that owns a factory in a leading industrial city in Germany. (He named the city, but suggested the name be omitted.) The parent American company has received a report from the German factory, Mr. Baruch asserted, that shows conclusively that despite low wages and long hours, with the German mark at 37 cents, the American plant is turning out the same products more cheaply.

"Oh, they can make gimcracks where we don't make them," Mr. Baruch remarked, "but there is no reason why we can't undersell them in important mass-production products provided we maintain a low price structure."

IMPORTANCE OF LOW PRICES

He stressed the importance of this. A price rise now would have to be liquidated in the post-war period, and that would throw this country off balance and place it in an unfavorable position to wage economic war, he pointed out. But if prices here are held down, Germany will be faced with the huge unemployment and economic problem after the war, he believes.

Won't that mean that Germany will be forced to attack us? Mr. Baruch was asked.

"Let 'em come," he replied. Mr. Baruch emphasized that he is not one of those who have been complacent about Germany over the past many years. Like Winston Churchill, Mr. Baruch can point to the fact that he has been trying to awaken public opinion ever since 1935 to the rise of Nazi military power and to the need for preparedness.

Mr. Baruch's comments followed a discussion of his book, American Industry in the War, which has just been issued by Prentice Hall, Inc. The book is a reprint of the report of the old War Industries Board, together with Mr. Baruch's own program for total mobilization of the Nation as presented to the War Policies Commission in 1931. It also contains material on priorities and price fixing.

QUESTION OF LABOR CONTROLS

The present national defense effort has followed some outlines of the previous emergency effort. One major point of difference seems to be that the present administration has not followed Mr. Baruch's recommendations for an over-all ceiling on prices and costs.

I call attention to this article because Mr. Baruch is not a theorist. He is an outstanding financier. He is an economist of national and international repute. He is not swayed by hysteria. He is a realist—a practical businessman.

The warmongers in this country—and there are many of them—and the columnists and others, are saying what? That unless we enter this war our people will be enslaved. That is what we hear from some persons speaking over the radio. They appeal to our emotions; but at no time do they give us the facts.

I am glad to call the Senate's attention to this article regarding Mr. Baruch because I know the respect with which he is held by a great number of the Members of the Senate as a patriotic American citizen; but I assume that because of this statement he probably will be attacked, as others have been attacked, as being an appeaser, or a Nazi sympathizer, or something else. So much for that article.

Then I desire to call attention, Mr. President, to another article, written by Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, which appeared the other day in the Washington Post and other newspapers throughout the country. I would not pay very much attention to what these columnists write except for the fact that we all know that Alsop and Kintner are close to some of the administrative agencies of government. We know that they do get inside information from the State Department. We know that they had published the White Book, which contained material that could have been obtained only from the State Department. Members of the Senate could not get the information; yet it was published in the White Book and sold to the public for a profit. Furthermore, we all know the close connections of Messrs. Alsop and Kintner and the family relationship of one of them to certain members of the administration. Here is what they say, under the heading "German incident":

All the President's recent utterances and actions have been made mysterious by a basic contradiction. He says that he means to act, yet he does not act, and in the next breath even seems to foreclose important avenues of action. The contradiction is easy to explain, however, once it is understood that the immediate future depends on the answer to a simple question. Will the President continue determined to force the Germans to fire the first shot?

I think the answer to the question is that the President is resisting many persons who are bringing pressure upon him for war. These columnists, however, put a very low estimate on the President of the United States, it seems to me, in the remainder of their article.

This determination of the President is apparently the most important of the psychological obstacles he must surmount before he can commit the United States to full fighting partnership with Britain. Of course, there are other obstacles. There is his desire not to move until the country is fully united behind him, from which his wish to force the Germans to give him a pretext for action no doubt arises. There are the various commitments and semicommitments he has made in the last year against convoying, against taking the country into war, and so forth. Strangely enough, considering earlier trends of constitutional interpretation at the White House there is even said to be some fear in his mind that if he orders action without requesting a prior declaration of war from Congress, he will be transgressing his constitutional prerogatives as Commander in Chief.

I do not believe that anyone in the Congress who is familiar at all with the Constitution of the United States will for a moment say that the President of the United States has the right under the Constitution, although he may have the power, to take this country to war without coming to the Congress of the United States. Yet we find men, lawyers, and columnists urging the President of the United States to take the country to war without a declaration by Congress. In one breath they say we must fight for democracy on other continents and in the next breath they urge disregard and of constitutional democracy in the United States. They urge the President to violate his oath of office, and to ignore the Constitution of the United States of America, in other words they are saying, "To hell with the Constitution, go ahead anyway."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that a few days ago or a few weeks ago the Senator from Montana himself in the course of a speech charged that the very policy of seeking to bring about an incident which would be equivalent to war was being urged upon the President. The Senator from Montana was assailed and abused like a pickpocket by all the mud batteries of the columnists of the war party and the limberlegged incense burners who have been trying to get up a war. Now these two columnists, who represent the nadir of the columnistic effort to get us into the war, not only avow that but charge that the President of the United States, in violation of his oath of office, is deliberately trying to pursue such a policy.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. The article goes on to say:

But according to men qualified to speak with authority—

Who are the men from whom they get this information that are "qualified to speak with authority"? Members of the Senate do not get this information, and yet some of these columnists get from the War Department, from the Navy Department, and from the State Department information which no Senator and no Member of the House of Representatives is permitted to have—

But according to men qualified to speak with authority, these other obstacles are now entirely secondary. Events have made them so. As Ambassador John G. Winant has reported to the President—

The article says Mr. Winant has so reported to the President—

and as all his ablest advisers here have been telling him for weeks, he has the choice between acting now or waiting until it may be too late. If he delays too long, neither public opinion, nor his own record, nor his constitutional prerogatives will matter a particle. The policy which he has been vigorously prosecuting for the last 2 years will be utterly defeated. He will find his niche in history as one of the great failures.

Because he does not take this country to war he will, in the opinion of these warmongers, go down in history as a great failure; he will go down in history as a failure because he does not take the Nation to war in violation of the Constitution of the United States and without submitting the question to the Congress.

And if German victory is as inimical as he and most other informed men suppose, the country will soon be overtaken by catastrophe

These are obvious facts, assuming the President's advisers are correct in their judgment of the urgency of the war situation.

Who are the advisers who are trying to tell him to go to war?

In the light of them, it is easy to see why all the secondary obstacles to action have ceased to be really important—

What are the secondary obstacles? The Constitution of the United States is the chief secondary obstacle.

Giving due weight to the President's penchant for doing a job the smart way, it is also easy to see why the primary obstacle remains to be surmounted. If the Germans can only be persuaded to shoot first, then they will have the major share of responsibility for what follows.

If only somebody can be persuaded to shoot first, then, according to these columnists, the President would welcome it, and we would get into the war.

The two thoughts, mutually inconsistent though they may seem, still coexist in his mind today. In the past weeks he has been repeatedly urged to order immediate action. He has been warned that to delay was to court disaster. He has been able to act, for all the necessary preparations for meeting the German threat in the battle of the Atlantic have at last been completed. Yet he has not acted, because he hopes to drive the Germans into shooting first.

What a charge that is to make against the President of the United States. Can any Member of this body conceive that the President of the United States is

hoping the Germans will shoot first so that he can take us into the war? I have criticized the President in debate here, as probably all of us have done at one time or another, but never have I charged the President with deliberately hoping that somebody would shoot so that we would go to war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The President, like the rest of us, takes an oath of office to support and uphold the Constitution, and when he does so he takes an oath to confine his activities within the limits imposed upon the President's office by the Constitution.

I do not know who wrote the article, but whoever he is he is intimating that many people are very much disappointed because the President hesitates to violate his oath of office; and the writer even goes so far as to intimate that the President will welcome a chance to do so. Whoever wrote that article impugns the motives and the honor of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate the date of the particular column from which he is reading?

Mr. WHEELER. It is dated June 4, and I have another article which was published this morning, along the same line, to which I intend to call attention.

Mr. NYE. It was written on June 4. Has there been any repudiation whatsoever by administration circles of that particular contention?

Mr. WHEELER. If there has been, I have not seen it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In view of the question of the Senator from North Dakota, does the Senator from Montana or does the Senator from North Dakota think that the President of the United States ought to rush into print and make a public statement about everything that is said about him or in criticism of him?

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call attention to the fact, however, that this same pair, Alsop and Kintner, as the Senator said a moment ago, once published what is called a White Book purporting to reveal the most intimate details of conversations between the President and Ambassador Bullitt and the President and Assistant Secretary of State Berle; I think it even purported to tell the color of the pajamas the President wore when he had one of the conversations with Bullitt or Berle. I do not recall whether that is exactly true; but the whole trend of the remarks revealed such an intimate knowledge, which they sold for profit, that the President of the United States at his press conference said it was a very interesting publication, and more or less gave his approval to the disclosure of the intimacy of these people with the White House.

Mr. WHEELER. My recollection was that he gave it his blessing in some form. While he may have repudiated it, I have not seen any repudiation; but the significant thing is that they republished something similar to it today.

I will go back:

The two thoughts, mutually inconsistent though they may seem, still coexist in his mind today.

They are telling what is in the President's mind.

In the past weeks he has been repeatedly urged to order immediate action.

Immediate action for what? Immediate action for war.

He has been warned that to delay was to court disaster. He has been able to act, for all the necessary preparations for meeting the German threat in the battle of the Atlantic have at last been completed. Yet he has not acted, because he hopes to drive the Germans into shooting first.

Perhaps, instead of depending on one simple question, the future may depend on two. The men around the President are now united in attempting to persuade him to order action out of hand, without waiting for a pretext. If they fail, if the President's determination is not weakened by the remorseless logic of events, then a second question will have to be answered. Will the President's plan succeed?

The problem was mentioned in this space in a recent discussion of the Atlantic patrol, in which it was pointed out that the President and the men around him privately hope the patrol will produce an incident.

That is to say, the President privately hopes, and the men around him hope, that the patrol will produce an incident.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When I made my previous remarks I was not aware who had written that statement. The fact that it has been announced that Alsop and Kintner wrote it makes the statement sound very much worse to me, knowing their past history, since they are apparently speaking ex cathedra on matters from the White House.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

No one can doubt the German high command will do everything possible to avoid shooting first. The President's plan leaves the initiative to Germany, which is a mode of procedure that has cursed the democracies from the start of the war.

Today, on the front page of the Washington Post, is another story by Alsop and Kintner:

Nothing better illustrates the strangely equivocal position in which present war policy places this country than the undisclosed episodes of the Atlantic patrol. In one case, rather more than a month ago, an encounter between German and American warcraft at sea very nearly terminated in an attack by the Germans. In another, slightly more recent, an attack on what was believed to be a German submarine was actually made by an American destroyer.

No details of the first episode are available, but the basic facts of the second are known.

Known to whom? Known to these columnists, who get inside information from the War Department and from the Navy Department—facts which are denied the Members of the United States Senate.

The destroyer, the name of which cannot be ascertained, was picking up survivors from a British vessel sunk not far from the coast of Greenland. While the operation was in progress the destroyer's detecting device announced the approach of a submarine. The submarine could only have been German. It was virtually certain to use its torpedoes, as semidarkness concealed the nationality of the American ship. And the commander of the destroyer accordingly dropped three depth charges.

SHOOTING ALREADY

Thus, although the President is waiting for the Germans to shoot first, the truth is that there has been shooting already.

In other words, here on the front page of the Washington Post is an article by these men saying, "Now you have an excuse. Shooting has already started. You ought to go into the war, and you ought to start shooting in a shooting war."

The truth may be denied—indeed, it is likely to be. The outcome of the episode is a mystery, since the light was too poor for the commander of the destroyer to make certain that the submarine really was nearby, or to guess whether the depth charges had taken effect. But official denials cannot alter either the episode's basic facts or its broad meaning.

What nonsense. One minute they say shooting has already taken place, and the next minute they say they do not know whether the submarine was a German submarine or not; they do not know how close it was; they do not know anything about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recollect that a few weeks ago certain newspapers in New York and Washington were very severely rebuked, first by the Secretary of the Navy and later by the President of the United States, for having published a picture of undoubted authenticity of a British warship which had come into New York Harbor for the purpose of being repaired, which was subject to being seen at any time by millions of persons in the city of New York, and the presence of which was certainly a fact which would have been disclosed to any interested foreign government. In view of the self-imposed censorship of the Secretary of the Navy, it will be interesting to see what he has to say about the alleged disclosures in this article by men who claim to be so close to the inner circle of the administration.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, what happens is that some of these columnists get inside information; and if it is the kind of information that the Secretary of the Navy wants to have published——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then they proceed to sell it.

Mr. WHEELER. They proceed to sell it to the American people, provided, of course, that it is information which the Secretary of the Navy and those who

want to take us to war want to have get out; but if it is information the publication of which the Secretary and others think is not to the interest of their war crowd, then, of course, the columnists are publicly reprimanded for disclosing it.

The article goes on to say:

The episode's meaning is pretty obvious. The Atlantic patrol in itself is not effective. Even now it has not been extended to cover the most dangerous waters, yet four British ships have recently been sunk in the part of the ocean it supposedly guards. The President, all his most important advisers, and the War and Navy Departments hope, however, that the patrol will produce an incident to serve as the pretext for really effective action by this country. The interest of the Germans is to avoid such an incident. It is perfectly possible that the submarine was in fact sunk, and that the Germans have suppressed all public complaint in order to keep public opinion here in its present lulled condition. Nevertheless, as the episode described above pretty clearly demonstrates the chances are strong that an incident will eventually occur.

In other words, here are the War and Navy Departments, here are the advisers of the President, and, according to this article, the President himself, hoping and praying that an incident will occur that will take the United States into the bloody conflicts of Europe and Asia. Talk about dastardly conduct. If that is true, I consider it one of the most dastardly and horrible things that ever happened to the United States. How terrible, how bloodcurdling, to think that the Secretary of War, that the Secretary of the Navy, and other close advisers around the President are hoping and praying for an incident which will take this country into war. If that article is true, and if that is the viewpoint of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Secretary of War, both those gentlemen should receive their passports out of the Government service.

It has just been called to my attention that Mr. Winant says that the British can win without America in the war. Of course, but these inside columnists say, "Oh, if we do not get in tomorrow, if some incident does not take place to get us in tomorrow, then it is going to be too late."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call attention to a portion of the article which the Senator read a little while ago, in which Mr. Alsop and Mr. Kintner make charges which are unquestionably true, but which they say will be denied by responsible officials; in other words, that the American people will be lied to. That seems to me to be a very serious reflection on the whole administrative group in this country.

Mr. WHEELER. I refer again to the article by Alsop and Kintner, and repeat:

Nevertheless, as the episode described above pretty clearly demonstrates the chances are strong that an incident will eventually occur.

Then they say:

The trouble with that is the word "eventually."

In other words, they are afraid it will not occur quickly enough.

The time is now desperately short. In his desire for a pretext for the action the President wants to take and knows he must take, he is wasting days and weeks that may forever alter the balance of the war.

The Navy, as has been stated before in this space, is fully ready to act.

Of course, Colonel Knox has been ready to act for the last year or so. I believe that he was ready to act when he was running a newspaper in Chicago. I am sure that he wanted to go to war then, when he did not know anything about the Navy and did not know whether it was ready or not. And there are naval experts who will say that our Navy is not ready today for a European war.

The article continues:

Possibly measures may soon be taken to solve the minor aspects of the Atlantic problem. It is far from improbable that the preventive occupation of the Azores and the Cape Verdes, or the garrisoning of Iceland, will be ordered in the near future. But among the men who should know the President's intentions if anyone does, the prevailing opinion still is that all-out shipping protection will not be instituted for some time, unless an incident occurs, even though other aggressive steps are taken.

There is considerable confusion about the nature of an all-out system of shipping protection, chiefly arising from the President's repeated assertion that convoys are outmoded.

I was glad the President made the statement that convoys were outmoded. There were Representatives, there were Members of this body, there was Secretary Knox, urging convoys. There was the Secretary of War urging convoys. There were all the columnists urging convoys. I was very happy the President repudiated these people when he stated that convoys were outmoded, and that he was not going to use them. But terrific pressure was put upon him to use convoys something like a week or 10 days ago.

Now the war group are complaining because the President does not desire to violate his oath of office, because he does not want to break his promises to the American people. But they say the reason for it is not that he does not want to go to war—they say he does—but that he wants an incident, and that he is hoping and praying for an incident, and all his advisers want an incident, so that they can take the American people into a bloody war. According to Mr. May, of the Office of Production Management, it would cost us $40,000,000,000 a year to assure a victory to England—$40,000,000,000 and the English have predicted that the defeat of Hitler will take from 3 to 5 years. Three years would mean $120,000,000,000 of debt for war purposes straddled upon the American people. Five years would mean $200,000,000,000 straddled upon the American people. And where is the person who will stand upon the floor of the Senate and say that this country can service a debt of $200,000,000,000, in addition to what we already owe? It would mean repudiation; it would mean inflation; it would mean that the United States would suffer the same fate that befell France and Germany and other countries after the first World War. Yet many of the President's advisers are so much interested in saving democracy across the water that they are willing to destroy democracy in the United States.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Who wrote the second article to which the Senator referred?

Mr. WHEELER. Alsop and Kintner.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It has been my observation that most of these commentators have the same theme song, that they intimate the same thing—that the only thing that keeps us out of war is that there has not been any shooting. They all intimate that the President is anxious to go to war, but that he wants an incident; and I hope it is not true.

Mr. WHEELER. If what Alsop and Kintner say about the President is not true, then they are doing the President of the United States a very great disservice. If what they say is true, then the American people should know it. Whether it is true or untrue I do not know, but it is inconceivable to me that a man who has been elected President of the United States for three consecutive terms, who has been given the greatest honor the American people could bestow upon him, would be anxious to take the country into war; I cannot believe he is praying for an incident which would make it possible for him to take us into war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. I say that a charge of that kind almost means that the President of the United States desires to violate the trust and the confidence of the people and to violate the Constitution of the United States. I cannot and I will not believe that to be true.

Mr. CONNALLY. The statement the Senator has just made obviates the necessity for my asking the question I was about to propound. I was about to ask the Senator whether he made that charge.

Mr. WHEELER. They made it; I did not.

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator quotes them about half the time in a condemnatory manner, and then he turns about and says, "If what they say is true, so and so and so and so."

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator would agree with me that if what they said was true——

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to ask the Senator whether he believed it; but he has denied it.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator would agree with me that if the charges are untrue Messrs. Alsop and Kintner are doing the President a very great disservice; and I am sure the Senator from Texas would not impute motives of that kind to the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, the Senator from Montana does not believe it?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether he attaches any importance to the fact that the Washington Post, one of the

leading war-mongering journals of the United States, apparently, and by common consent, prints this latest Alsop and Kintner story on the front page of the edition today, rather than in the usual place invariably occupied by it before, opposite the editorial page.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, it seems to indicate a concerted effort to attempt to besmirch the President of the United States.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has called attention to an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune Sunday in which a five-column headline announces, "Winant says British Can Win Without America in War." I observe that the Washington Post has not made any mention of that particular story involving Ambassador Winant's declaration.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Reference was made by the Senator a moment ago to a statement of some respectable authority that there was intention of spending $40,000,000,000 a year for the next 2 years.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the story came from Mr. May, who is Chief of the Division of Research and Statistics in the Office of Production Management. He stated that the United States would have to spend $40,000,000,000 a year in order to insure victory for England. I stated that I have seen reports coming from England in which it was predicted that the war would continue for at least 3 years, and perhaps from 3 to 5 years. So I say that on the thesis that the war will continue for 3 years we would have to spend at the rate of $40,000,000,000 a year, or a total for 3 years of $120,000,000,000, and if the war continued as long as for 5 years, we would have to spend $200,000,000,000.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Such a national debt could not be serviced by any tax formula ever suggested to Congress. It would be an utter impossibility to service the national debt under any such formula, and the debt would go to astronomical figures far beyond anything ever before dreamed of in this country I cannot conceive of a debt of a hundred and fifty billion dollars, or $200,000,000,000, or, possibly, $300,000,000,000 being attained and the country continuing with any of its normal activities. I am wondering, as I think everyone else is wondering what would happen to our economic fabric if we had such a debt saddled upon is. From time to time I have listened to able statements made by such Senators as the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I recall that he said only a matter of months ago that an increase in our national debt of $20,000,000,000 would threaten the stability of our economic institutions. I think he felt that was true, and I believe a great many other Senators felt it was true. I know the conservative journals of my own State have reflected that viewpoint. Obviously if an increase of from ten to twenty billion dollars would threaten the stability of our economic system, one could only wonder—and he would not wonder in a vague sort of way, for it would be a very acute sort of wonder—what would happen to our whole economic pattern if we had a debt of $200,000,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, those who would want to take us into war were a few years ago the loudest in proclaiming—and I do not mean this to apply to the Senator from Virginia—that we had to balance the Budget.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think the Senator from Montana was exactly accurate in his statement of what Mr. May, of the O. P. M., said. I know the Senator wants to be accurate.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the Senator from Texas will correct me if I was incorrect in my statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. May is a statistician and is the head of the department of statistics in the O. P. M., in charge of estimates, figures, and guesses. What he said was that if the United States should spend as large a percentage of our national income as Germany and England were spending of theirs, it would require an expenditure of $40,000,000,000 a year, and that he thought we ought to spend $40,000,000,000 a year. He intimated that the program was not going forward as it should go, and I pressed him for particulars as to who was at fault, and in what respect we were failing, and he declined to or did not point out anything. It is just a matter of mathematics with him, though, taking the common denominator, and the divisor, and so on, that it would take $40,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. BONE. I do not think it would be possible for American industry to absorb that much, because it could not step up the tempo of production to the point where that much money could be spent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, he fizzled out under examination.

Mr. WHEELER. I saw the story in the newspaper, and I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. The reason I know about the matter, I will say to the Senator, is that Mr. MAY appeared before the Truman committee a day or two following the public statement, and testified, and the Senator from Texas happens to be a member of that committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not see the statement he made before the committee, but I was quoting from his speech as it was published in the newspapers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that in the Herald Tribune bureau article, which appears in the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday, June 8, the following appears:

> Meanwhile, it was learned that in a 3-hour conference late yesterday with Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE and congressional leaders Mr. Winant based his conviction that Britain can defeat Germany without United States' participation on the following assertion:
>
> For the moment let me break the quotation while I point out that the conference with the congressional leaders was requested by Mr Winant, and was arranged by Vice President WALLACE.
>
> Among those attending it were Senators WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; JAMES F. BYRNES, Democrat, of South Carolina; TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas; and LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.

Since the columnists to whom the Senator from Montana has referred have been telling us that we must act before it is too late; that we must act now; that the President must not postpone his decision; that we must not let anyone down, and have made other similar assertions, when it appears that congressional leaders, following that conference, were quoted as saying of Mr. Winant's report, "It was not a gloomy picture at all," I think it becomes important that somebody give us the facts. It seems to me we should very properly ascertain under what circumstances and to what extent the United States is being pushed into war before it is too late, as these columnists would have it, when the American Ambassador, the Ambassador of our President at the Court of St. James, says that the British can win without America.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Montana I shall ask unanimous consent that the entire article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, to which reference has been made, be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that I rose originally to insert the article on Mr. Bernard Baruch's economic views. I wanted to point out how his views contradicted other statements which were being made to the effect that we would become economic slaves if Germany happened to win. The first contention originally made in the Senate of the United States was that if we did not get into this war we would be invaded from across the sea by Germany. When that theory was exploded by naval experts, then the next contention was that Germany would go to Dakar, Africa. From Dakar German forces would cross over to Brazil, and then go over roadless mountains, trackless swamps, and impenetrable forests, and finally reach the Rio Grande. When that idea was laughed out of court, so to speak, it was said, "But there will be an economic invasion of the United States, and consequently we must go to war to save this country from slavery."

Mr. President, it seems to me Mr. Baruch's article refutes that assertion beyond the question of a doubt, because all Senators who know him are aware of his vast experience and that he is not guided by sentiment but that he is a realist.

Then it was said that of course we have to fight. We must establish the four freedoms, and in our generation bring liberty to all the countries of the world. I presume we are going to establish the four freedoms under Chang Kai-shek, in China, where the people have never known what it was to have liberty or freedom. Then we will go to Russia, and then we will go to India, and then we will go to some of the countries of Africa.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Montana a question in all fairness. He had just made a comment about our going to China and enforcing the four freedoms, and going to Russia and enforcing the four freedoms. Does the Senator from Montana seriously contend that the President or any other responsible man in official life has taken any such position as that?

Mr. WHEELER. Oh, no; I do not say that the President has. He did talk about——

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, who in the Government is saying that?

Mr. WHEELER. I did not say that, but the President is the one who first brought up the matter of the four freedoms. Let me say that if the Senator from Texas will read a book by Thomas Mann and Herbert Agar, which has just been published, he will find that the men who are urging this country to go to war, and are not only urging——

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator——

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish, please.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator is very nimble, but he is not answering my question.

Mr. WHEELER. I will answer the Senator's question. All he has to do is to read the President's speech. He made such a statement. I do not pretend to quote him, but he did talk about the establishments of the four freedoms all over the world in our generation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have all read the President's speech. The Senator from Montana has read it; and I think the Senator from Montana not only read it but understood it.

Mr. WHEELER. I think I did.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Montana does not take issue with the statement that the four freedoms are highly desirable everywhere in the world. The point I am making is that I think the Senator from Montana is unfair if he maintains that at any time the President of the United States or any Member of the Senate has said that the object of the United States, or our proposed war aim, is to go over to China or Russia and, by force of arms, establish the four freedoms. I think that before we charge columnists with slipping around and expanding the truth, varying it, or changing it, we ourselves ought to be accurate when we are speaking on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. If I am not accurate I want the Senator to correct me. I say that in his speech to the Congress the President talked about the establishment of the four freedoms all over the world, and in our generation. If "all over the world" does not include China, Russia, the interior of Africa, and South America, then I do not understand the English language. I do not mean to say that the President said he was going to establish the four freedoms in China; but he did say what I have stated he said; and his statement has been taken up by speakers who urge American entry into war from an idealistic standpoint. They have even gone so far as to say that what we must do is to set up a City of Man, and elect a president of the universe. I do not know whom they propose to elect president of the universe.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know several who would like to be elected.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator may be one of them, but I am not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not a candidate.

Mr. WHEELER. Neither am I.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In all good conscience, I was not questioning what the President said on that subject. When I rose I understood the Senator to refer to the time when we shall go to China and Russia to establish the "four freedoms."

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will read my remarks, he will find that what I said was that certain persons are advocating that we go to war because we must establish the four freedoms all over the world. I did not say the President said that.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; but the Senator said that we must establish the four freedoms. I have not heard anyone advocate our establishing the four freedoms by force of arms.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has not been following some of the speeches which have been made by those who are trying to get us into war. Not only has such a statement been made, but, as a matter of fact, some of those who are urging us to get into the war have gone further. As I stated a moment ago, they have talked about setting up a City of Man, electing a president of the universe, and giving him absolute power in times of emergency.

I have been diverted. In closing, I simply wish to say that it seems to me that every argument which has thus far been advanced as a reason for us to go to war has been dissipated by the logic of events, reason, and by cold, hard facts.

First, I say that, regardless of what the Secretary of the Navy may say, this country is not prepared to wage a war on other continents at this particular time. I do not know of any first-class military or naval expert in the country who will say that we are fully prepared for an offensive war. Some persons state that the President should start shooting before someone else does. Some say that he is only waiting for somebody to shoot. Some are urging that we go to war now. I say that in my judgment they are doing a disservice to the Nation and to the American people.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that the Senators who participated in the conference with the Ambassador have been on the floor during the discussion and while the article in question was reported to the Senate. It appears from the article that Ambassador Winant told the Senators that there was no tendency in Great Britain to blame the United States for staying out of the war. It seems to me that that is an important consideration, in the light of the comments which have been so ably submitted by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article to which reference has been made be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 8, 1941]

HULL REVEALS SECRET FRENCH GUARANTIES ON COLONIES IN HEMISPHERE; WINANT SAYS BRITISH CAN WIN WITHOUT AMERICA IN WAR—ENVOY DECLARES ENGLAND IS NOT WAVERING, CAN HOLD SUEZ, BAR INVASION—CONGRESS LEADERS GET 3-HOUR REPORT—HE ASSURES THEM PATROLS ARE REDUCING LOSSES OF AMERICAN-AID CARGOES

WASHINGTON, June 7.—Great Britain is not weakening or wavering in the war against Germany, John G. Winant, American Ambassador to the Court of St. James, declared today. His statement came after he had informed congressional leaders that Britain's chances of winning the war still are favorable and that he sees no immediate necessity for the United States to intervene, provided this country intensifies its present aid program.

Mr. Winant conferred with Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, and later encountered Viscount Halifax in the diplomatic waiting room of the State Department. They chatted for several minutes. Asked later about the feeling in Britain toward the war, Mr. Winant said:

"There is no wavering at all—neither in the Government nor in the people. It is the people's fight and they know it."

WHY BRITAIN SHOULD WIN

Meanwhile, it was learned that in a 3-hour conference late yesterday with Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE and congressional leaders Mr. Winant based his conviction that Britain can defeat Germany without United States participation on the following assertion:

That the British can hold the Suez Canal and the Mediterranean and that they have large and well-equipped forces in Africa and Egypt capable of defeating Nazi invasion units.

That the British believe they have air superiority over the channel and the invasion ports of occupied France—a conclusion supported by a sharp decline in daylight bombings and fewer successful night raids by the Nazis in recent weeks.

That the administration's neutrality patrol is becoming increasingly effective and is narrowing danger areas for vital shipping in the Atlantic.

That there has been a tapering off of the sinkings of merchant ships carrying American war materials to Britain.

Several of the congressional leaders, after hearing Mr. Winant, expressed optimism. "It was not a gloomy picture at all," was the way one summed up the conference.

Mr. Winant jubilantly told reporters that he was "glad to see that increasing shipments of materials are going to Britain from this country" and noted that they were "on a constantly mounting scale." He said he would be glad to report this in detail when he goes back to London. After his conference with Mr. Welles, Mr. Winant called on Norman Davis, chairman of the American Red Cross. He is also scheduled to see Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, over the week end.

The conference yesterday with congressional leaders, it was learned today, was requested by Mr. Winant and arranged by Vice President WALLACE. Among those attending it were Senators WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Senatt Committee on Foreign Relations; JAMES F. BYRNES, Democrat, of North Carolina; TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas; and LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.

Among other things that Mr. Winant told the gathering was that he believed Rudolf Hess, No. 3 Nazi, fled from Germany by airplane to Scotland in fear for his life. Mr. Winant ventured that as his own opinion on the basis of his conversations with some British officials who had seen Hess. He added that while Hess was very close to Adolf Hitler during the years of his political rise, he may have had cause to fear military leaders now in power. Mr. Winant declared that Hess is not insane, as has been charged by Berlin.

Mr. Winant also told the Senators frankly that many Britons would like to see this country enter the war, but that there was no tendency to blame the United States for staying out.

Mr. Winant is convinced, the Senators said, that the French people do not want to fight Britain and that many hope Britain eventually will liberate them. He was represented, however, as believing with equal conviction that the Vichy Government is under complete Nazi domination and could be forced into war against her former British ally, even to the extent of letting Germany use the French fleet.

Lord Halifax, after his chat with Mr. Winant, conferred for half an hour with Under Secretary Welles on the tense situation growing out of Franco-German collaboration.

Lord Halifax declined to comment on the discussion, but he and Mr. Welles were believed to have exchanged views and information on the manner and extent of that collaboration.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I did not intend to rise for the purpose of referring to the article offered for the RECORD by the Senator from Connecticut; but I shall refer to it to the extent of saying that Senators who participated in the conference with the Ambassador might be on the floor, and might not make any statement with reference to that conference. Any failure to do so certainly does not mean that the various stories that are printed in the newspapers are correct.

I am one of the Senators referred to. I have learned much about the conference from the newspapers. I receive a great deal of information from the newspapers as to what took place there. I shall certainly not oblige the Senator from Connecticut by denying any of the statements in the newspapers. I have been in public life for 25 years; and to this good day I have never denied anything that ever appeared in the newspapers, even when it was written about me. I make that suggestion to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell us whether or not the Ambassador advised the conference that it was not necessary for the United States to participate in the war in order that Great Britain might win?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have already told the Senator that I do not intend to make any statement about the matter. If I intended to make a statement about it, I should make a statement; and when I do not, the Senator from Connecticut would be no more successful than are newspapermen when they try to provoke me into making a statement by suggesting what might have been said. That is an old and familiar custom among newspapermen. We are familiar with it. The Senator from South Carolina certainly will not make any statement as to anything that was published in the newspapers.

Let me say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that I hope he will not seriously say that the President of the United States should deny what columnists may say as to the views he entertains about foreign affairs. The other day, on the floor of the Senate, when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] was speaking with reference to one of the columnists, I heard the Senator from Montana say that he was devoted to the Senator from Louisiana, and that he really could not understand why the Senator from Louisiana should make the mistake of answering anything said by the columnists. That is the wise policy of the Senator from Montana. I know he would not want the President of the United States daily to deny statements of columnists. I can prove by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Senator from Montana believes that two of the columnists referred to, Messrs. Alsop and Kintner, are very inaccurate. Other Senators who have participated in this discussion have heretofore expressed the opinion that they are exceedingly inaccurate. I have a much higher opinion of them than have other Senators who have discussed the subject.

The columnists referred to are enterprising gentlemen. However, I think that when they undertake to say what is in the minds of the President and all his Cabinet officers, and of officials in the Navy Department and the War Department, they are covering too much territory. That is very difficult for anybody to do.

If the Senator from Montana should attempt to answer what the columnists say about him, he would not have an opportunity to do anything else in life, because the columnists have devoted considerable of their space to the Senator from Montana. Life is too short for a sane and discreet person to devote his energies and time to such a pastime.

PUBLIC POLLS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have sponsored, and it has been before the committee for 10 days or 2 weeks, a resolution which calls upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce to conduct an investigation into the manner in which public polls are taken and recorded. So many people are accepting such polls as being truly indicative of public sentiment that I think the public has every right to know the measure of care that is practiced in taking the polls. All of us have ability to remember that not so many years ago a magazine which had been affording what were accepted as very authentic polls went out of being because it was found on one occasion that one of its polls was far from accurate.

I think the public has a right to know how extensive is the set-up which polls the public and garners its sentiments. If 1,000 part-time poll takers should work for 20 hours a week, Mr. President, and if each one of them polled as many as 4 persons an hour, he would cover only 80 persons in a week, or 80,000 for all the 1,000 poll takers. Eighty thousand of 130,000,000 people, then, would be represented by a poll, if it were as extensive as the example just cited. I have reason to believe that not so large a poll as that is undertaken.

The manner in which polls are undertaken is revealed in an article by a very reliable writer, Helen Essary, in her column, "Dear Washington." A few days ago she reported this in her column:

> The authentic and startling glimpse I got recently into the methods of forming public opinion by poll taking gives me some concern.
>
> Not only had I never met a poll taker before, I had never met anybody who had ever been asked a question by a public-opinion poll taker. Nor had I ever met anybody who knew anybody who had ever been asked a question by a public-opinion poll taker.
>
> Naturally, talking to a poll taker in the living flesh, whose name must be anonymous, was a big experience. I was curious.
>
> "How do you choose the people to question?" I asked. "I assume that you pick at random in order to get a typical group."
>
> "Oh, no," the poll taker answered. "I am given the names of 15 people whom I must go to see."
>
> "What sort of people?"
>
> "P. W. A. workers and people on relief."
>
> "Well, aren't they likely to be prejudiced in favor of the administration?" I asked.
>
> "Possibly. But I do what I'm told. I've just finisned a questionnaire on convoys."
>
> "Did most of your people know what convoys meant?"
>
> "Very few of them did. So I had to tell them."
>
> "Now this is indeed interesting," I continued. "How did you describe a convoy?"
>
> "I merely said that convoys are ships going in pairs. One ship going with another."
>
> "Did you explain that one of such ships is a warship with guns to be shot when necessary? And that shooting such guns is an act of war and will put this country and its people in great danger?"
>
> "No, indeed," was the calm answer. "I didn't go into that. I didn't think they'd understand."
>
> Well, there you are. Of such stuff are opinion polls made. Hardly a serious, honest reflection of what people think.

Mr. President, upon the convening of the Senate today I offered a bill, which has been identified as S. 1606, going to the question of polls. The bill, if passed, would require all publications reporting polls to publish the statistics of the

number of samples taken and the number of persons polled, and would require the poll takers to keep intact for a period of 2 years all their polls, all their ballots, and all their reports growing out of the poll takings. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill referred to—S. 1606—may be printed in the RECORD at this point. It has been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, where my resolution asking for an investigation has gone.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1606) to require the publication of certain information and the preservation of certain records in connection with polls of public opinion, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) it shall be unlawful to publish in any newspaper, magazine, or other publication within the District of Columbia or within any Territory or possession of the United States, or to publish in any newspaper, magazine, or other publication with the knowledge or intent that such newspaper, magazine, or other publication will be transmitted through the mails or in interstate commerce, the results or purported results of any poll or straw ballot purporting to measure or indicate the state of public opinion upon matters of national interest or national importance, unless such publication also contains together with such results or purported results a statement showing the number of persons polled or voting, as the case may be, in such poll or straw ballot and the number of persons polled or voting in each of the respective places, States, or regions with respect to which the state of public opinion is purported to be measured or indicated separately.

(b) In any case where the results or purported results of any such poll or straw ballot are to be published in any newspaper, magazine, or other publication to which this section is applicable and are to be so published by any person other than the person by whom or under whose direction such poll or straw ballot was conducted, the person by whom or under whose direction such poll or straw ballot was conducted shall furnish to the person by whom such results are to be published the information necessary for the statement required by subsection (a); and the person publishing such results shall not be liable under this act because of inaccuracies in the statement required by subsection (a) if such statement is based on information furnished under this subsection and is not known by the person publishing it to be false.

SEC. 2. Any person who conducts or directs the conducting of any such poll or straw ballot with the knowledge or intent that the results thereof will be published in any newspaper, magazine, or other publication with respect to which the provisions of subsection (a) of the first section of this act are applicable shall preserve for a period of 2 years all reports, ballots, and other records used in ascertaining or computing the results of such poll or straw ballot.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates the provisions of this act, or who knowingly publishes or furnishes any false information in connection with any statement published or any information furnished pursuant to the requirements of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other form of association or organization.

(b) The term "interstate commerce" includes any transmission from any place inside any State, Territory, or possession of the United States to or through any place outside of such State, Territory, or possession.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT DECLARING FULL EMERGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 64)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the President of the United States sends a message to Congress the message is always printed in the RECORD in the largest type in which the RECORD itself is printed. On the 27th of May last the President delivered over the radio a very important message to the people of the country. It is one which deals with the vital subject of our international relations. I find, on looking for copies of it, that it has not been printed as a Senate document, and that it is not available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the ordinary type in which Presidential messages are usually printed. It was inserted in the RECORD at the request of a Member of the House of Representatives, together with the proclamation of the emergency, and with a list of laws which convey power to the President to act in case of emergency or in case of war.

The material offered—the proclamation of the emergency, the President's address, and the schedule of acts, prepared by the Attorney General—is of such great importance, Mr. President, that I feel that all three should be printed as a Senate document and made available to the Members of the Senate, the Members of the House, and to the public generally. In the circumstances I ask unanimous consent that this material may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of uncontested bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McCARRAN. Call the roll. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brewster	Capper
Aiken	Brooks	Caraway
Andrews	Brown	Chandler
Bailey	Bulow	Chavez
Ball	Bunker	Clark, Idaho
Bankhead	Burton	Clark, Mo.
Barbour	Butler	Connally
Bilbo	Byrd	Danaher
Bone	Byrnes	Davis
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Rosier
Ellender	Kilgore	Shipstead
George	La Follette	Smith
Gillette	Lucas	Spencer
Glass	McCarran	Stewart
Green	McFarland	Taft
Guffey	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murdock	Tunnell
Herring	Norris	Tydings
Hill	Nye	Van Nuys
Holman	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Houston	Overton	Wheeler
Hughes	Pepper	White
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1290) to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and Naval Establishments, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of Military or Naval Establishments as the Secretaries of War and Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4293) to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN L. SAVAGE

The bill (S. 1488) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage an employee of the United States to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940, Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United

States, to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India," approved June 29, 1940 (Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words "State of New South Wales, Australia," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words: "Commonwealth of Australia."

RED-CEDAR SHINGLE INDUSTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 79), submitted by Mr. BONE on February 24, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment at the beginning of line 2 to strike out "authorized" and insert "requested", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is requested, pursuant to the authority conferred by section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to investigate the effect upon the red-cedar shingle industry in the United States of importations of red-cedar shingles from Canada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

FIRES ON PUBLIC DOMAIN, AND SO FORTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 633) to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "willfully", to strike out "and without authority so to do"; in line 8, after the word "grass", to insert "or other inflammable material"; in line 9, after the word "or", to strike out "on" and insert "upon"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "States", to insert "which are"; in line 3, after the word "seashore", to insert "lake shore"; in the same line, after the word "cemetery", to strike out "or"; in line 4, after the word "project", to strike out "or in any"; in the same line, after the word "refuge", to strike out "or in any"; in line 5, after the word "or", to strike out "upon any"; in line 10, after the name "United States", to strike out "which are held by the Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "and under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Animal Industry or administered"; in line 13, after the word "act", to insert "(50 Stat. 522, 525), or upon any lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, or title III of the said Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act", so as to make the section read:

That section 52 of the Criminal Code (act of Mar. 4, 1909, sec. 52; 35 Stat. 1098, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 106) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 52. Whoever shall willfully set on fire or cause to be set on fire any timber, underbrush, or grass or other inflammable material upon the public domain or upon any lands owned by the United States which are included in a park, forest, monument, historical park, military park, battlefield site, parkway, recreational area, seashore, lake shore, cemetery, recreational demonstration project, wildlife refuge, grazing district, or stock driveway, or upon any land title to which was revested in the United States under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), or upon any land reconveyed to the United States under the act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), or upon any lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Animal Industry or administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 522, 525), or upon any lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, or title III of the said Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or upon any Indian reservation or lands belonging to or occupied by any tribe or group of Indians under authority of the United States, or upon any Indian allotment while the title to the same shall be held in trust by the Government, or while the same shall remain inalienable by the allottee without the consent of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 2, page 3, line 5, after the word "fire", to insert "or cause a fire to be built"; in line 8, after the word "including", to insert "lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, or under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 522, 525)"; in line 20, after the word "fire", to insert "or whoever shall permit or suffers said fire to burn or spread beyond his control"; in line 21, after the word "shall", to strike out "willfully or carelessly"; in line 23, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both", and insert "$500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months without hard labor, or both", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. Section 53 of the Criminal Code, as amended (act of June 25, 1910, sec. 6, 36 Stat. 857; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 107), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 53. Whoever shall build a fire or cause a fire to be built in or near any forest, timber, or other inflammable material upon any lands owned or controlled by the United States, including lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, or under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 522, 525), any Indian reservation, or lands belonging to or occupied by any tribe or group of Indians under the authority of the United States, or any Indian allotment while the title to the same shall be held in trust by the United States, or while the same shall remain inalienable by the allottee without the consent of the United States, shall, before leaving said fire, totally extinguish the same; and whoever shall neglect and omit totally to extinguish said fire or whoever shall permit or suffer said fire to burn or spread beyond his control or whoever shall leave or suffer said fire to burn unattended in such places, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months without hard labor, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCES OF COURT CLERKS, MARSHALS, AND UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

The bill (H. R. 148) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 13, 1875, and for other purposes" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLACES OF CONFINEMENT OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

The bill (H. R. 1831) to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930, relating to places of confinement and transfers of prisoners convicted of an offense against the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF METAL FOR MINOR COINS

The bill (H. R. 4132) to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH ARREAS

The bill (S. 708) for the relief of Joseph Arreas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Joseph Arreas, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act Joseph Arreas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding proceeding rests, and he shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted at San Francisco in 1928 as an immigrant for permanent residence.

CHAIM WAKERMAN, KNOWN AS HYMAN WAKERMAN

The bill (S. 456) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman, New York, N. Y., on June 23, 1929, and that he shall for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence.

MIRA FRIEDBERG

The bill (S. 452) for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 139 (e)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka), who is the wife of Louis

Friedberg, a citizen of the United States of America, on account of an offense admitted to have been committed abroad, prior to her marriage to said Louis Friedberg at Danzig, Europe, on or about May 30, 1933. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa shall be issued to her and admission granted to said Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka) under this act, for permanent residence in the United States of America.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the quota during the current year.

NELL VICTORIA LEA

The bill (S. 756) for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The Chair desires to state that this bill was recommitted earier in the day and there has been reported today a similar House bill without amendment. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill at this call of the calendar?

Mr. McCARRAN. I inquire what is the number of the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed it is House bill 3810.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, when the calendar was being called I objected to the consideration of Order No. 389, Senate bill 756. Subsequently I have been advised regarding the matter, and am informed that the House bill is identical with the Senate bill with the amendment reported by the committee. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3810) for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SEWARD, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 95) to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the House committee and the report of the Senate committee on House bill 95 appear in the RECORD at the point where the bill was being considered.

There being no objection, the reports, Nos. 502 and 377, respectively, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT NO. 502

The Committee on the Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 95) to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska," having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to enable the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to purchase certain private utilities consisting of an electric system and telephone system now being operated in and adjacent to the town.

By the act approved May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 282), the town of Seward was authorized to construct and operate a municipal electric system. Section 6 of the act made provision for the purchase of the local private electric utilities for a sum not to exceed $75,000. However, the owner of the private utilities did not elect to sell for that sum, and so the municipal plant was built and put into operation and has since been used. Money for the construction of the municipal plant was obtained by loan and grant from the Public Works Administration. The loan amounted to $96,000, and revenue bonds were issued by the town of Seward to the Public Works Administration in that amount. Those bonds are now held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

It appears that there is not sufficient business in Seward to permit the profitable operation of both plants, now or in the predictable future, but that the purchase of the private utilities and the operation of the plants, consolidated into one plant, by the town through largely increased income and materially reduced operation expenses, may give sufficient profits to justify the proposed purchase. Therefore, it may be advisable for the town of Seward to purchase the private utilities if terms can be agreed upon. The bill in question is intended to give authority to make such purchase, providing the holders of at least 75 percent of the outstanding electric revenue bonds of the town agree to the purchase, and provided that the purchase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors of the town of Seward. Authority is also given to refund the outstanding revenue bonds issued in connection with the loan to the town made by the Public Works Administration for the construction of the municipal plant.

The bill does not obligate anyone to do anything. It merely authorizes the purchase of the private utilities under the conditions mentioned, if it is considered wise to do so and if the money can be obtained to make such purchase. Every possible safeguard is afforded to all concerned.

The Bureau of the Budget offers no objection to the passage of the bill.

The bill was submitted to the Department of the Interior and to the Federal Loan Administrator for the customary departmental reports thereon. Both the Acting Secretary of the Interior, A. J. Wirtz, and the Federal Loan Administrator, Jesse H. Jones, have approved the bill, as indicated by their respective letters, each dated February 28, 1941, and addressed to the chairman of the committee, copies of which follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 28, 1941.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GREEN: I have received your request of January 8 for a report on H. R. 95, a bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska."

The act of May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 282), authorized the town of Seward to erect and operate a municipal electric plant and to issue revenue bonds for that purpose. By section 6 of the act the powers thus authorized were not to be invoked if within a specified time (1 week after proper notification of the passage of the act) the owner of the private utilities then serving the town should offer to sell his plant to the municipality for $75,000. The owner did not make the offer and the town of Seward constructed the plant authorized, issuing bonds in the amount of $96,000. These bonds are held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Both electric plants now solicit patronage from the residents of Seward, a town of approximately 950 inhabitants. It need hardly be demonstrated that there is insufficient sale of electric current to support two producers and distributors. Due largely to the divided patronage, the town has with difficulty been able to meet its interest obligations. The present owners of the private utility (heirs of Mr. S. M. Graff, owner in 1935) have, I understand, indicated a willingness to sell.

The enactment of H. R. 95 would enable the town to purchase the private utilities provided the transaction be approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 percent of the electric revenue bonds and by a majority of the qualified electors of the town voting upon the question. It also authorizes the town to utilize the property purchased in whatever way may be to its best interest. The bill further makes provision for the issuance of the necessary refunding and acquisition bonds, subject to the approval of the holder or holders of 75 percent of the electric revenue bonds at the time the approval is given.

It is my view that the town of Seward should be enabled to consider the purchase of the private utilities, and I recommend that the bill be enacted.

I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to presenting this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. WIRTZ,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
Washington, February 28, 1941.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your inquiry under date of January 8, 1941, in respect to H. R. 95, a bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska."

This bill, as did H. R. 10519, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizes the town of Seward, Alaska, to purchase certain private utility properties if, among other conditions, such purchase is approved by the holders of 75 percent in principal amount of the electric revenue bonds of that municipality now outstanding. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation now holds $96,000 in such bonds.

As indicated in my letter of December 4, 1940, in respect to H. R. 10519, Seventy-sixth Congress, there appears to be no reason against the vesting of this authority in the town of Seward and I, therefore, see no objection to the enactment of such legislation. The Bureau of the Budget has, under date of December 2, 1940, and in respect to H. R. 10519, Seventy-sixth Congress, indicated concurrence in this opinion.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES, *Administrator.*

Changes in existing law are indicated below, with matter proposed to be omitted enclosed in brackets and new matter proposed to be inserted printed in italic:

"SEC. 6. This act shall become effective thirty days after its passage: [*Provided, however,* That none of the powers herein granted to the said town of Seward, Alaska, shall be exercised by said town in the event that the Seward Light and Power Company, a corporation, shall within one week after a copy of this act is served on said Seward Light and Power Company, offer in writing to sell and convey to the said town of Seward all right, title, and interest in and to its electric generating plant or plants, electric distributing system, pipe lines, and water rights now

owned by it and used and employed in supplying electric energy to the inhabitants of said town, said offer of sale to be for the sum of $75,000, and to guarantee that delivery of said title, free from encumbrance and debt of any kind, shall be made to said town upon payment of said sum, any time within six months from date of said written offer to sell: *Provided further,* That said offer and agreement to convey title must be delivered by said Seward Light and Power Company, to the town clerk of said town of Seward, Alaska, within the time specified above. Service of copy of this act on the Seward Light and Power Company shall be made by delivery thereof to its president, S. M. Graff, or any other officer of the corporation: *And provided further,* That in the event the said Seward Light and Power Company offers to sell and convey its properties as provided for in this section, the said town is authorized to purchase such properties and to issue bonds for such purpose in an amount not to exceed $75,000, such bonds to be issued in the manner provided for in this act.] *Provided, That if at any time hereafter the public-utilities property consisting of an electric system and a telephone system now being operated in and adjacent to said town of Seward under the name of Seward Light and Power, or Seward Light and Power Company, shall be offered by the owner or owners thereof to the town of Seward at a reasonable price, and the purchase shall be approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of electric-revenue bonds of said town outstanding on the date of approval by said bondholders, and by a majority of the qualified electors of the town of Seward voting upon the question at a regular election or at a special election called and held for that purpose within ninety days after the formal submission of said offer, the town of Seward is hereby authorized and empowered (a) to acquire said property, and to pay the agreed purchase price thereof; (b) to operate and maintain all or any part thereof for its own use and benefit and for the use and benefit of public and private consumers or users within and without the territorial boundaries of said town, as an integral part of the municipal electric system of said town; (c) to issue its bonds to finance in whole or in part the cost of acquiring said property; (d) to prescribe and collect rates, fees, tolls, or charges for the services, facilities, and commodities furnished in connection with the operation of said property; (e) to pledge to the punctual payment of said bonds and interest thereon all or any part of the gross or net revenues from the operation of said property, separately or in conjunction with property heretofore acquired by said town (including improvements, betterments, or extensions thereto hereafter constructed or acquired): Provided further, That the principal amount of bonds authorized under the foregoing provisions of this section shall in no event be in excess of the purchase price stated in the offer and all proceedings for the issuance and sale of said bonds shall be submitted to and approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of aforesaid electric-revenue bonds of said town outstanding on the date of such approval: Provided further, That said town may, upon consent of the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of bonds of said town issued under this act and outstanding on the date of such consent, issue its refunding and acquisition bonds in the aggregate principal amount as the probable revenues from the operation of the combined systems will reasonably justify. Refunding and acquisition bonds, if issued, shall bear interest not exceeding 4 per centum per annum; otherwise they shall be issued in compliance with other bond provisions contained in this act."*

REPORT NO. 377

The Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 95) to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska," having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass without amendment.

The enactment of the measure is desired by all of the interested parties, and no opposition to it from any source has been expressed.

The objects and purposes of the bill are adequately explained in the House Report No 502 on the bill, and as therein appears, the bill has the approval of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Loan Agency, and there is no objection from the Bureau of the Budget. The bill does not authorize or carry any appropriation.

The House report on the bill follows:

"The Committee on the Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 95) to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled 'An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska,' having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

"The purpose of the bill is to enable the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to purchase certain private utilities consisting of an electric system and telephone system now being operated in and adjacent to the town.

"By the act approved May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 282), the town of Seward was authorized to construct and operate a municipal electric system. Section 6 of the act made provision for the purchase of the local private electric utilities for a sum not to exceed $75,000. However, the owner of the private utilities did not elect to sell for that sum, and so the municipal plant was built and put into operation and has since been used. Money for the construction of the municipal plant was obtained by loan and grant from the Public Works Administration. The loan amounted to $96,000, and revenue bonds were issued by the town of Seward to the Public Works Administration in that amount. Those bonds are now held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"It appears that there is not sufficient business in Seward to permit the profitable operation of both plants, now or in the predictable future, but that the purchase of private utilities and the operation of the plants, consolidated into one plant, by the town through largely increased income and materially reduced operation expenses, may give sufficient profits to justify the proposed purchase. Therefore, it may be advisable for the town of Seward to purchase the private utilities if terms can be agreed upon. The bill in question is intended to give authority to make such purchase, providing the holders of at least 75 percent of the outstanding electric revenue bonds of the town agree to the purchase, and provided that the purchase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors of the town of Seward. Authority is also given to refund the outstanding revenue bonds issued in connection with the loan to the town made by the Public Works Administration for the construction of the municipal plant.

"The bill does not obligate anyone to do anything. It merely authorizes the purchase of the private utilities under the conditions mentioned, if it is considered wise to do so and if the money can be obtained to make such purchase. Every possible safeguard is afforded to all concerned.

"The Bureau of the Budget offers no objection to the passage of the bill.

"The bill was submitted to the Department of the Interior and to the Federal Loan Administrator for the customary departmental reports thereon. Both the Acting Secretary of the Interior, A. J. Wirtz, and the Federal Loan Administrator, Jesse H. Jones, have approved the bill as indicated by their respective letters, each dated February 28, 1941, and addressed to the chairman of the committee, copies of which follow:

"THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
"Washington, February 28, 1941.

"Hon. LEX GREEN,
"Chairman, Committee on the Territories, House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR MR. GREEN: I have received your request of January 8 for a report on H. R. 95, a bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled 'An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska.'

"The act of May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 282), authorized the town of Seward to erect and operate a municipal electric plant and to issue revenue bonds for that purpose. By section 6 of the act the powers thus authorized were not to be invoked if within a specified time (1 week after proper notification of the passage of the act) the owner of the private utilities then serving the town should offer to sell his plant to the municipality for $75,000. The owner did not make the offer, and the town of Seward constructed the plant authorized, issuing bonds in the amount of $96,000. These bonds are held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"Both electric plants now solicit patronage from the residents of Seward, a town of approximately 950 inhabitants. It need hardly be demonstrated that there is insufficient sale of electric current to support two producers and distributors. Due largely to the divided patronage, the town has with difficulty been able to meet its interest obligations. The present owners of the private utility (heirs of Mr. S. M. Graff, owner in 1935) have, I understand, indicated a willingness to sell.

"The enactment of H. R. 95 would enable the town to purchase the private utilities provided the transaction be approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 percent of the electric revenue bonds and by a majority of the qualified electors of the town voting upon the question. It also authorizes the town to utilize the property purchased in whatever way may be to its best interest. The bill further makes provision for the issuance of the necessary refunding and acquisition bonds, subject to the approval of the holder or holders of 75 percent of the electric revenue bonds at the time the approval is given.

"It is my view that the town of Seward should be enabled to consider the purchase of the private utilities, and I recommend that the bill be enacted.

"I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to presenting this report to the Congress.

"Sincerely yours,

"A. J. WIRTZ,
"Acting Secretary of the Interior."

"FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
"Washington, February 28, 1941.

"Hon. LEX GREEN,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: Receipt is acknowledged of your inquiry under date of January 8, 1941, in respect to H. R. 95, a bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled 'An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska.'

"This bill, as did H. R. 10519, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizes the town of

Seward, Alaska, to purchase certain private utility properties if, among other conditions, such purchase is approved by the holders of 75 percent in principal amount of the electric revenue bonds of that municipality now outstanding. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation now holds $96,000 in such bonds.

"As indicated in my letter of December 4, 1940, in respect to H. R. 10519, Seventy-sixth Congress, there appears to be no reason against the vesting of this authority in the town of Seward and I, therefore, see no objection to the enactment of such legislation. The Bureau of the Budget has, under date of December 2, 1940, and in respect to H. R. 10519, Seventy-sixth Congress, indicated concurrence in this opinion.

"Sincerely yours,

"JESSE H. JONES, *Administrator.*"

Changes in existing law are indicated below, with matter proposed to be omitted enclosed in brackets and new matter proposed to be inserted printed in italic:

"SEC. 6. This act shall become effective thirty days after its passage: [*Provided, however,* That none of the powers herein granted to the said town of Seward, Alaska, shall be exercised by said town in the event that the Seward Light and Power Company, a corporation, shall within one week after a copy of this act is served on said Seward Light and Power Company, offer in writing to sell and convey to the said town of Seward all right, title, and interest in and to its electric generating plant or plants, electric distributing system, pipe lines, and water rights now owned by it and used and employed in supplying electric energy to the inhabitants of said town, said offer of sale to be for the sum of $75,000, and to guarantee that delivery of said title, free from encumbrance and debt of any kind, shall be made to said town upon payment of said sum, any time within six months from date of said written offer to sell: *Provided further,* That said offer and agreement to convey title must be delivered by said Seward Light and Power Company to the town clerk of said town of Seward, Alaska, within the time specified above. Service of copy of this act on the Seward Light and Power Company shall be made by delivery thereof to its president, S. M. Graff, or any other officer of the corporation: *And provided further,* That in the event the said Seward Light and Power Company offers to sell and convey its properties as provided for in this section, the said town is authorized to purchase such properties and to issue bonds for such purpose in an amount not to exceed $75,000, such bonds to be issued in the manner provided for in this act.] *Provided, That if at any time hereafter the public utilities property consisting of an electric system and a telephone system now being operated in and adjacent to said town of Seward under the name of Seward Light and Power, or Seward Light and Power Company, shall be offered by the owner or owners thereof to the town of Seward at a reasonable price, and the purchase shall be approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of electric revenue bonds of said town outstanding on the date of approval by said bondholders, and by a majority of the qualified electors of the town of Seward voting upon the question at a regular election or at a special election called and held for that purpose within ninety days after the formal submission of said offer, the town of Seward is hereby authorized and empowered (a) to acquire said property, and to pay the agreed purchase price thereof; (b) to operate and maintain all or any part thereof for its own use and benefit and for the use and benefit, of public and private consumers or users within and without the territorial boundaries of said town, as an integral part of the municipal electric system of said town; (c) to issue its bonds to finance in whole or in part the cost of acquiring said property; (d) to prescribe and collect rates, fees, tolls, or charges for the services, facilities, and commodities furnished in connection with the operation of said property; (e) to pledge to the punctual payment of said bonds and interest thereon all or any part of the gross or net revenues from the operation of said property, separately or in conjunction with property heretofore acquired by said town (including improvements, betterments, or extensions thereto hereafter constructed or acquired): Provided further, That the principal amount of bonds authorized under the foregoing provisions of this section shall in no event be in excess of the purchase price stated in the offer and all proceedings for the issuance and sale of said bonds shall be submitted to and approved by the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of aforesaid electric revenue bonds of said town outstanding on the date of such approval: Provided further, That said town may, upon consent of the holder or holders of not less than 75 per centum in principal amount of bonds of said town issued under this act and outstanding on the date of such consent, issue its refunding and acquisition bonds in the aggregate principal amount of bonds to be refunded and such additional principal amount as the probable revenues from the operation of the combined systems will reasonably justify. Refunding and acquisition bonds, if issued, shall bear interest not exceeding 4 per centum per annum; otherwise they shall be issued in compliance with other bond provisions contained in this act."*

COPPER RIVER AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1289) authorizing the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, page 2, line 12, after the word "contrary", to strike out "and to dispose of such of said properties or parts thereof, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, as may not be needed in the repair, operation, and maintenance of the highway, tramroad, or tramway, the proceeds from the disposition of such properties to be available until expended for the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in the Territory of Alaska under the provisions of the said act of June 30, 1932", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co., or any of its successors in interest or assigns, is hereby authorized to give and convey to the United States of America (1) all or any portion of its railroad right-of-way acquired under grants made by Congress or otherwise, including station and terminal grounds and lands used as sites for railroad structures or purposes of any kind, and (2) equipment, including telephone and telegraph poles and lines, ties, rails, rolling stock, bridges, buildings, and other properties in Alaska used in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of the railroad.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to accept, on behalf of the United States and without cost to the United States, gifts and conveyances of said properties to be used, operated, and maintained, as far as may be practicable or necessary, as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446), notwithstanding anything within any act to the contrary.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the act of March 8, 1922 (42 Stat. 414), shall not affect the right-of-way, or any portion thereof, or any other lands or properties donated, granted, or conveyed to the United States pursuant to the authorization contained in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1358) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 357) to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite coal industry was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL OFFICERS AND MEN FOR PROPERTY LOST OR DESTROYED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 378) to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, on page 5, line 13, after the word "paid", to strike out *"And provided"* and insert *"Provided further"*; in line 23, after the word "officer", to strike out "of" and insert "for"; and, on page 6, after the words "Coast Guard", to insert:

And provided further, That the provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in like manner as to the personnel of the Navy, except that all reimbursement shall be made in money and shall be limited to such articles of personal property as the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall decide to be reasonable, useful, and proper for such officer, member of the crew, or other person while engaged in the public service in line of duty, without reference to articles required by the United States Naval Regulations, and all of the duties, which, under this act, devolve upon the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps with reference to the personnel of that corps, shall devolve upon the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and in cases involving persons in the Coast and Geodetic Survey reimbursement shall be made by a disbursing officer for the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Coast and Geodetic Survey appropriation from which the officer or man is paid.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 389), entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service", be amended by adding the words "or by fires, floods, earth-

quakes, hurricanes, or similar disasters, occurring on land" immediately following the word "disaster" in line 8 thereof, and by adding a proviso at the end of the act, the act as amended to read as follows:

"That the Paymaster General of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reimburse such officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States as may have suffered, or may hereafter suffer, loss or destruction of or damage to their personal property and effects in the naval service due to the operations of war or by shipwreck or other marine disaster, or by fires, floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, or similar disasters, occurring on land, when such loss, destruction, or damage was without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant, or where the private property so lost, destroyed, or damaged was shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment, or where it appears that the loss, destruction, or damage of or to the private property of the claimant was in consequence of his having given his attention to the saving of the lives of others or of property belonging to the United States which was in danger at the same time and under similar circumstances. And the liability of the Government under this act shall be limited to replacement in kind of the clothing such individual may be required by regulation to have in his possession, reimbursement in cash or other personal effects which shall include toilet articles not exceeding $5 and where required for aviation ratings a watch not exceeding $25, and in addition, for chief petty officers, cooks, and stewards such additional clothing as the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation with reference to the personnel of the Navy, or the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, with reference to the personnel of that corps, shall decide to be reasonable, and the certificate of said chief of bureau or Major General Commandant, as the case may be, shall be sufficient voucher for and shall be final as to all matters necessary to the establishment and payment or settlement of any claim filed hereunder; and the action of the said chief of Bureau or Major General Commandant, as the case may be, upon all claims arising under this act shall be final, and no right to prosecute a claim or action in the Court of Claims or in any other court of the United States, or before any accounting officer of the United States, or elsewhere, except as herein provided, shall accrue to any person by virtue of this act: *Provided*, That the liability of the Government under this act shall be limited to such articles of personal property as are required by the United States Naval Regulations and in force at the time of loss or destruction for such officers, petty officers, seamen, or others engaged in the public service in the line of duty: *Provided further*, That with reference to claims of persons in the Marine Corps filed under the terms of this act the paymaster of the Marine Corps shall make the reimbursement in money, and the quartermaster of the Marine Corps shall make the reimbursement in kind herein provided for: *Provided further*, That all claims now existing under this act shall be presented within 2 years from the passage hereof and not thereafter; and all such claims hereafter arising shall be presented within 2 years from the occurrence of the loss, destruction, or damage: *Provided further*, That the term 'in the naval service', as herein employed, shall be held to include service performed on board any vessel, whether of the Navy or not, provided the claimant is serving on such vessel pursuant to the orders of duly constituted naval authority: *Provided further*, That all claimants under this act shall be required to submit their claims in writing and under oath to the said Chief of the Bureau of Navigation or Major General Commandant, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That claims arising in the manner indicated in this act and which have been settled under the terms of previously existing law shall be regarded as finally determined and no other or further right of recovery under the provisions hereof shall accrue to persons who have submitted such claims as aforesaid: *Provided further*, That sections 288, 289, and 290, Revised Statutes, and the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 962), are hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That reimbursement for loss, destruction, or damage sustained and determined as herein provided shall be made in kind for such articles as are customarily issued to the service and shall be made in money for other articles at the valuation thereof at the time of their loss, destruction, or damage: *Provided further*, That in cases involving persons in the Navy reimbursement in money shall be made from the appropriation 'Pay of the Navy', and reimbursement in kind shall be made from the appropriation 'Outfits on first enlistment', and in cases involving persons in the Marine Corps reimbursement in money shall be made from the appropriation 'Pay, Marine Corps', and reimbursement in kind shall be made from the appropriation 'Clothing, Marine Corps', respectively, current at the time the claim covering such loss, damage, or destruction is paid: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast Guard in like manner as to the personnel of the Navy, whether the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department or operating as a part of the Navy, and all of the duties, which, under this act, devolve upon the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps with reference to the personnel of that corps, shall devolve upon the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and in cases involving persons in the Coast Guard reimbursement in money shall be made by a disbursing officer for the Coast Guard from the appropriation 'Pay and Allowances, United States Coast Guard,' and reimbursement in kind shall be made by the Commandant from the appropriation 'Pay and Allowances, United States Coast Guard': *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in like manner as to the personnel of the Navy, except that all reimbursement shall be made in money and shall be limited to such articles of personal property as the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall decide to be reasonable, useful, and proper for such officer, member of the crew, or other person while engaged in the public service in line of duty, without reference to articles required by the United States Naval Regulations, and all of the duties, which, under this act, devolve upon the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps with reference to the personnel of that corps, shall devolve upon the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and in cases involving persons in the Coast and Geodetic Survey reimbursement shall be made by a disbursing officer for the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Coast and Geodetic Survey appropriation from which the officer or man is paid."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 374) to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recognize this bill as one which was considered a few days ago on the floor of the Senate. Disposition has not been made of it. I think it was agreed that the bill should come up on Thursday of this week. In any event, I object to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over under objection.

The bill (S. 1529) to amend the act approved May 13, 1908, relative to retirement of officers of the United States Navy after 30 years' service was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is temporarily absent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND REPORTS IN NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, in section 4, page 2, line 21, after the word "amended", to insert "or otherwise as he may elect", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. There shall be a civilian assistant to the Director of Budget and Reports, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy in accordance with civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or otherwise as he may elect. Such civilian assistant shall perform such duties as the Director of Budget and Reports may designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1467) to amend section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to have some explanation of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill likewise was reported by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is temporarily absent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask that the bill go over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

PAY OF AVIATION PILOTS IN NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The bill (S. 1508) to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each enlisted man of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve who is designated, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, as a student aviation pilot, and who commences flight training leading to designation as aviation pilot, shall sign an agreement, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he be a minor, to serve for a continuous period of

2 years on active duty in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve, following successful completion of flight training, unless sooner released: *Provided*, That in time of peace such aviation pilot may, with his own consent, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, serve on active duty for an additional period of not more than 2 years.

SEC. 2. Enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve who are designated, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, as aviation pilots shall, while on active duty, receive the pay of the third grade, or that of their rating, whichever is greater.

SEC. 3. Aviation pilots of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve may, if qualified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, be commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps Reserve.

SEC. 4. Any student aviation pilot or aviation pilot designated as such in accordance with sections 1 and 2 of this act may at any time in the discretion of such administrative authority as the Secretary of the Navy may designate, be discharged or released from active duty.

SEC. 5. Student aviation pilots shall, while undergoing training, be issued necessary uniforms and equipment at Government expense.

SEC. 6. Enlisted personnel of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve while on active duty undergoing training leading to designation as aviation pilot, and thereafter while on continuous active duty with designation as aviation pilot, shall be issued Government life insurance in the amount of $5,000, the premiums for which shall be paid from the current appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy," "Naval Reserve," or "Pay, Marine Corps," as may be appropriate. Upon release from active duty or discharge such enlisted personnel shall have the option of continuing such insurance at their own expense: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to restrict the total amount of Government life insurance to which such pilots would otherwise be entitled.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4671) to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of this bill by some member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may be permitted to make a statement, the Chair is under the impression that this bill is similar to the Senate bill to which the Senator from Oregon referred in his previous statement.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; then I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over under objection.

MEETING OF NATIONAL DIRECTORS OF METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942, to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942, and to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $14,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; communication services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); travel expenses; local transportation; hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; transportation of things; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; entertainment; official cards; badges; purchase of newspapers, periodicals, books, documents, maps, charts, etc.; stationery; and such other expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of observance of appropriate courtesies in connection therewith, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified.

PAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS OF WITNESSES AND JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1051) relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the word "No", to insert "Sec. 846"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "have", to insert "incurred"; in line 13, before the word "The", to insert "Sec. 855"; and in line 16, after the words "United States", to strike out "are parties", and insert "is a party", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 846 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 577), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 846. No accounts of fees or costs paid to any witness or juror, upon the order of any judge or commissioner, or to any witness upon the certificate of attendance of the United States attorney or assistant United States attorney, or to any juror upon the certificate of attendance of the clerk of the court, shall be so reexamined as to charge any marshal for an erroneous taxation of such fees or costs. Where the ministerial officers of the United States have incurred or shall incur extraordinary expense in executing the laws thereof, the payment of which is not specifically provided for, the President of the United States is authorized to allow the payment thereof under the special taxation of the district court of the district in which the said services have been or shall be rendered, to be paid from the appropriation for defraying the expenses of the judiciary."

SEC. 2. Section 855 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 608) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 855. The marshal shall pay to the jurors all fees to which they appear to be entitled on the certificate of attendance of the clerk of the court, and in cases where the United States is a party, the marshal shall pay to the witnesses all fees to which they appear to be entitled on the certificate of attendance of the United States attorney or assistant United States attorney, which sum shall be allowed the marshal in the General Accounting Office in his accounts."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to relieve the judges of the Federal courts of administrative duties. Under existing law the judges are required to certify in an order the attendance of witnesses and jurors. This has to be done purely upon the representation of the clerk or the district attorney; and the judge really certifies something that he knows nothing of, other than what is told him by the district attorney or the clerk, as the case may be. The purpose of the bill is to permit attending witnesses and attending jurors to be paid by the marshal upon the certificate of the clerk or of the district attorney, as the case may be, and, in the case of exceptional witnesses, upon the order of the President of the United States out of the fund set aside for the operation of the judiciary.

The bill came to the Senate, and was introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] at the request of the Judicial Council, in order to relieve the judges of this administrative burden, which really means nothing. In other words, no purpose is accomplished by having them certify to something of which they can have no personal knowledge. As the bill has been reported, the amendments are merely to clarify the English in it where a couple of mistakes were made by the original drafting officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVELING AND SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES OF JUDGES OF COURT OF CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1052) relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 13, after the word "receive", to insert "the same"; in line 14, after the word "expenses", to insert "as"; in the same line, after the word "for", to insert "other judges"; and in line 15, after the word "act", to insert "while absent from their actual places of residence"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of February 24, 1925, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation" (43 Stat. 965), as amended (46 Stat. 799; U. S. C., title 28, secs. 270, 275a), is hereby reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Each of the said commissioners shall devote all of his time to the duties of

his office and shall receive a salary of $7,500 per annum, payable monthly out of the Treasury. The chief justice, or any judge of the Court of Claims, may sit at any place within the United States to take evidence in any case instituted in said court. The chief justice, and any judge of the court, the commissioners, and stenographers authorized by the court, shall also receive their necessary traveling expenses and their actual expenses incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty and away from Washington in an amount not to exceed $10 per day in the case of the chief justice or any judge of the court, $7 per day in the case of commissioners, and $5 per day in the case of stenographers. Retired judges recalled to active duty in Washington or elsewhere shall be entitled to receive the same travel and subsistence expenses as provided for other judges in this act while absent from their actual places of residence. The expenses of travel and subsistence herein authorized shall be paid upon order of the court."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

STATEMENT AND EXECUTIVE ORDER BY THE PRESIDENT RELATIVE TO NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an Executive order of the President issued today, with reference to the North American Aviation Co., and the statement of the President accompanying the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement and Executive order are as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Continuous production in the Los Angeles plant of North American Aviation, Inc., is essential to national defense. It is engaged in the production of airplanes vital to our defense and much of the property in the plant is owned, directly or indirectly, by the United States. Production in this plant has ceased because of a labor dispute.

Conciliation was resorted to and efforts at conciliation failed. The dispute was then certified by the Secretary of Labor to the National Defense Mediation Board.

The course of mediation has now been interrupted in violation of an agreement entered into by the bargaining representatives of the workers to continue production during the course of the mediation. Full stoppage of production has resulted. This has created a situation seriously detrimental to the defense of the United States.

Because of this situation, as President and Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, I have determined that this plant must be reopened at once. I have therefore directed that the Secretary of War shall immediately take charge of the plant and remain in charge and operate the plant until normal production shall be resumed.

Our country is in danger and the men and women who are now making airplanes play an indispensable part in its defense. I call upon the workers to return to their jobs, with full confidence in the desire and ability of this administration to protect their persons and their interests. I have an abiding confidence in the loyalty and patriotism of the American workers, and I am sure that they will seize this opportunity to cooperate in the national interest. Their fundamental rights as free citizens will be protected by the Government, and negotiations will be conducted through the process of collective bargaining to reach a settlement fair and reasonable to the workers and to the company. The company already has stated that any such settlement will be retroactive to May 1.

The Army has been directed to afford protection to all workers entering or leaving the plant, and in their own homes.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

Whereas on the 27th day of May 1941 a Presidential proclamation was issued, declaring an unlimited national emergency and calling upon all loyal citizens in production for defense to give precedence to the needs of the Nation to the end that a system of government which makes private enterprise possible may survive; and calling upon all our loyal workmen as well as employers to merge their lesser differences in the larger effort to insure the survival of the only kind of government which recognizes the rights of labor or of capital, and calling upon all loyal citizens to place the Nation's needs first in mind and in action to the end that we may mobilize and have ready for instant defensive use, all of the physical powers, all of the moral strength, and all of the material resources of the Nation; and

Whereas North American Aviation, Inc., at its Inglewood plant in the city of Los Angeles, State of California, has contracts with the United States for the manufacture of military aircraft and other material and articles vital to the defense of the United States; and the United States owns aircraft in the course of production, raw material, machinery, and other property situated in the said company's plant; and

Whereas a controversy arose at said plant over terms and conditions of employment between the company and the workers which they have been unable to adjust by collective bargaining; and whereas the controversy was duly certified to the National Defense Mediation Board, established by the Executive order of March 19, 1941, and whereas before the negotiations had been concluded before the said Board, and in violation of an agreement between the bargaining representatives of the company and the workers authorized to appear before the Board and conduct the negotiations, production at said plant of said aircraft and other articles and materials vital to the defense of the United States was interrupted by a strike which still continues; and

Whereas the objectives of said proclamation of May 27 1941, are jeopardized, and the ability of the United States to obtain aircraft essential to its armed forces and to the national defense is seriously impaired by said cessation of production; and

Whereas for the time being and under the circumstances hereinabove set forth it is essential in order that such operations be assured and safeguarded that the plant be operated by the United States;

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, pursuant to the powers vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, hereby authorize and direct that the Secretary of War immediately take possession of and operate the said plant of North American Aviation, Inc., through such person or persons as he may designate, to produce the aircraft and other articles and materials called for by its contracts with the United States or otherwise, and to do all things necessary or incidental thereto. Such necessary or appropriate adjustments shall be made with respect to existing and future contracts and with respect to compensation to the company as further orders hereafter issued by the Secretary of War shall provide. The Secretary of War shall employ or authorize the employment of such employees, including a competent civilian adviser on industrial relations, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this order. And I hereby direct the Secretary of War to take such measures as may be necessary to protect workers returning to the plant.

Possession and operation hereunder shall be terminated by the President as soon as he determines that the plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 9, 1941.*

"THE FOUR FREEDOMS"

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in the course of the remarks made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] a little while ago, he was taken to task by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as to the pledges that have been made as to "the four freedoms." I desire to read into the RECORD—it will take only a moment—what, so far as I know, is the origin of the policy of the United States with regard to "the four freedoms."

At the end of the President's message to the Congress of January 6, 1941, he said:

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

I assume that India, China, Dakar, and other sections of Africa and Asia are parts of the world.

The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.

I assume that Asia and Africa and Europe and the islands of the sea are all parts of the world.

The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.

In his fireside chat of May 27 the President said:

We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—freedom from want—and freedom from terrorism.

It seems to me that those quotations, taken together, abundantly justify the statement made by the Senator from Montana.

ABANDONMENT OF BRANCH OF DENVER & RIO GRANDE WESTERN RAILROAD CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on March 13 last, Senate Resolution 82, with respect to an investigation of the proposal to abandon the connecting line between the Denver & Rio Grande Western and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad systems, was adopted by the Senate. Pursuant to the resolution a committee was appointed to make the investigation, the committee consisting of

the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. We were assisted in making our report by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The committee has finished its investigation, and I am at this time submitting the report of the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 82 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 82) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas authentic reports indicate that all of the pertinent facts were not disclosed in the hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission following which an order was entered on January 22, 1941, by a division of the Interstate Commerce Commission ordering the abandonment of the narrow-gage railroad between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex.; and

Whereas national defense, with which the American people are vitally concerned, demands that this railroad line be not abandoned but that it remain serviceable during the present emergency for the transportation of military supplies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make, and to report to the Senate the results of, a thorough and complete investigation of the proposed abandonment and all pertinent facts, including the practices, the methods, and acts or omissions to act, of The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. in the operation of the narrow-gage branch of said The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co. between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to obtain such facts as other Government agencies may have, and to secure the assistance of other Government agencies in the investigation hereby authorized.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and subsequent Congresses, to employ such experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I also ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report (Rept. No. 411) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT NO. 411

[Pursuant to S. Res. 82]

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 87, the Senate committee named to investigate the proposed abandonment of the rail line between Antonito, Colo., and Santa Fe, N. Mex., respectfully submit this report. The committee held public hearings in Alamosa, Colo., for 3 days, April 1, 2, and 3, and in Santa Fe, N. Mex., on April 5, where everyone interested was given a full opportunity to express his views freely. Many, many ranchers, townspeople, and shippers voluntarily appeared and protested against the abandonment. Their testimony was submitted to vigorous cross-examination by able railroad officials and attorneys who tried to dispute some of the statements which were made. The committee also made a trip of inspection over the rail line from Antonito to Santa Fe and were met at all stops by large delegations of shippers urging the continuance of this railroad connection.

It was established beyond any doubt that, while the investment of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad is considerable in southern Colorado, the investment of shippers, producers, farmers, ranchers, and townspeople is many times as great. The evidence clearly indicated that the railroad management has deliberately discouraged railroad traffic, both freight and passenger, by embargoes, rate discrimination, and extremely poor service and accommodations. It was proven at the hearing that the Denver & Rio Grande Western discontinued shipments of hogs from the San Luis Valley to California points via Santa Fe, and compelled such shipments to be routed via Pueblo and Salt Lake. This long haul required three feeds as against one feed via the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, and at least 24 hours' longer time in transit. Wool shipments to Boston were driven off this line by a 15-cent higher freight rate than that in force at competitive shipping points on the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, a fact which absolutely compelled shippers to route their wool against their will over the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe lines.

The evidence strongly indicated that the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad made it a practice to subsidize, with railroad funds and the free services of railroad officials, competing motorbus and truck service along all of its lines in southwestern Colorado and encouraged such competition in every way, but most effectively by arranging slower rail transportation schedules. Perishable local freight shipments to points on the Santa Fe branch were delayed until they rotted—a most effective method to make it impossible to ship by rail.

Even though the Denver & Rio Grande Western has excellent coal mines located on its narrow-gage system, it has made it necessary by a combination of poor service and high freight rates for shippers on this branch to ship coal to Santa Fe from points on the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe line in standard-gage cars then unload and deliver to points on the Santa Fe branch by truck.

The evidence indicated that the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad has not solicited traffic from shippers in competitive territory, nor has it shown any interest whatsoever in rail shipments to or from its narrow-gage territory.

The obvious policy of organized and directed promotion of truck and bus competition, the deliberate neglect and progressive curtailment of service on all of the Denver & Rio Grande Western lines south and west of Pueblo, and south and west of Salida, Colo., must convince even the most optimistic of southern Colorado citizens that the present management will divest itself of every rail line other than its main line at the earliest possible opportunity. If that policy is to be checked, it should be checked now by denying the pending application, and the actual situation should be understood by all of the people of southern Colorado and by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Even though transportation and its problems have always been the responsibility of the Congress, yet, due to the enormous detail involved, it became obvious long ago that Congress could not supervise the operation of railroads and other methods of transportation. It, therefore, created the Interstate Commerce Commission to serve as its right arm in establishing rates, issuing and revoking certificates of convenience and necessity, determining applications for abandonment, and the multitude of other details incidental to domestic commerce.

Nevertheless, Congress cannot escape its responsibility in these things and when a question incidental to them arises which affects the public interest to an unsual degree, it is the duty of Congress to see that proper consideration has been given to the welfare of the people. Congress cannot and does not go into every application for abandonment pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. To do so would constitute gross interference with its own agency.

A few years ago Congress did halt the contemplated abandonment of the Minneapolis, St. Louis & Southern Railroad and, as a result of its exposure of the purposes behind the proposal, a self-supporting railroad rendering the public a much-needed service was preserved. It is now proposed to abandon the railroad from Antonito, Colo., to Sante Fe, N. Mex., the connecting line between two great railroad systems. This proposal does not contemplate merely the abandonment of an unprofitable narrow-gage branch railroad line. Rather it involves the whole policy of the operation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad and its rail outlets. If this application be granted, a very important railroad system, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, and a very important trade area in New Mexico, Arizona, and California will be lost to the southern half of Colorado and portions of northern New Mexico, which will very materially affect their present prosperity and their economic future.

When General Palmer conceived the scheme of building the Denver & Rio Grande Western he visioned an international railroad running from Denver, Colo., to Mexico City, Mexico. With that object in view, the railroad was built from Denver to Santa Fe, N. Mex. Valuable and extensive ore bodies and other natural resources were being discovered about that time in many parts of western Colorado, and the Denver & Rio Grande Western postponed its dream of becoming an international railroad and devoted its energies to the extension of its lines over much of southwestern Colorado and northern New Mexico. It served well the development and growth of this virgin area, and grew in strength and popularity. Its directors were not satisfied with the natural outlet to the southwest and the Pacific coast via Santa Fe, thence over its enemy railroad of long standing, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe. Unfortunately for all concerned, the directors began casting their eyes to a Salt Lake connection and a new line to the Pacific coast which had no economic justification for its construction.

By this venture into the speculative, the Denver & Rio Grande Western quickly became hopelessly involved in the high-finance operation and stock manipulation of the Western Pacific, which some 20 years ago wound it up in bankruptcy and receivership.

During the last few years, due to the able management of its trustees, Wilson McCarthy and Henry Swan, much progress has been made toward solvency. Only in the last few days United States District Judge J. Foster Symes has agreed to an investment of $2,500,000 in new Diesel locomotives, which are now required to handle its greatly increased freight traffic. This management,

however, able and alert as it is, seems to be far more interested in converting the property into a trunk-line railroad, bridging eastern railroads entering Denver with Salt Lake connections, than it is with building up its whole system and giving southern and western Colorado good rail service.

It is very apparent even to the casual observer that the new policy is to improve the service and facilities of the main-line railroad (Denver to Salt Lake) to the highest degree, and to neglect the facilities and gradually curtail the service on the balance of the system, especially that portion of it serving the territory south and west of Pueblo and south and west of Salida, Colo. A cold-blooded railroad operation, without regard for the welfare of large and important areas of Colorado, might perhaps justify such a stern policy, provided dollars and cents were the whole consideration. The public interest, however, must never be lost sight of in the operation of a public utility. The use of the Moffat Tunnel (constructed with public funds) and the Dotsero cut-off (constructed with Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds) makes such an operation feasible. Doubtless it is very attractive to the city of Salt Lake, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and connecting lines, but it is absolutely disastrous to a large area of Colorado dependent upon the Denver & Rio Grande Western service for the right to live and develop. The proposed abandonment of the southern connection of this railroad, the Santa Fe branch, is an all-important step in furthering this scheme of getting out of southern Colorado. The Congress, whose first duty is to protect the public interest, is, therefore, compelled to examine with great circumspection the effect of the proposal of this public utility to divest itself of its natural and long-established outlet to the Pacific coast via Santa Fe, N. Mex., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe.

Prior to the Western Pacific fiasco, surveys, and studies were completed to replace the narrow-gage Santa Fe line with a broad-gage railroad, using the tracks of the San Luis Southern Railway Co., Blanca to Joroso, for a portion of the line. The distance from Pueblo, Colo., to Santa Fe, N. Mex., via this route would have been 275 miles as against 362 miles via the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway. It was an evil day for the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, its helpless stockholders, and all of southern Colorado when this route was abandoned to dip into the sordid manipulation of Western Pacific high finance and a Salt Lake outlet.

It must be borne in mind that the most vital thing in connection with the proposed abandonment of the Santa Fe branch is the loss of the right which the Denver & Rio Grande Western now enjoys—a southern Colorado rail connection with the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway. In other words, the Denver & Rio Grande Western, by virtue of the Santa Fe branch, possesses a certificate of convenience and necessity to operate a railroad between its Colorado lines and Santa Fe. If this railroad be abandoned, that certificate will be lost forever to all practical purposes, and Colorado will be denied a southern rail outlet on the west side of the mountains for all future time. For the public welfare of the State of Colorado and the future growth of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad system, the application to abandon the Santa Fe branch should be denied without further delay. In the opinion of the subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, the Interstate Commerce Commission should at least postpone permission to abandon this vital rail connection until the adverse effect on large areas of the Southwest has been given further study and examination.

It is alleged that this connecting line, in itself and by itself, does not return a profit. It is doubtless true that no railroad line in New Mexico, taken by itself or of itself, including the main line of the Santa Fe, returns a profit; but that does not constitute a basis for abandonment, since connections with profitable territory on both ends obviously must be maintained through unprofitable territory. The Post Office Department continues much unprofitable service in order to make its whole service more complete and satisfactory. Railroads, if operated in the public interest, must do the same thing.

The Denver & Rio Grande Western a few years ago had rail connections with the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway at Trinidad, but was permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission to sever that rail connection and abandon its line from Walsenburg to Trinidad. It is very apparent that the Rio Grande's present management does not desire rail connections with the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe. Nevertheless the public interest in four States demands that this connection be continued.

The public interest and general welfare of southwestern Colorado and the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California demand that rail connections with the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe be maintained for the reason that this railway is an outstanding system and that the natural market for southern Colorado products lies to the southwest and on to the Pacific coast. The public interest further requires that the neglected and obsolete narrow-gage line with its miserable service between Antonito and Santa Fe be replaced by a broad-gage line which doubtless will result in very satisfactory business. The junction with the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad has brought a large volume of new traffic to the Denver & Rio Grande Western because the new connection has made it the shortest rail line between Denver and Salt Lake City. If the Santa Fe branch be replaced with a broad-gage line, the Denver & Rio Grande Western will have the shortest rail line between Denver and Santa Fe, N. Mex., and rail traffic will be stimulated thereby to the south just as it so recently has been stimulated to the west.

ED. C. JOHNSON (Colorado), *Chairman.*
HARRY H. SCHWARTZ (Wyoming).
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD (Minnesota).
DENNIS CHAVEZ (New Mexico).[1]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I now ask that the report of the committee be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, within the last week there appeared in the various media of public expression two matters in which I feel every member of the public is intensely interested. The first dealt with the appointment by the President of a coordinator of the petroleum industry. This came in the way of a letter addressed to Secretary Ickes making the appointment, and I read two or three paragraphs from this first item of news:

In order to provide the desired coordination, I am hereby designating you as Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense. In that capacity it will be your function and responsibility as my representative:

1. To obtain currently from the States and their agencies, from the petroleum and allied industries, from the officers and agencies of your Department, and from other appropriate Federal departments and agencies information as to certain specified phases of the petroleum industry in connection with national defense, and to report any suggestions for alleviation or change or correction or protection of the national defense in connection with the petroleum industry.

Mr. President, for one I was very much pleased when I learned of this appointment. If the appointment of a coordinator is necessary—and perhaps in the situation in which we now find ourselves it is necessary—the appointment of Secretary Ickes is pleasing to me and perfectly satisfactory to me, and I am sure it must be to the great majority of the American people. He is an honorable, honest, hardworking, able man, thoroughly dependable, and thoroughly impressed with the subject matter committed to him.

There has been another development since this appointment to which I shall presently direct attention, and in that connection I think I may in fairness to the Senate review briefly a little history.

For a long time many of us were deeply concerned with the belief and feeling that the large integrated oil companies were taking advantage of a Nation-wide situation, and, through coordinated monopolistic efforts, were imposing on the general public a price level for gasoline and petroleum products which was much higher than justified, and in that connection were driving out of business independent producers, refiners, distributors, and retailers.

In conjunction with the late-lamented Senator from Idaho, Senator Borah, I introduced two measures—as I recall, the first was introduced in the Seventy-fifth Congress or the first session of the Seventy-sixth—both of them looking to the divorcement of the business of retailing from the production field and looking to the divorcement of the pipe-line distribution field from the production and refining field.

Due to the illness of the late Senator and due to the interest which he and all of us had in the neutrality discussion which followed shortly, after a few hearings were held on these measures, hearings conducted by a subcommittee headed by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], further action was postponed.

There followed the death of Senator Borah, and a year ago this past March Mr. Thurman Arnold, in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, called on me personally and asked me to postpone action on the legislative proposal because his department had for over a year and a half given study to the development of facts in connection with the petroleum industry, which they expected to make the basis of criminal action as well as certain equity actions. It was his request that legislative action be postponed so that hearings could be conducted on the legislative proposals at the same time the

[1] Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, not a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, due to the vital importance to his constituents in New Mexico of the proposal to abandon the railroad, Antonito to Santa Fe, joined the committee in its investigations, attended the hearings, and is wholeheartedly in accord with this report.

judicial proceedings were taking place, so that there could be parallel action. This I agreed to in March 1940. I waited until August 14, 1940. No suits were filed, and at that time I addressed a letter to Mr. Arnold. I read briefly from that letter:

> You requested me to delay hearings on the legislative proposals until such time as you were ready to proceed with the suits you were preparing to file. I recognized the wisdom of your request and acceded to it. I have delayed the hearings up to the present time. I learned indirectly that you were about to abandon the prosecutions contemplated. I am sure you will recognize the unfortunate position in which it places me and the pending legislation.

I will say in that connection that there appeared in the public press a statement that the Department of Justice was about to abandon this prosecution. Mr. Arnold personally brought to my office the reply to my letter of August 14, and I will read an excerpt from it.

> DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I have received your letter inquiring about the delay in starting the proceedings against the major oil companies which have been under preparation by the Antitrust Division for a number of months.
>
> As a matter of courtesy to the Defense Commission and information to this Department the matter was referred for study as to possible effects on national defense.

Without reading further, that seemed perfectly reasonable to me, and I was willing to wait until the Council for National Defense made a report to the Department of Justice as to their viewpoint of the extent to which these proceedings would interfere with or impede national defense. I will now read in that connection a paragraph from an article written by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley at that time:

> The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has pending several suits involving industries of importance to the national defense. But it is feeling the pressure to lay off, lest it make the industries involved noncooperative with the defense program.
>
> It already has run into difficulty in its suit against a number of the large oil companies. This was to have been filed almost 3 weeks ago. It was not regarded with open hostility by the oil companies, because it was a civil suit. It covered various questions which had been raised already in criminal suits and which would be raised eventually in additional suits if this over-all civil suit were not carried through.
>
> The filing of the suit, however, was deferred.

Mr. President, listen:

> The filing of the suit, however, was deferred on representations from the Defense Commission that it might impair the psychological attitude of the oil-company officials toward the national-defense program.

Proceedings which had been begun by the Department of Justice, based on facts which had been developed for a year and a half in an endeavor to lay the foundation for criminal suits, in connection with which pleas of guilty have since been entered and fines of almost $500,000 imposed, were delayed, and abandonment of the suits was suggested by the Defense Commission because of the psychological effect it might have on the companies, which might result in their unwillingness to cooperate in the defense program.

Mr. President, shortly after that I received a letter from the Department of Justice. I believe this letter was from the Attorney General himself. In reply I addressed a letter to him under the date of September 18 last. I shall read a paragraph or two from that letter:

> Since the receipt of your letter of August 27 ultimo, I requested Mr. Thurman Arnold to give me what information he had available relative to the prospects for filing these suits. Mr. Arnold informed me that suggestions had been made by him for changes in the prayer for relief in the suits, and he has made available to me the suggestions which he has made for these changes. From a copy of these proposals before me I note that the wish of the plaintiff is to secure three primary objectives:
>
> 1. To prevent fixing prices at artificial levels to the consumer.

That, of course, was the objective we sought.

> 2. To permit retail dealers to compete without artificial restrictions.

That was very desirable.

> 3. To provide a free market for the presently existing independent refiners and for new enterprise in the oil industry.
>
> While these three objectives are what I am trying to secure through the legislative proposals now pending in the Congress and which were introduced by the late Senator Borah and myself, I fully realize that none of us is ready to do or say anything which might jeopardize or delay our national-defense preparation. But I believe that any possibility of such result is removed entirely by the suggestion of Mr. Thurman Arnold that the last paragraph of the prayer in the petitions should state:

I quote from Mr. Thurman Arnold's suggestion for the equity prayer in his petition:

> Plaintiff prays for such further and other relief as the court may deem proper and in considering such relief, or in considering any of the specific relief herein prayed for, that the court hear all relevant testimony as to the effect of such relief on the problem of national defense to the end that no combination necessary for national defense be improvidently held to be illegal.

With the addition of that prayer, to which I think no fair-minded man can object, there certainly would not be any fear, psychological or otherwise, on the part of the oil industry, and that paragraph, Mr. President, was incorporated in the equity prayer for relief, and the suits were filed last fall. They have been pending since that time. But very recently, within the last 2 weeks, in fact, there has arisen a situation in which these oil companies now say that they are not disturbed psychologically, but they want the suits dropped, they want the suits disposed of and wiped off the docket. Since that time, on May 6, 1940, Mr. President, 12 major oil companies and 5 of their officers, on a plea of guilty which was sustained by the upper court, were fined more than $400,000, and in Madison, Wis., on the 2d of June, 2 oil companies and 4 individuals were fined a total of $18,000 by Federal Judge Lindley on charges that they had conspired to raise or fix retail gasoline prices at artificially high levels, in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

I have before me a list of those companies which were finally compelled to pay fines under pleas, not of guilty but of nolo contendere. Those fines were imposed last week.

Now, Mr. President, comes the appointment of the Coordinator, which, as I stated, I heartily favor; but what followed? The second item of news which appeared was contained in a news release by the Attorney General of the United States, dated May 31, 1941, from which I read:

> Last September, before authorizing the bringing of antitrust suits against the major oil companies, I wrote a letter to Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, in which I stated, in part, as follows:

Then he sets out a quotation from his letter to me, which is already in the RECORD. But this is the important part:

> The Antitrust Division has been negotiating a consent settlement of the oil cases.

These equity cases are now pending in the District of Columbia and involve over 300 defendants. The Attorney General says that the Antitrust Division has been negotiating settlement. There is no question that they have absolutely the goods on these defendants, just as they were able to produce the goods on other defendants and secure the imposition of fines under pleas of guilty or after conviction a year ago and also 2 weeks ago. But this is the thing that startles me:

> To avoid any conflicts with the administrative program which may be established by the Secretary of the Interior, further negotiations in the pending proceedings will be submitted to him, to the end that the national-defense objectives of the new oil control shall be in no way impeded.

I was glad to see Secretary Ickes appointed Coordinator. I want him to survey the field through the agencies under his direction and determine the facts. If there is anything impeding, jeopardizing, or thwarting the national defense, it should be dealt with. In that connection, with the authority which the President gave him, and which I suggested he utilize in the letter which I wrote to Secretary Ickes, his duty is to discover the facts and report them to the agencies which can utilize them.

But what is the result? Instead of waiting until Coordinator Ickes develops the facts and reports them to the Department of Justice for the Department to determine its course, the Department of Justice abnegates its rights and the judicial department of the Government says, "We are turning over to the administrative department our constitutional obligation to determine whether or not suits which are already filed shall be prosecuted or shall be dismissed"—not by the Department of Justice but by the Coordinator. The President gave the Coordinator no such power. He does not expect to use such power.

O, Mr. President, I have seen, much to my dismay, that to some extent at least the Congress of the United States has been reduced to a position of desuetude—not innocuous desuetude, as a former President would say, but to a position of desuetude. Today on this floor I heard a statement by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] that certain columnists were in possession of information relative to national policy, whereas Members of Congress who have

the responsibility do not have the information. I do not know whether that is true, but the allegation was made. I presume the information is available to Members of Congress through the proper channels; but the fact remains that those of us who are here representing sovereign constituencies are not in possession of information. When we are asked what is going on and what the policy is, we have to say we do not know, and depend on the statements of columnists.

It is not enough that the legislative department be put in a position of desuetude, as I stated; but now the judicial department does not say, "We will wait until we hear from Secretary Ickes, the Coordinator, and if justified we may delay these suits." It says, "We are turning the matter over to the Coordinator, and we will do whatever he says to do relative to those suits or suits hereafter filed."

Mr. President, this morning comes a news report, through the National Petroleum News, that Ralph K. Davies, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, has been appointed Deputy Coordinator under Secretary Ickes. On the 23d of April of this year the Standard Oil Co. of California announced that on April 24 it was advancing the cost of crude oil in the New Orleans area and other sections three-quarters of a cent. The Standard Oil Co. of California acted in conjunction with the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, which raised the price of gasoline on the eastern seaboard 2 cents within the past 10 days. The vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California has been named Assistant Coordinator to determine the course of the suits now pending. Of the list of 23 on the Advisory Council working with the National Defense Council at the present time, 14 are defendants in the suits which are now pending in the District of Columbia.

Twelve of them were defendants who were fined after a plea of guilty; and yet the American Petroleum Institute, which is one of the defendants, is asked to give advice. The matter then goes to the Department of Justice, which says, "We will do whatever you tell us to do."

Mr. President, I have no criticism of the Attorney General of the United States personally, politically, or professionally; but I am a United States Senator. I have a responsibility. When I see the legislative department in a democratic country, which we are trying to preserve for the world, short-circuited and detoured, and when I see these moves to turn over the judicial department to those who are defendants in the suits pending, and take their advice as to what action shall be taken, I think I should be derelict in my duty if I did not call attention to it. That is why I have imposed myself on the Senate at this time.

REHABILITATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement as to the objects and purposes of Senate bill 357, a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite coal industry. The bill is now on the calendar, and was objected to by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] when it was reached during the call of the calendar. I introduced the bill on January 14, of the present session, and an identical bill has been introduced in the House by Mr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, as H. R. 1083, providing for the rehabilitation of the anthracite coal industry of Pennsylvania by the establishment and operation, by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, of a research laboratory in the anthracite coal region for research and investigations relating to the mining, preparation, and utilization of anthracite coal, with special reference to conserving resources for national defense.

The bill further provides for the development of new scientific, chemical, and technical uses and new and extended markets and outlets for anthracite coal and its products. The proposed research laboratory is planned also to serve as a center of information and assistance in matters pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation in mining operations and other matters relating to problems in the anthracite coal industry.

I believe that if an anthracite research laboratory such as that proposed in Senate bill 357 were established by the Federal Government, it would fulfill a twofold purpose: First, creating new uses for anthracite coal and, second, substantially aiding in carrying out the program of the President and the National Resources Committee for conserving other national resources, the supply of which is limited.

COOPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. President, at this time I desire to express my sincere appreciation for the attentive cooperation and deep-seated interest of the members of the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining, and to the chairman of the committee, my colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who provided every possible assistance for the favorable report of this bill. This measure has won the endorsement of the members of the committee, the operators, the miners, and the public of Pennsylvania who are closely affected by it.

I wish to offer my heartiest congratulations to Representative FENTON, who introduced the bill in the other House.

Legislation of the character such as provided in Senate bill 357, for the establishment of an anthracite research laboratory, primarily for the purpose of rehabilitating a vital State industry without any related political significance, is a very splendid example of cooperation between both Senators from the State concerned in the accomplishment of the desired purpose. It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I want to pay this tribute to my colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] for the help he has given me in advancing this bill for Senate consideration.

ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

The present resources of anthracite coal, according to reports from the United States Bureau of Mines, are estimated at approximately 16,500,000,000 tons, which is about 75 percent of the original reserve.

The anthracite coal industry is the basic and fundamental industry of eastern Pennsylvania. It is the backbone of the business enterprises, especially since there are few diversified industries in that region. The existence and prosperity of our people in that region therefore must depend on the efficient utilization and mining of anthracite coal.

Senate bill 357 aims to make available technical agencies and facilities of the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Mines, to the anthracite coal industry for essential research on the utilization of anthracite coal. As nearly as I can ascertain, it is perhaps the first definite attempt on the part of the Federal Government to render essential technical aid in research work of this character on anthracite coal—at least on the scale contemplated in the bill.

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, in his letter of April 16, 1941, to my colleague, as chairman of the Mines and Mining Committee, in reply to the request from the committee for a report on this bill, made the following significant statement which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate:

> Comparatively little research, either by governmental or private agencies, has been conducted with reference to anthracite. On the other hand, many millions of dollars per annum have been expended on research and development in the petroleum industry. The result is evident in the widespread use of petroleum products. The anthracite industry has lost a large part of its natural domestic market through the development of efficient and reliable oil burners. It is reasonable to believe that similar research would help to avert the present declining trend in the use of anthracite.

FEDERAL AID TO INDUSTRY

Mr. President, in view of this very striking and important statement by Secretary Ickes, it is significant to note in connection with the consideration of this bill the instances of Federal aid to other essential lines of industry, especially in view of the fact that so little has been done by the Federal Government for the anthracite coal industry of Pennsylvania.

Federal aid, for instance, has been granted to various types of transportation systems, such as (1) water transportation, (2) railroads, (3) highways, and (4) aviation. Various types of Federal aid have been extended to agriculture. Some of the more recent acts have been the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Act of 1936, the Farm Credit Administration Act, and similar measures for the relief of agriculture.

The Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior is entrusted with the duty of stabilizing the bituminous coal industry, to study and report on its problems, and to initiate, promote, and conduct research designed to improve standards and methods used in the mining, preparation, distribution, and utilization of bituminous coal, and to discover additional uses for bituminous coal.

The Bureau of Mines, in the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Standards, in the Department of Commerce, render for industry services that are comparable, though in a lesser degree, to those performed by the Department of Agriculture, Engineering

experiment stations have been established at land-grant colleges.

The Bureau of Mines makes economic analyses of domestic mineral production and consumption statistics, and studies problems of distribution and marketing of minerals and scrap metals to aid in promoting commerce in mineral products. The Bureau also studies the properties, mining, preparation, and utilization of coal, providing information in the selection of coals for particular uses.

IMPORTANCE OF CHEMICAL RESEARCH

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the provision in Senate bill 357, for the conduct of research investigations by the Federal Government to develop new scientific, chemical, and technical uses for anthracite coal and its products.

In this connection I should like to quote from a letter dated July 28, 1939, from Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board, to the stockholders of General Motors Corporation, as follows:

In no field of industrial research has greater progress been made during the depression years than that of chemistry. The science of synthetics, through which new substances are brought into being from coal, milk, cotton, wood, from water and the elements of the air, seems to broaden with each forward step. Plastics, a growing family of chemically created materials, are finding hundreds of new uses in industry and the home, promoting job opportunities all along the line from the raw material to the sale of the finished product. Synthetic fibers make possible textile filaments and fabrics with entirely new characteristics, more durable and with wider utility than any now in general use. Here are new industries in the making, with what benefits in the way of expanded employment and consumer gains, can only be surmised.

NYLON PRODUCED FROM COAL

The bill recognizes the possible services that chemistry and technology may be able to render in working out new industrial uses for anthracite coal and its products. Some limited attention already has been given to this type of chemical-engineering research. Mr. Robert D. Potter, Science Service chemistry expert, in the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1939, in an article entitled "Coal Produces Better Stockings Than Silk," refers to the laboratory progress being made in evolving new fibers and fabrics from milk, coal, and other strange substances.

In this article Mr. Potter states:

Chemistry, long known as the wonder work of science, has had no more outstanding achievement in many years than the discovery of the way to make new synthetic fibers from coal, air, and water.

Out of these abundant ingredients has come a fiber that is potentially a rival of glistening silk; a fiber that promises to carry its commercial flight into the last remaining large market of natural silk—the hosiery field.

Known as Nylon, this new synthetic material has already been woven into experimental stockings that approach the long-time dream of inventors everywhere—the dream of making a sheer two-thread hosiery that would have the wearing qualities of three-thread service-weight hose.

And if America can produce a synthetic material that will look better, wear better, and cost no more than silk, the repercussions in international trade will truly be important, for the greatest single export of Japan to the United States is silk.

In working out processes for producing Nylon, this chemist of the Du Pont Co. founded what will some day be a great industry, an industry which already is having an $8,000,000 plant built to employ 1,000 people.

This chemist worked out ways of making fibers out of chemical components known as polyamides. Polyamides are chemicals that can be prepared from black, sticky coal tar, obtained from the destructive distillation of coal. It has been from coal tar that chemists have already fashioned odors never known to nature, colors never before seen, and countless important medicines, of which aspirin is only one example among hundreds.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH

Mr. President, the practical value of scientific research has been very definitely indicated by the establishment by the Department of Agriculture of the four new regional laboratories for scientific research on the utilization of farm products, at Wyndmoor, Montgomery County, Pa.; Peoria, Ill.; New Orleans, La.; and Albany, Calif.

In referring to this recent development in the Department of Agriculture, Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, in presenting the medal of the American Institute of Chemists to Dr. Henry G. Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, for outstanding service to chemists and the profession of chemistry, at the Wardman Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on May 17, 1941, stated as follows:

In case of need, these laboratories may help mightily in our national defense, especially in the field of working out substitutes for products which can no longer be imported from abroad. I know that both you (Dr. Knight) and the institute are profoundly interested in seeing the remarkable principles of chemistry put to work to help, to the greatest extent possible, in the defense of our beloved country during the months and years immediately ahead. We all share in the faith that our chemistry, unfettered by any ideology or compulsion, will outstrip, both in the theoretical and practical side, the best that Nazi-terrorized Germany can bring to pass. Gangsters cannot command the best that is in science. Only under democratic freedom can science make real progress.

SOME FUNDAMENTAL LINES OF ANTHRACITE RESEARCH

Mr. President, these new undertakings in the Department of Agriculture must therefore be regarded as one of the most conducive steps taken by the Department to bring the scientist into the field as a direct aid and help to the farmers of the United States.

It is therefore equally true that scientific and technical research can be used in a similar manner by the Federal Government in affording relief to the depressed anthracite coal miners in Pennsylvania, and that science can play a most important part and can render valuable services in the development of new uses for utilization of our valuable anthracite deposits.

With this in mind, in my speech of March 24, 1941, on Senate bill 357 I outlined some of the fundamental lines of technical research that could be carried out at these laboratories. This program included research on the following subjects:

First. Anthracite coal as a source of liquid fuels for automotive needs.

Second. Anthracite coal as a source of compressed gas for motor fuel.

Third. Anthracite coal for gas production, including water gas.

Fourth. Hydrogenation of anthracite coal as a source of oil production.

Fifth. Liquefaction of anthracite coal.

Sixth. Grinding and pulverizing of anthracite coal.

Seventh. Blending of anthracite coal.

Eighth. Chemical utilization of anthracite coal.

Ninth. Anthracite ash utilization.

Tenth. Anthracite coal for produce gas.

STATUS OF ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. President, the hearings on this bill before the Mines and Mining Committee of the Senate developed some very important facts regarding the present status of the anthracite coal industry.

The industry employs approximately 100,000 men and has a pay roll of nearly $150,000,000 annually.

The industry brings to the anthracite-carrying roads and connecting lines over 900,000 carloads of freight with a revenue in excess of $100,000,000 a year.

The industry has been crippled and injured by competitive fuels for the past 15 years to the extent that its present markets are now only about 60 percent of its 1927 capacity, with the result that it has been necessary to lay off approximately 60,000 men due to loss of markets for anthracite coal.

The anthracite industry has been crippled by competitive fuels for the past 15 years. In spite of the increased population in New England and the Middle Atlantic States and the Great Lakes territory, its present markets are now only 60 percent of its 1927 capacity, and these sections of the country have been the major markets for anthracite.

Should the anthracite industry continue to recede, the effects will be far-flung throughout the entire United States—from the Atlantic seaboard to the Mississippi Valley. Despite curtailed markets, the industry still is enjoying approximately 1,000,000 tons of domestic business annually in the Great Lakes territory, or an amount equal to the entire fuel requirements of a city the size of Cincinnati.

The anthracite industry and the anthracite mining population of one and a half million have been suffering from this loss of tonnage demand over a period of years which has wiped out the entire curb reserve of the industry and drastically reduced the annual income of those that remain.

The United Mine Workers report that their membership, which comprises the entire working force of the anthracite region, has dropped from about 155,000 to somewhere in the neighborhood of 95,000 men. The anthracite coal miner, after he has given most of his life in the mines, is not able to go out into other industries and compete, as are workmen from other business enterprises.

Mr. President, in very large measure the conditions now existing in the anthracite coal region have been brought about by the perfectly legitimate competition of another fuel—oil. The anthracite industry does not seek subsidies. In seeking Federal technical assistance for the solution of some of its own problems, as provided for in this bill, it hopes to contribute something of value to the conservation of national natural resources.

The extent of the future supply of fuel oil is, of course, a matter of opinion. But certainly the demand for oil is increasing rapidly in both defense and normal industrial uses, while the available sources of supply seem to have sighted their limit under current methods of production. It would seem, therefore, to be wise public policy to promote the conservation of oil by helping in some measure to restore the use of the fuel which it has, temporarily and in a considerable measure, superseded.

In order to conserve this important natural resource the anthracite industry and the Federal Government should act jointly. Prominent, if not chief, among the steps which need to be taken is the immediate institution of a program of technical research which will lead to better and more intensive mining methods, reductions in cost of production, and more complete and efficient utilization of anthracite coal and its products.

NEED FOR ANTHRACITE RESEARCH

Anthracite coal is one of the Nation's principal mineral resources. A prominent scientist appearing before the Mines and Mining Committee stated that—

> The anthracite reserves of the United States contain as much heat energy as all of the petroleum that has been produced in the entire world up to the present time, plus the world's known resources of petroleum obtainable by pumping and flowing methods.

Mr. President, the importance of the anthracite industry is shown by the fact that the number of men employed at anthracite mines is greater than at all metal mines of the United States, and is also greater than the total number of men employed at all mines and quarries producing nonmetallic minerals other than coal. There has been, however, as has already been pointed out, a very serious decline in anthracite production and employment.

RELIEF COSTS IN ANTHRACITE REGION

This decline in employment has caused major relief problems in the anthracite region, as shown by the following figures for W. P. A. expenditures and direct relief for the four principal anthracite producing counties—Lackawanna, Luzerne, Northumberland, and Schuylkill Counties—as obtained for the respective offices in Harrisburg, Pa.

	1938	1939	1940
W. P. A. expenditures	$44,398,863	$26,480,557	$14,018,114
General assistance (relief)	7,316,122	14,068,006	12,515,916
Total	51,714,985	40,548,563	26,534,030

The cost for W. P. A. and direct relief in these four anthracite region counties has averaged approximately $40,000,000 during the last 3 years. It has been reported that in these four principal anthracite counties, which produce about 92 percent of the total, there has been an expenditure of approximately $182,000,000 for relief purposes since 1932.

When we consider these extensive expenditures for relief in the anthracite region, the appropriation provided in this bill, S. 357, is very reasonable in comparison with Federal expenditures for technical research affecting other mineral products. It should be noted that the proposed appropriation of $350,000 for the cost of the building, land, and equipment is less than 1 percent of the recent average annual expenditure for W. P. A. and direct relief in the four principal anthracite counties. It should also be noted that the proposed annual appropriation of $175,000 for maintenance and operation of this research laboratory is less than one-half of 1 percent of the average annual relief costs which have resulted from decreased anthracite production.

IMPORTANCE TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

One important example of a lost anthracite market is its former use as a metallurgical fuel. For many years Pennsylvania anthracite was the principal blast-furnace fuel used in America.

A total of 275 anthracite blast furnaces were built in this country, ranging from Massachusetts in the East to Wisconsin in the West. Yet this important industrial use of anthracite has practically disappeared. The present generation of blast-furnace operators is scarcely acquainted with anthracite, and the lines and dimensions of furnaces have changed so greatly that today no one knows the best way of using anthracite. Furthermore, owing to the present demand for maximum iron output, operators are reluctant to experiment with an unfamiliar blast-furnace fuel.

Mr. President, it is very important to our national welfare in the present unlimited emergency to observe that American problems of production for defense are being aggravated by a serious shortage of coke. It would, therefore, be of incalculable value to the defense program if Federal research had already shown how to use anthracite to best advantage in modern blast furnaces. In an attempt to meet the coke shortage, millions of dollars and much-needed materials and manpower are being diverted to the construction of additional coke plants which will not be ready to produce coke for a year or so, and which may be shut down at a great loss when the emergency is over.

If, on the other hand, research had already shown how to use anthracite correctly in modern blast furnaces, millions of tons of metallurgical anthracite could be made available this year, beginning immediately. This could be accomplished without the need of additional capital investment or increased personnel. The extra anthracite could be obtained simply by working existing collieries a greater number of days per month.

RESEARCH LABORATORY AND COAL MINE INSPECTION ACT

Senate bill 357 provides for a Federal research laboratory in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania to carry out a broad and comprehensive technical research program as to new uses for anthracite coal with a view to developing new outlets and new markets.

Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Mines has never had any specific appropriation for the purposes indicated in this bill. Establishment by the Bureau of Mines of an anthracite experimental station in the anthracite coal region would not only provide for essential research but would also serve as a center of information for the industry, stimulating the operators to adopt the latest discoveries of science in the improvement of conditions in the anthracite mining region and developing more conveniences and greater efficiency in the utilization of anthracite. It would also be a stimulation to the anthracite coal miners and their families to know that their Government is planning to give technical aid and assistance in finding a solution to their problems.

The Coal Mine Inspection Act, recently passed by Congress, will doubtless make necessary the establishment by the Bureau of Mines of a central base of operations in the Pennsylvania anthracite field for the inspection of the mines in that region. This would be directly in line with the provisions of the bill S. 357, for the proposed research laboratory could be made a center of information and assistance to both operators and miners in matters pertaining to safety, health, and sanitation in mining operations and other matters relating to problems of the anthracite industry. This laboratory would then serve the important function of carrying on any research investigations considered necessary by the Bureau of Mines to develop essential measures for the adequate protection of both the miners and people in the anthracite region.

It would, therefore, appear to be both desirable and efficient for this research laboratory to be established by the Federal Government to serve these two important purposes. It would provide the necessary technical facilities for essential research as well as serving as the center of inspection and assistance for safety and health matters.

Mr. President, the passage of this bill means the dawning of a new day for the entire population in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania. It means that the Federal Government will make available for the first time essential technical aid that will bring new vision and new inspiration into the lives and hearts of the people in the anthracite coal fields, thereby giving new courage to a group of loyal Americans who justly deserve the aid and help their Government can give. I sincerely hope the Senate will take favorable action on this bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations (and withdrawing two nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

BITUMINOUS-COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther Harr, of Pennsylvania, to be bituminous-coal consumers' counsel.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have left the Chamber upon the promise that no further business would be transacted today. I have just suggested to the able Senator from Pennsylvania that we might take up this nomination tomorrow. I think that is agreeable to him.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all right.

Mr. McNARY. If so, I ask unanimous consent that the order for calling the roll may be vacated, so that we may proceed with other executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that the Senators from Pennsylvania are unable to agree upon a date for taking up this nomination. I therefore withdraw my request and ask that the roll call proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall make another attempt to adjust matters. I think it is now understood that this nomination may be considered a week from today, next Monday. I should like to have an order made to that effect, if that is agreeable to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. It is agreeable to me, Mr. President.

Mr. McNARY. Then, if that is agreeable, I ask that the order for a roll call be vacated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 9 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Guy N. Henninger, Adjutant General of Nebraska, to be State director of selective service for Nebraska. (This nomination is submitted at this time for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on October 24, 1940, in the name of Guy W. Henninger.)

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Lesley James McNair, United States Army, for temporary appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 127a, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved September 9, 1940.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers, relieved.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Radio Electrician Hamlett I. Allen to be a chief radio electrician in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from June 1, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Catherine C. Hudson, Spring Hill.

COLORADO

Edward F. Baldwin, Nucla.
Clarence A. Reynolds, Swink.

CONNECTICUT

John L. Bradley, Cheshire.
Joanna Madeline Clifford, Colchester.
Everett F. Wilson, Mystic.

FLORIDA

Leslie A. Sherouse, Hawthorn.
Frank H. Clyatt, Micanopy.
William J. Bulloch, Monticello.
Harry W. Craig, Tarpon Springs.
Dorothy E. Franklin, Venice.
Paul A. Tompkins, Webster.

IDAHO

Mildred Richards, Mackay.

INDIANA

Ozro Latshaw, Carlisle.
Damon C. Thompson, Darlington.
Neola S. True, Demotte.
Leander Franklin Adams, Depauw.
Frank E. Louette, Goodland.
Gertrude Armstrong, Hazleton.
Ethel L. Price, Howe.
George M. Mougeotte, Lagro.
Ruth O. Storen, Lexington.
Carl R. Kluger, Morristown.
Ralph H. Adams, Newport.
Thomas J. Lemasters, Oakland City.
Dawson M. Liggett, Spiceland.
Mary H. Greene, Westfield.
Lydia Rae Parker, Wheatfield.

MINNESOTA

Mervill W. Monroe, Browns Valley.

MISSOURI

Susan T. Fulbright, Doniphan.
Ernest P. Goggins, Elvins.
Earl J. Vinyard, Leadwood.
Edgar L. Todd. Mcrehouse.
William Goebel Ray, Purdy.
Ercelle W. Johnson, Ridgeway.
Frank E. Lafferty, Trenton.
Willa B. Dodge, Union Star.

MONTANA

Kenneth LeCompt, Arlee.
George A. Wright, Havre.
Guy R. McClarren, Ryegate.
Marvin E. Corkill, White Sulphur Springs.

NEBRASKA

Mary B. Packwood, Cook.

NEW YORK

H. Bertram Miller, Amenia.
Otis J. West, Bayville.
Eugene A. Westcott, Jr., Cleveland.
Augustus W. Dymes, Jr., Croton on Hudson.
Fred W. Odwell, Downsville.
Henry J. Hoogkamp, East Greenbush.
Joseph J. Reilly, Irvington.
Isidore F. Linehan, Mamaroneck.
William A. Eggison, Marcy.
Orville E. Velley, Millerton.
James H. Mackin, Oswego.
James Boylan, Peekskill.
Bert E. Holden, Peru.
Maryan Batt, Woodmere.

OKLAHOMA

Dora E. Senter, Bristow.

WISCONSIN

James F. Horan, Jr., Friendship.
John D. Costello, Racine.
Walter J. Amend, Ripon.
Alfred H. Bernhard, Waupun.
Oscar L. Ringle, Wausau.

WYOMING

Anna Edith Morgan, Sunrise.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 26), 1941:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission.

POSTMASTER

Abbie J. Yandell to be a postmaster at New Deal, in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of the weak and of the strong, teach us the sacrifice, and the work that blesses and binds. Let Thy voice be heard, uniting us in the sacred love of

truth and brotherhood. So clothe us with the spirit of our Master that we may pray in complete assurance of the final triumph of righteous law, authority, and the ideals for which our Democracy stands. Increase, we beseech Thee, our faith and confidence in that Providence which hitherto has shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic, that each citizen throughout the length and breadth of our land may be loyal to those patriots who caught the light of freedom. We thank Thee for those principles which they dared to enunciate, bold in their declarations of the right to worship, the right to speak, and the right to work. Give to our Speaker, the Congress, and all our people the strength and the will to bear their burdens and to think and labor for the common good with increased devotion to our institutions and to the Government of our fathers. We pray that in all high and humble places, wheresoever our citizens may come together they may plan for the increased good and contentment of our great Country. We most earnestly pray for the continued health and strength of our President and that the spirit of unity and cooperation may dominate all the proceedings of the Congress, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 6, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 6, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 179. An act for the relief of Frank E. Nichols;

H. R. 250. An act for the relief of Otto Meyer and Leigh Kelly;

H. R. 713. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Hessman;

H. R. 816. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York;

H. R. 1731. An act for the relief of Beulah Belle Nolte and George C. Nolte;

H. R. 1732. An act for the relief of Floyd Wilday, Vera Wilday, and James M. Wells;

H. R. 1801. An act amending the act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1144);

H. R. 2107. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell equipment and supplies to and perform work for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands;

H R. 3084. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Russell;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of Louis J. Banderet;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Irene Trauernicht;

H. R. 4105. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain equipment in part payment for new equipment of the same or similar character; and

H. R. 4466. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a letter that I have received from Mr. Knudsen, of the Office of Production Management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF ALUMINUM

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the letter that I have just offered for the RECORD deals with the production of electricity to be used in the production of aluminum. On Friday last there appeared before our committee Mr. Batt, of the O. P. M., and I commend to all you gentlemen the reading of his testimony. I trust every Member of this House will get a copy of that testimony and go through it carefully. Today the question of electrical energy and the production of aluminum is not only serious, but very critical, and when I say critical I mean just that—a most serious situation. There is a bottleneck in the production of electrical energy in the matter of the production of aluminum and there is a bottleneck in the supply of aluminum.

REQUISITIONING OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, there are so many Members interested in the matter about which I am going to talk that I thought it would be wise and proper for me to make a statement to the House this morning. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House will begin hearings tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock on the recently introduced proposal to authorize the War Department to requisition personal property. That bill is in the nature of an amendment to section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act, which we passed last year. So many amendments have been proposed and so many amendments introduced and suggestions as to the numerous particulars in which that act ought to be amended, according to the sponsors of the various suggestions and proposals, that I felt the Members ought to know about it. I have already referred all those amendments to the legislative subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs having jurisdiction of it, and that subcommittee has had an executive session and will make recommendations to the committee at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

TAKING OVER OF NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION PLANT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ATLANTIC PATROL

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the introduction of certain excerpts from a letter I received from a constituent, and also by the insertion of a telegram that I have received from the Governor of Colorado in respect to the gasoline tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Eddyville (Iowa) Tribune with reference to the dedication of a monument to a Revolutionary soldier, and also by including a telegram from the Governor of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project, and to include an article by J. Adam Bede, a former Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPERTY-SEIZURE BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I had a letter from a young soldier on yesterday who said that the property-seizure bill is a "dodge"; and he right. It is a "dodge", and so is the threat to seize and take over industry where strikes continue. I have said that the ending of strikes was the responsibility of the Federal Government, and I repeat it. The whole country is ashamed of Washington and ashamed of everything in Washington in the Government.

It has been said that there are those in the Government who have been encouraging the racketeers in labor; that both see in the slowing down of industry for defense purposes the creation of a condition that will afford an excuse for the Government taking over industry. How does the record appear to

you? Irrespective of how it appears, this is probably what you will see.

Homer, in his Iliad, said:

For when two
Join in the same adventure
One perceives
Before the other how they ought to act;
While one alone, however prompt, resolves
More tardily and with a weaker will.

What I would like to know is who perceives before the other, and who resolves with a weaker will, the Government or the racketeers in labor? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorial excerpts and news writings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESTRICTION OF USE OF GASOLINE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, great consternation has been caused in New England by the announcement that there was a likelihood that Secretary Ickes might cancel the right to buy gasoline in that territory. In New England we are beginning to have what is known as the recreation period. Five hundred million dollars are invested in recreational opportunities for the people of the United States to enjoy in New England, and if this threat of gasless Sundays should be carried out it would certainly interfere with the well being of that group of people.

We are all for national defense, but I, for one, am not for national defense to the extent of embarrassing our own people while supplying Canada with all the gasoline it may need on Sundays or any other day. Let us begin to look after our own people a little before we take such good care of our neighbors to the north. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PICKETING THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

[Mr. YOUNG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my comments pertaining to W. P. A. as it applies to the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Ponchatoula, La., Rotary Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill H. R. 4854.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent editorial from the Endicott Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Providence Journal on Factory Seizure and Production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the city of Caruthersville, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Albert W. Hawkes, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the Legislature of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include a reply from the Tennessee Valley Authority regarding the General Accounting Office controversy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. CURTIS, Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, and Mr. HOFFMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a memorandum submitted to the Office of Production Management by the Emergency Association of New York, setting forth pertinent reasons why daylight saving should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 4473) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (H. Res. 214, Rept. No. 757) for printing, under the rule:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 4473, a bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REGULATING POSSESSION OF EXPLOSIVES IN TIME OF WAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] to explain the bill.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that was unanimously reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining and was to be considered when the Consent Calendar was called the other day, but due to objection on the part of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]

it was passed over. Since that time the gentleman from Michigan has withdrawn his objections. I may explain the bill briefly by reading from a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Secretary on the Interior, who wrote:

H. R. 3019 is intended to revise the act of October 6, 1917, relating to the regulation of the manufacture and distribution of explosives. The act of 1917 is operative "when the United States is at war." The provisions of H. R. 3019 would become effective upon a declaration of war, or of the existence of a state of war, by the Congress or upon the issuance of a Presidential proclamation that there exists a state of war or a national emergency requiring the operation of the act to provide for the national defense and security. Past experience has indicated that dangerous sabotage may develop while the Nation is technically at peace. Under modern conditions of sudden undeclared warfare, the lack of adequate authority to deal with this menace may be disastrous. It is extremely desirable, therefore, that provision be made for the regulation of the manufacture and use of explosives whenever the needs of national defense require that such action be taken. The enactment of H. R. 3019 would provide the requisite authority.

I may state that a great many Members have this bill confused with another now pending which would license the use of firearms. This has nothing to do with firearms, merely with powder and the material that goes into the manufacture of explosives.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand it, then, this bill gives the President the same power the President had in the last war when the country was actually at war.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill recognizes the present condition as an undeclared war, and the purpose of the bill is to give the President the same power in reference to the subject matter covered as if the Congress had declared war. Is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that this bill came up last Monday on the call of the Consent Calendar, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] objected because he said there were some amendments that would be ironed out he thought between then and the next call of the Consent Calendar. I made the remark at the time that I hoped it would because this legislation is important. In the meanwhile, as I understand it, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], with representatives of the Department, have conferred, and now the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is satisfied. That is what the gentleman from New York informs me.

This bill, of course, is necessary in the emergency. It is not equivalent to any undeclared war. I respect the opinion of my friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] but I am expressing my opinion now. This is legislation necessary in the emergency and in no sense has it the remotest connection with an undeclared war. Nothing that has occurred to date has entered into the category of an undeclared war. Without getting into that question, and I would rather not, so far as this bill is concerned, the only objection was to some elements of the bill, not to the bill itself. These elements have been removed as a result of the conference between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] with representatives of the Department. Is that correct?

Mr. BEITER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand everything is satisfactory from that angle.

Mr. MICHENER. The matter is satisfactory to the gentleman from New York, and if it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], therefore the majority leader feels we should ask no further questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I always thought the gentleman from Michigan had too much respect for me to entertain that thought.

Mr. MICHENER. I have, and I do not want to leave a wrong impression.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would regret it if any one entertained any such opinion with reference to myself.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is one of the official objectors on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. He represents the minority in this capacity. He gives careful study and attention to the bills which are on the Consent Calendar. For one, I am usually quite willing to go along with him. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is on the floor at the present time. May I ask him to give us his views in reference to the advisability of passing this bill in its present form at this time?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was up for consideration on the Consent Calendar there was some thought by hunting clubs, target-practice clubs, and other similar clubs that it applied to the use of small weapons. I think there was some confusion between this bill and a bill which seeks to license firearms. The way it has been explained to me and the conclusion I have come to from a study of the bill is, there being an express exemption in the bill in respect to the use of shells and cartridges, it would not apply to the use of small arms in any particular. What they apparently want to accomplish is to be able to follow back to the source the purchase and sale of explosives which are used in bombs in connection with sabotage and other un-American activities.

I have no hesitancy in saying, after conferring with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] and representatives of the Department, and after restudying the bill, I not only think it is not a war measure but perhaps it is something which should be on the statute books in time of peace, so that the Government will have some check upon the use of explosives and un-American activities.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman think this proposal has very little to do with the national emergency and that this ought to be on the books anyhow as a peacetime measure?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It was brought out as an emergency measure. There is perhaps an immediate need for it because of the emergency, but it seems to me that the principle of the legislation could well be enacted to apply in peacetime as well as in an emergency.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do not want to object to the enactment of needed national-defense legislation, I do protest against the bringing of this kind of legislation in under the shroud of national emergency if it is to be peacetime legislation. I think many sins, legislative and economic, are being committed in the name of the national defense at this time. I have not studied the bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has. I therefore defer to his judgment and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not propose to object, I want to clear up right now a question that has been injected into the debate. There is no such thing recognized by the Congress or under our form of government as an undeclared war. This is perfectly proper legislation, and I think it would be perfectly proper in peacetime or in an emergency.

But only yesterday one of our most distinguished and one of our ablest Ambassadors, the Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Grew, was reported in the press as saying that we were in the war. I am quite confident that Mr. Grew never made any such statement. He is a career man, he knows what war is, he knows that there has been no shooting, no killing, no sinkings, and no blood has been spilt. We are not in the war and we do not recognize an undeclared war in America.

The only way we can go to war under our constitutional form of government is by act of the Congress of the United States. Certainly, if anybody is thinking of taking us into the war, the only decent, honest, and honorable course to pursue is to submit a war resolution to the Congress and let the Congress under our constitutional form of government vote it up or down.

Let us stop this talk about being in an undeclared war, at least until there is some shooting and killing of American citizens and Congress has acted. I want to go on record as saying very clearly that our Ambassador to Japan never made any such statement. He knows what war is. He was obviously misquoted in the press, because he never could have stated that we were in the war. All of our Ambassadors know that we are not in the war and will not be in the war until shooting starts or the Congress of the United States puts us into war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice the title of this bill is:

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives"—

And so on.

What is the idea of that phrase in there? If we are not in war, why do you want it now?

Mr. BEITER. That is merely the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does this bill in any way prohibit strikers from having weapons on the picket line? We do not want to interfere with them, do we?

Mr. BEITER. They would be required to get a license if they wanted to get some powder.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would be fine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the title of the act of October 6, 1917, is hereby amended to read as follows: "An act to regulate the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of explosives, to authorize regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes."

SEC. 2. The act of October 6, 1917, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That as used in this act—

"(1) The terms 'explosive' and 'explosives' shall mean gunpowders, powders used for blasting, all forms of high explosives, blasting materials, fuzes (other than electric circuit breakers), detonators, and other detonating agents, smokeless powders, and any chemical compounds or mechanical mixture that contains any oxidizing and combustible units, or other ingredients, in such proportions, quantities, or packing that ignition by fire, by friction, by concussion, by percussion, or by detonation of the compound or mixture or any part thereof may cause an explosion. The term 'explosive' or 'explosives' shall not include cartridges for small arms or shotguns.

"(2) The term 'ingredients' shall mean phosphorus and active oxidizing chemicals that can be combined with one or more reducing materials to produce an explosive.

"(3) The term 'person' shall include executive departments, independent establishments, and other agencies of the United States, the District of Columbia, Territories, and insular possessions of the United States, States, and municipalities and other political subdivisions thereof; and individuals, partnerships, associations, societies, and corporations.

"(4) The term "Director" shall mean the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

"SEC. 2. No person shall manufacture, distribute, store, sell, issue, give, or otherwise dispose of explosives or ingredients unless such person is licensed under this act.

"Except as provided in section 4, no person shall distribute, sell, issue, give, or otherwise dispose of explosives or ingredients to a person who is not licensed under this act.

"Except as provided in section 4, no person shall possess, purchase, accept, receive, acquire, or use explosives or ingredients unless such person is licensed under this act.

"No person shall import or export explosives or ingredients unless such person is licensed under this act.

"SEC. 3. The purchase or possession of ingredients when purchased or held in small quantities and not used or intended to be used in the manufacture of explosives shall not be subject to the provisions of this act. This act shall not apply to explosives or ingredients which are in transit upon vessels or railroad cars in conformity with statutory provisions or the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This act shall not be construed to prevent the manufacture under the authority of the United States of explosives for, or their sale to or possession by, the military or naval service of the United States or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This act shall not apply to arsenals, navy yards, depots or other establishments owned by, or operated by or on behalf of, the United States. The Director may, however, cooperate with the heads of departments having jurisdiction over such establishments. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or otherwise affect in any way the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to the investigation of explosives, accidents, or fires.

"SEC. 4. A superintendent, foreman, or other duly authorized employee at a mine, quarry, or other work, may, when licensed so to do, sell or issue to any employee under him such amount of explosives or ingredients as may be required by that employee in the performance of his duties. The employee may purchase or accept the explosives or ingredients so sold or issued, but the person so selling or issuing the same shall see that any unused explosives or ingredients are returned and that no explosives or ingredients are taken by the employee to any point not necessary to the carrying on of his duties.

"SEC. 5. Each person licensed to sell, issue, or otherwise dispose of explosives or ingredients shall keep a complete, itemized, and accurate record showing each person to whom and the purpose for which explosives or ingredients are sold, issued, or otherwise disposed of; the quantity and kind of explosives or ingredients sold, issued, or otherwise disposed of; and the date of such sale, issuance, or other disposition, and such other information as the Director by regulation may require. The record shall be sworn to and furnished to the Director or his authorized representatives whenever requested.

"SEC. 6. The Director is hereby authorized to issue licenses as follows:

"(a) Manufacturer's license, authorizing the manufacture, possession, and sale of explosives and ingredients.

"(b) Vendor's license, authorizing the purchase, possession, and sale of explosives or ingredients.

"(c) Purchaser's license, authorizing the purchase, possession, and use of explosives and ingredients.

"(d) Foreman's license, authorizing the purchase and possession of explosives and ingredients and the sale and issuance of explosives and ingredients to employees as provided in section 4.

"(e) Exporter's license, authorizing the licensee to export explosives, but no such license shall authorize exportation in violation of any proclamation of the President issued under any act of Congress.

"(f) Importer's license, authorizing the licensee to import explosives.

"(g) Analyst's, educator's, inventor's, and investigator's licenses, authorizing the purchase, manufacture, possession, testing, and disposal of explosives and ingredients.

"SEC. 7. The Director may designate as licensing agents persons authorized by law to administer oaths and may authorize such agents to issue vendor's, purchaser's, and foreman's licenses; and wherever possible the Director shall select as licensing agents qualified officers or employees of the several States or of political subdivisions or public bodies thereof. Applications for vendor's, purchaser's, and foreman's licenses may be made to the licensing agent in the district within which the explosives or ingredients are to be sold or used. Such agents may collect a fee of 25 cents for each license issued, and shall be entitled to no other compensation from the United States for their services.

"Licensing agents shall keep an accurate record of all licenses issued, in manner and form to be prescribed by the Director, and shall make reports from time to time as the Director may require. The Director shall furnish to the agents the necessary blanks and blank records. The Director may revoke the authority of licensing agents, and all licenses issued by them shall be subject to revocation by the Director as provided in section 8.

"SEC. 8. The Director shall provide for the renewal of licenses issued under this act. No license shall be valid for more than 1 year. All licenses outstanding on the termination of a war in which the United States may be engaged or on the day set by Presidential proclamation for the suspension of the operation of the provisions of this act shall expire on such termination or on that day.

"The Director or a licensing agent may refuse to issue a license when in his opinion, based on facts of which he has knowledge or reliable information, the applicant (a) is not sufficiently reliable and experienced to be authorized to manufacture or handle explosives and ingredients; or (b) is disloyal or hostile to the United States, or, if the applicant is a firm, association, society, or corporation, its officers, directors, or controlling shareholders or members are disloyal or hostile to the United States.

"When the Director has reason to believe on like grounds that any licensee is disloyal or hostile to the United States, he may revoke all licenses issued to such licensee. If, after notice and an opportunity to be heard, the Director finds that a licensee has violated any of the provisions of this act or of the regulations issued hereunder, the Director may revoke all licenses issued to such licensee.

"An applicant to whom a license is refused by the Director or any licensee whose license is revoked by the Director may within 30 days after notification of the rejection of his application or the revocation of his license apply to the Council of National Defense for such license or the cancelation of such revocation. The Council shall make its order upon the Director either to grant or to withhold the license, or shall affirm or reverse the revocation.

"An applicant to whom a license is refused by a licensing agent may within 30 days after notification of the rejection of his application apply to a regional officer for such license, and the officer shall grant or withhold the license. The Director shall designate officials of the Bureau of Mines stationed in the field to pass on such appeals. If a regional officer upholds a licensing agent, the applicant may appeal to the Director.

"SEC. 9. Unless the explosives and ingredients are to be purchased or accepted pursuant to section 4, any person desiring to manufacture, distribute, store, sell, issue, give, possess, purchase, accept, receive, acquire, use, import, or export explosives or ingredients shall make application for a license under this act. The applicant, under oath, shall state his name; place of birth; whether a citizen of the United States, whether native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States; if a naturalized citizen, the date and place of naturalization; if a firm, association, society, or corporation, the names, nationality, and addresses of its officers and directors, and the nationality of the controlling stockholders or members; business in which engaged; the amount and kind of explosives or ingredients which during the past 6 months have been acquired, disposed of, or used by him; the amount and kind of explosives or ingredients now on hand; whether sales, if any, have been made to jobbers, wholesalers, retailers, or consumers; the kind of license to be issued, and the kind and amount of explosives or ingredients which the license will authorize to be manufactured or handled; and such further information as the Director may from time to time require.

"SEC. 10. A licensee or an applicant for license under this act shall furnish such information regarding himself and his business, so far as such business relates to or is connected with explosives or ingredients, at such time and in such manner as the Director or his authorized representative may request. Licensees and applicants who are regularly engaged in the manufacture of explosives prior to the date upon which the

provisions of this act are made operative by a proclamation of the President shall not be compelled to disclose secret processes, costs, or other data unrelated to the distribution of explosives.

"SEC. 11. No person shall represent himself as having a license issued under this act when he has not such a license, or as having a license different in form or in conditions from the one which he in fact has, or without proper authority make, cause to be made, issue, or exhibit anything purporting or pretending to be such license, or intended to mislead any person into believing it is such a license, or refuse to exhibit his license to any law-enforcement officer, Federal or State, or to a representative of the Bureau of Mines.

"SEC. 12. Every person licensed under this act to manufacture or store explosives shall clearly mark and define the premises on which his plant or magazine may be and shall conspicuously display thereon the words 'Explosives—Keep Off.'

"SEC. 13. No person, without the consent of the owner or his authorized agents, except law-enforcement officers, the Director and persons designated by him in writing, shall knowingly be in or upon any plant or premises on which explosives are manufactured or stored, or knowingly be in or upon any magazine premises on which explosives are stored. No person shall discharge any firearms or throw or, without the consent of the owner, place any explosives or inflammable bombs at, on, or against any such plant or magazine premises, or cause the same to be done. This section shall not be construed to prohibit the discharge of firearms by law-enforcement officers or others in the lawful performance of their official duties, or to prevent the proof-firing of weapons, projectiles, ammunitions, or explosives, or the testing of fuses, detonators, or other materials upon the premises.

"SEC. 14. The Director is hereby authorized to investigate all explosions and fires which may occur in mines, quarries, factories, warehouses, magazines, houses, cars, boats, conveyances, and all places in which explosives or ingredients are manufactured, transported, stored, or used. The Director is authorized to investigate all explosions, accidents, or fires in which there is reason to believe that explosives were involved. The Director may in his discretion report his findings in such manner as he may deem fit to the proper Federal or State authorities, to the end that if such explosion has been brought about by a willful act the person or persons causing such act may be proceeded against and brought to justice; or, if the explosion has been brought about by accidental means, that precautions may be taken to prevent similar accidents from occurring. In the prosecution of such investigations the employees, under the direction of the Director, are hereby granted the authority to enter the premises where such explosion or fire has occurred, to examine plans, books, and papers, to administer oaths to, and to examine all witnesses and persons concerned, without let or hindrance on the part of the owner, lessee, operator, or agent thereof.

"SEC. 15. The Director shall exercise the authority conferred upon him by this act under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The head of any executive department or independent establishment of the Federal Government may cooperate with the Director in the administration and enforcement of this act and may assign employees to operate under the direction of the Director. The officers and employees of the District of Columbia and of the Territories and island possessions of the United States and of the municipalities and other political subdivisions thereof shall cooperate with the Director in the administration and enforcement of this act. The Director may cooperate with the officers and employees of the several States and of the municipalities and other political subdivisions thereof. When such officers and employees act under the direction of the Director, their acts done in the administration and enforcement of this act shall be deemed to be fully authorized.

"SEC. 16. To administer this act, the Secretary of the Interior may employ such number of employees of the various classes recognized by the Classification Act of 1923 as may be appropriated for by the Congress. The Secretary may appoint as officers or employees persons who volunteer to serve without pay. The Secretary may delegate to subordinates the power to employ.

"SEC. 17. Without authority from the applicant for a license, from the licensee, or from the Director, no officer or employee or licensing agent engaged in the administration or enforcement of this act shall divulge any information obtained in the course of his duties under this act regarding the business of any licensee or applicant for a license.

"SEC. 18. The Director may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 19. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act or any rules or regulations made thereunder shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 20. The provisions of this act and the regulations issued hereunder shall become operative only upon a declaration of war or of the existence of a state of war by the Congress, or upon the issuance by the President of a proclamation declaring that there exists a state of war or a national emergency requiring the application of the provisions of this act to provide for the national defense and security, and shall remain operative until the termination of the war, or until such proclamation is revoked by the President.

"SEC. 21. This act shall be known as the Federal Explosives Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HAZEN G. CHAMBERLAIN AND CUBA MEMORIAL HOSPITAL (H. DOC. NO. 253)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval (H. R. 926) a bill for the relief of Hazen G. Chamberlain, doctor of medicine, and Cuba Memorial Hospital.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $95 to Dr. Hazen G. Chamberlain, and the sum of $99.50 to the Cuba Memorial Hospital, Cuba, N. Y., for services rendered by them to six enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps who were injured in an automobile accident on September 19, 1937, while on leave, and while riding in a privately owned vehicle.

At the time the Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees were injured and the medical and hospital services rendered by Dr. Chamberlain and the Cuba Memorial Hospital, respectively, the law permitted payment by the Federal Government of medical and hospital expenses of enrollees injured in line of duty, but the regulations promulgated by the Director of the corps specifically provided that private medical attendance and private hospitalization of a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps, sick or injured while on leave, were not to be chargeable to public funds.

The War Department, which has been delegated by the Director of the corps to handle hospitalization and medical attendance for members of the corps has, in accordance with the regulations hereinabove referred to, declined to pay a number of accounts where the enrollees were sick or injured while on leave, and no substantial reason is known why the enrollees for whom special relief is proposed in this bill merit special legislation to relieve them from personal obligation for their hospitalization and medical attendance.

I, therefore, feel obliged to return the bill to the Congress without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 9, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as this is the day upon which the Committee on Appropriations reported out the W. P. A. bill, I believe I ought to take a moment to call attention to a grand example of W. P. A. efficiency. To get 25 copies of the hearings, reports, and the bill, they sent a chauffeur, a man, and a woman and a big limousine up here. The package would be less than a foot high. A 3-year-old youngster could handle it. The only trouble was that they did not have an armed guard along, and David Lasser to supervise that armed guard. I believe when you come to consider a measure of this importance you should consider the ability in administration of this agency. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to civilian defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the Illinois House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has picked on an incident in order to poison our minds with respect to a very important measure that is shortly to come before us. Just understand the logic of his position. He takes a single, isolated instance with regard to the delivery of a small package of bills here and says that is a symbol of W. P. A. lack of efficiency. I hope we are not going to legislate on such an important program, important to the welfare of millions of our citizens and their families, on any such illogical and trivial basis as that. The gentleman is engaged in his usual pastime of throwing pebbles. We should discuss these questions on their merits, and in a large, broad way, to find out where the truth lies and where they lack merit, rather than bringing in such trivial incidents. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

AID FOR NEEDY BLIND PERSONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4660) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the expenditure of funds for the necessary burial expenses of blind persons who have been receiving aid under existing law. At the present time there are 219 persons in the District of Columbia who are receiving assistance, and if the proposed bill is enacted into law it is estimated that the cost would not exceed $1,000 per annum. The measure has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and also the Bureau of the Budget.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor", approved August 24, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting at the end of said section the following: "On the death of a recipient of aid under this act such reasonable funeral expenses as the Board or its designated agency may deem necessary may be paid for the burial of such person and such funeral expenses so paid may be recovered in the same manner as provided in sections 11 and 12 for the recovery of amounts expended as aid."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD TO CROSS NEW YORK AVENUE NE.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 774) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure is to grant to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. the right to construct an underpass at New York Avenue. This proposal has been considered by the Director of Highways for the District of Columbia and it is found that there is no reason why such an underpass should not be constructed. The bill contains provisions which amply protect the District of Columbia and the measure has the full approval of the Commissioners.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., operating lessee of all of the railroads and appurtenant properties of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., in the District of Columbia, be, and it is hereby, authorized to establish switch and siding connections with its tracks in parcel 130/9, to cross New York Avenue by means of a suitable underpass, and thence into and through parcel 129/33 and lot 801 in square 3585, as well as into and through the bed of Brentwood Road between New York Avenue and Florida Avenue, if and when said road is officially vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, all of said parcels of land being thus known and identified on the plat books of the Surveyor's Office of the District of Columbia, with all switches, crossings, turn-outs, extensions, spurs, and sidings, as may be or become necessary for the development of the said squares and parcels of land above indicated for such use as may be permitted in the use district or districts in which said squares and parcels of land are now or may hereafter be included as defined in the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia and shown in the official atlases of the Zoning Commission.

SEC. 2. Before any of the work above authorized shall be begun on the ground a plan or plans thereof shall be prepared and submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their approval and only to the extent that such plans shall be so approved shall said work or any portion thereof be permitted or undertaken.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as limiting or abridging the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. L. 1353), entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying the requirements of section 1 (18) of the Interstate Commerce Act insofar as they would apply to the construction referred to in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 5. That Congress reserves the right to amend, alter, or repeal this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it had been the intention of your Committee on the District of Columbia to bring to the House today the so-called small-loan bill. At the request of our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE], a member of the committee, who had the measure in charge and who finds himself unable to be present, I am asking that the legislation be passed over for the day. It is the intention of the District Committee to bring the bill before the House on June 23, the next District of Columbia day.

This completes the business for today of the District of Columbia Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4965, the military appropriation bill, 1942, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left for debate on the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state for the information of the Committee that when the Committee rose on Friday, time on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto had been limited to 50 minutes, including the 5 minutes which had already been used by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. Of that time there remains 24 minutes, and the names of the Members who are to be recognized in that time are Mr. SMITH of Virginia; Mr. PACE, of Georgia; Mr. FITZGERALD, of Connecticut; Mr. CASE of South Dakota; Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts; Mr. HOOK, of Michigan; Mr. RAMSPECK, of Georgia; Mr. DOWNS, of Connecticut; Mr. HOFFMAN, of Michigan; and Mr. SNYDER, of Pennsylvania. Accordingly the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, at the close of the debate upon this amendment on last Friday I wished to make some remarks. I rise now in opposition to the amendment because I want to resent a great many things that have been said about organized labor, of which I have been a member for over 35 years, carrying a card in the International Moulders Union, and today I have seen in the papers where the International Moulders Union has just celebrated its fiftieth anniversary of peace, never having had a strike in 50 years.

I am just as strong in my belief as any man in the United States that the racketeers of labor should be driven out of the labor movement, but I do not believe that the Starnes amendment will do this. I believe the amendment will put into the hands of the racketeers the greatest weapon they can ever have. The Starnes amendment provides that when a strike is called and lasts over 10 days, the employer shall not be able to hire back any of his help and that those who are engaged in the strike shall not be permitted to work on any kind of defense program. In this way you will stop production and paralyze it.

In my opinion, this would be the greatest weapon that could be put into the hands of the racketeers who are in control of some of the unions today. I believe the President of the United States has the power, and I have confidence in the President of the United States using this power. I believe he will control these racketeers when the time arrives. [Applause.]

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD] just pointed out, this amendment permanently blacklists any worker who continues on strike for 10 days. It seems to me that the adoption of this amendment would be one of the greatest gifts that we could bestow on the radical and subversive elements in the labor movement. If we should adopt the amendment we could go to some one who had subversive purposes in mind and say to him, "There is a defense plant down the road where there are some grievances. It is an important factory, and the workers there are skilled workers, such as tool makers and die casters. Go there and get them out on strike and just keep them out on strike for 10 days. Just keep negotiations going on that long. In other words, just cripple the defense program for 10 days and then we, the Congress of the United States will go to your aid. We will make the strike permanent. We will permanently cripple the defense program."

Mr. Chairman, I know that that is not the aim of the proponents of the amendment and that they are seeking to cure a difficult situation, but I submit that the remedy is far worse than the disease.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. No. However we may feel about the organized labor movement, however much disturbed and alarmed we may be about the defense strikes, this is not the way to meet that problem. It would play squarely into the hands of the enemies of the Republic. I urge the rejection of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I want first to read to you a short paragraph from the fireside chat delivered by the President a few nights ago:

> A Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes has been set up. That machinery must be used promptly—and without stoppage of work. Collective bargaining will be retained, but the American people expect that impartial recommendations of our Government services will be followed both by capital and by labor.

I have drawn the following, by way of amendment, for your consideration and I ask you to listen to it carefully:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person—

and that applies to the employer and to the employee alike—

> who shall for as long as 10 days fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendations of the National Defense Mediation Board.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Just a moment. It does not prohibit strikes, but after a Government agency has investigated the facts, and has made its recommendation, I think, as did our distinguished former President, Mr. Wilson, in 1918 think, that when a person continues on strike or does strike against the recommendation of a constituted Federal agency, he is in fact striking against the Federal Government itself. This covers the employer should he fail or refuse, and it also covers the employee. They are treated the same and are both required to respect the findings and recommendation of the duly constituted Federal agency, and, as President Wilson notified them in 1918, if they continue to strike against that agency, they should not be permitted to participate in defense work, or compensation. I shall withhold this amendment for the present and await further discussion of the question and your consideration and action on amendments which are now pending.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment at the desk, which I desire to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to have it read for information or does he offer it at this time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to have it read and offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Substitute amendment for the Starnes amendment by Mr. CASE of South Dakota:
>
> "SEC. 13. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the amendment is offered at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has offered a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the substitute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the Starnes amendment last week the point was made that the phrase in that amendment "by whomsoever employed" would prevent the payment of salary to a person who had been engaged in a stoppage of work for more than 10 days and thereafter was drafted and drawn into the Army. The use of that phrase "by whomsoever employed" would prevent the payment to him of his salary while in the Army or in the Navy. I think that is correct, because the Starnes amendment applies to all of the appropriations in this act and uses the phrase "by whomsoever employed."

The other day there was considerable discussion of the phrase "10 days," as to how that should be determined and whether the 10 days would count from the start of the strike or after it had been examined by the National Mediation Board. At least, many questions were raised with reference to the language of that amendment.

I have drawn a substitute amendment in a way that I think takes care of those objections. I want to read it very slowly:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the compensation to any person for services in a plant—

That does not prevent payment for services in the Army or something else, but—

> in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program.

I think that amendment is workable. It does not draft labor, but it protects the men who want to respond when the Board says further stoppage of the defense program is dangerous. It opens the way for a man to go back to work who wants to work and will make possible the operation of the plant. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. On what ground?

Mr. SNYDER. From the reading, that it requires the performance of an act by an executive agency. It is, therefore, legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, it does not, by reason of the fact that the National Mediation Board has such authority at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair would permit, I might point out that this amendment does not require the National Mediation Board to make a certification, but says that after the National Mediation Board shall have done so, then no money can be paid.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair has so stated. In the opinion of the Chair, the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is not subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]; but inasmuch as it is a limitation, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Chair, however, is clearly of the opinion that the substitute amendment is not in order by reason of the fact that it is not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. The amendment as offered by the gentleman from Alabama has to do with the stoppage of work, by its terms saying "shall hereafter stop work for a period in excess of 10 days," and so forth, whereas the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota has to do with picketing and picketing lines, which is quite different from a stoppage of work.

For that reason the substitute is not in order, inasmuch as it is not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. On the ground that it is not germane, the Chair holds it is out of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the ruling of the Chair, I understand it would be in order if offered as a separate new section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, would pass upon that question when it was presented.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a very heavy burden rests upon your shoulders and my shoulders here today. We must have responsible labor support in this great national-defense program but we cannot get it by repressive legislation against legitimate patriotic desires of labor.

You know and I know that the great majority of labor, both organized and unorganized, are truly American, ready and willing to sacrifice their lives and their fortunes for their country—your country and mine.

There is a well-organized efficient minority group in organized labor today working and collaborating with a handful of leaders operating throughout certain sections of the United States, Mexico, and the Latin countries under the leadership of Berlin and Moscow in an attempt to break down our great national-defense program and our aid to democratic countries of the world who are attempting to stop Hitler, the enemy of freedom.

You heard our distinguished minority leader last Friday point out that this amendment would bar certain patriotic Americans from participating in the national-defense program. If this amendment were adopted, we would be doing the very thing that these unpatriotic saboteurs under the leadership of Berlin and Moscow, agents of Hitler and Stalin, are seeking to accomplish.

Philip Murray of the C. I. O. and William Green of the A. F. of L. are leading that great patriotic group representing real American labor in a valiant fight to rid this Nation of the rats who are undermining the very foundation of our liberties. Let us uphold this patriotic group but drive out those who are collaborating with our enemies.

Great Britain did not meet the situation with repressive legislation, because repressive legislation would inflame, not retard, this scourge of strikes, but followed a program such as was recommended by Philip Murray, known as the Murray council plan, where labor and industry collaborated together with the Government in councils set up in each national-defense factory to the extent of 100-percent productions.

There is no doubt that if this minority group of saboteurs are allowed to destroy patriotic organized labor, patriotic industry, and Government agencies it is open revolution, and if this group are in open revolution then we should treat it as an open revolution and take such action as is necessary to put our national-defense production program in order.

Let us uphold the patriotic hand of labor and join with industry and Government to carry out an all-out aid program to the democracies of the world through the national-defense program so as to stop the onrush of Hitlerism throughout the world. We need patriotic labor in our fight. Let us defeat this amendment. Let us set up a program that will forever rid ourselves of the rats that are collaborating with Berlin and Moscow. They would like to have this legislation on the statute books. Do not fall into this trap. Councils of patriotic labor leaders, patriotic industry, and Government must be our goal. We must save this Nation but we cannot save it without 100-percent cooperation from patriotic labor groups. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. For what purposes does the gentleman fron. Alabama rise?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I sent to the desk last Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, when I asked for time to speak on this amendment I did not realize that the gentleman who offered the amendment intended to withdraw it. I think this effort on his part deserves favorable comment, and if he deems it advisable to do so, I believe he should be allowed to withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman, as an employer dealing with three different unions, I take the floor to oppose the amendment taking away the constitutional rights of labor. There is no question in my mind but that the rank and file of labor in this country is patriotic. You cannot blame these people for the acts of a few with un-American tendencies and Communists who have been allowed to creep into key positions in labor unions in various parts of the country.

I represent a district in Connecticut that is an arsenal for defense. Some of the largest factories in the country are located in this district. I am happy and proud to say that with these factories working day and night we have not had a single defense strike. I congratulate the laboring men in the district. I cannot conscientiously come down here and vote for an amendment which is going to take away their rights.

I say what this Congress should do is to take drastic and definite action against the leaders of labor who have communistic leanings and un-American tendencies, such as Bridges and a few others.

If this amendment is not withdrawn I urge that it be defeated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the idea of the gentleman from Alabama in asking to withdraw his amendment was to offer a substitute.

All are for national defense, but all are not for production for national defense. This is quite evident from numerous votes which have been taken. William Green, Daniel Tobin, of the A. F. of L.; Phillip Murray and Frankensteen of the C. I. O. have condemned the strike on the west coast. They asked the men to go back to work on the west coast. The men refused and are still out, delaying, as these labor leaders say, national defense. We need legislation to take care of the very few outlaw strikes and racketeer labor leaders just as we need legislation to take care of the small minority of law violators in this country.

It has been said, in fact, we here in the House have been threatened and told that if we interfere with these radical labor leaders we are not going to get production because they will not work. They forget that they can be separated from Government jobs—that they can be drafted. What have you to say about the proposition that you will draft men into the Army at $21 a month for a year, yet you will keep on the pay rolls men who voluntarily quit their jobs in national defense when they receive eight times the pay the drafted men get? Why not insist upon a little justice, a little equality? Whether this amendment or some other be adopted, at least let us do something, let us not say we are for national defense and then every time legislation which would aid in giving us production for national defense is offered come back with the excuse that this is not the time, this is not the way to do it. If the President has to call out the Army, as he has, to break a picket line, why should not we give aid to that program and adopt legislation which, while permitting picketing, protects the willing, patriotic worker

from the violence of the pickets, legislation which will let patriotic men go to work and which prohibits those who would interfere with the national defense by unlawful means from accomplishing their purpose of delaying or preventing the production of defense materials?

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The remaining 2½ minutes are yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has asked me to yield to him to propound a unanimous-consent request. I now yield to him.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I failed to state a moment ago in submitting my unanimous-consent request that I did it for the purpose of later offering an amendment, which I think will be more comprehensive than the one that is pending.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In making my request I did not make it clear that I was not relinquishing any position I had theretofore held. In view of what has occurred since we last met, I think it would create a tremendous psychological effect all to the disadvantage of this country if we did not take some action at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that I may withdraw the pending amendment so that I may later offer a substitute.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COX. Am I in order? I take it that the gentleman agrees with me——

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] yielded time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. The gentleman from Georgia asked a question, which is the regular order.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman agree with me that this concoction of anarchy and communism that has been stewed up by the leftists in and out of Government and which they call democracy ought to be crushed? That is as I take it what the amendment is aimed at.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time, may I say that from what has happened since last Friday, and from what happened this morning at the White House, I am convinced, as far as I can see, that it would be unwise for the Congress to pass the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Alabama. From now on I feel these situations will be adjusted all right and in an orderly manner and that we will not need the amendment. We did not conceive of the turn of events last Friday. That is all I have to say.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Alabama has attempted to withdraw his amendment, which unanimous-consent request was denied. If the amendment which the gentleman has offered is voted down, the House will then be given an opportunity to vote on the later amendment which he contemplates offering?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be permitted to vote on any amendment that is in order.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOREN) there were—ayes 20, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. No part of any money appropriated herein or included under any contract authority herein granted shall be expended for the payment of any commission on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 percent of the purchase price.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Are we reading another paragraph now? My amendment was on the paragraph last under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has just read section 11.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My amendment was on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk read the next paragraph, section 11.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My amendment was offered to the same section that the Starnes amendment was offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that he is advised by the Clerk that the gentleman from Virginia had an amendment on the desk to section 10; consequently, the gentleman from Virginia will be recognized to offer the amendment at this time, in the absence of any member of the committee offering an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am recognized to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does a member of the committee who has had on the desk since last Friday an amendment receive priority in recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. To be sure; if he is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is the case in my instance.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that I have been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he is advised by the Clerk that the gentleman's amendment to the bill is on the next page, and to a different section.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order I have been recognized on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 71, line 12, after the period, insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation—

"(1) Who employs any person who is a member of any union which hereafter calls, encourages, or promotes a strike to enforce, as a condition of employment of any employee that he either join or not join or belong or not belong to a labor union unless the same be for the purpose of enforcing an existing contract between such employer and such union; or

"(2) Who employs any person who is a member of any union which hereafter calls, encourages, or promotes a strike in violation of a collective-bargaining agreement entered into in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act, or to prevent recognition of another union which has been certified as the bargaining agency by the National Labor Relations Board in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act; or

"(3) Who employs any person who participates in any strike called on account of any jurisdictional dispute; or

"(4) Who employs any person who, by intimidation, violence, or threats of violence, seeks in any way to hinder or impede the operation of any industry engaged in the production of any article for use in connection with the national defense;

"*Provided further, however*, That the foregoing provisions shall not apply in any case where the employee subsequently furnishes to the employer a statement in writing and under oath that he will no longer maintain membership in such offending union, and will not again participate in such prescribed conduct."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is an amendment to section 10. The Clerk has already started the reading of section 11. The gentleman from Virginia was not recognized before the Clerk went on to section 11. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, and I make the further point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Insofar as the first point of order is concerned, the gentleman from Virginia had the amendment to section 10 pending on the desk and had advised the Chair that he was offering the amendment to section 10. In accordance with customary parliamentary procedure, the Chair recognized the gentleman to offer his amendment to section

10. The Chair consequently overrules that point of order and will investigate the matter of germaneness.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Chair, I desire to press the point of order on the additional ground that this amendment is not germane to the section to which it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had understood that that was one of the points of order made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I beg the Chair's pardon. I did not hear it.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not a restriction.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the Chair care to hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Virginia on the question of the germaneness of the amendment to this particular section.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I may state in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that that question has already been ruled upon. On the question of its relevancy at the particular point to which it is offered, I would say two things: First, that it is offered at that point in the bill where we have a like provision with respect to Communist activities. I should like to say further in that connection that I have offered similar amendments to nearly every appropriation bill at the same point, and they have passed the gantlet of points of order.

May I call the attention of the Chair further to the fact that a similar amendment was offered by the gentleman from Alabama on Friday and was sustained, and we have just disposed of that amendment. I have examined the bill pretty carefully, and I cannot think of any place where the matter can be more nearly germane than to the point in the bill where we are dealing with the question of the limitation on the payment of any of this money to Communists.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on that section and all amendments thereto was closed by the agreement entered into on Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say for the information of the gentleman from California that the debate had been closed only on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, not on the section, and such was the order of the House on Friday.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I submit in reply to the gentleman from Virginia that the section to which he is offering the amendment relates to pay with regard to persons who advocate violence, and his amendment deals with the question of the open shop and the closed shop. These questions are entirely unrelated; consequently, the amendment offered by the gentleman is not germane, because the subject with which the amendment offered by the gentleman deals is entirely unrelated to the subject with which the section the gentleman seeks to amend deals.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, out of courtesy to the gentleman offering the amendment I reserved the point of order. I now make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has already made the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to have it disposed of, Mr. Chairman. I do not care to make a speech unless the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, section 10 deals with a subject matter different from that of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, and the amendment, therefore, would not be germane to this section. The Chair sustains the point of order with reference to germaneness.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 71, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 10A. No part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation—

"(1) Who employs any person who is a member of any union which hereafter calls, encourages, or promotes a strike to enforce, as a condition of employment of any employee that he either join or not join or belong or not belong to a labor union unless the same be for the purpose of enforcing an existing contract between such employer and such union; or

"(2) Who employs any person who is a member of any union which hereafter calls, encourages, or promotes a strike in violation of a collective-bargaining agreement entered into in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act or to prevent recognition of another union which has been certified as the bargaining agency by the National Labor Relations Board in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act; or

"(3) Who employs any person who participates in any strike called on account of any jurisdictional dispute; or

"(4) Who employs any person who, by intimidation, violence, or threats of violence, seeks in any way to hinder or impede the operation of any industry engaged in the production of any article for use in connection with the national defense;

"Provided further, however, That the foregoing provisions shall not apply in any case where the employee subsequently furnishes to the employer a statement in writing and under oath that he will no longer maintain membership in such offending union and will not again participate in such prescribed conduct."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is new legislation and sets up new duties for the executive branch of the Government and, in fact, sets up entirely different and separate, as well as new functions for sundry departments and I submit it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill even though offered as a separate section.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York indicate to the Chair wherein the amendment imposes additional affirmative duties on any governmental agency?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. They would have to determine, for instance, what member of what union had done the things which the gentleman proscribes in his amendment, and certainly such new duties are set out in the amendment. The amendment definitely and affirmatively sets up duties to be performed by other branches of the executive department, including the National Labor Relations Board, and in addition there has to be determined what constitutes a closed shop or an open shop, which is a judicial question. Questions after questions are set up to be determined by other branches of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Virginia on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I have offered similar amendments, as I have said before, to nearly every appropriation bill. I, of course, foresaw the enthusiasm with which certain gentlemen would press points of order against this amendment, so I therefore drew the amendment with a great deal of care, and if the Chair will read it carefully the Chair will entertain no doubt whatever about the fact that the amendment could not be construed as imposing additional duties upon any Government official. The amendment is purely a limitation.

Gentlemen have also spoken on the question of the germaneness of these provisions. As the Chair well recognizes, limitations on appropriations are an exception to the general rule relative to germaneness. I am satisfied from previous rulings of the Chair on this very matter that the amendment is in order.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. In addition to the point of order already pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I would ask the Chair to examine closely the last paragraph of the gentleman's amendment or a new section thereto. In there you will find the amendment requires that an affidavit be filed on behalf of the person or persons affected. This, strictly speaking, is not a limitation on an appropriation bill, but rather, as I submit to the Chair, is new legislation and therefore not in order here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my reply to that statement is the same as the other. There is no duty imposed on any Government employee. That section merely provides a way out for the offending employee, but does not require anything to be done by any Government official.

Mr. McGRANERY. It is not a limitation, however, but is new legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But it is an exception to the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment being offered as a new section is not subject to the point of order of germaneness. The Chair having read the amendment very carefully, noting that it is negative in its provisions and therefore a limitation, cannot se that it imposes any affirmative duties on any governmental agency and, furthermore, accepts the statement as made by the gentleman from Virginia that the last provision is an exception to a limitation and therefore in order.

In the opinion of the Chair the points of order are not well taken and are overruled.

The gentleman from Virigina [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SNYDER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will let us proceed a little farther before limiting debate.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object. I would like to go a little way on this matter and see what develops.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may fully explain the amendment I hope the Committee will not object to a unanimous-consent request by myself to be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia be granted 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I certainly would like to help my friend from Massachusetts, and I feel that we should have open discussion on this and I hope we will have open discussion from now on with no limitation on debate. For that reason I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I express my deep gratitude to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] for obtaining for me this additional time and I also appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]. I shall take the time of the House only to explain to the House in as simple language as I can exactly what this amendment does and what effect it will have. I decline to yield until I have finished the explanation, because I believe the House wants to know what this amendment is, and what will be its effect. I think the House knows that I have had some experience in these labor matters in the last few years and I wish to give the House a full explanation of the full purport of the amendment. I am offering the amendment in the first place because the Starnes amendment has been defeated. We have had extended debate on this subject of strikes in defense industry. I think it would be a terribly bad influence on the country if it went out from here today that this House is unwilling to even express in the mildest way its disapproval of the outrageous conduct of some labor leaders on the most important matter that is holding up the national defense today. It would be said that this House has not the courage to do anything about it. I know that is not the fact, because we came in here last year with amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, and this House in the face of a coming election, in the face of all the power and persuasion of the labor unions that could be brought to bear, passed those amendments because the House regarded it as a patriotic duty to do so, and it passed them by a vote or two to one. I regret that those amendments still lie in a pigeonhole in another body because I believe if they had been adopted and put into effect, many of the disastrous things occurring today would never have occurred.

Now, to my amendment. It has four sections. The first section provides against the employment of any person who is a member of a union which calls, encourages, or promotes a strike to enforce a condition of employment that a person belong or not belong to a labor union, and I have made an exception there—except where such strike is for the purpose of enforcing an existing contract between such employer and employee. Where they have a closed-shop agreement, it is all right, they can go on a strike, they can maintain the closed-shop agreement; but where, as is the case in nine-tenths of these strikes, they are striking for organizational purposes, as well as increase in wages, and are insisting on a closed shop, insisting on enforcing on American citizens their dicta that no man shall work unless he pays his tribute to a labor union, then this amendment says "No." It says if you strike in a non-closed-shop plant for the purpose of enforcing a closed shop, then these men who strike may not again be employed. I repeat, where there is a closed-shop contract, this amendment does not affect it. I hope that is clear.

The next section, section 2, prohibits the employment of persons who are members of the union which calls, encourages, or promotes strikes in violation of a collective bargain or agreement entered into in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act, or prevents recognition of another union which has been certified as a bargaining agent by the National Labor Relations Board. Under the National Labor Relations Act a union may go before the Board and get itself recognized as a bargaining agency by election or by certification, or it can by negotiation enter into a contract with the employer. All this amendment does is to say to these fellows, "You have gone before the Labor Board and submitted your claim and gotten your contract, and you have a binding contract which is binding on your employer; it is going to be binding on you also; and if you strike in violation of your contract, then you are out on this recognition."

Is there anything wrong with that? Is that not fair? Is that not honest? Is that not just? Why should a labor union, any more than you or me or a corporation or any other citizen, be permitted to enter into a binding contract and then say that the employer must perform, but "we can strike any time we want"? I would like to hear somebody argue against No. 2.

No. 3 prohibits the employment of anyone who employs a person who participates in a strike called on account of any jurisdictional dispute.

Why should your national defense be tied up, for instance out here at Walter Reed Hospital, because one union has a contract to build this building and another union has a contract to build that building, and the one union says, "We will not build this building because our rival union is going to build another building over here for the Government"? They say, "We are going to tie up your whole national-defense program while we are having a jurisdictional dispute with a rival union."

I want to hear some of you gentlemen who want full debate on this matter get up on the floor and defend that.

Let us see what you have to say about section 3. Let us see how you defend any such conduct as that. I challenge you to do it. If you have no objection to it and you cannot defend it, I expect you to vote for this amendment, and the American people expect you to vote for it.

No. 4 prohibits any person from working who by intimidation, violence, or threats of violence seeks in any way to hinder or impede the operation of any industry engaged in the production of articles for national defense.

Is there anybody on this floor who wants to get up and defend violence today? Is there anybody who wants to get up here and defend those striking employees who are ready with a blackjack or a baseball bat or a piece of lead pipe to strike down their fellow workmen? That is all I have to say on section 4.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; not now. When the time comes to debate this I hope my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH], who is very able and capable, will undertake to defend violence, which prohibits and prevents work in a national-defense industry.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

Now, those are the provisions of this amendment, but I have given them an out on it. I have an exception at the

close of the section. I have given every one of them an out. It is as follows:

Provided further, however, That the foregoing provisions shall not apply in any case where the employee subsequently furnishes to the employer a statement in writing and under oath that he will no longer maintain membership in such offending union and will not again participate in such proscribed conduct.

In other words, if he comes back and says, "Yes; I have been a bad boy, but I am going to be a good boy from now on," he can go back to work and everything will be forgiven.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his generosity. I would like to direct his attention to section 4 of his amendment:

No allowance in this appropriation to be paid—

And so forth—

who employs any person who by intimidation, violence, or threats of violence, seeks in any way to hinder or impede the operation of any industry engaged in the production of any article for use in connection with the national defense.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who is to judge of these particular threats and intimidation, and so forth, that he refers to in this phraseology? Who is to decide whether or not they are violence?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The employer can decide.

Mr. McKEOUGH. So it is to be an ex parte situation? It is a generous contribution to the thing the gentleman from Virginia seeks.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois if he really wants to do something about this and he is sincere, that he just offer a clarifying amendment, and I assure him I will accept it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not think I violate any secret when I say to this House that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is to be commended for his perseverance and his determination to make impossible the development of the so-called movement of labor as it is defined by an organized effort, voluntarily arrived at by any group of workmen in any kind of factory or commercial establishment in America for collective bargaining purposes. I have no particular quarrel with his approach. I concede to the gentleman from Virginia every prerogative, every right, and every privilege as a Member of this Congress in his deliberation and consideration of any pending legislation, his approach to whatever philosophy he subscribes. I cannot, however, fail to remember that some year or two ago the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] sought action of this House with relation to a program that provided the fullest measure of protection of a closed shop for the milk producers of the States of Virginia and Maryland, as that production related itself to the consumptive power of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia. It was then the philosophy of the gentleman from Virginia that the idea of a closed shop was certainly an acceptable one, because it related to those who produced milk in Virginia and Maryland, and legislated out every other one of the 46 remaining States of the Union with relation to the market for milk on the part of the consumers of the District of Columbia.

I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia at that time would have brought to the House in connection with his proposal the language he inserts in paragraph 4 of his pending amendment that makes it impossible for anyone to understand what would constitute intimidation. I submit, under the language of this amendment, a representative of an employer seeking to obtain information on the part of those who were employed, and who were applying in their interest the legally established American principle of collective bargaining, and who reported to the employer that John Smith was actively attempting to organize his fellow workers in a union under the principle of collective bargaining, that that would constitute intimidation, or if John Smith would say to John Jones that in the interest of John Jones he should join a labor organization, it would also be construed by the employer—who is the sole judge—it would be intimidation within the scope of this proposed amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOUGH. I shall be pleased to yield when I finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, applying that reasoning to the milk producers of Virginia and Maryland, if some one of those producers sought to impress upon a fellow producer the advisability of joining their organization to protect their interests with relation to the District of Columbia milk-consuming public, he would infringe upon this particular language even if he only sought to "sell" the idea to his fellow producers of milk in those two States.

I submit to the House there is need for some action to curb so-called "outlaw" strikes. I am confident this Congress realizes, as it must, that the 50,000,000 people who toil in America whether they be in labor organizations, or unorganized, contribute more to the defense program in a single instant than the Office of Production Management, or any other group in the country. I also submit that a single one of the highly skilled mechanics engaged in defense work contributes more effective results than all those engaged in the Office of Production Management, because the latter are equipped only to make plans whereas the toilers in the factory, in the commercial areas of America, or in the mine, if you please, produce the materials, and by their skill convert them into the finished product that spells adequate defense of America.

I hope the Congress, in its good judgment, will vote down this amendment in the interest of sound Americanism, and in the interest of the real preparation every red-blooded American wants to see made to the defense of our beloved country. [Applause.]

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today's newspapers carry a quotation that must be of interest to this House and is certainly of interest to the American people relative to the strike now in progress in California. You see on this page I hold in my hand the picture of a group of men trying to protect a man who encouraged them to go back to work, trying to protect him from the violence of the other group which is attempting to hold the hands of Uncle Sam at a time when this Government is trying to make the necessary defense preparations for this country.

The statement I refer to is that Elmer Frietag, head of the strike negotiating committee for the union, wired Stephen Early, White House Secretary, "Armed forces will not break our strike. Bombers can't be made with bayonets."

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. Very briefly.

Mr. STARNES. That is the same Frietag who swore before a congressional committee here in this Capitol last week that he registered as a Communist in California in 1938.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know what he swore to, but my idea of Americanism leads me to swear that he is not a good American. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the American people are more disturbed over this situation today than any other one thing in the world except Hitler. It outranks Mussolini. [Laughter and applause.] And the American people are not willing for this House to assemble here and say, We are against this, we are against that; and every suggestion that is made the wrecking crew attempts to stop it. The safety of America is at stake and I for one say let us do something. I would rather do something partially wrong about this thing than to sit idly by and see the national-defense program of this country strangled in any such way.

Mr. Chairman, we have a Labor Committee in this House. I do not know of any situation that has confronted the American people in the past 10 years that has caused more comment or that more vitally affects labor and industry than this very situation existing at the present time. I feel that it is time for the Labor Committee to take cognizance of this. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Labor. But every Member of this House is going to have to assume his or her share of responsibility.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman knows, does he not, that most of the legislation that should have been sent to the Labor Committee was referred to other committees of the House?

Mr. BARDEN. Madam Chairman—and I would not enter into controversy with my chairman—I have heard it intimated in the House that probably the reason for that was that the Committee on Labor has been a little slow about acting on matters of this kind. [Ap-

plause.] I do not say this with any idea of attacking the chairman of the Committee on Labor, but I think the lady may be taking my suggestion a little too seriously.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that I have never taken him too seriously at any time on any subject.

Mr. BARDEN. I certainly take Madam Chairman very seriously.

Mrs. NORTON. I remind the gentleman that before the Labor Committee had any opportunity to act, the bills that should have been referred to it were referred to other committees. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Labor and should resent as much as I do the discrimination against the committee. I intend to vote against every amendment to this bill. It is an appropriation bill and should not be used as a vehicle to carry amendments which if considered in a separate bill would at least receive the consideration of a committee and we would understand their purpose. This is an extraordinary method of considering labor legislation. It is unfair to the great body of American labor, the majority of which can be depended upon to serve our country, and should not be confused with that small segment of labor responsible for agitating against the national-defense program. I have the utmost confidence in the responsible labor leaders and believe they will do a good job in housecleaning within labor ranks. They will see to it that America is not "sold down the river" by the Communists and Nazis who are creating dissension within the ranks of labor. The amendments offered here today will not help the labor situation. If adopted they will do a great deal of harm. They are unnecessary. The President has already signed the order designating the United States Army to take over the North American Co. at Inglewood, Calif. If and when it becomes necessary to the defense of our country to act we can depend upon the President to do so. New legislation enacted in the heat of emotion and without full and deliberate consideration would, in my opinion, be a crime against the hundreds of thousands of honest, patriotic, loyal workers throughout the country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, where bills are referred is something over which I have no control whatever. I am not here for the purpose of attacking the Labor Committee. The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and myself disagree, but we respect each other, I am sure. I say this is our responsibility. It is our responsibility, and the good laboring people of this country, the honest, hard-working patriotic labor, are entitled to some protection at our hands. I say that the labor of this country has never been successfully accused of being unpatriotic, disloyal, or unwilling to provide the necessary weapons of defense for this land. It centers around a certain small group that would flout and challenge even the White House. No; tanks cannot be made with bayonets, and I do not know how many bayonets it will take to open up these plants and to provide the necessary defensive weapons, but I hope they will be used if necessary.

In the last 3 days I talked to one of the commanding generals of a large camp, and I asked him, "General, how are you on equipment?" He said, "I have about 15,000 men, and if they were called upon to fight, Heaven knows what we would do." I said, "You mean you have not cannon, and you have not equipment for them to fight with?" He stated, "I am sorry to report we do not have them, and I do not know where they are coming from." It is bad enough to call on a man to go to camp, and even fight, if necessary, for $21 per month, and then for us to permit a hold-up in the production of arms and planes with which these same men are to train and defend this country it not only unfair and absurd, but reckless. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of labor is a subject that I seldom address myself to the House on. I do not think that there is anybody in this Chamber who has a better labor record than I, and if voting in support of those things to which labor is entitled can be called a labor record, then I know I have as good a one as anybody. But I see going on this afternoon something that I think we ought to stop and take stock of. Today the world is upside down, topsy-turvy, the United States is on the brink of no one here knows what. Certainly we are in the middle of the most determined and desperate era of preparation for war that this country has ever seen. Despite all this I find you, my colleagues, are divided for the most part in but two groups, for or against labor.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bigger problem than that. The right of labor, the right of any individual or any group, is insignificant and infinitesimal at this particular time. This involves the protection of 130,000,000 people. Better, I say to you, it is that a laboring man or any other man have a few cents or a few dollars less in his pay envelope at the end of this week than that he lay one thing in the way of this big program which may mean the life of your child and mine. Labor has no more stake here than the farmers or does the little merchant. Labor has no more stake than my mother and yours. This is not a fight for labor, and it is not a fight against labor.

I would sound this warning to labor: You had better clean house, if you can, my labor friends, and I hope you can and I think you can; because, if you do not, whether this amendment passes or some other at the moment is unimportant; it is inevitable if you do not do it yourself the Congress will, and that is going to hurt.

I think a conservative estimate would be that 96 percent of labor are good, loyal, true, hard-hitting, hard-fighting, red-blooded American citizens, as patriotic as you or I. I do not want to hurt them. Let them take care of the 4 percent; because, if the Congress has to do it, legislation goes straight down the line, and you are going to hurt the 96 to get the 4.

Mr. Chairman, this country is getting a little bit weary of all the arguments about labor. They are a little bit weary of you and I dividing ourselves on this floor as pro- and anti-labor. Let us forget that. This job is big. It is bigger than they are. It is the biggest thing that confronts you and me today. The very idea of one man standing up and telling the great Government of the United States that even if it sends troops in there to protect men's right to work he does not bow to the will of any government is absurd. It is he that speaks for a part of labor, if not all of it. I beseech you to drop this argument between the pros and antis and let us get down, whether it is the Smith amendment or something else, and take care of the job. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not subscribe to any attitude that would divide Congress for or against any group of American people. We have got a good, hard job ahead of us, but there is a silver lining. All the taxes that are being piled upon us and all additional burdens we will have to bear will awaken our social consciousness. Some American businessmen are intent upon a profit to the exclusion of everything else. I know them personally. They have little knowledge of the relationship of the welfare of the Nation as a whole to the welfare of their own particular business. They have less knowledge of the relationship of the welfare of other nations to the welfare of this country. This crisis is awakening them. I plead for unity; I want unity because we have a big job ahead of us. You are attacking this problem from a little, small angle. You call it labor trouble. Why not call it employer trouble? Why not call it employer-labor trouble?

What causes these strikes? Oh, yes; you can pick a few. You can take a few of them, but if you do you do not see all of the picture. You just see the strikes, such as the North American Aviation strike. This is held up before us and we lose our perspective. The great rank and file of labor love this country; they want to serve it. In trying to pass legislation hastily, ill-tempered, with venom, during a period of hysteria, and tying it on to an appropriation bill, you are going to give the great army of labor in this country a gratuitous insult. You are going to insult that section of labor that never tied up the defense program. They have the right to strike, but they have not used it. It is a constitutional right for labor to withhold its services,

and it is no good unless it is withheld en masse. It has no force and effect otherwise.

When I tell you that there is employer trouble here as well as labor trouble, and that we should condemn them both equally, I mean that from the beginning of this defense program employers have held up the program demanding 50 percent increase on their contracts. Did you get stirred up about that? If you did not, your view is distorted.

I have before me facts that show that 50 percent of these strikes are caused by the failure of employers to acknowledge the National Labor Relations Act, and that is the law of the land. We condemn jurisdictional strikes, but they are only 5 percent of the total strikes. There are employers in this country who are making more than they made in 1929 I could read the list.

Is it not only natural that the man who works should ask for a raise? A 5-percent increase, a 10-percent increase to take care of the rising cost of living. He is not asking that in this program he be allowed to make millions. He ought to be allowed to make enough for food, shelter, and the other necessities.

The administrative branch of this Government ought to take care of specific instances of flagrant abuse of the right to strike. It ought to do it with resoluteness. If it lacks any power, we ought to give that power to the administration. If you do it by general legislation you will be doing a harm that you will not be able to undo for a great many years to come.

Consider this advisedly. Give it your considered judgment as statesmen. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts, who just concluded his remarks, that manufacturers are obtaining an exorbitant profit is easily answered, and it is no answer to a charge that some workers are preventing or delaying national defense to say that some employers are making an excessive profit. Why not bring in legislation, if there are such instances, and let us do away with the profiteers? I will support it, and undoubtedly the House will pass it.

The further answer is, if some are making an excessive profit, are you going to cure it by letting someone else hold up the whole national-defense program? If I steal, is that an excuse for you?

I call the attention of my criticizing colleagues, some who have designated me as a labor baiter, to the fact that William Green and Daniel Tobin, of the A. F. of L., and Phil Murray and Richard Frankensteen, of the C. I. O., have used as bitter terms in condemning some of the strikes which are now being carried on as I ever used anywhere.

I call their attention to the fact that there is not one single thing in this amendment which interferes in any way with any legitimate right of organized labor. This amendment applies, as the gentleman from Virginia so well said, to only four things. It applies, first, to the employees, members of unions, who violate their contract. Do those who vote against this amendment sanction the violation of collective bargaining agreements by union members and unions? It applies, second, to those unions that engage in industrial jurisdictional strikes. Do those who will vote against this amendment believe that the existence of our Nation should be jeopardized because these unions are quarreling? If not, then why not vote for this amendment?

We had illustrations of this down here last year in Washington. One store was picketed by the A. F. of L., and another store, not a block away, was picketed by the C. I. O. The sole reason in each case was that the other union was doing the work. As the gentleman from Virginia said, there is not a man on the floor who believes in that kind of conduct, which results in the holding up of our defense program.

The next proposition was that we should have here in America legislation which permits the man who wants to work, who is not guilty of any offense, to go to work without being forced to purchase a work permit. A committee of the other body has now established the fact that on one Government job at one of these forts just outside of Washington men were forced to pay $800,000 for the privilege of working. As the gentleman from Virginia said, is there anyone here who will rise in defense of that kind of conduct? Is there anyone here who would bar an American citizen from working for his Government until he has paid for the privilege? Have men who want to work no right which will be protected by this Congress?

The other proposition is that the use of force on the picket line shall be prevented. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] wanted to know when you would find intimidation. I show you here some pictures of intimidation, of the gentle art of persuasion as established by the C. I. O. in the Dearborn strike at the Ford Motor Co. plant. These show one of the methods used by the C. I. O. to obtain members. I want you to take these pictures and look them over. They show four men beating another until he was unconscious. He was a defenseless worker, a man who wanted to do his part on a Government job, a timekeeper who wanted to get into the plant to make up the pay roll for the strikers. Not one of these four men was employed in the Ford plant. They worked over at Briggs. The man who is being beaten, the man who is bent over, the man with his overcoat over his head, is Melvin Bartling. At the time he was beaten, sworn testimony in the Federal court at Detroit shows that Michigan State police, some 20 of them, were within 50 feet of where these law violators were pounding him. The State police took no action to protect him. The assault occurred in daytime, on a public highway.

The man with the U. A. W.-C. I. O. overseas cap, the man with the upraised club which he is about to bring down on the back of Bartling is Roy Snowden. He was not an employee of the Ford Motor Co. The second man in front of Snowden and to the left of Bartling and who is attempting to bring an upper cut to the face of the helpless Bartling is Eugene Torrence. He was not an employee of Ford Motor Co. Torrence and Snowden are both Communists, both are members of the Communist Party in Michigan and hold membership therein.

The man just back of Bartling and who is about to swing a right into Bartling's right side or groin is one of the Ferraza brothers. The other brother is just at Bartling's head and is swinging left and right to Bartling's head and neck.

A pretty picture, is it not? I only wish it could be printed in the RECORD so that all might see how brave, how courageous, these C. I. O. unionists really are. I wish you could see how the Michigan State police fail to protect helpless citizens when a gang of strikers assault them. This is not an isolated instance. Hundreds of men, yes, and of women too, have been beaten by burly cowardly strikers and pickets. Let those members of this House who always defend pickets take the pictures I have passed out home to their wives and children and show them the kinds of men and actions Congress protects by its inaction. None of these men assaulting were employees of Ford. They were members of Briggs Local No. 208 U. A. W., C. I. O.

Oh, I know, you do not approve of conduct like this—Oh no? Then why not adopt this amendment which would aid in preventing a repetition.

This sort of thing has prevailed in Michigan ever since the sit-down strikes of 1937. It is the usual and customary thing—the approved practice whenever men seek to pass a picket line—whenever men seek to go to work where the C. I. O. has called a strike. As the attorney general of Michigan said in substance not long ago—if protection is not given peaceful citizens the time will come when, and I use his word, "night riders" and "vigilantes" will take the law into their own hands and we will have civil strife throughout the land. That we will all deplore, and perhaps the strikers and pickets more than anyone else, for they will learn to their sorrow that while our people are patient and long suffering when they do let loose the C. I. O. will have no monopoly of violence.

Let us adopt this amendment and not only aid Green and Murray in controlling the outlaw strikes but put an end to this lawlessness.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Would the gentleman judge the 50,000,000 by one?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but I would take care of the one when the time came.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot conclude this debate very shortly? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. THOM. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. SNYDER) there were—ayes 22, noes 79.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and I agree with him explicitly; but I believe that most of those who are trying to straighten out this situation do not really realize the actual condition that exists.

As I stated in my previous remarks, there is a militant minority in organized labor that is collaborating with agents of Stalin and Hitler and have operating organizations in Mexico and in the Latin Americas. Mr. Chairman, the patriotic, real American labor want to get rid of that group, but you cannot rid the country of that group by repressive labor legislation. I take my hat off to the valiant fight that is being made by Great Britain in the face of odds. Why is that fight being made, and how is it being made? It is being made because of the fact that there has not been one single, solitary piece of repressive labor legislation passed by the British Parliament. Mr. Bevin, representing labor; industry, and the Government, collaborate in their councils with regard to production management, and thus take care of the national-defense program. I am pleading with you here today to vote down repressive labor legislation and let the patriotic American group have the help of the Government in order to rid themselves of that group that is sabotaging the defense program.

There have been suggestions previously made that would, if carried out, straighten out this whole affair. I say to you that the Murray council program is parallel to the program that is now in operation in Great Britain that has been so successful, and if you will emulate the very thing that is going on in Great Britain and take into your confidence those great labor leaders in this country who are true Americans, those great industrialists who are true Americans, and set up your councils where the members of the councils will sit down and see that everything is carried on without interruption, then if a small minority group tries to sabotage this great program, your councils are in a position in these factories to rid the defense program and the factories of this country of Communists and Nazis and those who are operating with them. But do not do something that will cause a reaction on the part of labor to the point where it will interfere seriously with the defense program.

Let me make it impressive that if we follow the program that has been carried on in Great Britain we will have 100 percent, all-out aid to Great Britain, and that is all we are asking; and I hope we will be given the opportunity to go on for at least this week, and you will see that there will be things happening that will open your eyes and show that we will take care of these saboteurs. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make one or two observations. Several weeks ago the President of the United States declared an unlimited emergency. I am sure all of you read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a day or two later a list of all the powers that the President has under such an unlimited emergency. Surely, no further legislation is needed. The responsibility for every difficulty rests with the President of the United States. He, today, has the power to put an end to communistic activities everywhere. As a matter of fact, he has assumed the authority to make almost anyone in this country goose-step, as he has commandeered the goose-step from most of his Members in Congress.

This country is not weary of Congress, as has been stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]. The country is weary of "Ma" Perkins and Harry Hopkins and the way they have been running this show. They are asking for action, and the only way we can get action is to have someone take "Ma" Perkins' place and Harry Hopkins' place and give us action instead of delay and more delay. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

This is not the time nor the occasion for name calling or denunciation. It is rather a time to face the cold facts. The facts are that there has been delay in our defense program. There has been an unjustifiable delay in the manufacture of arms for the men who have been drafted to serve their country.

It has been said that millions are being made in war contracts. I know there is selfishness and greed among employers. But, Mr. Chairman, we will deal with that problem at the proper time. If we could deal with it in the pending legislation, I would gladly do so. I believe there should be no war profiteers, no war millionaires in the present emergency, and as a member of this body I think I speak the sentiments of the House when I say that we are looking to the Committee on Ways and Means to report a tax bill that will substantially prevent any increase in income as a result of excess profits that accrue from manufacture of munitions, and we will look after the selfish employers when that bill comes before the Congress. For my part, I trust that it will not be possible for any person or institution in the United States, in the present defense program, to make a larger income than they have been making on the average during the past few years. So much for the selfishness of the employer. Our business is to attend to that problem when we can.

However, Mr. Chairman, as the facts are stated, and not denied, there are more strikes in war manufactures today than ever before in the past 12 months. If it be true, as it is agreed that there are communistic and subversive leadership in labor organizations of our country, I say that now when we are providing for additional manufactures and for additional defense, it is time to call upon labor to clean house, because labor can no longer hide behind the skirts of subversive, un-American, or communistic leadership. The Members of Congress have the right to call upon labor to clean house, and to rid itself of such leadership. No better way has been suggested, than the adoption of the pending amendment.

In the third place, Mr. Chairman, it is said that there must be collaboration as a result of voluntary cooperation in leadership. If we had depended upon voluntary cooperation, I respectfully submit that no legislation in behalf of labor would have been demanded at the hands of the Congress. We passed legislation with respect to wages and hours, and we passed legislation with respect to the National Labor Relations Board. If that Board is unable to function; if the Mediation Board established by the President of the United States cannot enforce its adjudications, I say that there is just as much, if not more, reason for asking the Congress of the United States to pass legislation making those adjudications effective as there was to pass legislation to provide for labor in this country. There must be no more strikes in the defense plants of this country. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend, I should like to say that, while I believe the great body of laborers in the United States are patriotic, I also believe that the great body of Americans are patriotic. I favor collective bargaining; I am sympathetic with labor; but the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has set up a National Defense Mediation Board to do justice between the employer and employee. Bargaining must not result in delay; delay is dangerous.

We boast of our power and of our wealth. We indulge in denunciations of Hitler; we challenge Hitler, but thus far, with strikes multiplying and without the curbing of strikes, we confess our inability to overcome admitted communistic and subversive enemies of America within our own borders. If the United States cannot deal with "fifth columnists," labor baiters, subversive and communistic leadership in labor groups; if we cannot overcome these within our own borders, how can we expect to overcome Hitler?

The people of the United States are alarmed at the strike situation; they are demanding action; they are expecting the President and the Congress to prevent strikes. There is a feeling that the Department of Labor is not functioning effectively. There are even demands for the resignation of the Secretary of Labor. Many citizens feel that the agencies that administer the labor laws are arrogant and intolerant. The administration of the Wages and Hours Act is repulsive to many patriotic Americans. The country is not satisfied with the delays in national defense; it is not satisfied with the mistakes in preparedness; it is not satisfied with the unjustifiable demands of labor, particularly with respect to jurisdictional matters. Our citizens are not satisfied with the arrogant and selfish demands of war profiteers; they are concerned about prompt and adequate preparedness. The defense of our homes and of our firesides depends upon speed.

The President of the United States declared an unlimited emergency on May 27. He referred to it in closing his address on that date. His words reassured the American people. He said, and I quote:

> A Nation-wide machinery for conciliation and mediation of industrial disputes has been set up. That machinery must be used promptly—and without stoppage of work.

Collective bargaining will be retained, but the American people expect that impartial recommendations of our Government services will be followed both by capital and by labor.

During the Seventy-sixth Congress, the House passed amendments to existing labor laws. The bill died in the Senate. During the present session the President of the United States has informed the Congress that he needs no additional legislation to prevent strikes. I am among those who believe that a word from the Commander in Chief will prevent and stop strikes in national-defense plants. The President has now spoken. Both capital and labor must cooperate.

Today the President of the United States is making good his words by his deeds. He has placed the Army in charge of an airplane factory in California. Labor is important, industry is important, but it is time to put first things first, and country comes before either capital or labor.

In the pending bill $10,000,000,000 are appropriated for the national defense. The taxpayers will be called upon to foot the bill. Congress owes it to the country to safeguard the expenditure of these funds. Both labor and capital should be given a square deal. Arrogance and selfishness by either capital or labor must not be condoned or encouraged.

The laborer is worthy of his hire, the manufacturer is entitled to a reasonable profit, but if men are to be drafted to defend—is there, after all, any good reason why labor and capital should not be drafted to prepare?

There are other matters vital in defense. Normal expenditures should be reduced. The ordinary expenses of the Government can be reduced at least a billion dollars. There must be no quibbling about reduction and the reduction should be general; it should not be confined to any one department or to any one bureau. While some bureaus and while some activities can be eliminated altogether, I repeat that the reduction should be general. There are agencies that can be abolished, but there abolition alone will not do the job. There must be reductions all along the line. Congress cannot escape its responsibility, but, after all, as a practical matter, there will be no general reductions unless the Chief Executive recommends these general reductions. Undoubtedly there should be material reductions in the Work Projects Administration. With the unprecedented defense program all willing to work can obtain employment. It may be necessary for some to change locations, but there is, generally, employment for those able and willing to work. The career W. P. A. worker has sinned away his day of grace if he ever had one. If there is no opportunity for employment today, there will never be opportunity for employment. At the same time provision must be made for the aged and for those unable to work.

As long as the Congress depends upon the W. P. A. for facts and for information for continuing appropriations, those whose jobs are at stake will continue to insist that there must be appropriations for unemployment.

Defense requires that we place our economic house in order. Our Budget must be balanced.

There must be no inflation. The costs of living must be kept within bounds. Wages can be too high as well as too low; commodities may be too high as well as too low. Inflation means bankruptcy and bankruptcy means unemployment and low wages and suffering, and none will suffer more than the workers. A bankrupt nation cannot defend, and certainly such a nation cannot wage, a successful war.

But back to the subject under discussion—back to strikes in defense plants. It is passing strange that spokesmen for labor, while admitting communistic and subversive leadership among labor groups, while denouncing jurisdictional strikes, propose no legislation and advocate no remedies. The spokesmen for labor admit defects, but they do not propose any cures.

I know that there is Executive responsibility. I believe the laborers of the country will heed the words of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. His word will put a stop to strikes, but there is a responsibility on Congress.

While I advocate collective bargaining, I favor mediation for the adjustment of strikes and for doing justice between capital and labor.

It has been said that strikes can only be prevented by voluntary cooperation. I answer, as I have indicated, that if legislation has been enacted to help labor, legislation should be enacted to control labor in the interest of national defense. If legislation to provide for wages and hours and to provide for the National Labor Relations Board was necessary, legislation is necessary to make effective the recommendations of the National Defense Mediation Board. Legislation is necessary to prevent strikes and to provide that those who strike against the Government shall not be permitted to work in Government plants.

When young Americans now in camps have no arms it is no time for strikes They cannot be tolerated.

If compulsory legislation was necessary to help labor, compulsory legislation can prevent strikes. The argument that compulsory legislation will not do the job is not sound. If legislation helps labor, legislation can prevent strikes.

I would not deprive labor of the right to insist upon reasonable or even higher wages in many cases, but I believe country is above labor and capital and that mediation with teeth in it will secure to labor and to capital their just rights.

The country has been patient, but it has lost patience with the unpatriotic and selfish arrogance of subversive labor leaders. Fathers and mothers have offered their sons on the altar of their country, but they demand that they be armed.

It is said that no additional legislation is needed and that the problem is for the Executive. This contention has been repeated for a year. By their fruits ye shall know them. Strikes continue; they increase; they have multiplied. There are more strikes in defense production today than in any previous time in the past 12 months. The situation grows worse every day. The people are losing confidence. They are demanding action and they are entitled to action now.

President Wilson spoke in 1918 when he warned that strikers would be barred from future defense work. It is time for the President and for Congress to speak now.

Again it is said that the amendment will not cover all phases of the strike problem. I answer that no other amendments have been proposed. I want to condemn the unjustifiable strikes. The Committee on Labor has reported no bill. No other bill is pending on the floor of the House. I have supported every amendment proposed and every law to curb strikes. I have followed the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He has studied the question, he is thoroughly familiar with the problems. Fault was found by the spokesmen for the strikers, but it is well to observe that no proposal has been submitted by the spokesmen for the strikers to prevent strikes.

Strikes in defense plants are justified by the spokesmen for strikes because the plants themselves are making enormous profits. The remedy is not to slow down production by striking but the remedy is to tax excess profits so there will be no war millionaires and no war profiteers. It has been done before and the country expects it to be done again. No person or corporation should be permitted to make more than was being made for a reasonable term preceding 1941 and all income in excess of the average prior income should be collected as taxes to pay for national defense. There must be no quibbling either about strikes or war profits. Strikes must stop and excess profits must be collected as taxes.

It is not enough to appropriate for national defense. The appropriations must be made effective. There must be no delay; bottlenecks must be removed and strikes must be curbed. If either labor or capital delays the Government must intervene. America must be prepared. Strikes must stop and production must be speeded up to the limit, otherwise the President and the Congress will not keep faith with the citizens of the Republic who are being taxed as never before to provide for their defense, nor will they keep faith with the youth of America who have been called upon to give their lives, if need be, in defense of their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, there can be little doubt in the mind of anyone that public sentiment is outraged by strikes that are called for unjustifiable reasons, such as outlaw strikes, and jurisdictional strikes. That strikes at this critical time are cause for alarm we can all agree. Labor or any other element of our society must first of all have public opinion on its side if it is to prevail. However, some of these defense strikes have been called for justifiable reasons. If Members will take the time to analyze the full facts, and I think they owe that duty to their constituents, they will find,

from figures of the O. P. M., that 83 percent of the strikes that had been called up to a short time ago, were called by employees who were seeking to have the principle of collective bargaining established for the first time in those plants in which they have been employed, and called strikes only as a last resort in their collective efforts to establish basic machinery for peaceable adjustment of disputes such as is guaranteed by the Wagner Act. Yet those employers have resisted every effort by their employees to establish in their factories and mills the underlying principles of the Labor Relations Act. I say to the people who are conducting these outlaw strikes, these unjustifiable strikes, that they are seriously injuring the cause of sound and responsible labor organization and are causing irreparable injury to the Nation. The struggle that has gone on for more than half a century in this country to establish the rights of labor is likely to suffer a crushing blow as a result of their actions. Those of us in the Congress who have fought for the just cause of labor and have vigorously opposed the efforts of those who have attempted to impede and injure its orderly progress are finding our task immeasurably more difficult because of rash and unconsidered actions on the part of some hasty and unthinking labor leaders.

But let us get down to a concrete analysis of this particular amendment that is being offered in an hour of hysteria purportedly on the basis of public indignation aroused by outlaw strikes. However, the present situation is more the opportunity than the cause for this amendment being offered. It is being submitted by the able and experienced gentleman from Virginia, who has long sought to accomplish the very objectives that this amendment would achieve. I submit to you that this amendment can be voted on only as an entirety. It is not divisible. The second clause of the amendment seeks to freeze the status quo of closed and open shops in this country. In other words, it seeks to block the progress of labor and to outlaw legitimate objectives, recognition of which organized labor has won for workers in this country.

There is another section of the pending amendment relating to intimidation, coercion, and violence. Who decides what conduct constitutes so-called coercion, intimidation, and violence? What authority decides those important facts under this amendment? The author of the amendment, in response to a question, said the employer may decide that. How can we, as reasonable and reasoning men, possibly vote for a provision of that sort leaving as it does the decision on a judicial question of this kind up to the very man who is an adverse party in interest in the controversy? How can we reconcile such a provision with the constitutional prohibition against parties in interest sitting in judgment on a controversy? The objective of that course is to impede the progress of labor, to try to prevent the organization and unionization of people who work in industry. But let us not forget this: The right of labor to organize and to strike is a basic and fundamental right under our American form of government. Does this proposed abridgment of basic civil liberties presage a general assault on the individual rights of free men? Are we to expect attempts to curtail free speech, a free press, and the other fundamental rights that exist under democracy? Maybe the time may come when the national welfare will compel such action. But I, for one, hope the day will never come when these most priceless rights under democracy must give way to autocratic and repressive restraints characteristic of the Nazi system. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason I take the floor for these few moments is because last week and today Members have repeatedly referred to the profits being made by business as if they were something disgraceful and should not be permitted to take place in a country such as we have. After all, this thing we call business, which to me is the fowl that lays the golden egg, which we tax in order to maintain this Government and in order to carry on its programs and its activities, is a pretty good institution. Until I came here a few years ago I never did complain about the company with which I worked, there being several of them when I was trying to work myself up in the business world—I never did complain about the company making profits. As a matter of fact, I tried to put in an average of about 300 hours or more a month assisting those companies to make profits. I never found any employees during my business experience who hesitated to make it possible for the companies which engaged them to make profits.

American business is so organized that when you permit a plant to run to capacity, as at the present time, the management reaches out and brings economic forces together and welds the whole operation into a profitable undertaking. I think I have spoken to enough members of the Ways and Means Committee to convince them that insofar as the four or five companies that I happen to be directly or indirectly connected with at the moment are concerned, I want them taxed. It is quite immaterial to me how much you tax them on war or excess profits, so long as you permit them to remain a going concern with reasonable or normal returns to investors. If the Ways and Means Committee reports a bill to this House which does not take away from the corporations of this country most of the excess profits due to the war operations, I am frank to say I will be disappointed in the Ways and Means Committee. I expect that kind of a bill to be reported. It upsets me just a little to have Members of the House get up and attempt to justify improper strikes, unjust strikes, outlaw strikes, and every other kind of a strike that can be mentioned simply because the company is making profits, because it is up to us to exercise the taxing power to gather those profits into the Treasury of the United States, if they are profits flowing from defense or wartime activities.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion on the following situation: Where the worker's dollar which he has been receiving for the last year does not match the increased cost of living this year, and where profits have been increased, does not the gentleman believe that business or industry should take those factors into consideration and grant to the American workers who are making his profits possible a dollar which will match the cost of living?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Management should give serious consideration to such factors, and if the gentleman was sitting on a board of directors with me we would advocate that doctrine and we would under present conditions agree to it and we would vote for it in the board of directors' room, for this reason: Suppose the profits for the first 5½ months of this year up to June 15 were running 1,000 percent above last year and suppose this increase in living costs, to which the gentleman has just referred, had occurred; you do not know what the tax liability of that corporation is going to be in the year 1941, and you would be saying to your official staff, if you used good business judgment, "Now, listen, fellows, you had better keep in reserve about 80 percent of the profits that are now running, in order to pay the tax liability that is likely to fall on you next March 15 as a result of the tax law that will be enacted toward the end of this year."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The taxable income would be reduced by the amount of increased wages paid.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, I happen to be connected with a little concern that will probably make $350,000 this year. That is an enormous profit as compared with what they have been making for the past 10 years, because they are engaged in defense production, and the Government set the price which was to be paid for the goods that we are producing.

I have said to the management "You had better keep in reserve 80 percent of the estimated $340,000 to $350,000 of profits." Believe me they had better keep it in reserve, because my opinion is that this Congress will reach in and take that as tax money before we finish the job.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. It is a fact also that industries that now have the majority of the defense orders are not making as much profit as they made during normal times. Is not this true?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not agree to that just now. I expect they are making profits as great, if not greater, than normal profits. If they are not making as great profits I would look a little bit into the question of management. I cannot agree to the gentleman's observation.

If this House expects to adopt an amendment along this line in the near future I think we better give serious consideration to the adoption of this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes what I had to say.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Profits are reduced by wages.

Mr. TERRY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas rise?

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, owing to the fact that there are a couple of other amendments along the same line pending I would like to find out if we cannot reach some agreement as to limitation of time for further debate on this section and amendments thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all time for debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, six Members are standing desiring recognition on this amendment, and there are other amendments to be offered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman would make his request apply to this amendment instead of this section, to this amendment and all amendments thereto, which would be the proper way, it seems to me, I believe we would make faster time and that he might get quick action on such a request.

Mr. TERRY. I so modify my request, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SCHULTE. I object.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and make it 30 minutes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas that he ascertain the number of Members who desire to be heard and then multiply that by an even number of minutes for each man, such as 3 minutes, or 4 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request again and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair has taken down the names of the Members standing seeking recognition and will recognize them in this order for 4 minutes each: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH], and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, again I find myself in opposition to my good friend from Virginia who has offered this amendment not once, not twice, not three times, but a number of times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. No. If the Smith amendment is adopted the only thing labor can do without fear of going to the penitentiary, is to draw its breath. Every other right would be taken away from them. If this amendment had been offered by any Member of the House who had at any time in the past taken this floor to defend labor it would have gone over no doubt. Who are the men who speak in favor of this Smith amendment? Have they ever stood on the floor to defend labor? I do not bow to any man in this House in my thoughts of the Communist problem. We are all agreed, each and every one of us, that we despise that Communist, yet, Mr. Chairman, it took the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of this House to handle the Bridges case. My friend, the gentleman from Alabama, is a member of the Dies committee, yet it has not offered any remedial legislation to handle the radical situation.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal about labor. My good friend from North Carolina said there was a shortage of guns, that in talking to a general he found the Army has not sufficient guns, has not sufficient cannon, airplanes, gas masks, and other defense material.

Whose fault is that? That is not the fault of labor. Certainly that must be the fault of the Army itself for not having plans ready. Then, again, we hear the statement made that we must give to our soldiers arms and ammunition to do the fighting. You bet we do. Each and every Member of this House wants to give them every gun, every cannon, and every gas mask that is necessary to defend this Nation, and they intend to do just that.

Who are the men in the front lines? Who are the men who are going to do the fighting, and who are the men who must die if necessary? They are the sons of the very individuals you are trying to hamper this afternoon, the sons of the laboring men who come from the everyday home in America. Ninety-nine percent of them come from the homes of men who find it necessary to work for a living. Do you tell me that the fathers of those sons are going to strike and deny their sons the ammunition unless there is some justification?

We hear a great deal about strikes. Was there a word uttered in this House when one of the largest manufacturers in the United States went on a sit-down strike against a law that was passed by this Congress? Was there a voice raised in opposition to him? No; not one. Was there a voice raised in defense of labor when Big Business hired thugs in West Virginia to shoot union men because they were organizing or going to meetings? Did any of the men who are here offering amendments this afternoon stand up and defend labor? No; not one of them did. Was there anyone who defended labor because industry was taking advantage of labor and beating them down? No.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House will see fit to defeat the Smith amendment. No one wants a strike. Labor does not want to be sacrificed; and, so that we may have some semblance of unity in this country, stand up for labor, as labor will stand by their Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I just got off an airplane. I took my family part way home to California, and I came back here because I wanted to be here when the W. P. A. bill was being considered. Since we are still on this subject, I have two or three things I very much want to say.

In the first place, the President has taken action with regard to the strike at the North American Aircraft plant in California. Every single person in the United States has got to back this action. For it is a national matter now—so far as both the company and the workers are concerned.

There have been speeches made here about strikes against the United States when they were not really strikes against the Nation but strikes against private employers. It is different in this case now. There can be but one answer. The other day the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] made a speech in which he said there was no political aspect to any of these strikes, that it was wrong to say that this was a Communist-inspired strike, a Communist-led, or a Communist-protracted strike. I do not agree with that statement in some cases. Sometimes it is a Communist-inspired or a Communist-led or a Communist-prolonged strike that we have to deal with.

I believe that at this very moment for the first time we have all over the country a genuine determination by laboring men to clean out the Communists from the ranks of labor. I do not think there is a shadow of doubt but that due to whatever cause it may be that determination exists and that the constructive 95 percent or 98 percent in the ranks of labor intend to clean house and to do it thoroughly. If employers could do the same with Fascist-minded attitudes and

individuals we would be on our way out of the woods.

Under these circumstances the greatest mistake that the Congress could make would be to pass a piece of legislation which would hit at all labor and which would put the 95 percent of labor in a position where the destructive groups could say, "Now, you see that is what you are going to get from the Congress, therefore you had better follow us."

There is only one real solution to this problem and that is to get out of the labor movement by labor's own action those groups who never should have been in a position of leadership in the American labor movement. You have to have workers in the plants, you have to have men to do this national-defense work, they have to be doing it enthusiastically and they have to be doing it as free men. We should assist the leaders of the A. F. of L., we should assist Phil Murray in the things he said recently, we should support every constructive leader and man in the ranks of labor in this important and essential job. That is the only way this thing can ultimately be worked out.

I do not blame Members for saying they have been slow. That has been true, but difficult as it may be, we have to keep our heads and do the thing that is fair and discriminating so that we do not place a lot of fellows who have been trying to keep free of this trouble in the same basket with a lot of fellows who have been trying to cause strife for ulterior reasons.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman does not think that the Secretary of Labor has helped out very much?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have not mentioned her name. I spoke of the President and I spoke of certain leaders in the ranks of labor.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman name anyone in the Government who has done anything about it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe the National Defense Mediation Board has been doing on the whole a most excellent and fair job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] for 4 minutes.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the House does not want to do what this amendment proposes to do. By this amendment you seek to fasten a penalty on a member of a union even if he disagrees with the decision of his union as arrived at by a vote of the membership thereof. Even, Mr. Chairman, if he voted against calling the kind of strike this amendment deplores he is penalized by being ineligible for employment.

Let me read the first section of the amendment:

> No part of this appropriation shall be paid to any person, firm, or corporation who employs any person who is a member of any union which hereafter calls, encourages, or promotes a strike to enforce, as a condition of employment of any employee that he either join or not join or belong or not belong to a labor union unless the same be for the purpose of enforcing an existing contract between such employer and such union.

In other words, if the man votes against the strike and, worse than that, if he is absent from the meeting of the union at which the decision to strike is made, he is forbidden from further employment under the appropriations of this bill solely because he is a member of the union. Why, that is an unfair thing—to charge the individual member of the union with the acts of the union which he did not endorse. The same thing applies to the next section of the amendment which states that if the union calls a strike in violation of a collective-bargaining agreement then any member of the union is foreclosed from working. This applies, too, against the man who voted against such a strike.

Then you top it all by providing that a member can get back into the service of his employer by signing a statement after the strike that he has quit the union. This is required from even the man who voted against the strike and after perhaps he made a speech against the strike, if he wants to escape nonemployment. You do not want to enact such an amendment. It is faulty, it is vicious in this aspect, and it is unfair to the conservative members of the unions of this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, in April during the recess I made a visit home, about which I have told this House once before, and I visited Camp Walters, where they had 10,500 soldiers training with broomsticks for guns. I asked the commanding officer, as I stood on the side of the hill there and watched those full-blooded American youths, what the trouble was. He said they could not get the equipment with which to train them. I wondered then as I wondered back yonder in January when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] first introduced this amendment, what was going to happen. In January this House said: "The amendment is all right, but we are going to have a regular bill reported out, so it has no place here." For the second, third, and fouth times this amendment has been offered, and you are saying the same thing.

When, in the name of high heaven, is this House going to act to stop this foreign element in America? When I see what has been going on here I am reminded of what Mr. Hitler says. Let me read it to you:

> When I wage war I shall long have had relations with the men who will form a new government (in the enemy country), a government to suit me. We shall find such men; we shall find them in every country. We shall not need to bribe them. They will come of their own accord. Ambition and delusion, party squabbles, and self-seeking arrogance will drive them. Peace will be negotiated.

Then his Commissioner of Agriculture has said in line with this:

> We have in the United States a political organization with the same exactitude as Berlin or Prague, and we have no fear of any activities on the part of the United States.

It seems to me he is making good that threat.

Some of you have said that is not Americanism. I wonder if that is when the time comes that a man cannot in free America work in the defense program.

After the gentleman from Virginia first introduced this amendment back yonder in January I got out and began to mix and mingle with my kind—that is, those who have the horny hands of toil, from whose ranks I come. I kept count, and let me say for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts I counted a hundred of those men who had union cards and I did not find a single one of them who was not as bitter against these strikes as any man in Congress. Most of them said in a praying tone, "Why doesn't Congress do something?" I say we ought to do something now to give those Americans in the ranks of union labor a chance to assert themselves.

Let me refer to what Mr. Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General, has said. No union man can claim for a minute that Mr. Arnold is unfair to labor. He wrote in the last Reader's Digest about what is happening in New York, what the union is doing there, and in Chicago, where they ostracize men who do not do as they tell them to do.

You may tell me that is Americanism. Then I say to this House that I was raised wrong, and I do not want that kind of Americanism.

Two gentlemen spoke about the employers. It seems they have it in for the employers. Let me say that if there were no employers there could be no employees, so let us take care of both of them and see that they get their just rights. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to say anything that would give offense; but I have been hearing alibiing on this proposal for a good long while. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has been introducing this same amendment to appropriation bills for many months. The gentlemen who are now opposing it opposed it then. Their arguments then were that while the proposal is wise and what it has in mind should be done, still it should come on a legislative bill.

My colleagues do not seem to realize the seriousness of the situation in which we find ourselves. They do not seem to realize that this world is on fire and that the responsibility is upon the Congress to save America, if that be possible.

The pending amendment is directed only at the racketeers in labor, and certainly they are a group with whom the Congress should deal. They are on strike, not against the employers, not against management, but against America. They are on strike against the

young men who have been drafted into the Army for the purpose of soldiering for the country.

The mothers of this country, who have led out their first-born and offered them in the service of the Republic, do not like what is going on. People generally do not like it. The responsibility of ending strikes is upon the Government, and it is a responsibility that should have been met long, long ago. What is happening on the west coast is what the Government has bid for. It is what the Government has invited, because there are those in the Government who have been working hand in hand with the racketeers in labor seeking to produce a bad situation, affording an excuse for the Government taking over industry, and the taking over of industry in the name of the Government, and operating plants by the Government does not solve the problem. That is what the racketeers in labor want. That is what they have been working for all the while; and the taking over on the part of the Government and the operation on the part of the Government mean that the reds in labor win, because this Government has not thus far even sought to restrain them. These conciliation boards that you have set up are mere representatives of the radicals in labor. They are mere shams, and some of their representatives have encouraged labor to carry on this fight against national defense, producing the situation that we now have on hand.

Mr. Chairman, this country is aflame with indignation over the behavior of the Government, which includes the behavior of this Congress. This is no time to dodge. Let us meet the issue and let us decide it now. [Applause.]

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not especially want to vote for the Smith amendment, although I am going to do it. I have said for sometime, and believed in all seriousness, that the administration has sufficient power, if exercised, to cope with the strike situation. There are evidences today that the President is going to deal firmly with the situation on the west coast. I hope so. I think the people of this country have become more impatient than we men serving in Congress and hearing each other more than we hear from the country realize. I am convinced that labor is being dominated by labor racketeers and professional troublemakers in many instances, and that such leadership is leading it into trouble which will require many years to overcome.

I rise primarily to say something about excess profits, about which we have been hearing much recently. The gentleman from New York said a few days ago that some of the companies were making 4,300 percent more pront than they made before receiving these war orders. A speaker said this morning that some of these industries are making 1,000 percent more profit than formerly. I am wondering if people who do not take time to study the financial sheets occasionally might not be greatly misled by these statements. What are the facts in connection with the profits that are being made by such companies? Many of them are making some more profits and some are not. I suspect the average increase is from 4 to 6 percent after the payment of increased taxes. The industries in America today that have the greatest defense orders are not making the most money. The department stores, for instance, are making a better profit than the munitions factories. Is there anyone who will deny that? The General Motors Co., which has more than one-half billion dollars of war orders today, is selling on the board for less than $40 per share. If it is such a bonanza, why do not some of you gentlemen step out and grab some of it? It is for sale. A year ago it was selling from 50 to 60, before it had these orders. Chrysler Corporation, manufacturing vast quantities of war materials, is selling between 50 and 60, as against 75 to 80 approximately a year ago. General Motors and Chrysler have both always paid out a liberal part of their earnings. Bethlehem Steel, that has more than one-half billion dollars in Government orders for defense, is selling around 70. Bethlehem Steel has always paid out a liberal portion of its earnings, and I will say to the gentleman from New York that, if it is making so much money, why not buy a little of it or advise your friends to buy it? Now, what is the truth about these industries? Men who have money today are not putting it in the industries handling defense orders. [Applause.] Why? Because they are unsafe, unstable, and constitute an unsatisfactory investment. Witness the labor problems with which they are now confronted. Consider the additional equipment which must be purchased for a few months' use. And do not forget this, these corporations will have to return to the Government, and properly so, any excessive profits which they may be able to make out of war business. In order to legislate on this question intelligently we must face the facts sanely and intelligently, otherwise we will do more harm than good by our efforts.

I have only mentioned a few industries making war equipment, but the same is true as to practically all of them. The American people must not be misinformed if they are to arrive at a correct conclusion regarding this most important issue.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief statement on this. In opening I may say that you cannot indict a whole people. Burke said this a long time ago. You cannot indict a whole organization or a whole group because a part, a very infinitesimal part, of that group is doing something that is opposed to the general policy.

Many of the speakers here have said that the vast majority of the members of labor unions and labor leaders do not want to strike. This in itself proves my contention, but this amendment would put them all in the same category as that small group who are fomenting strikes. Therefore, in my judgment, this is not a fair amendment. Furthermore, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that every metropolitan newspaper in the United States this morning carried the headline that "The Army takes over the airplane plants."

In connection with that, it has been charged on this floor repeatedly that this President of the United States has not taken action. He has taken action, and this strike has not been in progress over a week. In spite of that fact, however, he has taken action within that time.

Another thing that has been charged is that the National Defense Mediation Board and the Department of Labor's Conciliation Service are in league with the racketeers and labor saboteurs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Not at this time. Mr. Chairman, I happen to know the Chairman of the National Defense Mediation Board, and if there ever was a square shooter, a thoroughgoing 100-percent American, Clarence A. Dykstra is that man, and he is nobodys man. He is for neither capital nor labor. He is for the American defense program. He is pouring out every atom of his energy, and has a splendid store of it, to try to bring about a peaceful and just settlement of this tremendous problem.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I just received a special notice from the United States Chamber of Commerce stating that they are opposed to this kind of legislation and are favoring a peaceful adjustment.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances would it not be wise to defer action on this and other amendments and wait and see what the President's plan will develop in the course of the next 2 or 3 days?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 3 minutes remaining of the time for debate and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, as I said as to a former amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], it seems to me that the situation has changed entirely today from what it was on Friday last. The gentleman who just came back from California [Mr. VOORHIS], I think hit the nail on the head when he said that the situation in California at the North American plant is now in the hands of the Army. The President has called to action the Army to see to it that radical elements are cleaned out. And if I understand correctly, or if the papers I read are correct, both Mr. Murray and Mr. Green have made the declaration that they would clean such elements out of national-defense industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has been attempting to offer an amendment which I think meets the situation that exists today, and if this amendment is defeated, personally I would be inclined to vote for the Case amendment if the gentleman offers it. What we are concerned about is the Communist element, and we do not want to penalize decent labor, which is over 99 percent of labor. This amendment provides as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment

of compensation to any person for services in a plant in which the manufacture or production of any defense article, as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workers after the National Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program.

That amendment seems to me to meet the situation, and if the Smith amendment is defeated, and that amendment offered, I am inclined to vote for its adoption.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SNYDER. For a question.

Mr. COX. I hope this House will not take a run-around like this as an excuse for defeating the Smith amendment, which is an honest proposal to do an honest and a righteous thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Just to ask this question: Can there be today in America a justifiable strike in a defense-production institution?

Mr. SNYDER. That is conceivable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 73, noes 115.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. SNYDER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 89 and noes 143.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 71, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 10–a. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, by whomsoever employed, who, while employed directly or indirectly in the manufacture or production of any defense article, as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, shall hereafter stop work for a period in excess of 10 days by reason of being a participant in any strike called in any plant manufacturing or producing defense articles, except that this provision shall not be effective in the case of persons (1) who register with their employer opposition to the strike on the day work is stopped, (2) who join and continue to serve in any of the armed services of the United States during the effective period of this section, (3) who do not resume work after 10 days for reasons not associated with the strike, or (4) who, in the case of a plant taken over by the Government for operation, resume work within 3 days after such taking over, irrespective of the period of prior absence from work."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and also on the further ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Nothing more than to call attention to the fact that it is negative; it is clearly a limitation; a new section and therefore germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled on a similar point of order when the Committee was last in session.

This is clearly a limitation, and the further provisions of it are exceptions to the limitation which, by parliamentary precedent, are in order.

Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this amendment is being offered by a member of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the bill is offered with the sincere hope that it will be adopted. It differs from the original amendment which I offered on last Friday and asked unanimous consent to withdraw today, in that it meets some of the objections which were earnestly and conscientiously made by some of my colleagues who realize the seriousness of the situation with which we are confronted today as a Nation and who desire to take constructive and remedial steps to meet the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to four exceptions to the limitation. First, exception No. 1 provides for a method of ascertaining the involuntary strikers. The mechanics, of course, would be worked out by the various plant executives.

The second would meet the objection raised by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], that none of the funds herein provided could be used to pay those men should they be drafted for service in the Army or the Navy. With this safeguard and provision, those men could now go into the Army or Navy and receive pay from this bill.

The third would take care of situations where work could not be resumed because of the plant being unready for one cause or another to recommence work after the strike, or where it was evident that the operators, with ulterior motives, were blocking the resumption of the work.

Fourth, and finally, it anticipates executive action and paves the way for men on strike to resume work, no matter how long they have been on strike, if they come back within 3 days after a plant has been taken over by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly there were Members of the House who desired to go along with my amendment on last Friday. I have drafted this amendment very carefully with the able assistance of the clerk of the committee and others, to meet the objections raised last Friday. Under this amendment now under consideration it cannot be said that if a man goes out on a strike in this particular instance, there are no mechanics for finding out who the involuntary striker was. It cannot be said that he is barred from receiving pay in the Army or Navy should he be drafted or called into service or enter the service voluntarily. Third, it cannot be said that some operator or some Communist in the ranks of labor who would want to prolong the strike would have the effect of closing down the plant and shutting these people out of employment.

Furthermore, we anticipate executive action by the fourth provision in the bill; and if a worker goes back to work within 3 days after the Government takes a plant over, regardless of how long he has been out on strike, then he can obtain employment.

Now, I call on my good friends on the right, who have so earnestly expounded their philosophy with reference to the rights of labor, and tell you that we have done everything in our power, as one who has voted with you on every piece of labor legislation heretofore in order to meet your objections. Now, I am pleading with you gentlemen for support for this amendment. I am doing it because I know you are genuine, patriotic American citizens, and you want to meet this threat, this challenge to the United States Government, this threat to our national security.

I am calling on you at this time to support this amendment. I am calling on you regardless of your philosophy with reference to labor and your tender regard for the rights of organized labor, which I share—I am calling on you to have a more tender regard, a more deep and abiding affection for the lives, the liberty, and the security of all of us regardless of whether we are in the ranks of labor or out. I am basing my plea, Mr. Chairman, on the fact of a national emergency far greater than this country has ever faced in its peacetime history. I am pleading with you as I have never pleaded with any group of men before to place the interest, the security, and the safety of 130,000,000 people over and above the interest or the rights, either fancied or real, of any particular group of people in this country.

In the case of the strikes on the Pacific coast I repeat each of them is unauthorized, each of them is outlawed, each of them is condemned by the leaders in the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., but this condemnation has not brought any results. Construction on half a billion dollars' worth of battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and so forth is being held up by an outlawed strike in San Francisco. Construction upon a $200,000,000 contract for planes is tied up by an outlawed strike led by Communists in the North American plant. As a result of this strike 40 planes which would have been delivered within the past 4 days have not been delivered.

United States troops are on duty out there now by order of the Chief Executive. Are you going to give your moral support to your Chief Executive in this hour of crisis to meet this challenge?

You have positive proof from Frankensteen himself if you needed any more after the leader of this local strike in North American swore himself he was a registered Communist—you have Frankensteen going out on yesterday and pleading with the men to go back to work and accusing Communist influence and activities for shutting down that plant in violation of an agreement made by the union and the management that there would be no strikes while this matter was before the National Defense Mediation Board. I want to call your attention to another serious situation, Mr. Chairman. Since debate on this bill began today I have been informed of a strike having been called in Cleveland, Ohio, in the aluminum plants, a vital element in the making of planes. Our investigation in that area has reported the records show the strike is being led by Alex Balint, an alien Communist who has served a term in the penitentiary in the State of Illinois. That is the man who is leading the strike out there today in Cleveland which has closed down the aluminum plants in another challenge to the constituted authority of the United States of America, another challenge to the President, another challenge to the national security, and another challenge to national unity by an alien Communist.

O my friends, too many of these strikes have followed the same pattern. We know the hand of Stalin is in the background and his agents are being financed in part by Hitler money in all too many of these strikes.

It may be true, as some of my colleagues have said, that large profits are being made in some of these industries. I do not know whether that is a sin or not. I do not know of any written law that it offends, but I call your attention to the fact that we propose to enact legislation which will take these profits back and pay in part this program. We will be called upon to pass legislation which will give the President authority to take over any and all plants needed for defense purposes. He already has the authority, Mr. Chairman, to take over certain of these plants, certain plants which refuse or fail to cooperate in this defense effort. I want to tell you if it is a sin, if it is a crime for a man to make a profit in business, that two wrongs do not make a right. I protest with all my heart and soul against business and labor, either or both, making a Roman holiday out of this, my Nation's peril.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understood the gentleman's amendment of last Friday, which he withdrew today, it was construed as being so broad as to bar these men from future employment, which employment was paid for by funds provided in this act.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. The difference between that amendment and the pending amendment is that within 3 days after the Government takes over a plant the men who have already struck may go back to work.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct. The amendment further provides that if at the time the strike is called the employee registers his complaint against the strike with his employer he shall not be prejudiced.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have 2 additional minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What if the Government does not take over a struck plant and these workers have remained on strike 10 days or more, under the provisions of the pending amendment they could not be paid from appropriations carried in this bill. Is not this correct?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Wherein am I in error?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The amendment provides that if a strike is called and an employee is against the strike, as many of them often are in these plants, he may register his protest at the time, and the provisions of this amendment would not operate against him. Furthermore, if it is beyond his control, we still have the voluntary provision in there which protects that man.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We might as well work out the mechanics of this amendment. I think the Members ought to know how it is going to work. Let us assume the ordinary situation where workers go out on strike. They are in support of the strike, therefore they do not register their opposition with the employer. The Government does not take over the plant. Under the gentleman's amendment, therefore, he refuses employment to these men if they stay out on strike for more than 10 days.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct; and they should be.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Getting back to the question of profits, may I say to the gentleman, if he does not know it already, that the North American Co. is not making excessive profits. The stock is selling on the board today at about one-half of what it was selling for before these huge Government orders poured in.

Mr. FOGARTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman is sincere about his statements in regard to these communistic influences in connection with these strikes, why does not the Dies committee do away with those influences and throw them in the Pacific Ocean?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The Dies committee has made certain recommendations which would deal effectively with Communists and other subversive influences in our country, but no congressional committee has yet acted upon them. I hope we can count upon the gentleman's support.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just proposed by the gentleman from Alabama is essentially no different from the amendment which this House voted down earlier today. When we deal with legislation treating this question, we take into consideration not the exceptional cases, such as where the Government has taken over the plant; we deal with the situation which is general and that is that in most cases the Government does not take over the plant. We also do not deal with a situation where an employee or a worker who goes out on strike registers his opposition to a strike, because in that case those registering their opposition would be in the minority. So that the two exceptions he has made in his amendment, namely, to exempt workers who return to work within a period of 3 days after the Government has taken over a plant and to exempt workers who have registered their opposition, exempts only a very small percentage of workers involved in labor disputes.

As to the overwhelming majority of workers who may become involved in labor disputes and strikes, his present amendment is the same as the amendment voted down earlier this afternoon in that any worker who has been out on strike for more than 10 days, is forever barred from receiving any wages under this appropriation.

Again, what does this mean? A strike takes place. The men are out on strike for more than 10 days. The Government does not take over the plant. It means that this plant can never reemploy any of these men who have gone out on strike. Where are you going to get the people to do the work?

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be contended here that this is going to act as a deterrent, but make up your minds on one proposition, and perhaps this may not meet with the approval of the majority of the Members because of the hysteria which has been worked up here today. Call these leaders Communists, call them Republicans, call them Democrats, call them Socialists, call them what you please, you cannot get away from the fundamental proposition that American workers do not go out on strike because of the political views of any leader. American workers do not go out on strike because of any political philosophy. These are American citizens just as good as you or I. I repeat, they are Americans. There must be some reason for going out on strike. It is not politics. It is bread and butter, and you are not going to deal with that question by passing legislation which not only sabotages the national-defense program, but which forces American workers into a state of

shackled labor akin to that of the enslaved labor of Nazi Germany.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] for 4 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this new amendment could not have been thought of more than 10 or 15 minutes ago. Its consequences are something that we cannot anticipate, something we cannot foresee. I am sure that you gentlemen who consider American labor as freeholders with a stake in this democracy are not going to vote for this hastily contrived amendment.

I do not know whether the gentleman has any more amendments in his other pockets or not, but I am not going to detain this House any longer than to say that this amendment and all similar amendments should be voted down in the interest of wise legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS] for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment to be no different than the first amendment offered by the gentleman. It simply intends to carry out everything the first amendment contemplated, and is slightly painted over. I say as the gentleman from Rhode Island said that if the Dies committee, which has been investigating communistic conditions in this country, would bring in definite legislation against the men who are causing these strikes in our labor circles they would be doing something constructive. I will vote for and support such a measure on the floor of the House.

In connection with every strike that has been referred to here today a Communist or some other "red" has been pointed to as the leader, or the men behind it. Some of these men have been in jail. Now they are out of jail and are creating the strike at Cleveland. I say we should put these fellows back in jail. The laboring men of this country are patriotic and loyal. They want to stand by this defense program. Do not strangle them. Do not take them out of work on defense projects. Get after the Communists and clean up the labor unions and much of the trouble will end. This is the body that can do the job. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not misinterpret this amendment. It seems to me this is an amendment which would make a conscientious effort to protect honest and sincere labor.

I have been sitting here thinking about a condition that might occur. Let us in our mind's imagination go into a home in an industrial center at, say, 2 o'clock in the afternoon. We find the man, his wife, and his little girl sitting around a table. The man has been employed at a factory that has been producing defense materials, but there is a strike on now, and he is not at work.

While they are talking, the son, 21 years old, comes home on furlough from the United States Army. He is amazed and surprised to find the father at home, and he says, "Dad, what are you doing at home?" "Well, Son, the plant where I am working is on strike." "Well, Dad, we don't have guns down in the camp in which I am soldiering; we haven't got things to train the soldiers with. You are working on some of them. I know you are a good, red-blooded, patriotic American citizen. I know you don't want to send me into battle without the equipment to fight with. Why are you here?"

It seems to me that would be an embarrassing question.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I cannot yield to my friend. I wish I had time to yield, because the gentleman's observations are always pertinent and enlightening.

I hope the answer of the father would not be something like this, "I did not want to go out on this strike. I did not want to go out, but I was driven out by the leaders of an element within the plant which forced all of us out. Congress has shown no evidence of wanting to protect me as against these subversive elements in the plant. Congress sits idly by twiddling its thumbs and arguing about the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum. I am afraid to oppose this strike myself. If I had a route out whereby I knew I would be protected and that my family would be protected, I would be happy to take that course."

I am just wondering if this amendment does not offer that course. You are no more interested in protecting the rights of honest labor than I am, but I shall tell you how far I will go in order to protect the rights of those boys who are drawing $21 a month, and they are not picketing those camps for a raise in salary or shorter hours or better conditions or the right to collective bargaining.

I am willing to take a chance on making it hurt just a little in order not to protect capital, for that is not the argument. Capital will be taken care of in the tax bills that will be brought out from the Committee on Ways and Means. This is not a test of whether you are for capital or for labor or against one or the other. This is a test of what will be the answer to the demand of the American people that they be given the privilege of preparing for that which may happen. And so I am willing to let it hurt just a little in order to guarantee them the protection of every preparation that can be had. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 90, noes 110.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. STARNES of Alabama and Mr. SNYDER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 71, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act, No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman this is the amendment to which I directed attention earlier and which the majority leader called attention to subsequently. It may not go as far as some want to go, but it is positive action. I have tried to work out something on which we can get sufficient agreement to act.

This amendment seeks to meet the objections that have been raised to proposals thus far considered, and also to meet the objectives which have been suggested that we ought to seek in this type of legislation. It does not try to get the rank-and-file worker who may have been misled. It avoids the danger of disqualifying a large number of needed skilled workers inherent in some proposals. It seeks only to get at those people who try to prevent loyal workers from returning to work after the Defense Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in a particular plant will interfere critically with the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work. After the Board has done those things, this amendment would deny the use of funds in this bill to pay any person for services in a plant engaged in the production of national-defense articles if he attempts forcibly to prevent others from returning to work.

A great deal has been said about constitutional rights. This amendment attempts to protect the constitutional right of those men who want to go back to work after an appeal has been made and it is found that it is critical that these plants be permitted to go ahead. This amendment tries to make it possible for those men who want to work to go back to work.

In today's paper, the Washington Times-Herald I see a dispatch from California which speaks of pickets who surrounded a worker who attempted to enter the airplane plant yards in his automobile. They picked up his car by force and threw him out of it, turned the car around, and of course, the worker left. This amendment would operate in such a case.

This amendment would get at the men who tried to prevent other men from going back to work after the National Defense Mediation Board has certified that their production is critically essential and has appealed to the workers in the name of national need. It seems to me that the least we can do if we are to do

anything is to protect the workers who want to respond. It is all very well to say the President has power to handle the situation but the country expects Congress to do something about it. If this bill passes the House today without action on the strike situation, the Nation will feel that we have failed in our duty.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The amendment is applicable to what persons? From the language used in the amendment I understood it was applicable only to those who aided in maintaining a picket line.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And to those who otherwise seek forcibly to prevent the return of workers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice the gentleman's amendment uses the word "workmen." I would suggest that the gentleman change that to "workers," because many plants have both men and women working in them. I think that would strengthen the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, although I think the term is in the generic sense and would cover women as well as men. In order that there may be no uncertainty, however, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the word "workmen" in my amendment may be changed to "workers."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All right. I think the amendment is clear because "workmen" is a generic term and because subsequently we use the word "employees."

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I wonder who will determine, under the gentleman's amendment, whether the activity has been forcible or not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Those who audit the expenditures and determine whether employees are rightfully paid or not and that is true of every limitation. Somebody must make a determination as to whether or not a limitation has been violated. Obviously, however, they pass on the question only where it is raised.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What Board is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The National Mediation Board.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The National Mediation Board is not——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman for a question and not a speech. The Mediation Board has a member who provides a voice for the American Federation of Labor, it also represents the public, it also——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is the Railway Mediation Board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Board I have in mind is the one composed of men who were appointed by the President to iron out disputes in defense industries after the dispute has been certified to them by the Secretary of Labor. They have not any power today to enforce their recommendations. This attempts to give that Board some shadow of power.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman means the National Defense Mediation Board. There is a distinction between the two boards, and I wish the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to have the word "defense" inserted at the proper place in his amendment, because the National Mediation Board is a railroad-mediation board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let the RECORD show that the National Mediation Board referred to in this amendment is the National Defense Mediation Board which deals with disputes affecting the national-defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. CASE of South Dakota: At the end of section 10, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10 (a). No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation who shall for as long as 10 days fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board, provided this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the substitute in that it is not germane to the amendment offered. The amendment offered deals with picketing, while the substitute deals with a decision of the Mediation Board and with the right to strike after a decision has been handed down by the National Defense Mediation Board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the point of order is on the ground that it is not germane?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the point of order made by the gentleman from New York, as the Chair understood it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question presented by this point of order is just the reverse of the one which the Chair ruled previously during the afternoon. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has to do with picketing, whereas the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia has to do with the refusal of employees to abide by certain recommendations. Consequently, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia would not be germane as a substitute.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, of course the House will use its own judgment in acting on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota, and in some respects I am in full accord with that amendment, but I feel that what this Nation needs now, more than it probably ever did in its life, is unity. I doubt if you will ever have unity in the enactment of legislation that relates to one group only. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota applies only to the employees, the strikers. I have sought in the amendment which I have proposed, and, of course, I shall immediately offer it should the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota be defeated, to make it apply to both parties.

The President has set up the National Defense Mediation Board. It is the constituted authority. Its recommendations are entitled to be respected. For instance, in the unfortunate situation we have now in California, the National Defense Mediation Board investigated and recommended those workmen to stay on the job, and that the negotiations between themselves and their employers continue. The employers entered into an agreement that whatever wages were agreed on as a result of the negotiations would be retroactive until May 1. Notwithstanding the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board, notwithstanding the statement made by the President in his fireside chat, that the agencies for mediation and conciliation set up by the Government must be respected, must be abided by, without the stoppage of work, the strike was called and has gone on.

The President said the people of this Nation expect not just labor, but capital and labor, to abide by the decisions of the constituted authority. I say to you with all the sincerity in my heart that I believe the people of this Nation are determined, if possible, through their Representatives in Congress, to prepare for the successful defense of this Nation. My amendment is quite similar to the letter which President Wilson wrote September 13, 1918, to the group in Bridgeport, Conn., where an award had been made, and that group refused to respect it or return to work. The President said in effect, "If you continue to strike after this, then you strike against the Government of the United States, and if you do not go back to work, immediately, you will not be employed in defense activities for the next 12 months, and the United States Employment Service would not serve you, and every last one will be inducted into the military service of the United States." That, in substance, was the letter of President Wilson, September 13, 1918, and that is what produced results at that time. I feel that the least that we can do, we who hold the money bag, is to tell these workers and employers that when these agencies which have been set up for mediation and conciliation make recommendations, that it is the solemn obligation, under the law, of the employee and the employer to go back on the job and

respect the constituted authorities, and let the defense of this Nation go forward.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman had a substitute here which had a great deal of merit to it, but I understand that was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. PACE. I have just said that I do not rise exactly in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota. It has some merit, but it applies only to one group. I believe that we might have that unity that the Nation needs, and that it would be the part of wisdom for the Congress in the enactment of any legislation to have it apply to both employer and employee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: In the Case amendment strike out the words "National Mediation Board" and insert "National Defense Mediation Board."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota deals with the National Mediation Board. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan deals with the National Defense Mediation Board, an entirely different subject and therefore not germane to the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the Case amendment deals with the payment of wages and states what must be done before this appropriation can be paid out to workers. My amendment to the Case amendment changes the name applied to the Board. It is a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to say that the National Defense Mediation Board is the correct legal designation of the agency to which the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] refers?

Mr. ENGEL. That is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I be heard on that point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The original amendment specifically stated "National Mediation Board." That deals with railway workers. That is a Board set up for the settlement of disputes in the railway industry. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGLE] to the amendment deals with the National Defense Mediation Board of the Office of Production Management, two entirely different subjects. I submit, therefore, that this amendment is not germane to the original amendment for the amendment of which it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair make inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as to whether the National Mediation Board and National Defense Mediation Board are one and the same Board or agency?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the amendment I used the term "national-defense program," and the Board referred to is the one that has the power to report to the President with reference to the defense program.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], What is his conception of the National Mediation Board as stated in his amendment? What is the jurisdiction of that Board?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My understanding of the National Defense Mediation Board is that it is a Board set up by the President, to which the Secretary of Labor may certify strikes, for purposes of conciliation.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what is the National Mediation Board?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When I used that term, Mr. Chairman, it was my impression that that name identified the Board which I have described. I have since been informed that the word "Defense" should be in there. So I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The inquiry of the Chair was directed to a determination of the question whether or not the National Mediation Board and the National Defense Mediation Board are one and the same Board, and that one is the correct designation of the Board and the other is not.

Mr. ENGEL. They are not the same Boards. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] intended to write "National Defense Mediation Board" and unintentionally wrote "National Mediation Board." They are not the same Boards.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is simply a change in the Board which would have control, under the amendment as offered. The Chair thinks it is entirely in order for the gentleman from Michigan to offer an amendment for a different Board to be charged with the operation than the Board stated in the amendment as originally offered, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as amended.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEALEY. Has the Pace substitute been overruled by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it has not. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] changed the agency from "National Mediation Board" to "National Defense Mediation Board," and that has been agreed to.

The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SANDERS. What was the ruling of the Chair and what is the parliamentary situation with regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was sustained that it was not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in view of the fact that one dealt with picketing and the other with the stoppage of work.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. That does not prevent the reoffering of that amendment after the adoption of the present amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not. A point of order was sustained in that the amendment was not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 126, noes 76.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. SNYDER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 138, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: At the end of section 10, as amended, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 10 (b). No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation who shall for as long as 10 days fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, let me try to be helpful. The amendment the Committee has just adopted does one thing

only—it applies only to one single person, the striker who gets in the picket line and prevents a person from going to work. This is the only single thing the Case amendment does. Get this straight: it applies to only one single person, and that is the striker who gets in the picket line and forcefully prevents a person from going to work. If you think that has solved the problem before the Nation then in your opinion there would be no need for the amendment I have offered.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. It includes the man under 35 who may have received deferment from selective service.

Mr. PACE. It does exempt anyone who might later be inducted. I have done that in my amendment. It simply says we have the money bags here. I think, frankly, it is probably more powerful than the bayonet. We simply say that this $10,000,000,000 we are appropriating today shall not be used in paying either the workman or the employer for any work or any defense article where that workman or that employer has gone for 10 days and refused to comply with the recommendations of the National Mediation Board. It applies to both alike. The Case amendment applies to one person only—the striker who gets in the picket line and prevents a person from working.

I believe it is proper that we throw around the Mediation Board some authority, or else we should eliminate and get rid of the Mediation Board. The Mediation Board appealed to these people who are on strike in California, as I told you a few moments ago, asking them to go back to work and negotiate their differences. The strikers refused to do so, yet there is no authority in the Mediation Board to continue defense production. We are appropriating $10,000,000,000 here, and the only solution up to this minute that you have made of the problem of the stoppage of defense production is that you single out one individual and one only. I dare say there would not be over 100 in any big plant who might be affected. The amendment would become entirely ineffective if they imported men to man the picket line. The maintenance of the picket line would not then affect any of the employees of the plant. They could go out on strike and stay as long as they pleased. They could entirely disrupt and stop defense production.

I am not going to detain you longer. Frankly, I think the two amendments will have to be worked out in conference. I believe very firmly that the only proper solution is to treat the parties alike and cover them all, not just simply one man who is seeking to continue a strike, not just an individual or Communist who might be out there trying to keep somebody from going to work. This should apply to anybody who refuses to pay respect and attention to and comply with the recommendation of the constituted Mediation Board set up by the Government.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The only difference between this amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] that we voted down is that the Starnes amendment provided that nobody could return to work——

Mr. PACE. I do not agree with the gentleman. Do not make a statement in my time, please.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just a moment. There is quite a good deal of difference. I feel that we should proceed in keeping with the need of the hour. All other proposals have been defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has reserved a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to press the point of order. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that the difference between the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is that in the case of the Starnes amendment you prohibited reemployment if the striking worker did not return until after 3 days subsequent to the plant being taken over by the Government. In this case the striking worker is denied the right to work if he does not return to work within a period of 10 days after a decision has been made by the Mediation Board. So that from all standpoints, particularly from the standpoint of you gentlemen who have raised the question right along about speeding up production in the so-called national-defense industries, you will be defeating the very purpose of speeding production, for if a group of workers remains out of work for a period of 10 days or more after a Board decision, they can never be returned to work even though that strike may be settled, even though the President of the United States himself may, by his personal intercession, bring about a settlement, even if some Government agency may bring about settlement; no matter how beneficial the settlement may be to industry or labor these workers cannot return to work. I submit that in national-defense industries, with the need for skilled workers, you are doing serious injury to production by the adoption of this amendment.

Again, what are you doing? You are making it impossible for all time for workers to return to work in any industry where they are very much needed simply because they have been out on strike for 10 days after the National Defense Mediation Board has made its decision.

I want to present another point. We are going more than far by adopting this amendment and, incidentally, by adopting the Case amendment. The National Defense Mediation Board was set up to do what? Supposedly to mediate, to bring labor and capital together, or so it was stated at the time it was set up. How are we working it out? How is it being worked out? With what the President has done today by edict, the Board is no longer one of mediation, but is now converted by bayonets into a board of compulsory arbitration. Now we, too, are converting it, by hasty and hysterical legislation, into a compulsory arbitration board. In other words, you are legislating here—and you know it—fundamental labor law. You are going on record in 10 minutes' time legislating what? Legislating compulsory arbitration in the United States of America, a system which has been repugnant not only to labor but to the entire American people.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In view of the fact that the Committee has adopted the Case amendment, does not the gentleman think it would be more equitable for all concerned to now adopt the Pace amendment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. The Pace amendment is worse. I was opposed to the Case amendment because it leads to compulsory arbitration to the extent that it deprives American labor of the right to picket, and a strike without the right to picket becomes meaningless. As far as the pending amendment is concerned, you are adopting the principle of compulsory arbitration in that a decision becomes enforced by the deprivation of work for all time, if the workers do not accept the decision of the National Defense Mediation Board within 10 days after it has been rendered. Therefore, by the Case amendment you deprive American workers of the right to picket, and by the Pace amendment you deprive American workers of the right to strike.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Is it not true also that an employer who has a contract under the terms of this appropriation bill will have funds withheld from him if he does not comply with the order of the Mediation Board?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This amendment you may rest assured will be wielded only against the workers. Experience of compulsory arbitration has established this to be so. This amendment is intended only to deprive workers of their right to strike and this is exactly how it will be enforced. Do not have any illusions about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I may point out, labor already is protected by the Walsh-Healey Act on defense contracts. This does not legislate compulsory arbitration as a general proposition, only after the National Defense Mediation Board has said that further stoppage is seriously and critically crippling the national-defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, let me answer the gentleman from South Dakota. When the Defense Mediation Board has said that the stoppage cripples the national-defense program—well, it will say so in all cases, because it deals only with strikes and labor disputes in so-called defense industries.

As far as compulsory arbitration is concerned, when you deprive men who are on strike of the right to continue that strike after the Board has made its decision, you are enforcing that decision by force and you have thus established a condition of enforced labor. You are legislating compulsory arbitration and enforced labor no matter what you may call it.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that my amendment did not cover the employer?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. PACE. It says "any person, firm, r corporation."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That does not make any difference. It will be enforced only against labor. It will work out that way.

Mr. PACE. How is the gentleman going to cover him then?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is specifically aiming at labor and that is the important proposition. That is the intent of his amendment and it will be used only against labor. I have no illusions on the matter nor has anyone else. As far as labor is concerned, the decision is made and labor remains out on strike for 10 days. In that case if those men do not go back to work within 10 days after the decision is rendered, they are not going to be paid any more, they are not going to be employed. Where are you going to get the men to do the work? Why do you shackle labor here by an amendment of this character?

Mr. PACE. If the employer fails to carry out the recommendation of the Mediation Board he does not get paid either.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Again I say, that sounds fine in theory. The application and intent are what count. Both are against labor. The employer will have very little to fear from the gentleman's amendment.

Say all you please about the impartiality of your amendment the proposition is that this is compulsory arbitration. It is no longer mediation. You have illegalized picketing by the Case amendment and you are destroying the right to strike by this amendment. It is the end of collective bargaining. Say what you please, at least I want you to know what you are doing before you do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. For months, now, this Congress has labored day in and day out on what we have been calling a defense program, a preparedness program. The people of this country have been called upon to make stupendous sacrifices.

Nearly a year ago the President called out the National Guard and the Reserves. Men gave up their businesses; they left their families; doctors and lawyers closed their desks; everything was wiped clean, because the security of the country was at stake.

Not only that, but we went into the homes of America—I say we did, because this Congress passed the bill—and put our hands upon the young men and called them into uniform, changing their way of life and interrupting their careers, because the welfare of America was at stake.

We passed the lease-lend bill. We appropriated $7,000,000,000. In a few days we will bring in a tax bill that will dig deep down into the pockets and the savings of every citizen of America and call upon them for additional sacrifice.

All of this is to be frustrated and put at naught. Why? Because labor in America is unpatriotic? Oh, no; that is the tragedy of it. Because labor says apologetically that a few radicals have gotten in control of the situation.

The tragedy of this whole thing is that what is happening in this country today does not represent the sentiment of the great rank and file of the laboring people of America. [Applause.] They are as patriotic, as God-fearing, and as loyal to the democratic way of life as any man who sits upon this floor. The trouble is they are being led by false prophets. The Army of the United States has been called out today. Ah, gentlemen; do not fool yourselves. The time has to come when men upon the floor of this House are willing to vote for America, even if they know they are going to stay home 2 years from now. [Applause.]

My fellow Americans, it is not asking too much of organized labor to be willing to stay at the job while these differences are being ironed out and adjudicated in the established way. The President has set up a Mediation Board. There is no partisan of labor on this floor who can say that that Board certainly has not been fair to organized labor. They have not made a decision that the most partisan advocate of labor can complain about.

This amendment simply states that when these controversies have been submitted to that Mediation Board and they have acted, that edict must be carried out, because this country is faced with imminent peril.

I say this as one who has supported regularly and systematically every piece of progressive legislation that has been offered here for labor. I have a district that has a lot of laboring people in it. Their sons are in the camps wearing the uniform, but they have no guns to shoot and no ammunition because of work stoppages. It is an intolerable situation, and to me it is ridiculous. Let us be a bit realistic. To me it is a rather ridiculous situation for the people in America, for you and me—let us make it personal—to be strutting around bragging, thumbing our noses at Hitler and telling him what we are going to do and what we can do, when we do not have the intestinal fortitude to come to grips with a little crowd of radical labor leaders in America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPM. Mr. Chairman, the right of labor to strike in peacetime industry is a precious right. Practically all labor in our country is loyal. Make no mistake on that score. Certainly no Member of this House should ever abrogate the rights of the workers of America. However, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has just said, this issue calls for all of us to meet our responsibility in a period of emergency. Those who believe in labor and those who believe in capital want honestly to see a movement to close ranks in a time of crisis in this country. We must march forward in behalf of unity, cooperation, and harmony which will be recognized by all of the American people. There can be no classes, no division, no backbiting today. No group can be allowed to cripple our preparedness program.

Irresponsible labor leadership on the one hand and selfish employer leadership on the other are not to be tolerated in this hour of our need. I tell you, my colleagues, the citizens of our country are rightly aroused and demand action. The people of America will enthusiastically commend fearless effort in Congress today, as I know they have commended the President of the United States in their thoughts for the courageous leadership he has displayed in the aircraft-factory strike in the past few hours. We must show by a determined vote now that we are not going to allow any ill-advised segment of labor or any greedy segment of capital to destroy the defense effort in this period of crisis.

This is no time for hysteria, it is no time for flag waving, it is just a time for Members of Congress in a sane manner, knowing their obligations to constituents and to the Republic, to stand foursquare together. Let us bring from this House to America clear-cut word that we believe in defense plants operating. I know full well in my own heart that the loyal laboring people of America unite with the loyal employer groups on this issue. All of us must band together. There will be not groups but just one great group, a determined body of patriotic Americans speaking in a forthright fashion to those who would take advantage of this critical hour to further their own selfish ends.

I say with all the sincerity that is within my heart that if the Congress will act this afternoon, as we believe we can and we must act, the Nation at large is going to honestly approve what is done. I wish we would have spoken out months ago on the matter. Let us not be afraid

to cast our votes in behalf of a plan which will aid in stopping strikes in the defense industries of America. We have the opportunity to proceed courageously. Let us, Mr. Chairman, speak that the country, and Hitler as well, will hear us. No racketeer or saboteur must be allowed to halt this defense job.

We have a fight in the world between a system of Hitler, which would bring about the subjugation of man and the blasphemy of God, and our own system of recognizing the dignity of humanity and the freedom of democracy. In such a fight we are called upon to stand united for what we believe to be right. Let us see to it that the defense industries of America continue to turn their wheels and that any difficulties between worker and management be ironed out at the mediation table and not when men are off the job.

This Congress can and will rise to its real responsibility. We must stand together with closed ranks in this time of our country's need. I listened recently to speeches by four men who had been candidates for President of the United States—Cox, Davis, Smith, and Willkie. I liked the sentiment which they expressed. They were more than former Presidential candidates. They were more than men who had disagreed with the President on domestic issues. They were leaders who were big enough to put littleness aside and stand by our Chief Executive in our defense plans for protection of our people, our institutions, and our way of life. So in our hour of need we stand together. Let us demonstrate to the United States and the world that this Congress, expressing the will of loyal citizens will not fail in the time of testing. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 172, noes 31.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the so-called Case amendment and the Pace amendment have just been adopted and are numbered section 10 (a) and section 10 (b). I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may adjust those section numbers so that they will appear as section 10 and section 12, and I ask that the succeeding sections be numbered to correspond.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. No part of any appropriation contained in this act may be obligated for the construction of quarters, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, except in Alaska, for greater amounts per unit than follow:

Permanent construction:

For commissioned officer, $10,000.

For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $7,500

For enlisted man, $6,000.

Temporary construction:

For commissioned officer, $7,500.

For commissioned warrant or warrant officer, $5,000.

For enlisted man, $3,500.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

On Friday the Committee adopted the so-called Engel amendment, which bars the Army from entering into any more contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

As was stated here on Friday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], that form of contract is under scrutiny by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which he is chairman, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] indicated that we might expect legislation growing out of such investigation in the near future. That is the way to reach this matter. We just do not know what the effect of the Engel amendment might be. Since Friday I have talked with General Somervell and with Admiral Moreell, who are the two men in direct charge of defense public works, and they tell me that there is no question in their minds that the Engel amendment would so tie their hands that it would be impossible to undertake many projects which are vital to the defense program. I do not think we should take precipitate action of this kind in the face of that sort of warning, and I am going to ask, at the proper time, for a separate vote on the Engel amendment. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk be permitted to read this letter which has come to me from General Somervell.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 9, 1941.

Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: In response to your request concerning the effect of the Engel amendment prohibiting fixed-fee contracts, I can say without reservation that the amendment will do more to delay the War Department's construction program than any other device which could be adopted without actually ordering the program stopped. It will delay the completion of the work on an average of 6 months.

Although everyone realizes certain disadvantages which are inherent in the fixed-fee type of contract, the cure proposed is worse than the disease. In fact, it will kill the patient. Owing to the military situation, it will not be practical to prepare plans and specifications at all times sufficiently far in advance to permit advertising, and the conduct of the work along orthodox competitive lines. The correction of the difficulties in fixed-fee contracts lies in administrative action, which has been and is being taken, rather than in the elimination of the only possible method of finishing the program when needed. Where we can use lump-sum contracts and complete the work when required, our policy is to use them. We must have authority, however, to use fixed fee where that type, though perhaps more expensive, is the only method of completion of work to meet military necessities. It will do no good to complete the work in an economical fashion after the emergency has passed.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Brigadier General, United States Army.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The answer to the assertion that it cannot be done is that it has been done and is being done right now. Take the case of Camp Dix. It was built by 14 separate contractors running all the way from a contract for $5,000,000 on down. It cost $9,800 to construct a 63-man barracks at Dix, as against $17,364 at Camp Meade for the same kind of a barracks. They did the same thing at Camp Jackson; a competitive-bid job as compared to fixed-fee jobs. The chairman of the committee investigating these contracts referred to a contract in Missouri where it is being done. It is being done on all competitive contracts now in force. This amendment of mine does not require advertising. They can negotiate the contract the way they are doing now, but they cannot have a cost-plus fixed-fee job.

I have in my possession the name of every insurance company that wrote insurance on these projects, and the name of every agent and the amount of the insurance he wrote. Boss Crump, down in Tennessee, wrote nearly $500,000 of insurance on Army projects. The commission runs from 15 to 20 percent, I am informed. If this is true, Boss Crump's firm made a profit of from $75,000 to $100,000. If this work is done on a competitive-bid or lump-sum basis, then the contractor himself will arrange for his own insurance and politicians cannot pay political debts that way. I talked with General Somervell Saturday afternoon. Of course, these generals in the Army will not admit that they are wrong; they will not admit that it can be done. I have no objection to the Secretary of War expressing his views to Congress. I have no objection to the head of a department or General Somervell, head of the construction, expressing his views, but I do object to generals and officers of the Army getting down to the level of common lobbyists and calling up Members of Congress and lobbying against my amendment. As I said on Friday, the whole World War cantonment program, which housed 4,000,000 men, cantoned and trained them, was built at a cost of two - hundred-and-six-million-and - odd dollars. The Graham committee said that $76,000,000 of that was wasted. Two hundred and six million dollars was expended to build the cantonments to train 4,000,000 men. We have already expended $800,000,000 to build cantonments to train a million men.

Mr. Chairman, we often hear it said that our national resources and the national credit are our first line of defense. Time and again you have heard men asking what will happen to our Government and our financial system if we get into the war. Wasting of those resources and of that credit must not be permitted. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be passed.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. During the gentleman's investigation of these various defense contracts did he inspect any naval air bases in this country?

Mr. ENGEL. No. I am a member of the subcommittee having in charge the military appropriation bills and would not have anything to do with the naval air bases.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have one of the largest air bases in the country in my district in Rhode Island at Quonset Point, and I know that they could not have finished those things in the length of time if they had been on a competitive-bidding basis. I think the gentleman will find that the fault will lie in the personnel of the War Department in charge of these cantonments, because the Navy Department seems to be far ahead of them in engineering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I said the other day, I honor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for the work that he has done in connection with the investigation that he has made, but I do say that there has been no charge of fraud in connection with the work that has been done by General Hartman or by General Somervell, who have had charge of the construction program for the War Department. No one on this floor has said that these gentlemen have not done the best that they could to give America 100 cents out of every dollar for the work done. We are told by the military experts that if we adopt the Engel amendment it will delay the work that is so vital, for at least 6 months. If we believe in these military experts who are giving us these opinions, if we believe in them to the extent of spending ten billions of dollars; if we feel these men are worthy of trust, then we should say by our votes this afternoon that we do trust them to make these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if this House adopts the Engel amendment we will set back our program at least 6 or 8 months. We talk a lot about what Hitler thinks about us. If we adopt the Engel amendment Hitler will laugh in his sleeve at what the American Congress is doing today. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the other day the Engel amendment was adopted by about 15 votes in Committee of the Whole. We all respect our distinguished friend, and we admire him for the great work he is doing. We value him as a Member of this body, but we all have our own responsibilities. The Engel amendment does not bring back competitive bidding. Some Members have the idea that the effect of the Engel amendment is to compel competitive bidding, under which a contract would be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. The Engel amendment only precludes the Navy Department and the War Department from awarding contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. It allows, outside of competitive bidding, only the lump-sum basis. It is a restriction of the discretion of the two departments, a restricted discretion that both departments have told us will retard our national defense. We have to look to the men in charge of those departments.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. These lump-sum contracts which are being let are let upon competitive-bid basis.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are selective.

Mr. ENGEL. But they are competitive bidding.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are not competitive bidding in the sense that we understand competitive bidding under the law, where anybody can submit a bid.

Mr. ENGEL. They are if the War Department takes the bids.

Mr. McCORMACK. It goes to the lowest responsible bidder. Now, we have to follow the suggestions or recommendations of those who are entrusted with the responsibility of conducting our national defense. Personally I would like to see competitive bidding under the law if it could be done. Then every contractor could bid, and the lowest responsible bidder would get the contract. But they tell us that policy alone cannot be followed without retarding our national-defense program.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] wants to limit it to one type of noncompetitive bidding under the law. I have a letter from Under Secretary Patterson, and he says that "if the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is forbidden by law, the program for arming and equipping our troops will be greatly retarded. The effect on the Air Corps program with the greatly expanded plant would be disastrous." He also says in this letter, which I will put in the RECORD later, "the lump-sum form of contract is preferred by the War Department and is used wherever possible."

There is a commitment. But they do not want to have the discretion taken away on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract where that is necessary for our present defense program.

I submit that when we go into the House and a separate vote comes on the amendment, in view of the advice we have received from the competent authorities in the War Department and the Navy Department, without regard to our own personal feelings and our likes or dislikes about some contractor getting or not receiving a contract, we should uphold the hands of our officials in the War and Navy Departments and vote down the Engel amendment.

I hope that action will be taken. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter received by me from Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1941.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I understand that a vote is imminent on an amendment introduced by Mr. ENGEL to prohibit use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by the War Department.

I hope that this measure will be defeated.

The cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, as you know, was authorized last year by Congress as an aid to rapid performance of contracts for national defense.

The policy of the War Department regarding these contracts has been made public a number of times. They are availed of in cases of urgency, where there is no time to prepare detailed plans and specifications, or where there is no experience available as to what would constitute a fair price. The lump-sum form of contract is preferred by the War Department and is used wherever possible.

If the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is forbidden by law, the program for Army and equipping our troops will be greatly retarded. The effect on the Air Corps program, with its greatly expanded plan, would be disastrous.

The bulk of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts have been made by the Construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps under charge of General Somervell. I am confident that General Somervell will make use of this form of contract only when necessary and that he will keep careful check on operations under these contracts.

I have not had time to take this matter up with the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. SNYDER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments be limited to 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time, after the House has taken the most devastating action against American workers, an action which is similar to what was done against the French workers before France's entry into the war and an action which you will inevitably regret. I am not going to debate that issue again. It has been debated. The arguments have been stated for one side as well as for the other. However, the American people will debate it. It is their decision which will be final.

Now we are confronted with the proposition of having a separate vote on the Engel amendment.

I agree that that amendment is important and I personally supported it and will support it on a record vote. Ironical is it not? We are asked to take out an amendment aimed at exploiting sharks in defense industries after we have legislated against labor here and bayoneted against labor in Inglewood, Calif., just today. I want to make this appeal to every Member of this House, and in doing so I am not reflecting on your courage nor your integrity; but I submit that the vote on the two amendments which we have adopted, one which means no picketing and the other which means no striking after the Mediation Board has made its decision, which means compulsory labor, should not be concealed in the Committee of the Whole. It is the most fundamental vote that has been taken

here and I appeal to your sense of fairness—yes; if it is a question of courage, I appeal to your courage—that we have a separate vote on both the Case amendment and the Pace amendment, and we owe it to the American people to have a record vote, so that they may know where the men and women of this Congress stand on those two basic, fundamental propositions, on those two assaults we have made on the rights of American labor.

Yes; I feel strongly on this question. This has been a most tragic day in the history of our country. Today the blood of American workers has been spilled and they have been deprived of their God-given right to strike by the bayonets of our Army at the direction of the President. This is the first time that American soldiers have been called out against American workers in 47 years. How the clock has gone back, from collective bargaining to enforced labor. I know what it means to American workers to be deprived of their right to picket and the right to strike. It means complete mastery over them by employers whose profits mount high and who refuse to pay American wages. We mark the end of collective bargaining, an end brought about by edict, hysterical legislation, proclamations, and bayonets. I know that you say that you are depriving workers of their rights under the guise of defense of democracy. I wonder how much democracy will be left to defend after you have deprived the workers of America of their constitutional and inalienable rights—rights which every great American patriot has defended from time immemorial. What is there to defend, when you will have American labor, under the guise of so-called national defense, shackled and fettered? By the use of hysteria, propaganda, proclamations, and bayonets we are marching steadily with 7-league boots in the direction of the establishment of slave labor in the United States such as they have in Nazi Germany. What are the American people going to fight for if they find that in their own country you have done to labor what Hitler has done to labor in Europe? You are giving American workers the enslavement that Hitler has given to the workers of the conquered European countries.

Without any hearings, without any study, this House, on the spur of the moment, worked up by hysteria forced onto the people of this country through the medium of an appropriation bill, compulsory arbitration, and illegalized the right to picket; and you have given the National Defense Mediation Board the power of enforcing its decisions by depriving American workers of their basic rights and even of the opportunity to work. All for what? Not for democracy, but for imperialism and profits.

Therefore, let us at least stand up as American men and women; let us tell the country how we stand. Let us have a record vote on these two propositions. I appeal to you. You owe it to your constituents; you owe it to the country; you owe it to every man, woman, and child in this country to let them know how you stand on these two amendments; and I beseech you, through a sense of justice and in the name of American fairness, to let us have a record vote on the Case amendment and on the Pace amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I merely asked for the 2 minutes to direct the attention of the House to the language the majority leader referred to in the letter he received from the Assistant Secretary of War, which I will repeat:

> If the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract is forbidden by law, the program for arming and equipping our troops will be greatly retarded.

I lay particular stress on the next sentence of the letter from the Assistant Secretary of War to Majority Leader McCORMACK:

> The effect on the Air Corps program, with its greatly expanded plans, would be disastrous.

I do this to emphasize the danger of so hastily legislating on such important matters. This likewise applies to the efforts to legislate with reference to the rights of labor, which has been resorted to in the consideration of this appropriation bill. This danger is pointed out in the letter from the Assistant Secretary of War to Majority Leader McCORMACK, from which I have quoted, and I regret that any amendments involving labor's rights were likewise hastily approved in the consideration of this appropriation bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOUGH. I have not the time. I am sorry.

If you confirm the amendment adopted in the committee last Friday in spite of the warning from the Assistant Secretary of War, you will make the expanded Air Corps program impossible and will contribute to a disaster. I hope better judgment will be exercised by the Members as they vote on this amendment this afternoon and that we will not adopt the Engel amendment. I agree with the gentleman from New York that we should have a separate vote on the Case amendment and on the Pace amendment when we get back in the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. One-half minute only.

Mr. ENGEL. I just wanted to comment in answer to the letter read by the majority leader and referred to again by the gentleman from Illinois, that Camp Jackson, S. C., a competitive-bid project, was ahead of similar projects on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Fort Dix, in the same area, was ahead of Meade, Devens, and Edwards. The three latter contracts were cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Dix was a competitive-bid contract. These statements are borne out by the progress sheets made by the contractors themselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, every amendment that was offered this afternoon which would have aided William Green and Phil Murray in taking care of these outlaw strikes, which they and the O. P. M. have condemned, was voted down except the Pace amendment. Now, do you know what the Pace amendment does? Get it and read it.

The Pace amendment provides that the National Defense Mediation Board is the final judge not only of the sum which shall be paid by the contractor, the sum which shall be paid by him as wages, but that if he fails to comply with the request of the Board he cannot receive compensation for the work he has done nor complete his contract. If the Board decides that the worker shall be paid 50 cents an hour, he gets 50 cents an hour and no more. If it decides he shall get $2 per hour, the employer loses the contract if he does not pay it. Get the amendment and read it before you vote on it in the House. It means compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded reading the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Engel amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire a separate vote on any other amendment?

Mr. SNYDER. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on what is known as the Case amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Pace amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Engel amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL: On page 70, line 17, before the period, insert the following: ", except that no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for paying any obligations incurred in pursuance thereof under an original contract on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis for the construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto, any other provision in this act to the contrary notwithstanding."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL) there were—ayes 114, noes 124.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 175, nays 179, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—175

Allen, Ill.	Gore	Paddock
Angell	Gossett	Pittenger
Arends	Graham	Plumley
Baumhart	Grant, Ind.	Poage
Bender	Guyer, Kans.	Rankin, Miss.
Bennett	Gwynne	Rankin, Mont.
Bishop	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Hancock	Rees, Kans.
Boehne	Hare	Rich
Bolles	Harness	Richards
Bolton	Hartley	Rivers
Bonner	Healey	Rizley
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Bryson	Hill, Colo.	Rockefeller
Burch	Hill, Wash.	Rodgers, Pa.
Burdick	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Burgin	Holmes	Rolph
Butler	Hope	Rutherford
Canfield	Hull	Sauthoff
Carlson	Hunter	Scanlon
Carter	Jackson	Simpson
Case, S. Dak.	Jarrett	Smith, Maine
Casey, Mass.	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jensen	Smith, Pa.
Clevenger	Johns	Smith, Va.
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Wash.
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Springer
Colmer	Jones	Stefan
Connery	Jonkman	Stevenson
Copeland	Kean	Stratton
Courtney	Kelley, Pa.	Sutphin
Crawford	Kinzer	Taber
Crowther	Kirwan	Talle
Cunningham	Knutson	Thom
Curtis	Kunkel	Thomas, Tex.
Day	Lambertson	Tibbott
Dewey	Landis	Treadway
Dirksen	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Disney	McArdle	Vincent, Ky.
Ditter	McGregor	Voorhis, Calif.
Dondero	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas	McMillan	Vreeland
Dworshak	Maas	Wasielewski
Eaton	Marcantonio	Weiss
Eliot, Mass.	Martin, Iowa	Wene
Elston	Michener	Wheat
Engel	Moser	White
Englebright	Mott	Wickersham
Fenton	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Fish	Murray	Wilson
Fitzgerald	Myers, Pa.	Winter
Flannagan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolcott
Ford, Leland M.	O'Connor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	O'Hara	Wolverton, N. J.
Gehrmann	Oliver	Woodruff, Mich.
Gilchrist	Pace	Young
Gillie		

NAYS—179

Allen, La.	Andrews	Barry
Anderson, Calif.	Arnold	Bates, Ky.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Barden	Bates, Mass.
	Barnes	Beam
Beckworth	Granger	O'Neal
Beiter	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bell	Gregory	Patman
Bland	Haines	Patrick
Boggs	Harrington	Patton
Boland	Harris, Ark.	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Ga.
Brooks	Hart	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Brown, Ga.	Harter	Pheiffer, William T.
Buck	Heffernan	Pierce
Buckler, Minn.	Hendricks	Plauché
Buckley, N. Y.	Holbrook	Priest
Bulwinkle	Hook	Rabaut
Byrne	Houston	Randolph
Camp	Imhoff	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Jacobsen	Sabath
Cartwright	Jarman	Sacks
Chapman	Johnson, Luther A.	Sanders
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer
Claypool	Johnson, W. Va.	Satterfield
Cochran	Kee	Schaefer, Ill.
Cole, Md.	Kefauver	Schulte
Cooley	Kerr	Scrugham
Cooper	Kilday	Secrest
Cox	Kleberg	Shanley
Cravens	Kocialkowski	Sheppard
Creal	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Crosser	Kramer	Sikes
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Smith, Conn.
Davis, Ohio	Larrabee	Snyder
Davis, Tenn.	Lea	South
Dickstein	Leavy	Sparkman
Dingell	Lewis	Spence
Domengeaux	Ludlow	Starnes, Ala.
Doughton	Lynch	Steagall
Downs	McCormack	Sullivan
Doxey	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Drewry	McGranery	Terry
Duncan	McKeough	Thomason
Durham	McLaughlin	Tinkham
Eberharter	Maciora	Traynor
Edmiston	Mahon	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott, Calif.	May	Walter
Ellis	Merritt	Ward
Faddis	Meyer, Md.	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Mills, Ark.	Welch
Flaherty	Mills, La.	West
Flannery	Monroney	Whelchel
Fogarty	Murdock	Whittington
Forand	Nelson	Williams
Ford, Miss.	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Ford, Thomas F.	Norrell	Worley
Gathings	Norton	Wright
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman
Gearhart	O'Leary	
Gibson		

NOT VOTING—76

Andersen, H. Carl	Halleck	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Hébert	Powers
Baldwin	Hinshaw	Ramsay
Bloom	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Boykin	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Rogers, Okla.
Celler	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Romjue
Chenoweth	Keefe	Russell
Clason	Kelly, Ill.	Schuetz
Cluett	Kennedy, Martin, J.	Scott
Collins	Kennedy, Michael J.	Shafer, Mich.
Costello	Keogh	Shannon
Culkin	Kilburn	Short
Cullen	Lesinski	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	McIntyre	Stearns, N. H.
Dies	Maciejewski	Sumner, Ill.
Fellows	Magnuson	Sweeney
Fulmer	Mansfield	Tarver
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Gerlach	Mason	Tenerowicz
Geyer, Calif.	Mitchell	Thill
Gifford	O'Day	Thomas, N. J.
Green	Osmers	Tolan
Hall, Leonard W.	Pearson	Wadsworth
		Youngdahl

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Powers against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.

Mr. Thill for, with Mr. Martin J. Kennedy against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Romjue against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Kelly of Illinois against.

Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Cluett for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Culkin for, with Mr. Maciejewski against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy against.

General pairs:

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Collins with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Green with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Tenerowicz with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Schuetz with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Youngdahl.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Geyer of California with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. MOSER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 71, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 10 (a). No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Defense Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work."

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Pace amenndment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: At the end of section 10, as amended, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 12. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation who shall for as long as 10 days fail or refuse to respect and abide by the

recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board, provided this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces."

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on the division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 192, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 1, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—352

Allen, Ill.	Coffee, Nebr.	Fulmer
Allen, La.	Coffee, Wash.	Gamble
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Md.	Gathings
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cole, N. Y.	Gavagan
Andrews	Colmer	Gearhart
Angell	Connery	Gehrmann
Arends	Cooley	Gibson
Arnold	Cooper	Gilchrist
Barden	Copeland	Gillie
Barnes	Courtney	Gore
Barry	Cox	Gossett
Bates, Ky.	Cravens	Graham
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Grant, Ala.
Baumhart	Creal	Grant, Ind.
Beam	Crosser	Gregory
Beckworth	Crowther	Guyer, Kans.
Beiter	Cunningham	Gwynne
Bell	Curtis	Haines
Bender	D'Alesandro	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bennett	Davis, Ohio	Hancock
Bishop	Davis, Tenn.	Hare
Blackney	Day	Harness
Bland	Dewey	Harrington
Boehne	Dickstein	Harris, Ark.
Boggs	Dingell	Harris, Va.
Boland	Dirksen	Hart
Bolles	Disney	Harter
Bolton	Ditter	Hartley
Bonner	Domengeaux	Healey
Boren	Dondero	Heffernan
Bradley, Mich.	Doughton	Heidinger
Bradley, Pa.	Douglas	Hendricks
Brooks	Downs	Hess
Brown, Ga.	Doxey	Hill, Colo.
Bryson	Drewry	Hill, Wash.
Buck	Duncan	Hoffman
Buckler, Minn.	Durham	Holbrook
Buckley, N. Y.	Dworshak	Holmes
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Hook
Burch	Eberharter	Hope
Burdick	Edmiston	Houston
Burgin	Eliot, Mass.	Hull
Butler	Elliott, Calif.	Hunter
Byrne	Ellis	Imhoff
Camp	Elston	Izac
Canfield	Engel	Jackson
Cannon, Mo.	Englebright	Jacobsen
Capozzoli	Faddis	Jarman
Carlson	Fenton	Jarrett
Carter	Fish	Jenkins, Ohio
Cartwright	Fitzgerald	Jensen
Case, S. Dak.	Fitzpatrick	Johns
Casey, Mass.	Flaherty	Johnson, Calif.
Chapman	Flannagan	Johnson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Flannery	Johnson, Ind.
Clark	Fogarty	Johnson,
Claypool	Forand	Luther A.
Clevenger	Ford, Leland M.	Johnson, Okla.
Cochran	Ford, Miss.	Johnson, W. Va.
Jones	Ford, Thomas F.	Jonkman
Kean	Oliver	Smith, Pa.
Kee	O'Neal	Smith, Va.
Kefauver	O'Toole	Smith, Wash.
Kelley, Pa.	Pace	Smith, W. Va.
Kerr	Paddock	Snyder
Kilday	Patman	South
Kinzer	Patrick	Sparkman
Kirwan	Patton	Spence
Kleberg	Peterson, Fla.	Springer
Knutson	Peterson, Ga.	Starnes, Ala.
Kocialkowski	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Steagall
Kopplemann	Pheiffer, William T.	Stefan
Kramer	Pierce	Stevenson
Kunkel	Pittenger	Stratton
Landis	Plauché	Sullivan
Lanham	Plumley	Sumners, Tex.
Larrabee	Poage	Sutphin
Lea	Priest	Taber
Leavy	Rabaut	Talle
LeCompte	Randolph	Terry
Lewis	Rankin, Miss.	Thom
Ludlow	Rankin, Mont.	Thomas, Tex.
Lynch	Reece, Tenn.	Thomason
McArdle	Reed, Ill.	Tibbott
McCormack	Rees, Kans.	Traynor
McGehee	Rich	Treadway
McGranery	Richards	Van Zandt
McGregor	Rivers	Vincent, Ky.
McKeough	Rizley	Vinson, Ga.
McLaughlin	Robertson, N. Dak.	Voorhis, Calif.
McLean	Robertson, Va.	Vorys, Ohio
McMillan	Robinson, Utah	Vreeland
Maas	Robsion, Ky.	Walter
Maciora	Rockefeller	Ward
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Wasielewski
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
May	Rolph	Weiss
Merritt	Russell	Welch
Meyer, Md.	Rutherford	Wene
Michener	Sacks	West
Mills, Ark.	Sanders	Wheat
Mills, La.	Sasscer	Whelchel
Monroney	Satterfield	Whittington
Moser	Sauthoff	Wickersham
Mott	Scanlon	Wigglesworth
Mundt	Schaefer, Ill.	Williams
Murdock	Schulte	Wilson
Murray	Scrugham	Winter
Myers, Pa.	Secrest	Wolcott
Nelson	Shanley	Wolfenden, Pa.
Nichols	Sheppard	Wolverton, N. J.
Norrell	Sheridan	Woodruff, Mich.
Norton	Sikes	Woodrum, Va.
O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson	Worley
O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Conn.	Wright
O'Connor	Smith, Maine	Young
O'Hara	Smith, Ohio	Zimmerman
O'Leary		

NAYS—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—77

Andersen, H. Carl	Halleck	Pearson
Andresen, August H.	Hébert	Ploeser
Baldwin	Hinshaw	Powers
Bloom	Hobbs	Ramsay
Boykin	Howell	Ramspeck
Brown, Ohio	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Rogers, Okla.
Celler	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Romjue
Chenoweth	Keefe	Sabath
Clason	Kelly, Ill.	Schuetz
Cluett	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scott
Collins	Kennedy, Michael J.	Shafer, Mich.
Costello	Keogh	Shannon
Culkin	Kilburn	Short
Cullen	Lambertson	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Lesinski	Stearns, N. H.
Dies	McIntyre	Sumner, Ill.
Fellows	Maciejewski	Sweeney
Gale	Magnuson	Tarver
Gerlach	Mansfield	Taylor
Geyer, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	Tenerowicz
Gifford	Mason	Thill
Granger	Mitchell	Thomas, N. J.
Green	O'Day	Tinkham
Hall, Leonard W.	Osmers	Tolan
		Wadsworth
		Youngdahl

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Granger with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Short.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Collins with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Green with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Tenerowicz with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Schuetz with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
Mr. Ramsey with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gerlach.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Geyer of California with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the name of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE] was called, but he did not answer. I wish to state that on yesterday he and his wife, while returning to Washington, had a severe accident, which prevented his being here today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON and Mr. MURDOCK asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter that appeared in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement which I filed with the Committee on Ways and Means during its consideration of the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Com-

mittee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein a letter I received from Assistant Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Alsop and Kintner appearing in this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a joint resolution of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

"REDS" SEEK CONTROL OF OFFICE WORKERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inspired and directed by Moscow, the Communists lose no opportunity to further their efforts to overthrow this Government by force, though in many instances violence does not appear in their initial efforts. No one ever has accused the Communists of lacking intelligence, persistence, or loyalty to their objective. If patriotic Americans, in behalf of their country, would show but a fraction of the diligence and the determination exhibited by the Communists in their efforts to undermine and destroy our Government, there would be no danger to us, either from within or from abroad.

OVERTHROW OF OUR GOVERNMENT

It long has been the purpose of the Communists, in this country as in others, to worm their way into every possible organization, whether it be a civic, labor, religious, or fraternal organization. With their objective at first in the background, they can assume and wear coats of as many colors as that of Joseph. But their purpose always is the same—the overthrow of this Government. First by boring from within, tearing at and ruining the foundations, and if that does not serve the purpose, then by force and open defiance of the Government.

COMMUNIST SUCCESS

Their success is being amply demonstrated in this country. From the time when they conceived and brought about the sit-down strikes in Michigan in 1937, which cost the workers in General Motors alone more than $40,000,000 in loss of wages, they have won victory after victory, until today the very existence of our Government is threatened. Often have I been branded as a labor baiter because I called attention to and condemned as best I could the violence, the unlawfulness of the labor agitator, the strikes which were inspired and carried on by Communists using typical Communist methods.

FALSE SLOGANS

Under the slogans of "bettering the condition of the American worker," of "maintaining the American way of life," these would-be traitors, these wreckers, have infiltrated their members into labor unions throughout the country. They preached class hatred, they characterized as a wage slave the workingman, who, here in America, in many instances owns not only his radio, his electric refrigerator and washing machine, his automobile, and his own home, but many of the things which a few short years ago were unattainable by even wealthy individuals. These Communists know of no place in the wide, wide world where the lot of the workers is as good as here in America. They know of no other country where he can live in as great comfort, enjoy as many of not only the necessities but the luxuries of life; the opportunity to educate his children and advance his own welfare, as here. Yet, strange as it may seem, they would destroy the land which harbors them, overthrow the Government which protects them, which grants them free speech, liberty, and freedom, and at time provides food and clothing.

LABOR LEADERS SEE THE LIGHT

The things which I have denounced, that is, the unjustifiable strikes where, through violence, force, threat, and intimidation, men were deprived of their God-given and constitutional right to work, are now denounced in terms equally as bitter by William Green, president of the A. F. of L., by Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., by the Office of Production Management charged with production for national defense, and by every patriotic American. This change in sentiment is, from their viewpoint, a startling one, though nonetheless welcome. To hear and to read of Philip Murray and William Green denouncing strikers and strikes as unpatriotic is something new. These men have been forced by the march of events to condemn the activities of some of their followers and affiliated organizations. The strikes on the west coast have reached such a point, have so threatened our national life, and the forces behind them have been so exposed to the people that public indignation has grown to such a point that Murray and Green realize at a belated last that unless they take action the whole legitimate labor movement must pay a part of the penalty for the actions of these Communists who have been taken into, sheltered, and protected by their respective organizations. The malignant cancer of communism has grown to such an extent that it is eating at the very vitals of patriotic unionism. And so we find that recognized labor leaders, men who have been leaders in union organizations for many years if they have not joined hands with those who heretofore have been termed labor-baiters, nevertheless are advocating a course of action long ago pointed out by the real friends of labor.

STILL ATTEMPTING TO DECEIVE

But do not be deceived. Not all of the activities of the Communists have been exposed. Not all of their destructive work, their treasonable program, has been exposed to the public. Throughout this country, in many a city and town, in industry after industry, the Communists, I repeat, inspired, financed, and directed by the "reds" of Moscow, are working behind the scenes, underground, strengthening their position in labor organizations, not only among the industrial workers, but among the office workers, preparing for the time when they can strike, not only in the factory, paralyzing the making of munitions, planes, ships, and ordnance, but preparing for the day when they can, through the office workers by strikes and by sabotage, the more effectively paralyze the industries of the country upon which our salvation depends.

COMMUNISTS MAKE DRIVE IN NEW YORK

A current example of this is found in the present attempt of the Communists to organize the office forces of a concern which for many years has been engaged in the fabrication of cotton goods. In the downtown cotton fabric manufacturing district of New York City is the firm of M. Lowenstein & Sons, which for many years has been one of the leaders in the cotton-converting industry and which today is one of the chief sources of supply for cotton fabrics. If the United States Government wants cotton cloth, it must go to M. Lowenstein & Sons and like concerns.

Until 4 years ago M. Lowenstein & Sons had little, if any, labor trouble, though in 1937 the Bookkeepers, Stenographers, and Accountants Union, affiliated with the C. I. O., made an attempt to organize the office staff of that concern, then consisting of some 300 employees. The then employees, recognizing the movement for what it was; that is, an attempt sponsored by the Communists and directed from Moscow, refused to be either deceived, misled, or inveigled into joining the C. I. O.

The employees formed an organization of their own, and through the efforts of their officers they were able to adjust practically all of their grievances in a manner satisfactory not only to the employer but to the individual employees. They also secured wage increases which satisfied their membership as a whole. The C. I. O., finding itself unable to force itself upon the employees, followed the customary procedure of instigating charges before the National Labor Relations Board against the company. Because some members of the Labor Board, its investigators, trial and reviewing attorneys and regional directors had a decidedly "red" tinge, such charges usually were sustained, and in this particular instance, because a few department heads were members of the employees group, the National Labor Relations Board and the court ordered the disbanding of the employees' organization, and directed that the company should no longer recognize it as a bargaining unit.

EMPLOYEE ELECTION

By September of 1940 the office workers of M. Lowenstein & Sons had increased in number until there were some 450 employees. A general wage increase, effective as of January 1, 1941, has gone into effect. By employing their usual tactics of promising everything for the worker and charging the employer with all sorts of discrimination and unfair tactics and preaching class hatred, envy, and jealousy, the C. I. O. secured sufficient members so that its leaders felt safe in calling for an election. That election has been ordered, and it remains to be seen whether the office workers of this company will be fooled by the Communists who direct the activities of United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16, C. I. O.

No one is so foolish or so ignorant as to believe for one moment that all C. I. O. organizations are controlled by the Communists, or that their objectives all are improper or unworthy. Each case must rest upon its own foundation. Almost invariably, though not always, the character and the objective of an organization can be determined by its leadership.

The question which will shortly come before the employees of M. Lowenstein & Sons is whether they wish to have represent them as their bargaining agent with the company a union which has as its officials individuals who are Communists, remembering, of course, that a Communist is one who is always loyal to the "red" government of Russia, who believes in and endeavors to bring about by force the overthrow of this Government which protects him, which enables him to earn a livelihood, obtain an education, and live in comfort and peace.

At the coming election the office employees of this concern will determine for themselves whether they desire to be represented by loyal, patriotic Americans, willing to fight for and die for their country, or whether they wish to be represented by local 16, some of whose officers belong to that organization which would destroy not only the foundations of the Government under which we live but the very jobs from which those employees obtain their livelihood.

PATRIOTISM OR COMMUNISM

The issue is a simple one, and no office worker should be deceived by tirades against the employers, by extravagant promises of what can and will be done by local 16. Every employee should remember that local 16 does not create jobs, it does not give employment, it does not meet a pay roll; and if its purpose of creating dissatisfaction and discord in M. Lowenstein & Sons is accepted, it and affiliated organizations will go on throughout the industry in an effort to obtain control in that industry so that when, in the judgment of its officers, the proper time arrives it can strike successfully at national production, national preparedness, and security of the worker.

WHAT KIND OF ORGANIZATION IS LOCAL 16?

Let us take a look at the history of the organization which is attempting to gain control of the office workers in this industry.

WHAT COLOR IS LOCAL 16?

Local 16 had as its origin the office workers' union which was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League of the Communist Party. The office workers' union went out of existence when Moscow changed the policy of the Communists from dual unionism to infiltration, and its members went into the A. F. of L. union known as B. S. A. U., Local 12646. Shortly, however, their "red" activities attracted the attention of the A. F. of L. organization, which seized their books and withdrew their charter, and Moscow adherents then voted to join the C. I. O. Shortly thereafter, the A. F. of L. formed a new local, which today is known as the American Federation of Office Employees.

The Communists and the non-Communists in the new C. I. O. union got along fairly well until 1938, when Peter K. Hawley refused to permit the non-Communists to make speeches, present motions, or hold office. In 1939 the non-Communists voted to abandon the union, which by this time had changed its name to the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16, C. I. O.

In March 1939, 500 members of this union, however, outraged by its course of conduct, bolted local 16 and rejoined the A. F. of L. union. This was accomplished by resolution presented by Anna Gould. Hawley attempted to prevent the adoption of the resolution, but was unsuccessful. The resolution condemned local 16 as a "sorry failure as a trade-union," and asserted that it had been captured by an organized machine which violated its oath to serve the membership by placing the interests of the Communist Party above those of the union.

The resolution further charged that the officers of local 16 had made that organization subservient to a "party line." The officers of local 16 were further charged with "attempts to force its political views down the throats of the membership" and with inflicting "punitive reprisals" on "non-Communists."

It is this local 16, so condemned by the membership of the organization in 1939, which now seeks to rule the office employees of M. Lowenstein & Sons. Approximately 700 of the employees who were actively working in this union at the time proclaimed it to be Communist-dominated. It remains to be seen whether the present office employees wish to be represented by that sort of an organization.

Note what John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, testifying before the Dies committee, stated:

The United Office and Professional Workers of America, another C. I. O. affiliate. This organization has as its basic background the office workers' union, which was started and kept going by the Trade Union Unity League of the Communist Party. Its president is Lewis Merrill, a member of the Communist Party in New York City. He has attended numerous conventions of the A. F. of L. as a delegate from the B. S. A. U. local of the A. F. of L. At the Federation of Labor conventions he associated with and voted with known Communists. Ever since then he has been giving aid and comfort to Communist comrades whenever he possibly could. The headquarters of this union, which is a C. I. O. affiliate, is in New York City.

Here is a little more information about Lewis Merrill, who is international president of United Office and Professional Workers of America:

Merrill joined other radicals and "reds" in defending the Soviet purges in 1938. He was a member of the labor committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy. This movement discontinued its activities in 1940 as a result of the Dies committee exposures in connection with its Communist leadership and party-line activities.

Merrill was on the advisory council of the Society for Cultural Relations with Soviet Russia. He was associated with the John Reed clubs (communistic).

Merrill was a member of the committee demanding recognition of Russia in 1932.

Merrill was a member of the committee that formulated the "red" front organization, the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Merrill opposed anti-Communist legislation in 1938 in New York.

Merrill was chairman of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which has opposed the Dies committee and the Rapp-Coudert committee.

Merrill has objected to the dropping of the Communist Party from State ballots.

Merrill opposed the dismissal of Communist students from the University of Michigan on November 19, 1940.

Merrill is a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, which appears to be the New York branch of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and which is beyond question of a doubt a "red" front organization, and all of whose officers are extreme left-wingers and Communists. He was a member of the sponsoring committee of the testimonial dinner to Frank Boaz in 1941. Boaz is definitely pro-Russian and pro-Communist.

Merrill appealed for the freedom of Luis Prestes, head of the Brazilian Communist Party. He was also signer of the call for a meeting of the "red" front American Peace Mobilization, April 5 and 6, 1941. This movement has been definitely labeled as communistic by every responsible authority in America, and only recently the Dies committee produced conclusive proof that the American Peace Mobilization is another of the Moscow-controlled organizations aimed at disrupting our national unity and defense. It is interesting to note that this Communist document is also signed by Peter K. Hawley, and among the names of the organizations sponsoring the American Peace Mobilization there appears the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 16.

Merrill has recently attacked the President's proclamation that an indefinite national emergency exists.

A witness before the Dies committee—Mr. Zack—testified that Merrill was a member of the Communist Party. Merrill is one of the men whose advice and counsel are influential in guiding local 16.

Sam Baron, a witness before the Dies committee, testified in substance that he was acquainted with Lewis Merrill, and said that on two different occasions Merrill told him that he—Merrill—was a member of the Communist Party. The witness further stated that Merrill attended a political conference at the headquarters of the Communist Party in New York, at which he—Baron—was present.

PRESIDENT OF LOCAL 16 CHARGED AS A COMMUNIST

Testifying before the Dies committee, Sam Baron stated that Peter K. Hawley, president of the Local 16, was expelled from the progressive group of the U. O. P. W. A. because he was a Communist "plant" in that organization.

Still another witness, Benjamin Gitlow, testifying before the Dies committee, stated that he knew Lewis Merrill personally, though that was not Merrill's real name. He testified under oath that Merrill was a member of the Communist Party and so conducted the affairs of the union of which he was president, that all those office workers who were not Communists were compelled to break away from the organization and rejoin the A. F. of L.

LOCAL 16'S ORGANIZER

To show the general "red" tinge in Local 16, it might be said that Norma Aronson, general organizer, was formerly leader of the dual Communist Office Workers' Union of New York and that she is known as a Communist. Those who care to investigate can easily learn the character of the leadership of Local 16.

Never should it be forgotten that always, everywhere in this country of ours, whenever opportunity offers—and even if the opportunity does not offer, it is, if possible, created by the Communist Party organization—members of that organization, by one means or another, sometimes get themselves into other organizations for the sole purpose of aiding the Communist Party.

LOCAL 16 ATTACKS DIES COMMITTEE, DEFENDS COMMUNISTS

The charges made on December 29, 1939, by the U. O. P. W. A. over the signatures of Merrill and Turner, general secretary and treasurer, against the Dies committee were multigraphed by Local 16 of the U. O. P. W. A., and as late as 1941, Local 16 issued a statement in defense of the Communist Party and Communist leaders under the name, "Initiating Committee."

Local 9 of the U. O. P. W. A., Los Angeles, circulates the (Communist) International Labor Defense material, as do Local 24, Chicago, and Local 16. Local 27, Washington, D. C., gets out the propaganda for the (Communist) Workers Alliance. Local 5 issues the material for the Cleveland section of the Workers Alliance. Workers (Communist) School propaganda issues from Locals 7 and 16 in New York City, and Local 24 handles the material of the school in Cleveland. Local 18 in New York published a circular for the Workers Library Publishers, Inc., 39 East Twelfth Street, New York City, on November 11, 1939. This Workers Library is registered in the State Department as an agent of a foreign government. The circular included a catalog and price list of many Communist works by such writers as Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V. I. Lenin, Joseph Stalin, and so forth.

With this record of Merrill, Hawley, Aronson, and Local 16 itself in mind, remembering, as we must, that the members of the Communist Party, and that organization itself, is always active, always driving toward its goal, the destruction of our Government, that its procedure is to place party members in key positions in labor unions and other organizations, is it not vital that patriotic Americans should ever be on the alert to detect and suppress Communist activities wherever they may appear?

Only by the wide-awake, observant attention, followed by the vigorous action of not only industrial workers but office workers, not only in our larger cities but throughout the Nation, can the purpose of the Communist Party be defeated. Every loyal American, wherever he may live, however he may be employed, whether on farm, in mine, mill, factory, or office, should be alert to detect and to oppose the influence of the Communists.

It remains to be seen whether at the election to be held for the office workers of M. Lowenstein & Sons the office employees of that firm will make proper investigation to ascertain the character and the objective of those individuals and of that organization which seeks to represent them. Those employees are intelligent, they are patriotic; and if they be not misled by false propaganda, they can do much to destroy the foundation upon which the Communists, if here successful, will later base their drive to interfere with national defense and the orderly processes of our Government.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McINTYRE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROMJUE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PEARSON (at the request of Mr. COOPER), for 1 week, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold a further public hearing on the subject of royalty payments, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Tuesday, June 10, 1941, at 10 a. m. in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, new House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

599. A letter from the acting executive officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

600. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to place the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency on a calendar-year basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

601. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President (H. Doc. No. 247); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

602. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the draft of a proposed

bill to provide for a quinquennial census of industry and busines and for the collection of current statistics by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on the Census.

603. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

604. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

605. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for fire escapes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

606. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting reports that contracts have been awarded under the authority of this act as follows: Schedule 5997—Aviators' helmets, bid opening April 11, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

607. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the importation of defense articles by, or on behalf of, the United States free of import duty or import tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

608. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

609. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

610. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of Labor; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

611. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of lists of papers by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

612. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

613. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of lists of papers by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

614. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of photographic negatives by the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

615. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for the disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

616. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

617. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting recommendation for disposition of a list of papers by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

618. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, reexamination of Bayou du Large, La., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

619. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 5158 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 90), to authorize national banks to pledge assets to secure deposits of funds in official custody of public officers of a state or political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

620. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting chapter I of part 4 of the Commission's overall report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 246); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

621. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1935, 1937, 1938, and 1939 amounting to $3,084.71, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 amounting to $10,092,400, in all $10,095,484.71, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

622. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the executive branch of the Government for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

623. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the American Battle Monuments Commission (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

624. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, in the amount of $87,000 (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

625. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of $2,750,000, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 252); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4473, a bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 1409. A bill designating building guards employed in buildings under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency as United States Building Police, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 4911. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5002. A bill to exempt from national and municipal taxation the property, both real and personal, of the George Washington University Hospital, title being in the name of the George Washington University; the Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital; the Episcopal Eye, Ear, and Throat Hospital; the National Homeopathic Hospital, title being in the name of the National Homeopathic Hospital Association; the Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia; the Providence Hospital, title being in the name of the Directors of Providence Hospital of Washington City, District of Columbia; the Garfield Memorial Hospital; the Sibley Hospital, title being in the name of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital; and the Georgetown Hospital, title being in the name of the president and directors of Georgetown College; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 5003. A bill to create a board to be known as the Accident Prevention Board, composed of three members whose duties shall be to foster, promote, and develop the safety of the wage earners of the District of Columbia in relation to their working conditions; enforce such safety laws as exist and others that may be from time to time enacted; making such inspections and investigations as are necessary; collect and compile statistical information; to require employers to keep their places of employment safe; to require employers to keep records and to furnish Accident Prevention Board with complete, detailed reports relative to all accidents; to bring necessary suits and institute such prosecutions as may be necessary to enforce the safety laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5004. A bill providing for an examination and survey of the Little Calumet River, Ind.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5005. A bill to authorize the enrollment in the Civilian Conservation Corps of men honorably discharged from the military and naval forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GUYER of Kansas:

H. R. 5006. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to retain Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, United States Army, on active duty with combat troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5007. A bill to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5008. A bill to authorize a naval ordnance laboratory at the Navy Yard, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 5009. A bill authorizing the employment of additional personnel in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUYER of Kansas:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing reproduction in colors of the Howard Chandler Christy painting The Signing of the Constitution, and the printing of 300,000 copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider legislation providing for the prohibition of vice in, and in the vicinity of, Army camps, Government-owned plants, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the general welfare bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to immediate aid to Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their house simple resolution No 315, with reference to the establishment of shipyards; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their senate concurrent resolution No. 20, with reference to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 5010. A bill for the relief of James Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 5011. A bill granting a pension to Edward Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 5012. A bill for the relief of Raymond Crosby; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5013. A bill for the relief of James P. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1323. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the importation of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1324. Also, petition of the Society of the Cincinnati, Vineyard Haven, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to printing of the writings of George Washington; to the Committee on Printing.

1325. Also, petition of the Texas Ports Association, Galveston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Building of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1326. Also, petition of the town of Harrison, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to sugar legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1327. Also, petition of the Forward Trinity Valley Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to congressional approval of the Trinity Valley project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1328. Also, petition of I. O. O. F., Grand Lodge of Georgia, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1329. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, St. Louis Southwestern Railway, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence River navigation and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1330. Also, petition of the Fight for Freedom Committee, signed by 316 citizens of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1331. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of various citizens of Santa Clara County, Calif., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1332. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Elkhorn, Wis., supporting Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors and the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1333. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of 699 residents of Lawrence, Mass., opposing the passage of any compulsory Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1334. Also, resolutions adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring legislation for the preservation of the cane-sugar industry and opposing any change in existing Federal law that would create unemployment in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and detract from existing good will between the United States and the Latin-American countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1335. Also, resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State convention of the Knights of Columbus, affirming belief in the policy of nonintervention by our armed forces in foreign wars which do not concern the United States; favoring an early negotiated peace; approving the Hoover plan for relief of famished European people; and opposing induction of girls of draft age into compulsory service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1336. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of sundry residents of Schenectady, N. Y., opposing passage of House bills 6 and 1019; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1337. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Emily McCulloch, of Pawtucket, R. I., and 35 others, opposing Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1338. Also, petition of Mary W. Whitford and others, of Rhode Island, to defend the United States of America by defending the health and morale of the selectees by prohibiting prostitution and the trade in alcoholic beverages by passing House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1339. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, endorsing the provisions of House bill 4545 and requesting that flood-control improvements not within the plans of the United States engineers be included as a part of the projects to be financed by money appropriated by House bill 4545; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1340. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition signed by numerous residents of Wichita, Kans., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1341. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of the Laconian Toastmasters Club, of El Centro, Calif., Robert C. Rayburn, president, Alan Gillespie, secretary-treasurer, relative to the group's stand against unnecessary strikes and lock-outs in the defense industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1342. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of 147 citizens of Atlantic, Iowa, urging the Congress of the United States to bring about the passage of House bill 4000, a bill to stop the sale of all alcoholic beverages, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the Army and naval camps, and to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Navy to get zones sufficiently wide around all Army and Navy training camps to prevent taverns and vice districts in close proximity thereto; enactment of this legislation is urged in the interest of efficiency, health, and safety of our soldiers and general morale of the people throughout the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1343. Also, petition of 39 citizens of Council Bluffs, Glenwood, and Silver City, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, identical bills now pending in the Congress, these bills propose that a majority vote of the barbers of the District of Columbia shall determine upon what day all barber shops shall be closed, and that those who observe another day than Sunday as holy time must also observe Sunday or forfeit their licenses and have their businesses confiscated; the signers of the petition are opposed to the compulsory observance of any religious day, and also the injustice demanding that those who observe another day forfeit 2 days of income from each week; the petitioners, in asserting their opposition to the bill, state that equal rights for all barbers should be provided without designating the specific day upon which all barbers must close their shops; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1344. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of R. E. Bryant, of Frost, Tex., opposing proposed legislation to defer men above 27 years of age for Army service; to the Committee on Military Service.

1345. Also, petition of E. F. Wright, of Mexia, Tex., favoring House bill 3383; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1346. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Ralph L. Bennett, of Terre Haute, Ind., and 124 others, opposing Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1347. Also, petition of J. R. Parrish, of Danville, Ind., and 27 others, opposing Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1348. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., endorsing the provisions of House bill 4545 and requesting its Congressmen to make every effort to see that improvements suggested by the county board be included with the improvements suggested by the United States Army engineers and be made a part of the project to be financed by money appropriated by House bill 4545; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1349. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully memorializing the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to make a survey and to study the possibilities of the development of Highway 20 in the State of California, and to take such steps in the development of the

highway as such survey and study shall justify; to the Committee on Roads.

1350. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Violet Rader and 17 other citizens of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of House bill 2475, which proposes protection to the service men of the United States in connection with the sale of alcoholic liquors and the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1351. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of C. W. Whitman and other railroad employees of Newark, Ohio, protesting against the completion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1352. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of the members of the Methodist Church, Meshoppen, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1353. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Mrs. Martin Stoutenberg and 11 other citizens, of Osage, Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1354. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Syrian and Lebanese American Federation of the Eastern States, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national defense and patriotism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1355. Also, petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of the Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs; to the Committee on Flood Control.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, who holdest in Thy hand the destinies of all mankind: We beeseech Thee to look upon our Nation with Thy special care and fatherliness, quickening in us thoughts that beget true emotions, which, passing into action, shall make our lives serviceable, if not sublime, as, in imitation of Thy blessed Son, we strive to work the work of God while it is day.

Dispel all gloom and fear that may oppress the hearts of any, and, while we ask for the grace of humility for all upon whose shoulders have been placed the responsibilities of Government, we beseech Thee, especially to endue our leaders with strength and the courage that is born of justice, that right may prevail, manifesting itself on the part of everyone in rectitude of personal conduct, and a wholehearted loyalty to our country and the ideals for which it stands.

And now we pray for all who shall foregather here today, and as they strive to advance in singleness of heart Thy purposes for America, be Thou near them to defend them, within them to refresh them, about them to preserve them, before them to lead them, behind them to justify them, and above them to bless them. All of which we ask in our dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, June 9, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 774) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 4660. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935; and

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The Vice President laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 65)

A communication from the President of the United States submitting a proposed amendment to the Budget for 1942 for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, amounting to $50,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented by Senators and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LODGE:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of South Haven, Ashton, Winfield, and Arkansas City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing Congress to enact promptly House bill 1036, known as the general-welfare bill, providing for a national old-age retirement system, etc.; to the Committee on Finance. (See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate on the 5th instant by the Acting President pro tempore, p. 4732, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging that all possible aid be promptly rendered to Great Britain, including patrols and the convoying of ships by the United States Navy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (See memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate on the 5th instant by the Acting President pro tempore, p. 4732, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Resolution relating to the preservation of moral conditions in the vicinity of Army and naval camps and plants erected and maintained by the Federal Government in providing for the national defense

"*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring):*

"SECTION 1. That the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring) respectfully petition the Congress of the United States of America to give early consideration to legislation suppressing and prohibiting all forms of vice, including the sale of intoxicating beverages, on, in, and in the vicinity of all plants owned, leased, or maintained by the United States of America for national defense, including all reservations, camps, bases, training schools, barracks, and other areas used for the quartering, training, or encampment of the armed forces of the Army and Navy of the United States.

"SEC. 2. *Be it further resolved*, That the secretary of state forthwith prepare suitable copies of this resolution and cause the same to be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairmen of the several committees on Army and naval affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 31, 1941."

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 143

"Whereas it appears from present reports that a serious effort is now being made to induce the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps toward completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power treaty; and

"Whereas the Senate of the State of Texas, although actuated by every desire to cooperate with the Government in its plans for our national defense, firmly believes that such a development would not be in the public interest in any manner, but would be hostile to the best interests of the State of Texas and of the United States, as it would disrupt and demoralize the transportation systems of the United States, land and water, and would disastrously affect the economic welfare of the country, and would particularly work a hardship on the Texas ports, and would cause irreparable injury to a large percentage of the public interests and labor of this State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas*, That it go on record as being strongly opposed to this project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of Texas, be memorialized and requested to use their utmost influence in opposition to said project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the secretary of

the United States Senate, Col. Edwin A. Halsey; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Sam Rayburn; and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of Texas."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 148

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, House Resolution No. 4816, the purpose of which is to give the right of eminent domain to interstate oil pipe lines; and

"Whereas the citizens of the State of Texas are interested in the same right being given to interstate gas pipe lines which afford a market for Texas gas, which is an essential fuel in defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That the Congress of the United States be requested to amend said House Resolution No. 4816 so that it will include gas pipe lines and give said pipe lines the right of eminent domain in the event said act is finally passed; and be is further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of Texas be instruted to forward copies of this resolution to each Member of Congress from Texas and to the Secretary of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs;

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 50

"Whereas this Nation is now in the midst of a vast preparedness and rearmament program for the protection of our Nation and homes; and

"Whereas there exists a monster dictator in Europe who is trying to destroy all democratic nations; and

"Whereas this Nation has already drafted her young manhood for protection; and

"Whereas the United States has already called upon the people to give their money so that our Nation can have sufficient money to finance this vast program; and

"Whereas money, men, capital, and labor are all needed to better prepare our Nation to meet this great emergency; and

"Whereas our great citizenship is responding with money and men; and

"Whereas, in order to further the national defense, it is essential that there be full cooperation between capital and labor and all branches of our Government; and

"Whereas there are instances where groups of capital and labor, by their failure to cooperate, are seriously impeding and endangering the defense program; and

"Whereas unless capital and labor do respond as they should the same tragic end will happen to this Nation that has already happened to democratic nations of Europe who were unprepared: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sentiment, will, and desire of the Texas Legislature that the Congress of the United States immediately take such steps as may be necessary to properly prepare these United States of America to defend themselves from any aggressor from within or from without; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress from Texas, to each United States Senator from Texas, to the Vice President of the United States, and to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt."

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD presented a letter from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke, Va., transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the national affairs committee of that chamber, which letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF ROANOKE, VA., INC.,
April 16, 1941.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the request of our committee on national affairs I enclose copy of a resolution which the committee adopted at a meeting on April 15, which you observe sets forth the committee's reasons for opposing the development of the St. Lawrence shipway as a defense project.

You will recall that this chamber has on various occasions from November 20, 1932, opposed the development of the St. Lawrence waterway by the Government of the United States.

Our committee will appreciate very much your further consideration of the matter.

Yours sincerely,
B. F. MOOMAW, *Secretary.*

Resolution passed by the national affairs committee of the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce on April 15, 1941

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke, Va., after a careful study, on November 20, 1932, adopted a resolution opposing ratification of a pending treaty providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and

Whereas the declaration of policy expressed in said resolution has ever since been adhered to by this chamber with the consistent support of our Representatives in the Congress and the Senate; and

Whereas the executive department of our Government has recently sought to revive this unsound project in the guise of a defense measure; and

Whereas judged solely from the standpoint of national-defense requirements this proposed adventure is devoid of merit because—

(1) The emergency we face requires action now and not 5 years hence, the minimum time which must elapse before the sponsors of this plant promise us it can be placed in operation.

(2) The concentration of shipbuilding facilities on an estuary more vulnerable than the Panama Canal with a depth that will not admit the passage of a capital ship but only destroyers and light flotilla craft which can be built in dozens of existing harbors scattered along our coast line ignores all the lessons to be learned from the present war.

(3) The embarkation of so much of our national wealth and productive capacity as the prosecution of this enterprise would require will definitely embarrass and delay our production of weapons needed now for the defense of democracy to which we are committed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence shipway at this time is detrimental to the successful defense of the United States and that the Senators and Representatives of this State be respectfully requested to oppose the present effort to launch this project as a defense measure.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES, ETC.

Mr. BYRD presented resolutions and letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens and organizations in the State of Virginia, and elsewhere in the United States, relating to the control of strikes in defense industries, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROANOKE, VA., *May 28, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise that we, the Navy Mothers Club of Roanoke, Va., which is a club made up of mothers of Navy boys actually in service, our purpose in mind to support the Government in every way possible in the national-defense move and at the same time aid our boys in every way possible, have adopted unanimously an appeal to all workers throughout the Nation to give all support possible and stay away from strikes and lay-offs under all circumstances; and if and when they have difficulties, to take them up before the proper board and work them out in the form of arbitration, but by all means keep on working during the course of such procedure.

For your information we are enclosing a copy of this resolution, which has already been run in several of our Roanoke newspapers. I am glad to advise that the newspaper in this city approved of this move 100 percent and has cooperated with us perfectly.

We trust that this move will benefit the national defense in some small way and will meet with your approval 100 percent; and if so, we would greatly appreciate you passing the message on as you see fit to do, either through local or national publication, or both.

With kindest regards, we remain,
Yours respectfully,
PEARL A. PROFFIT,
Commander, Roanoke Local Organization.

STRIKE DENOUNCED—NAVY MOTHERS TAKE ACTION

Opposition to all strikes during the present national emergency is voiced in a resolution unanimously adopted by the Roanoke Navy Mothers Club and released by Mrs. Pearl Proffit, commander, yesterday. A copy of the resolution, adopted by 53 members, is being sent to the national organization

The resolution is as follows:

"We, the Navy Mothers Club of Roanoke, wish to go on record as opposed to any strike for whatever cause in any organization producing any vital defense materials in this time of emergency.

"Since the lives of our boys may depend upon their having proper and sufficient equipment to meet any need, and since they are willing to offer their lives if necessary for the welfare of our country, we feel that no worker has the right to put his personal demand for higher wages, shorter hours, or any other personal advantages above the welfare of our country at the present time

"We feel that a safe country in which the worker can live and rear his family would be of greater value to him than any increase in wages could ever be. We believe that any worker who has a grievance against his employer should be allowed to submit that grievance to a neutral board, but because of his patriotism and his love of his country he should keep on working to produce materials so vitally needed for our defense today.

"Our only hope for preserving our democratic form of government for future generations lies in the willingness of each citizen of our country to do his part in this emergency regardless of whatever sacrifice it may demand, to preserve the welfare and freedom of our beloved Nation."

At a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., held in the courthouse at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it appears to this board that the widespread labor disturbances and strikes in

industrial plants charged with the production of defense materials constitute a serious threat to the safety of our Nation; and

"Whereas it appears that some of those directing the affairs of labor are making deliberate and continuous attempts to delay the Nation's program of defense by unreasonable and exorbitant demands of a selfish nature, which, in addition to hampering the production of defense materials, also cause dissension and controversy at a time when complete accord and sacrifice is essential to the Nation's safety; and

"Whereas it appears that such efforts as have been made by Federal authorities to curb these disorders and strikes in defense plants have met with but scant success: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., in regular meeting assembled at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941:

"(1) That this board places itself on record as opposing and condemning labor disturbances and strikes in defense plants as being dangerous to the welfare of the Nation during the present emergency.

"(2) That we hereby express to our Senators and Congressmen and others in authority at the seat of the Government our condemnation of and opposition to such disturbances and strikes.

"(3) That we respectfully request that appropriate action be taken by Congress to immediately provide such laws and penalties as may be necessary to prohibit and prevent such disturbances during the present emergency; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of this board be authorized and instructed to certify a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the Secretary of War; to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Secretary of Labor; to each Representative in Congress from Virginia; and to the representatives of the press."

Unanimously adopted at regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, Va., in regular meeting at Lawrenceville, Va., this the 26th day of May 1941.

W. E. ELMORE,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors,
Brunswick County, Va.

Whereas a national emergency exists, and our great Government finds its existence challenged by forces beyond our borders, and a duty rests upon all good Americans to lend full support to our President in his efforts to prepare this Nation for the defense of our form of government; and

Whereas our young men are being called upon to give of their time and talent in an all-out preparation of the military defense of the Western Hemisphere, and the young men are responding in the typical American spirit, and it has come to the attention of the membership of the American Legion, department of Virginia, that there are strikes and other labor disputes prevalent in some of our defense industries which are delaying the speedy production of materials necessary in the defense of our country; and

Whereas it is the belief of the American Legion that all men in all walks of life should subordinate their personal interest in the interest of the United States of America during this emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the fifth district of the American Legion, Department of Virginia, in convention assembled in the city of Danville this 6th day of April 1941, That the Honorable CARTER GLASS, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, Members of the United States Senate from Virginia, and the Virginia delegation of the House of Representatives, be, and they are hereby, petitioned to support legislation as may be necessary to prohibit strikes, lockouts, or other labor disputes that will in any way tend to hinder or delay the speedy production of armaments and other supplies necessary for our all-out effort against aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion is not opposed to organized labor, but it does deplore in no uncertain terms prevailing conditions at this time which tend to deprive our comrades in arms of the necessary materials and supplies for proper training; and be it further

Resolved, That the department adjutant, W. Glenn Elliott, be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy hereof to Senator CARTER GLASS, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and to each Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia and deliver a copy hereof to the press.

J. B. ALLMAN, *Chairman,*
F. W. KAPPES,
RALEIGH M. FELTON,
Resolutions Committee.

Adopted by unanimous vote of the convention.

Transmitted from the American Legion, department of Virginia.

W. GLENN ELLIOTT,
Department Adjutant.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, Va., May 15, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Senator from Virginia, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by a large group of Legionnaires, members of the auxiliary, and their guests, following the seventh district convention held in Charlottesville, May 14:

"A group of members of the American Legion, the American Legion Auxiliary, and their guests from the seventh district and many sections of Virginia, assembled at this banquet in Charlottesville, Va., go on record as requesting that the President of the United States declare a national emergency to exist, so that our national-defense plans shall not be retarded by strikes or any other agency whatsoever."

We trust that this resolution meets with your approval and that we may have your support in our desire to have the President declare a state of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

W. GLENN ELLIOTT.

At a joint meeting of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, of Berryville-Winchester, Va., held on the 28th day of May 1941 in the American Legion Community Building at Berryville, Va., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it appears to these two organizations that the widespread labor disturbances and strikes in industrial plants charged with the production of defense materials constitute a serious threat to the safety of our Nation; and

"Whereas it appears that some of those directing the affairs of labor are making deliberate and continuous attempts to delay the Nation's program of defense by unreasonable and exorbitant demands of a selfish nature, which, in addition to hampering the production of defense materials, also causes dissension and controversy at a time when complete accord and sacrifice is essential to the Nation's safety; and

"Whereas it appears that such efforts as have been made by Federal authorities to curb these disorders and strikes in defense plants have met with but scant success: Therefore be it

"Resolved by Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, in joint session assembled at Berryville, Va., this 28th day of May 1941—

"(1) That this post and voiture place themselves on record as opposing and condemning labor disturbances and strikes in defense plants as being dangerous to the welfare of the Nation during the present emergency.

"(2) That we hereby express to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States our condemnation of and opposition to such disturbances and strikes.

"(3) That we respectfully request that appropriate action be taken by the Congress of the United States to immediately provide such laws and penalties as may be necessary to prevent and prohibit such disturbances during the present emergency; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the commander and adjutant of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, and the chef de gare and correspondent of Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, be authorized and instructed to certify a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Labor, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from Virginia, and to representatives of the press."

Unanimously adopted at a joint meeting of Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia, and Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight Society, Le Departement de Virginie, in joint session at Berryville, Va., this 28th day of May 1941.

Official:

H. B. HARRIS,
Commander, Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia.

HAROLD C. SCHENER,
Adjutant, Lloyd Williams Post, No. 41, the American Legion, Department of Virginia.

ROBERT D. BEETON,
Chef de Gare, Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, Virginia.

JOHN E. ZOMBRO,
Correspondent, Shenandoah Valley Voiture, No. 1078, Forty and Eight, Virginia.

DANVILLE, VA., *March 3, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Brosville Council, No. 51, Jr. O. U. A. M., which is composed of businessmen and farmers, is alarmed at the numerous news accounts from many sections of our country indicating that strikes, delays, and stoppages in our vital industries are impeding the progress of our national-defense program at a time when full speed ahead should be the watchword of every patriotic American citizen.

This council does not criticize either capital or labor. However, in view of the recognized fact that wages paid American labor, dividends enjoyed by American industry, and living standards of American people are incomparable throughout the entire world, and in view of the further fact that thousands upon thousands of American youth are willing to serve their country for a nominal compensation, we feel that this is no time to tolerate petty quibbling from either capital or labor.

We believe in the fundamental principles of collective bargaining, but not to the extent of paralyzing our national-defense program while the bargaining is in progress.

In this hour of national emergency we demand that capital and labor together shall ban all strikes, delays, and stoppages in every vital defense industry pending a settlement of any and all grievances by the proper authorities.

In this hour of national emergency we feel that you, our representative, should know that we view this entire situation with in-

creasing alarm and that we expect you to take every necessary step to insure the elimination of all strikes, delays, and stoppages in our national-defense program, both in Virginia and throughout the country at large.

Very truly yours,

BROSVILLE COUNCIL, No. 51,
JR. O. U. A. M., BROSVILLE, VA.,
By F. MARTIN COLLIE,
Acting Councilor.
By H. C. ASHWORTH,
Recording Secretary.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,
April 15, 1941.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the annual meeting of John C. Culin Post, No. 1827, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held at their club rooms here last night, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and I was instructed by the post to transmit a copy of same to you and to inform you that our organization here is 100 percent behind you in your fight to prevent subversive strikes and unpatriotic actions by any person or group of persons which tend to nullify our preparedness program.

We do not fail to realize the seriousness of the present war situation, and we assure you that we are ready to answer the call and do the job as we did in 1918. We are proud to know we have a man of your foresight, honesty, and integrity in the United States Senate to look after the best interest of all classes.

I beg to remain with best wishes

Sincerely yours,

M. H. CASON,
Adjutant, John C. Culin Post, 1827,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Resolution attached hereto.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., *April 14, 1941.*

Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of John C. Culin Post, No. 1827, V. F. W

"Whereas there have been and now are being conducted strikes, sit-downs, and all kinds of subversive actions in various industries, factories, and plants and businesses in various parts of the United States, which are seriously hampering the defense and aid-to-other-democracies program of the United States; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Labor, who is under the direction of the President, has failed to put a stop to such strikes, sabotage, and un-American activities, which are disloyal to the men who have been and are being conscripted to train to defend this great country of ours: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by this post in regular meeting assembled,* That we endorse the speech of our great Senator BYRD, delivered before the United States Senate on March 27, 1941, and that we urge him to continue his efforts to put an end to all subversive actions by any group, person, or persons, official or otherwise, in order that we may present a united front with 100 percent of production and 100-percent American loyalty."

Proposed by Ernest R. Duff, P. C.

Seconded by Judge J. Callan Brooks, P. C.

Attest:

M. H. CASON, *Adjutant.*

KIWANIS CLUB OF
VICTORIA-KENBRIDGE, INC.,
Kenbridge, Va., May 26, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F BYRD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Victoria-Kenbridge Kiwanis Club of Lunenburg County, Va., has directed me as its secretary to send you a resolution entered at its regular meeting, held on Thursday, May 22, which you will find enclosed herewith.

We wish to assure you of our unified interest and cooperation with the program of national defense, and we shall be ready and willing at all times to help in any way possible to make it a complete success.

With kindest personal regards, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Rev. F. A. SAPP, *Secretary.*

Inasmuch as the right to live as free men has been denied certain nations of the world and has been challenged in certain others, and inasmuch as this right in our Nation is thereby imperiled, it is hereby

"*Resolved by the Victoria-Kenbridge Kiwanis Club of Lunenburg County, Va., in regular meeting, assembled this, the 22d day of May 1941,* That we wholeheartedly and unreservedly approve the national-defense program;

That we will by all means that we can employ support every effort to carry it out;

That we urge a declaration of policy by the President of the United States, that no one has the right to strike against public safety;

That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to the United States Senators from this State and to the Members of the United States House of Representatives from this district, and to the proper Kiwanis officials.

The Hanover County Board of Agriculture, through a vote by mail over their signatures, have endorsed the following resolution. I herewith transmit it to the Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States, and personally, considering this a responsibility of the Executive, I am sending a copy to President Roosevelt:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defense of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligation in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the members of the Hanover County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Hanover County Board of Agriculture through a ballot by mail, March 27, 1941.

Sincerely,

C. E. MYERS,
Chairman, Hanover County
Board of Agriculture.

NORTH RICHMOND POST, No. 38,
Richmond, Va., March 22, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am quoting below a resolution unanimously adopted by North Richmond Post, No. 38, of the American Legion, Department of Virginia, at their regular meeting on March 15, 1941:

"*Be it resolved by North Richmond Post, No. 38, American Legion, of Richmond, Va.,* That while this post is not opposed to collective bargaining, it feels that during the period of emergency caused by the passage of the lease-lend bill to aid the democracies all difficulties between labor and employers should be settled by mediation, without recourse to strikes; and this post urges the President of the United States and the Congress to take such action as may be necessary to accomplish that end; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the post; that a copy be sent to the President of the United States; that a copy be sent to the Senators from Virginia; and that a copy be sent to the Representative in Congress from this district."

Respectfully,

C. F. WASSER, *Adjutant.*

THE YOUNG MEN'S CLUB OF DANVILLE,
Danville, Va., February 26, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Young Men's Club of Danville, Va., which is composed of business and professional men, is alarmed at the numerous news accounts from many sections of our country indicating that strikes, delays, and stoppages in our vital industries are impeding the progress of our national-defense program at a time when full speed ahead should be the watchword of every patriotic American citizen.

This club does not criticize either capital or labor. However, in view of the recognized fact that wages paid American labor, dividends enjoyed by American industry, and living standards of American people are incomparable throughout the entire world, and in view of the further fact that thousands upon thousands of American youth are willing to serve their country for a nominal compensation, we feel that this is no time to tolerate petty quibbling from either capital or labor.

We believe in the fundamental principles of collective bargaining, but not to the extent of paralyzing our national-defense program while the bargaining is in progress.

In this hour of national emergency we demand that capital and labor together shall ban all strikes, delays, and stoppages in every vital defense industry pending a settlement of any and all grievances by the proper authorities.

In this hour of national emergency we feel that you, our representative, should know that we view the entire situation with increasing alarm and that we expect you to take every necessary step to insure the elimination of all strikes, delays, and stoppages in our national-defense program, both in Virginia and throughout the country at large.

Very truly yours,

W. H. DODSON, JR.,
Secretary, Young Men's
Club of Danville, Va.

MAY, SIMPKINS & YOUNG,
Richmond, Va., May 28, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator, State of
Virginia, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The president of the Ruritan Club of Henry District, Hanover County, has asked that I inform you that a resolution was passed by the Ruritan Club of Henry District at its last meeting to the following effect:

"*Resolved,* That the Ruritan Club of Henry District, Hanover County, go on record as being of the opinion that strikes in defense industries at this time are subversive to the national welfare and are unfair to those called upon to make great sacrifices under the terms of the Selective Service Act; and that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator GLASS,

Senator BYRD, and Representative SATTERFIELD."

I could not get the secretary this morning to certify the resolution, and I am therefore merely advising you of it. Certified copies will be sent to you by the secretary.

We as a club feel, and I personally feel, very strongly that our Government should do something, if possible, to prevent a small minority of workers from agitating unfairly and thereby causing strikes which definitely cripple our defense effort.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD P. SIMPKINS, JR.

BEAVERDAM, VA., *April 29, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Member of the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The eighth grade of the Beaverdam High School unanimously passed the following resolutions:

1. That strikes in national-defense industries be eliminated by appropriate legislation.

2. That strikers receiving over $4 per diem be placed in the Army of the United States with the men who are earning $21 per month.

3. That Congress take immediate steps to settle the soft-coal strike, authorizing the Government to operate the mines if such is deemed necessary.

Yours very truly,

DEAN HALL,
Chairman of the Committee on
Resolutions of the Eighth Grade,
Beaverdam High School.

At a meeting, April 4, 1941, of the executive committee, Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, an organization of Princess Anne County farmers, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations and other interferences in essential defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the executive committee of the Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Princess Anne County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held April 4, 1941.

M. B. FLANAGAN,
Chairman.
H. W. OZLIN,
Secretary.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
AUGUSTA-STAUNTON POST, 2216,
Staunton, Va., April 21, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRD: Our organization, Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has observed very keenly the serious situation caused by strikes when defense orders are involved, and the most of them apparently are called for no justifiable reason whatsoever.

We refer you specifically to the Allis-Chalmers strike, the one at Ford Motor Co., the soft-coal strike which has been in progress since April 1 and is now affecting our defense industries, the complete tie-up in some of our vital airplane and steel plants, and at present a strike is threatening in General Motors.

The situation is gnawing at the heartstrings of our defense program. It is weakening the morale of the boys who have been conscripted for 1 year's training, for they dislike to see some slacker walk out on strike who is already receiving from $10 to $15 a day, when they are serving their country as best they know how at $21 per month, and our organization is heartily in favor of the Conscription Act.

By permitting this condition to exist, our Government is playing to the hands of the Axis Powers, and at a recent meeting of Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, a motion was made and unanimously adopted that letters be written to our representatives in the Senate and Congress, urging that necessary legislation be enacted to prevent future recurrences and straighten out the existing strike situation. Time has proven that the condition will not adjust itself, for we have been confronted with this problem now for a period of years.

Your assistance and support in providing measures to relieve this situation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

W. I. WOODDELL. *Adjutant.*

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF VIRGINIA,
ROBERT E. CRAIGHILL CAMP, NO. 11,
Lynchburg, Va., April 19, 1941.

The Robert E. Craighill Camp Lynchburg, Department of Virginia, United Spanish War Veterans and its auxiliary, in a joint meeting, adopted a resolution in tenor as follows:

(a) That strikes and lock-outs in plants engaged in war work are a menace to the national security and should be prevented.

(b) That the national administration has been lax in its handling of such strikes, and has therefore been derelict in its duty to the public.

(c) That all strikes and lock-outs in war work shall be prevented. But such prevention should not be taken at the expense of the general public, as has almost uniformly been done in settling recent strikes.

(d) That the Senators and Representatives from Virginia be requested to use their utmost endeavors to safeguard the interest of the general public in this matter.

ROBERT E. CRAIGHILL CAMP,
L. E. WINGFIELD, *Adjutant.*

BRISTOL LODGE, NO. 232, B. P. O. ELKS,
Bristol, Tenn., April 17, 1941.

Hon. HARRY BYRD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of Bristol, Tenn.-Va. Lodge No. 232, B. P. O. Elks, held Wednesday evening, April 16, 1941:

"Whereas it is apparent that a national emergency exists due to strikes in industrial plants vital to national defense and that it is further apparent that delayed settlement of these strikes tends to weaken and destroy national unity and that it is further apparent that something drastic should be done immediately to alleviate the situation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by Bristol, Tenn.-Va., Lodge No. 232, B. P. O. Elks*, That it is the opinion of the lodge that the Government of the United States of America should take such prompt and immediate action in the premises as is necessary to alleviate the situation, going so far as to take over the temporary control and management of the industrial plants so affected by said strikes and mustering the management and workers thereof into the Regular Army of the United States of America; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to our Senators of Tennessee and Virginia, and our Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America from the First District of Tennessee, and the Ninth District of Virginia."

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL] C. F. HENRITZE,
Secretary, Bristol, Tenn., Lodge No. 232, B. P. O. Elks.

INTERNATIONAL LIONS CLUB,
Staunton, Va., April 15, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At the last meeting of the Lions Club of Staunton the motion was made and unanimously carried that we write our Representatives in Congress relative to our position in the present labor situation in this country.

The Lions Club endorsed your recent stand taken in labor disputes and your effort to have the question referred to the agency recently set up by the Federal Government for mediation and the settlement of grievances of labor unions.

We believe that appropriate action should be taken immediately by Congress to prevent any strikes that interfere with any part of the national-defense program. We further believe that the names, addresses, and compensation received by labor leaders and agitators together with their party affiliations should be made public through the press of the entire United States.

We feel that our reaction to the present labor situation is typical of that of the public generally throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. STAUDERMAN,
President.

LADIES' AUXILIARY,
AUGUSTA-STAUNTON POST, NO. 2216,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Staunton, Va., April 15, 1941.

HON HARRY F. BYRD,
Senator, Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: At a regular meeting of the Ladies Auxiliary to Augusta-Staunton Post, No. 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a motion was made and unanimously carried that we write our Representatives in Congress relative to our position in the present labor situation in this country.

The auxiliary endorsed your recent stand taken in labor disputes and your effort to have the question referred to the agency recently set up by the Federal Government for mediation for the settlement of grievances of labor unions.

We believe that appropriate action should be taken immediately by Congress to prevent any strikes that interfere with any part of the national-defense program. We further believe that the names, addresses, and compensation received by labor leaders and agitators together with their party affiliations should be made public through the press of the entire United States.

We also feel that our reaction to the present labor situation is typical of that of the general public throughout the country.

Sincerely,

AILEEN BROWN, *President.*

COMMITTEE TO DEFEND AMERICA
BY AIDING THE ALLIES,
Richmond, Va., April 7, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: At a meeting of our executive committee held today, I was instructed to

write you and express our endorsement and appreciation of the speech made by you on March 27, on the subject of control of strikes in defense industries.

We believe that we are expressing the views of our committee membership and the thinking element of your constituency in this section, when we say that the desperateness of the shipping situation is not generally appreciated.

We sincerely hope that you will continue your efforts to speed up production of all defense materials and also to urge that whatever steps may be necessary to get essential materials to England, Greece, and Yugoslavia, even though American naval vessels have to be used to insure delivery.

Very truly yours,

OLIVER J. SANDS,
Chairman.

ROANOKE, VA., *March 29, 1941.*

Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our official Representative in Washington, we, the undersigned engineers and draftsmen of the Virginia Bridge Co. and loyal citizens of the United States, are alarmed and exasperated at the growing number and extent of strikes affecting sorely needed defense materials.

We are working long hours and are doing everything humanly possible to complete our part of defense contracts in the shortest possible time, but our effort will avail nothing if others who, according to reports, under questionable leadership, are allowed by their actions to in any way stop or retard our united effort to produce all things necessary for our safety and for the defense of our way of life.

We therefore ask that you use your best efforts to secure a fair and appropriate law which will stop these strike delays and enable those who want to work to do so without intimidation or restraint.

We feel strongly that we workers are defenders of our country and should be encouraged and protected in our vital task.

Respectfully yours,

J. Fred Hoefer, Frank H. Wade, Wista H. Scott, Everett L. Webster, Alfred Thomas, D. W. Reed, Jr., W. P. Noptsinger, A. M. Merchent, R. L. Little, T. E. Greene, G. L. Nininger, Stanley Forbes, O. G. Adkins, Leon C. Bailey. J. E. Myers, S. R. McGheer, L. W. Fischel, E. W. Miller, R. F. Murray, Arthur C. Matthews, George W. Shaw, F. S. Lankford, L. H. McGeorge, L. T. Scott, A. B. Doyle, F. W. Nover, R. L. Mastin, Jr., W. R. Burkholder, L. A. Coffey, W. R. Vickers, W. P. Adams, G. L. Smith, Jr., Harry M. Webber, Sr., L. A. Hansen, T. H. Jones, N. S. Burkholder, Charles D. Herring, Chas. J. Hayes, J. C. Webster, R. L. Fisher, Paul B. Culp, Alvan R. Hayden, John W. Merchent, Everett F. Croxson, Herman Scott, Charles R. Wentworth, William K. Overstreet, William E. Newcomb, Enal S. Slusher, H. K. Webster, C. K. Brown, P. L. Thorpe. H. C. Bringman, L. F. Barranger F. S. Cram, H. H. Cheatham, Henry P. Sadler, Phil A. Palmer, E. A. Montgomery, E. L. Campbell, Harry M. Webber, Jr., Clovis W. Slusher, Jr., R. P. Ross, T. Cabell Jones, John D. Weaver, Lewis K. Martin, William E. Kester, George P Jones, W. M. Tate, W. M Green, T. T. Doering, P. C. Bryant, Thomkin B. Pierce, W. W. Crossgrove, J. R. Cogar, Ringold Olivier.

At a meeting April 8, 1941, of the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, an organization comprised of 42 farmers in Westmoreland County, each of whom was elected by his neighboring farmers to represent their respective communities on the County Board of Agriculture, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to fully meet its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded, and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the members of the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Westmoreland County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held on April 8, 1941.

JAMES H. LITTLEFIELD,
Chairman.

FARMVILLE, VA., *April 3, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRD: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution which was passed at the board meeting yesterday. The board directed me to call your particular attention to the matter. Of course, I am sure you are already giving this vital question your earnest consideration. You can, therefore, count on the cooperation and support of this very representative group.

Very truly yours,

E. F. STRIPLIN,
Secretary, Prince Edward C. A. C. A.

At a meeting of the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture, held in the courthouse at Farmville, Va., on April 2, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas every effort and sacrifice must now be made by the citizens of the United States as individuals and groups to prepare the defenses of this country; and

"Whereas agriculture is striving to meet fully its obligations in response to the President's appeal of March 8, 1941; and

"Whereas the farmers of Prince Edward County are cooperating in every possible way in the national-defense program; and

"Whereas the defense program is and has been seriously retarded, and the security of the Nation threatened by numerous strikes by labor organizations in essential industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we the members of the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture do request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to introduce and/or support such immediate and proper measures as will correct this alarming situation; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to all Senators and Representatives of Virginia in the Congress of the United States and to the local press."

I hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Prince Edward County Board of Agriculture, at a meeting held April 2, 1941.

H. E. BOSWELL, Jr.,
Chairman.

OLIVER & PADGETT,
Bedford, Va., April 5, 1941.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: On Thursday, April 3, 1941, the Bedford County Democratic Executive Committee made and adopted a resolution, a copy of which I am enclosing herewith.

To my mind this resolution expresses the attitude of the people of Bedford County, with, of course, a few exceptions, and I trust that Congress will soon act to prevent the strikes which are now occurring.

I feel sure that you will do all that you can to bring about the end sought in the resolution.

Respectfully,

M. E. PADGETT, Jr.,
Chairman, Bedford County
Democratic Committee.

Whereas the safety and security of this Nation at this time demand that there be no interruption in the production of those materials so essential to our program of national defense; and

Whereas heretofore and now disputes between labor and capital have resulted, and are resulting, in strikes and shut-downs of plants engaged in producing material for national defense, thus seriously affecting the morale of the public and endangering and retarding the efforts of this Nation to prepare for any danger the future may hold; and

Whereas it appears to this committee that our National Congress has not yet acted with the firmness the situation so obviously demands. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of this committee, in view of the national emergency that exists, the time has now come for the National Congress to enact all proper and necessary legislation, prohibiting and making unlawful strikes and lockouts in plants or industries certified by the Secretary of War or Navy as being engaged in work needful for national defense and requiring all controversies and disputes between capital and labor in such industries to be referred to the National Defense Mediation Board or to such other appropriate authority as may be designated by the Congress, with full power vested in such Board, or other authority, to make final adjudication of all such controversies or disputes; be it further

Resolved, That severe and appropriate penalties be provided by law for the violation of the above-suggested legislation by any person, firm, corporation, union, and/or the officers thereof; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable CARTER GLASS, to the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, to the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and to such other persons and officials as the chairman of this committee, in his discretion, may deem expedient.

APRIL 26, 1941.

Hon. Senator HARRY BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have read of your demands that Madam Perkins be removed from office. We congratulate you on the move and trust that you will not give up until you have accomplished what you recommended.

Yours very truly,

C. L. Grandin, Jr., 2500 Humboldt Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn.; Norman Nelson, 115 South Seventh Street, Minneapolis, Minn.; Catherine E. Stubel, Mound, Minn.: E. L. Brown, 2615 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.; John E. Fritsche, 2801 Lake Isles Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.; Gabriel E. Garber, Minneapolis, Minn.; S. E. Whitney,

R. F. D. No. 1, Hopkins, Minn.; P. Malzen, New Ulm, Minn.; W. H. Babcock, Jr., R. F. D. No. 2, Excelsior, Minn.; John S. Getchell, 2101 Humboldt, South Minneapolis, Minn.; P. W. London, 1825 Girard Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn.; W. J. Nickerson, Wayzata, Minn.

SOUTH BOSTON, VA.,
April 12, 1941.

Be it resolved, That the Junior Chamber of Commerce of South Boston, Va., realizing the gravity of the strike situation in national defense industries and projects in the United States, hereby petitions the Senators of Virginia and Congressmen from this district, to use unstinting efforts to put in effect the necessary machinery to immediately end this deplorable condition; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Perkins, Senators CARTER GLASS and HARRY F. BYRD, the State Junior Chamber of Commerce, the State Chamber of Commerce, and the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, requesting them to recommend a similar resolution.

Done by order of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, South Boston, Va., in conference April 10, 1941.

FRANK SIZEMORE, *President.*
S. M. WALLER, *National Councillor.*

BRADENTON, FLA., *April 25, 1941.*

Senator HARRY BYRD,
Washington, D. C.:

We agree that best interests of the country would be served by resignation of Labor Secretary Perkins.

R. W. Bentley, editor-manager, Bradenton Herald; Col. Ernest Coulter, Bradenton; Rev. Fred Smith, Palmetto; Dr. Larry Schulstad, Palmetto; Ray Schultz, Bradenton Art League president; Kay Howze, Manatee County Aid Britain Committee; Harvey Schultz, Bradenton; Capt. Leroy Wilcox, Bradenton; Dr. W. D. Sugg, Bradenton; O. J. Detrick, school principal, Manatee; O. C. McLean, councilman, Palmetto; Earl Mason, city clerk, Palmetto; M. D. McLean, grower packer; William Snyder, president, Palmetto Country Club; J. D. Howze.

RENO, NEV., *May 3, 1941.*

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Thomas H. Barry Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Reno, at their meeting last night endorsed your action in demanding the removal of Secretary of Labor Perkins The time has come when we must have stanch Americans representing our Government.

DRUMMOND, *Adjutant.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of the Neal Storage Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 413); and

H. R. 3233 A bill for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard; without amendment (Rept. No. 414).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1602. A bill to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 14), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 418).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3847. A bill to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 415).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 1580. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 416).

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1471. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 417).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 9, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman;

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 583. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States commissioners;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin;

S. 829. An act for the relief o. Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers;

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle and the Dauterive Hospital;

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss; and

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 1613. A bill to permit the importation of defense articles by or on behalf of the United States free of import duty or import tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1614. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish-restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 1615. A bill to provide for the disposition of all moneys received from the sale or other disposition of surplus wildlife on refuges established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

S. 1616. A bill to appropriate funds for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building and the installation of an adequate lighting system therein on San Jacinto Battlefield near Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROWN (for Mr. WAGNER):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1618. A bill granting a pension to Mary S. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 1620. A bill for the relief of Lucille Sleet; and

S. 1621. A bill for the relief of George Alfred Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution commending the work of the San Jacinto Museum of History Association and authorizing an appropriation for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building on San Jacinto Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 4660. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from a previous day.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. BYRD on May 26, 1941, as follows:

Whereas the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and

Whereas numerous strikes are taking place in national defense industries throughout the United States; and

Whereas such strikes are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies: There be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned.

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the consideration of the concurrent resolution be postponed until the next legislative day. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is offering the concurrent resolution as an amendment to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG AT ALBION COLLEGE, MICH.

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him on the occasion of the commencement exercises at Albion College, Albion, Mich., on June 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETIREMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE HUGHES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence published in the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1941, entitled "The Tragedy of Hughes' Retirement," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER UNION ON THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union of June 9, 1941, entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1524.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	McNary
Aiken	Danaher	Maloney
Andrews	Davis	Murdock
Bailey	Downey	Norris
Ball	Ellender	Nye
Bankhead	George	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Gillette	Overton
Bilbo	Glass	Pepper
Bone	Green	Radcliffe
Brewster	Gurney	Rosier
Bridges	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Brown	Hill	Spencer
Bulow	Holman	Stewart
Bunker	Houston	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Kilgore	Tunnell
Capper	La Follette	Tydings
Caraway	Lodge	Vandenberg
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chavez	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	White

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. At this time I wish to offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment to Senate bill 1524.

In the Senate Military Affairs Committee it was decided that the twenty-eighth birthday should be the deciding line for each individual registrant. The perfecting amendment is proposed simply as a matter of efficiency in administration. Instead of making the line individual for each registrant as he individually shall reach his twenty-eighth birthday, the perfecting amendment will make it July 1 of each year. So the amendment I offer is as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "who", insert "on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year."

Then on line 7, after the figure "(3)", insert the word "have", strike out the word "attain", and insert "attained."

So the amendment would make the bill read, on page 2, as follows:

The men who on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth.

To complete the amendment it is not necessary to have the word "prior" in line 8, or any of line 9. So I move the amendment as I have stated it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senate consider first the printed committee amendments on page 1, and dispose of them before taking up the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment is, on page 1, line 8, after the word "deferment", to strike out the comma and the words "by age group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On line 10, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate, by age group, the deferment of any or all of the men so deferred", and insert "the men who (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) attain the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth prior to their induction for such training and service."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the committee amendment just read.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, before I discuss the amendment, I call attention to the fact that there has returned to the Senate today, after an illness of some 2 months, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. It happens that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee was born in the great State of Alabama, just 50 miles from the place where I first saw the light of day. He is not only beloved by me but he is beloved by every colleague in the Senate. I know that I voice the sentiments of each of us in expressing our gratification and our joy that the able and indefatigable Senator from Tennessee is back with us again.

Mr. NORRIS. Amen.

Mr. HILL. I note that the senior Senator from Nebraska says, "Amen."

Mr. President, as to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], I hope the amendment will be agreed to. The Senator from South Dakota offered in the Committee on Military Affairs the amendment which is now the committee amendment before the Senate; and all that is done by the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota now offers from the floor is simply to make sure of better administration and a more effective carrying out of the purposes of the committee amendment.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I have been requested to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the committee considered the advisability of making retroactive the provision that none shall be inducted into the service after they have attained their twenty-eighth year. A number have been inducted into the service who have passed the age of 28 years.

Do not misunderstand me. I think the amendment is correct as it is, and I am not seeking to oppose it in any way; but I desire to know whether the committee considered that phase of the matter.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the committee considered many different questions such as the one he has raised. We spent 2 days in the consideration of

the bill; and after considering the testimony of General Hershey, the Acting Director of the Selective Service System, and the testimony of other witnesses, and after discussing the bill as a whole and the pros and cons of the different questions, we felt that the bill, with the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, was the best and the fairest thing to do under all the circumstances.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would the Senator mind explaining to the Senate the reason for this distinction?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am about to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not questioning the wisdom of the Senate committee, but it seems to me on its face to be unfair to distinguish between a man who happened to be drafted when he was 28 years old and a man of the same age who has not yet been drafted. I shall be glad if the Senator will explain what ground there may be for that distinction.

Mr. HILL. I will reach the Senator's point, but I will try to explain the bill in an orderly fashion, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. As the Senate knows, the Congress passed the Selective Service Act. That act fixed the selective-service age limits from and including the age of 21 to and including the age of 35. The pending bill (S. 1524) as it was originally prepared by the Selective Service Administration, authorized the President to defer, by age groups, any groups between the ages of 21 to 35. I desire to say that the deferment provided is not of a permanent nature. If this proposed legislation becomes law, and the President sees fit to provide for the deferment, it will be on a temporary basis and the men will be deferred only for such time as the President shall see fit to have them deferred. If the necessity should arise whereby he felt the deferment should be terminated and these men should be inducted into the armed forces under selective service, he would have the power under the bill to terminate the deferment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. How long can the President defer—for what period of time?

Mr. HILL. There is no period of time set out in the bill. It is left to the President's discretion. He may defer them until such time as he sees fit.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, under the amendment the President can defer any ages below 28.

Mr. HILL. No. As set out in the committee amendment, as modified by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, the President can defer all those persons who have attained the age of 28 years on the 1st day of July 1941 or have attained that age on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year. Any such deferment must include all the men who have attained or who are over the age of 28 on July 1.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is mandatory, under this provision, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is not mandatory. It is entirely discretionary with the President. He can defer men 28 years of age and over, if he sees fit to do so, but there is nothing that requires him to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, men between 28 and 35 are left in the same category in which they are at the present time—that is, if the President wants to leave them there?

Mr. HILL. Exactly so. Unless the President acts to defer these men, they are left in the same status in which they are today. If he does defer them, the deferment is, as the word "defer" implies, temporary; it is not permanent. Any time the President sees fit, he can terminate the deferment, and the men can be inducted into the armed forces under selective service.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Alabama under what theory is it left discretionary between the ages of 28 and 35.

Mr. HILL. There are several reasons for that. We have a sufficient number of men, all we need, so far as we can see at the present time, in the younger age groups; that is, from 21 to 28.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the present law how many do we need? How many can we take under the present law?

Mr. HILL. At the present time, as the distinguished Senator knows, our Army is fixed at 1,400,000 men; but that includes the National Guard, the Reserves, and the Regular Army. To reach the number 1,400,000, it is contemplated that we will get about 646,000 inductees under the selective service.

Mr. LUCAS. Will it be necessary eventually, then, in order to get the million four hundred thousand, to constantly take men between 28 and 35?

Mr. HILL. I should say not. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we not only have the reservoir of men who registered on October 16 last, but we will have another registration on July 1, at which time we will have about 832,000 new registrants, and those 832,000 new registrants will, of course, be added to the pool which we now have from which to select the men.

Mr. LUCAS. The 832,000 new registrants will still be men between 21 and 35?

Mr. HILL. No; the 832,000 will be men who have reached 21 years of age since October, so, of course, this deferment would not affect them in any way until they reached the age of 28, which will be 7 years hence.

Mr. LUCAS. I rise only for information——

Mr. HILL. The questions are very interesting, and I am glad to have the Senator ask any questions he desires to propound.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the previous law which was passed, the Congress said a certain number of men were necessary for the Army, and before we can get any more men, if we need additional men as the emergency grows, we will have to have further legislation.

Mr. HILL. It was the understanding, at the time we authorized the strength of the Army at 1,400,000, that if the Army wished to increase the number of men further legislation by the Congress would be required. However, I have heard or read somewhere in a paper that it has been interpreted, perhaps, by someone, that when an unlimited emergency is declared, such as has been declared, the Army can be increased without coming back to Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. That raises a very important question.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it does raise a very important question.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am trying to ascertain is why men between 28 and 35 are left in more or less suspense as to what their position is to be during the next year or more. It seems to me that if there is not some mandatory feature in the amendment, the amendment is more or less worthless, because the President has the same power today he would have under the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; the President has not the same power today. As the law now stands, the President has no power to defer anyone from 21 years of age through 35. He cannot defer these men even if he desires to defer them. In other words, as the law now stands, men from 28 through 35 years of age are subject to all the conditions of selective service, just as are the men from 21 to 28.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the committee discuss the question of fixing a certain age limit between 21 and 35, eliminating the other men?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the committee gave some consideration to that. I recall particularly that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] raised that very question. As the Senator from Illinois perhaps recalls, when the selective-service bill was before the Senate for consideration the Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment making the ages, not 21 to 36, as the Congress did, but from 21 through 25. So we did consider that question in the committee when the bill was before us.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The purpose of the bill is to carry out an idea which has been expressed by the Army, as I understand.

Mr. HILL. By the Selective Service System.

Mr. STEWART. Is it not true that the Army officers themselves desire younger men?

Mr. HILL. They do, both the Army and the Navy. Not only are the younger men much more physically fit for training but we must bear in mind that what we propose to do is to carry these men in a reserve over a period of 10 years, and

what we want is to have the level of effectiveness over the 10-year period as high as possible. The man who is 21 years of age and gets his training during the next 10 years, of course, will keep a much higher level of effectiveness than a man who is, say, 25 years of age.

Mr. STEWART. In the event the bill becomes law, as I understand the Senator, it will be discretionary with the President as to whether he will avail himself of the privileges of the act.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. If conditions should change, and if it should be found necessary or advisable to use men between the ages of 28 and 36, then the President could terminate the deferment.

Mr. STEWART. Assuming that is done, will the group of men between the ages of 21 and 28 still have the benefit of the privileges of the various exemptions?

Mr. HILL. Oh, surely; the bill does not change any exemptions, or anything of the kind. In other words, any man who has any right of exemption or deferment would continue to enjoy that right after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator does not think that in the desire to procure a larger number of men than might now be available for the Army between the ages of 21 and 28 there is any likelihood that the exemption laws or deferment laws would be altered in any way so as to make them somewhat stricter?

Mr. HILL. In the 21- to 28-year group I think not, because we have more men than we need. There can be no reason why there should be any change in the requirements for that group.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Alabama was present no doubt when hearings were held on this bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Did anything occur in the hearings to indicate that if this bill should become law there would be a likelihood of lowering the age limit from 21 to 18, as has been previously discussed?

Mr. HILL. No. So far as General Hershey's testimony was concerned, and so far as expressions by members of the committee were concerned, I think it was very definitely expected that at this time there certainly would not be any lowering of the age limit below the age of 21 years.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Alabama, then, does not think that by the passage of the pending bill we might precipitate a movement in that direction?

Mr. HILL. No, I think not, because, as I have said, we have such a great reservoir that we have no need for such a change at present.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. The suggestion appeared in the newspapers that the age limit should be made 27 instead of 28.

Mr. HILL. The General's testimony was to the effect that it should be to the 27th year.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, according to the amendment which has been offered to the bill, the age has been moved up practically another year, has it not, to 29? Suppose a boy attained the age of 28 years on the 2d or 3d of July of 1941, would he have the benefit of the deferment?

Mr. HILL. No; he would not have the benefit of the deferment so far as the present year is concerned. If he were not inducted into service until July 1, 1942, then he would have the benefit of the deferment. I will say that the committee gave much thought to that very suggestion. We sought to write into the bill a provision that if a man was 28 years of age he should not be inducted, but, as the Senator can well see, that might result in a great deal of trouble, for the following reason: Let us say a man had been called by the board; he was not 28 years of age, but he would become 28, we will say, within 30 days. The Senator can see that in such a case there would be a great temptation to that man to try to delay his induction, to exercise every right of appeal he might have, then if he failed there to ask that the board reconsider his classification, and then perhaps ask for some temporary postponement of induction on the ground that he was not well or that some member of his family was sick or that he had to take some kind of important examination, or for any other reason that ordinarily might be grounds for temporary postponement of induction. He might be greatly tempted to resort to some means of that kind in order to avoid his induction.

Furthermore, in many of these cases there may be a close question as to whether a man should be inducted, and the board may give very serious consideration to that question. If by reason of the fact that the board stopped to consider the question, or by delay being caused in any way, the man became 28 years of age, and therefore was deferred, the board might very well be criticized severely and its good faith in the matter might be challenged. The board might be accused of having delayed the matter so as to keep a given man from being inducted.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, under the bill the President will have the power to defer men if they have reached the age of 28 years by July 1, 1941, but the President will not have the power to do so if they have not reached that age by that date?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. How does it happen that the age of 28 was selected as the flooring rather than 27 or 29? I have the impression from something I have read that the Department recommended a different age than 28. Am I correct about that?

Mr. HILL. General Hershey talked in terms of 27.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I understand.

Mr. HILL. He also talked in terms of using the date October 16, 1940, which was some 8 months ago, rather than July 1, 1941. The committee, after weighing his testimony and all the other testimony, thought the age of 28 was about the correct age.

Mr. WHITE. So the committee rejected the recommendation of the Department in that respect?

Mr. HILL. It rejected it in the respect that it did not take the recommendation of 27 years as of October 16, 1940.

Mr. WHITE. That is, the committee followed its own judgment rather than the recommendation of the War Department?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Am I to understand that the option given to the President is to defer every man subject to service beyond the prescribed age limit?

Mr. HILL. There is no right to say, "I will defer those from 30 to 35, but I will not defer those from 28 to 30." He either defers everyone 28 years of age or over or he does not defer anyone by reason of age.

Mr. ADAMS. If the deferment is made, does the Senator think the President, under this measure, could rescind his deferment?

Mr. HILL. I think, unquestionably, he could rescind the deferment. I think, unquestionably, he could terminate the deferment at any time.

Mr. ADAMS. Then, that leaves the man between 28 and 35 entirely uncertain as to whether he is subject to call?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Senator is correct, and that would depend upon what the conditions were. Of course, I understand what is in the Senator's mind, but I think in the majority of cases men between 28 and 35 would rather have their deferment with the uncertainty than to be called immediately and inducted into the service.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Colorado can make quite clear what is in his mind. It is my judgment that if the Congress thinks that men beyond 28 years of age should not go into the service, Congress should say so, or if Congress thinks they should, Congress should say so. I am not yet persuaded that the decision should be left to an individual's uncontrolled discretion. It is a matter which the Congress has determined in the first instance. Congress fixed the age limits and the methods by which the men were to be drawn. Now we are drawing a line and saying that up to a certain point the law applies, and beyond that point it is left to the discretion of the President whether it shall apply or whether it shall not apply. It seems to me that if Congress thinks men over the age of 28 should not go into the service, Congress should say so.

Mr. HILL. The reason the committee did not make such a recommendation was that the committee felt that no man could foresee what the needs of the future might be; what there might be in the

way of changed conditions. As the bill is now written, if the President makes deferment, as I am sure he will from what General Hershey said, he will have the right, if conditions were to change, to terminate the deferment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator understand that under the language of the bill, if the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is adopted, the President will have the discretion of deferring persons below the age of 28?

Mr. HILL. No; it is not my understanding that he would have that right at all. He could only defer men 28 years of age and over. He would have no power under this bill or under existing law to defer anyone under 28 years of age, by reason of age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a new interpretation of the amendment. The committee did not understand the effect of the Gurney amendment in that light at all.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Colorado voted for the Gurney amendment, and the Senator from Alabama did not. One reason why I did not vote for it in its original form was because I thought it was a matter which ought to be more carefully considered. Under the terms of the bill in its original form the President might have deferred any group, by age, from 21 through 35; but under the Gurney amendment he may defer only those 28 years of age or over; and if he provides for any such deferment, he may not pick out any one age group between 28 and 35. He must defer all those 28 years of age or over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator's interpretation is correct, the Senator from Colorado supported the Gurney amendment under a misapprehension.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from South Dakota will confirm my interpretation of the amendment. I think the amendment is clear on its face.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In view of the question asked by the Senator from Colorado, is it not a fact that as the language is written, three conditions must concur? First, the men must be liable for the training and service. Second, they must not already have been inducted into the armed forces. Third, they must have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the date of their birth on or before the date in question, July 1 of this year, or of each succeeding year. But the three conditions must concur.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that the exact language of the Gurney amendment was not before the committee. There was an amendment, but the Senator wanted to perfect it; and it was my understanding when I supported his amendment that the President would still have discretion to defer those below the age of 28 if he should see fit to do so.

Mr. HILL. That was not my understanding.

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. HILL. I see the Senator from South Dakota is on his feet. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I did not hear the question.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado to state his question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the committee I understood that even though the Senator's amendment should be adopted, the President would still have discretion to defer those below the age of 28.

Mr. GURNEY. No; not the way the provision is written. As I understood—and I am quite sure that was the sense of the committee—he would be authorized to defer only one age group, that between 28 and 35.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not so understand the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I could not hear the Senator's reply to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] when he was inquiring what would happen to the draftee between 28 and 35 who had previously been inducted. Would he gain any new status?

Mr. HILL. He would not gain anything. If he were in the service, he would continue in the service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that fair?

Mr. HILL. The committee thought about that question. As the Senator knows, in connection with all these questions there must be some line of cleavage. The Senator might ask whether it would be fair to draft a man who is 35 years of age, and not draft a man who is 35 years and 1 day of age. There must be a line somewhere. Some of the men in the category referred to by the Senator have gone into the service. Some of them have had months of training. The Government has spent a great deal of money training, preparing, and equipping them. The idea was that they should continue their service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the terms of the bill, could any discretion be used in their behalf?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. They would be in for good?

Mr. HILL. They would be in for at least a year.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the position of the man who is 34 years of age, and who has been called, but has not been actually inducted?

Mr. HILL. If the bill should become law, I should say that he would not be inducted.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if he has not already been inducted, he would not be inducted.

Mr. HILL. I should say he would not be inducted, provided the President should proceed immediately to grant deferment, which I am sure he would do. As I have stated, the reason for the bill is that we have a reservoir of younger men so great as to be more than sufficient to meet the present needs of our armed forces; and younger men are much better subjects for training than are older men.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many men between the ages of 28 and 35 have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to give the Senator the figures in a moment. While we are waiting for the figures, let me give the Senator some other figures which I think are very much in line with the question he has in mind.

Through March, 74.76 percent of all men inducted were between the ages of 21 and 28. Through March, 78.5 percent were men between the ages of 18 and 28. The men between the ages of 18 and 21 are not subject to the draft. There is no compulsion about their service; but a considerable number of them have been volunteering under selective service for 1 year's service. When they have come in of their own free will and accord, and have stated that they would like to have the training, they have been inducted if they have been found physically and otherwise fit. So, 78.5 percent of all the men inducted have been between the ages of 18 and 28; 21.5 percent have been between the ages of 28 and 36; and 10.08 percent have been between the ages of 31 and 36. The figures as to the number between 31 and 36 confirm what has been said by the Selective Service Administration, that in the higher age group we get 10 percent of the men and 90 percent of the headaches, because among the older men not only do we run into all kinds of questions of physical disability, but we run into all kinds of questions of dependency. Naturally, those men are more fixed in our economic and social life; and when they are called into service there is greater dislocation in our economic and social life.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do the Senator's figures indicate how many married men have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator the number of married men who have been inducted, but I can give him certain figures which have a bearing on that question. Of some five and a half million men who have been classified, 3,706,379 were put into class 3; that is, they were classified as having dependents, and therefore deferred. Of those 3,706,379, I presume that a great many have dependent wives.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has been my observation that in the various draft areas there has been a great variation in the use of discretion in respect to married men. Does the Senator agree to that statement?

Mr. HILL. We talked to General Hershey about that question. He has some 6,500 draft boards throughout the

country, and naturally it is very difficult to make all the 6,500 draft boards think alike and use the same yardstick General Hershey has men out in the field who are constantly in contact with the draft boards, trying to impress upon them the necessity of uniformity of regulation and trying to give them the right kind of yardstick, so that discrimination may not result from the decisions of the various boards throughout the country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are no figures available as to the number of married men who have been inducted?

Mr. HILL. I can get that information for the Senator, but at this time I have not those figures here on my desk.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Excuse me; the Senator asked me another question which I am glad to answer now. The question was, How many men who have been inducted up to date were between the ages of 28 and 36? The figures I am about to state are through the month of March Of the 336,636 men inducted up to date, 56,764 were between the ages of 28 and 36.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if I correctly understand the import of this matter.

Under the original law which the Congress enacted there were registered about sixteen and one-half million registrants, which has been figured out as the committee stated in its report, as about a million in each year's classification along in the late twenties and thirties.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under the provisions of this proposal the President is given power to defer approximately 8,000,000 of these registrants under rules and regulations to be prescribed, or not to defer 8,000,000. He has either to defer 8,000,000 or to let sixteen and one-half million stay in. He has no choice?

Mr. HILL. He has no choice; that is correct. The figures of 8,000,000 and 16,000,000 are approximate figures, though they are generally correct; but I want to convey the thought that the group of 8,000,000 in the higher brackets—that is, from 28 to 36—contains nothing like the number of eligibles as does the group of 8,000,000 between 21 and 28.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suppose the balance probably would run in the same ratio as the figures the Senator gave a while ago—about 78 and 22?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. I think we have every reason to believe they would run in about the same ratio. In other words, roughly speaking, today we are getting approximately four-fifths of our selectees from the ages of 21 to 28. We are getting only about one-fifth from the ages of 28 to 36.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for one more question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In the report I notice that the committee says:

> Dividing this entire group into classes, it has been estimated by the Selective-Service officials that, in round figures, there were 5,000,000 in each class, viz, 21 to 26, 26 to 30, and 31 to 36.

Which would mean about 1,000,000 in each age group. The committee has changed the original bill, which provided for deferment by age groups.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. What was the reasoning that appealed to the committee which made it incumbent upon the President to defer all these men or not to defer any of them?

Mr. HILL. The committee felt that the Congress should determine those who could be deferred, rather than leave it to the discretion of the President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator if the committee was advised that the War Department, or those in charge of war activities in that Department, would recommend to the President deferring all men above 28 years of age if this amendment should be adopted?

Mr. HILL. I do not know that there was any direct testimony that the War Department would make such a recommendation. There was direct testimony that the Director of the Selective Service System would make such a recommendation, and there was testimony that both the War Department and the Navy Department favored the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That they favored the passage of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Therefore I assume that if we should pass the bill there would be issued by the President a general order deferring all men who had reached 28 years of age and who had not been previously inducted into the military service.

Mr. HILL. I feel quite certain that unless something very unforseen should occur, that would be the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that the War Department had a representative at the hearing——

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And that he fully and completely concurred in all the statements which were made by General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. As I read the bill as amended, we are conferring upon the President a completely new power. Is that conclusion correct?

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is a new power, because, as the law now stands, he has no power to defer any men between the ages of 21 and 36 by reason of age.

Mr. DANAHER. That is my understanding. I thank the Senator. That being the fact, why should we not strike out line 6 on page 1 as a matter of sheer clarity in draftsmanship, so that the section would read:

> The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations—

And so forth. Thus we would state by our amendment that we confer a power upon him.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the Senator wishes to strike out the words:

> Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I do not know that those words are necessary or needed; but ordinarily I think that when we are amending an existing law we use those words so as to make sure that if there should be any conflict between the amendment and the existing law, the amendment should prevail. As I view the situation I do not think that clause is very material one way or the other; and yet, on the other hand, I do not see that the words would lead to any harm.

This bill has been rather carefully worked over, both by the Selective Service System experts and by our own legislative drafting experts; and since I can see no good reason for striking out these words, there may be some reason we do not know about why they should stay in there, just as the Senator from Colorado said about the Gurney amendment that if he had understood all this and all that he might not have taken the position he did.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator, as to the first point he makes, that the words were put in at a time when the words the Senator from Iowa pointed out, "by age group," were in the draft submitted to the committee. That is the reason why they were put in.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. DANAHER. But when those words were stricken out, the reason for their existence fell.

As to the second point of the Senator's comment, I say that if there is a reason why those words should be in there, we ought to know what that reason is.

Mr. HILL. As I have said, there might be some prohibition somewhere in the existing law, and that prohibition might in some way be in conflict with the amendment which we now seek to put in the existing law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy and patience with me; but he has admitted, as I asked him, that we are conferring upon the President a brand-new power. We are creating an authority which up to this time he has lacked; and I say that the way to amend existing law to confer that power is to say just that.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what the bill does. It says the President is authorized.

Mr. DANAHER. No. There is a line there that gives him a blanket catch-all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to return to an answer which the able Senator from

Alabama made to a question by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The Senator answered, as I recall, that, in his opinion, the President of the United States will issue, on the recommendation of the Army and the Navy, probably General Hershey, a deferment order affecting men of all ages between 28 and 35.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. That will be one complete class?

Mr. HILL. That will be one complete class.

Mr. LUCAS. And the order will take care of all men within that class?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that this proposed legislation gives the President of the United States the power to rescind that order within, we will say, 30 days after the order is made?

Mr. HILL. Within any time.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, we say to these men, "By an order from the President of the United States, you are not subject to the draft"?

Mr. HILL. We do not say to them, "You are not subject to the draft." We simply say, "For the time being, we are not going to call you." That is what it amounts to.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, they are deferred for the time being?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot understand the real purpose of a deferment order of that kind. What could it accomplish?

Mr. HILL. It could accomplish this: As the law now stands, these men must be inducted; while if we pass this bill, and the President issues a deferment order, the men may never have to serve; they may never be inducted.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true; but these men, at the present time, as I view this proposed legislation, absolutely know where they stand; yet if this bill is passed, all men between the ages of 28 and 35, most of whom are in business, at the present time will not know where they stand. They will not know what to do. They may be deferred for a month under a general order of the President of the United States; they may set up their business and say, "Well, we can go ahead now under this deferment order"; but in 30 days' time or 60 days' time the position of these men is changed materially as a result of the rescindment of the order by the President of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator that, from the testimony before the committee, the War Department and the Navy Department and the Selective Service Administration would not recommend the termination of deferment unless and until there was a need, that is, unless and until we could not get the men we have to have from the age group from 21 to 28, including those from 18 to 21 who now may volunteer; and, as matters now stand, as I have said, we have more than an ample supply.

Mr. LUCAS. When that time comes, when we need more men, we will need more legislation to get the men.

Mr. HILL. We will not need more legislation to get the men if we pass this bill as it is now written.

What the War Department and the Navy Department and the Selective Service Administration seek to do is to defer these men, with every intent and every purpose of their never being inducted unless there should be such a need that we could not meet the need from the younger age groups.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator candidly that, from the discussion, and the debate upon the floor of the Senate, and from what I have read of the hearings involving this particular amendment, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Colorado, that the Congress of the United States ought to say for the moment that all men up to 28 years of age shall be inducted, from 28 to 35 they shall not be inducted, but if such an emergency arises that we need these men, I think the Congress of the United States then ought definitely to say thereafter that we do need them, and enact legislation to that effect. I do not believe we ought to leave these men in a suspended condition, as it seems to me this amendment would leave them. They ought to be in or they ought to be out.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be right about letting Congress do the deferring; but I do not know that would change their suspended condition, because I think their suspended condition does not depend either upon the President or upon the Congress; their suspended condition depends upon future conditions which will determine what the need may be. In other words, if the need is so great that we cannot get the men we have got to have from the young age groups, then, whether it be the President or the Congress, the deferment will be terminated and the men previously deferred by reason of age will be called and inducted into the service.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that perfectly, but I think the Congress, perhaps, should retain that authority and say when the time comes that these men are needed, and should enact legislation to that effect.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand the Senator from Alabama, if there were need for the men there would be no deferment?

Mr. HILL. If there were no need for these men they would be deferred; if there should be need for them because we could not get the men we have got to have, as I have said——

Mr. CHANDLER. There would be no deferment.

Mr. HILL. There would be no deferment.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the emergency should not be acute, the men would not be needed.

Mr. HILL. Then there would be deferment. Unless the need comes about, these men will never be inducted into the service.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to continue for a moment further. If the emergency is not acute, the object of the bill originally was over the run of years to try to get an effectively trained force of men to defend the United States of America.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. CHANDLER. Over a long period of years young men who are in training now and who will be inducted hereafter, if the amendment is agreed to, will be available and useful for a great many years in the future, but the men who are in the age groups that we intend now to permit the President under this authorization to defer will not be useful for any great length of time. When the emergency is not acute, the object is to get an effective force to defend the people of the United States of America. It is my belief that we would make a serious mistake if we should not give to the President full power and authority to do what is proposed, because if the emergency is acute they will not be deferred; if the emergency is acute he will have to call them, because he has not got enough trained reserves or trained men in the younger-age groups. I understand what the Senator from Illinois means when he says men do not know what to expect; but in time of war, men over the country never know what to expect; they have got to be ready for anything.

Mr. HILL. There is another thing I will say to the Senator from Kentucky. If these men are simply deferred by an Executive order of the President, the Selective Service Administration can go ahead with its inventory, it can go ahead and inventory these men and classify them, so that if they are needed all that information would be ready, and it would not be necessary to incur the delay which would be brought about if they had then to make the inventory.

Mr. CHANDLER. And the President would not have to come back to Congress if he needed the men. It is my judgment that no men between the ages of 28 and 36 deferred will mind being deferred in the manner proposed; but they will be very glad to know they are going to be deferred, and they will also be glad to know that if there is an actual emergency they will be called, because we can say that there is a pretty clear indication that that will happen to them.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is right, and I think men between 28 and 35 will be very much relieved if this bill passes as reported by the committee.

The Senator has well emphasized the point that I tried to make earlier in the discussion, namely, that the effectiveness of the young man can be maintained and continued at a high level over the 10-year period, whereas the effectiveness of the older man cannot be. He begins to wear out; he develops physical disability and loses his efficiency.

Mr. CHANDLER. And those who, in the run of the years, do not want the burden to be any heavier on the American people—and obviously it is going to be heavy—can see at a glance how much less expensive it will be to complete training the young men who will be prepared for 15 or 20 years to meet the country's emergency.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky comes from the greatest horse-producing State in the Union—the greatest

horse-producing area in all the world—and he knows if he were going to buy a race horse, he would buy a young horse that would run many races; he would not invest his money in an old horse that perhaps would run but one race.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kentucky also comes from a State that gave more volunteers in defense of the country before the selective-service law was passed than any other State in America. I call the Senator's attention to that fact.

Mr. HILL. And I thank the Senator, representing that great State, for the contribution he has made to this debate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me once more?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Referring to the discussion as to the delegated power given to the President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. We are specifically delegating the power to provide for the deferment of the men in the group specified. Now, say the President issues an order as soon as this bill is enacted deferring these men for 9 months, and 3 months from now such an occasion arises as makes it necessary to use them. These men have been notified that they are deferred; at present they are on a list subject to call under the general law; but now they are notified that they are deferred for 9 months. What authority is there under the proposal which is now before us for the President to rescind his order and to notify these men that they are not deferred?

Mr. HILL. The deferment would be an indefinite deferment, subject to termination by the President. We reserve to him the power to terminate the deferment at any time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment further?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. What if the President does not make the deferment an indefinite one? What if he says, "The deferment is for 9 months"? What right will he have to call the men before that time unless we give him power here to rescind or change the deferment at any time?

Mr. HILL. I think he would have power, under this language as it is now written, to terminate any deferment that he might make. The language very closely follows the language in section 5 (e) of the Selective Service Act; and we note in that language that no such limitation is put upon the length of the deferment. That is, the deferment may be terminated.

A man might be deferred today because he has a dependent. The dependency might terminate. He could then be inducted. He might be deferred temporarily because he was ill at the time, or had some condition that would make it not proper or right to induct him; but when that condition was alleviated or removed he could be inducted.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Is this deferment suggested by Army officials because they believe that the average inductee over 28 finds it more difficult to adapt himself to Army life, less flexible emotionally, or what is the reason?

Mr. HILL. There are several different factors. One is that the inductee over 28 years of age is not as adaptable; he is not physically capable of becoming, ordinarily, as good a soldier as a younger man. The other reason, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has well pointed out and I have tried to point out before in the debate, is that the idea is to train these men so that we shall have a great reserve. If we train a young man, his period of effectiveness remains at a high level much longer than if we train an older man. Another reason is that we do not have as much dislocation in our economic and social life when we take a younger man. The older man is more apt to have become fixed, to have become set, in the economic and social life of the community. Another thing is, from the administrative standpoint, that in the older groups it is necessary to process so many men for comparatively so few inductees.

Mr. BONE. I can understand that when a young man is given training, and goes back into the pool of reserves, his potential usefulness as a soldier would extend over a much longer period of years than in the case of an older man. I suspect that that was a persuasive argument with the committee.

Mr. HILL. Very persuasive.

Mr. BONE. I think it was suggested, perhaps by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], that legislatively we just cast out all men over 28, instead of allowing their deferment to be discretionary, because of some aspects of the problem presented by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who says it leaves him somewhat up in the air. Has the committee considered that angle of the matter—in other words, drawing a red line, and chopping off all induction into the service after the age of 28?

Mr. HILL. The men may be needed in the future.

Mr. BONE. Congress could repair that breach in the law, if there should be one, in 24 hours' time.

Mr. HILL. Yes; Congress could go back and repair it; but let me say to the Senator that whether the President called the men back or whether the Congress called them back after all would not make any difference in their situation; they would be dislocated just as much. Does the Senator see that?

Mr. BONE. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. HILL. Is not that true?

Mr. BONE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I say, it is not a question of whether Congress shall defer them or whether the President shall defer them, so far as their situation in the future is concerned. It depends upon the need, upon conditions which may arise over which neither the President nor the Congress has any control.

Mr. BONE. In the mine-run of experience of the officials under the Draft Act, have they found that they were able to get enough men between the ages of 21 and 27 to meet the needs?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes. I gave those figures early in the debate.

Mr. BONE. I know the Senator did. I came in just as he was giving them.

Mr. HILL. For instance——

Mr. BONE. I do not care to have the Senator go into detail again. The figures will be in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. I will give the Senator those figures. Up to date we have inducted only some 336,000; and yet, out of the 336,000, we had from 21 to 28 years of age, 1,802,000 eligibles.

Mr. BONE. Have the authorities called only that many men because they were unable to equip a larger number; or what was the reason?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; but the Senator must realize this condition: Our Army was to be at a maximum of 1,400,000. That was the ceiling. We had a large number of men in the National Guard. We had a large number of men in the Regular Army. We had a large number of men in the Reserves who were called in. We have not needed to induct more men than we have been. I will say to the Senator that the figures I have given him are only through the month of March.

Mr. BONE. I understand. What is the total number of men we have under arms now and actually in training?

Mr. HILL. The total number of men under arms, I should say, is between 1,300,000 and 1,400,000.

Mr. President, unless some Senator has some further question to ask, I think I have pretty well gone over the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment as amended was agreed to

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Chavez	La Follette
Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Lodge
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Lucas
Bailey	Connally	McCarran
Ball	Danaher	McFarland
Bankhead	Davis	McKellar
Barbour	Downey	McNary
Bilbo	Ellender	Maloney
Bone	George	Murdock
Brewster	Gillette	Norris
Bridges	Glass	Nye
Brooks	Green	O'Mahoney
Brown	Gurney	Overton
Bulow	Hayden	Pepper
Bunker	Herring	Radcliffe
Butler	Hill	Rosier
Byrd	Holman	Shipstead
Byrnes	Houston	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Chandler	Kilgore	Taft

Thomas, Idaho	Tydings	Wallgren
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wheeler
Tunnell	Van Nuys	White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following:

That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided (1) to any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith, and (2) to any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials. Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or other cause, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators, because I changed two or three words in the printed text of the amendment I propose to offer. I call the attention of Senators to page 2 of the printed amendment, line 15, where the language reads "of a strike or other labor disturbance." I strike out the words "other labor disturbance" and insert the words "threatened strike." My reason for that is that a number of Senators have suggested that "other labor disturbance" is an uncertain term, somewhat nebulous, that it might create a good deal of question among both employers and employees as to just what was meant by the term "labor disturbance." Since the essence of what we are trying to get at is the actual occurrence of a strike or steps leading to a strike, such as a vote to strike on a certain day, which would certainly constitute a threatened strike, I would provide that under the bill the President would have authority to step in and take charge of a plant in order that production might not be hindered or delayed, but that it might be continued.

Mr. President, I think most Senators are familiar with this matter, and I do not care to consume much of the time of the Senate in discussing it. I do desire, however, to suggest that this is not a new question before the Senate. About 8 weeks ago, as I recall it, on April 2, 1941, I made a speech in the Senate proposing the taking over of any strike-bound plant where the strike was hindering or delaying the production of essential war materials. At that time I announced that I intended to introduce a bill providing for an amendment to the Selective Service Act authorizing the Government to take over strike-bound plants where the strikes were interfering with, impeding, or delaying the production of defense materials.

I had such a bill drafted at that time, and almost wore it out carrying it around in my pocket waiting for what I thought would be an opportune time to offer it as an amendment to some legislative act. I could not offer it as an amendment to an appropriation bill, because it was legislation. So last Thursday I introduced it on the floor of the Senate, and submitted some remarks in connection therewith as well as a tabulation of a great deal of material furnished me by Government authorities, showing the number of man-hours that had been dissipated and wasted in national-defense plants by strikes, and the number of plants producing national-defense munitions and implements of defense throughout the entire country in which there were strikes.

The country is familiar with the fact that in the original Selective Service Act, section 9, and particularly the amendment to that section offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], provided in the case of an employer, that if he declined or refused to manufacture defense articles for the Government at a reasonable compensation, he would have to suffer the probable taking over of his plant by the Government. So the basic idea of my proposed amendment is the same, except that it applies to the employees refusing to continue the production of necessary or essential defense materials, just as the former amendment applied to failure of the employer.

The thesis of this amendment is that the essential and primary necessity of the Government is to continue the manufacture and the production of defense materials. The Government, under this amendment, is not taking the side of labor against the employer; neither is it taking the side of the employer against labor. The processes of mediation and conciliation are in no wise interfered with. The Government agencies which we have set up for the hearing, and for the adjudication, and for the possible settlement of labor controversies as to working conditions and hours of labor and all those questions, are still preserved. All this amendment does is to provide that if we have these agencies for settling these disputes, but if the employees do not avail themselves of them, if they do not submit when the quarrel is adjudicated, but simply go out and say, "We will not work, we will not produce, we will tie up this necessary agency for national defense," that in that kind of critical emergency the Government has the right to step in and take charge of the plant and to operate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I gladly yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is just one phase of the matter which disturbs me, and I want to submit it to the Senator for his comment. I am not doing it critically. I am in complete sympathy with what the Senator undertakes to do, and I certainly cordially approve of what the President did yesterday. I am fearful only of this possibility, and I ask the Senator from Texas to discuss it. Would this provision of law serve in any way to encourage strikes on the part of those who might thus want to precipitate the general nationalization of industry? Will the Senator discuss that possibility, and does he think there is anything in it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will be very glad to discuss it. The matter has been raised before. I have received several letters about that matter, mostly from employers. Some employers were fearful that if the power were given to the Government to take over the plants because of strikes, it might encourage some of the employees to foment strikes in the hope that the Government would be more generous with the employees than the employers would be. Of course, that is a hypothetical theory, but as against that let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the amendment proposes the conferring of a power on the President which need not be exercised. It would only be exercised after other measures had failed. But now, suppose other measures do fail? Suppose we have a situation out in California similar to that which we had in Inglewood. All these other processes failed. What would be the answer of the Senator from Michigan to a situation similar to that which existed at Inglewood? It would be just what he said a moment ago, when he said that he approved the action of the President of the United States. That is all this amendment means. This amendment means to make it clear and unequivocal that the President has the authority to do what he did yesterday in California.

What other parties to this controversy are there except the employer and the employees and the Government? If you have a strike, then the strikers take the plant over and they are going to run it to suit themselves. Let us assume that the employer forces a lockout, and he is going to run the plant. There is nobody else who can intervene except the Government of the United States, and I think the Government of the United States can be trusted, when it intervenes and takes possession of a plant to see that the men have fair wages and good working conditions. The employer is protected under this amendment by a provision that he shall be compensated, if necessary, in a court where condemnation proceedings would determine, according to the laws and under the Constitution, what his compensation should be.

To whom else would you give that authority except to the Government of the United States? You gave authority to mediate to the Mediation Board, and the Mediation Board is defied. You gave authority to the Secretary of Labor, through her mediation facilities and she is defied.

If the laboring people and the employers themselves cannot settle their difficulties, if the Mediation Board cannot settle them, if the Secretary of Labor cannot settle them, who else is there in this Government except the Government of the United States itself to settle the difficulties?

Mr. President, the time has come in this Republic for the people to know who is sitting in Washington, and whether the Government itself or factions and groups are to control the destinies of the people and the life of this Republic. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I think the fear he has just called attention to is greatly exaggerated. Does he think that the strikers out in Inglewood today would like to encourage another strike in another plant where they might be working after the experience they have had?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is my observation and my very deep belief, as the responsible C. I. O. leaders themselves have said, that that particular strike is definitely and specifically inspired by Communist influences, and it is simply our "fifth column" on the march, and it is my belief that a great deal of the labor difficulty which organized labor itself now confronts is the difficulty of communism on the march. Communism is interested in the nationalization of industry. Communism, I assume, would figure that it had served itself if it forced the nationalization of industry, and what I am asking the Senator from Texas is whether this amendment thus might inadvertently become a weapon for them to promote their own objectives, and I am wondering if there is any protection possible against that possibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think I can answer the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to tell him how I think it perhaps might be done, so he will fully understand that I am not contending against his objective, but that I am trying to protect it if possible against this one contingency which it seems to me is dangerous. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when the President directed the Secretary of War to take charge of the North American plant and remain in charge and operate that plant, he said that should continue "only until normal production shall be resumed."

I was wondering whether some such limitation as that in the Senator's amendment might not still leave the amendment fully reaching every objective he seeks, and not forfend against this other menace which it seems to me might exist.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his interest. I know he wants to be helpful. Let me say that the amendment, by specific terms, is limited to the emergency. The President may not exercise any of these powers except during this emergency.

Let me further suggest to the Senator——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I wish to answer the Senator from Michigan. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The Senator from Michigan says it is his view—and I think it is the general view—that many of the extreme strikes which the national leaders are denouncing, are caused by Communists; and his fear is that a few Communists may be willing to have bayonets jabbed into them, as was the case in the strike in Los Angeles, in order to provoke a disturbance so that the Government will take over the plant.

Let us see about that. If the Government steps in and takes charge of the plant, the Government will say who shall work there. The Government does not have to continue to employ Communists, if any of them are in the plant. The Government does not have to continue the employment of radicals, labor disturbers, and troublesome individuals. The Government can do a little weeding, a little combing, a little eliminating, and perhaps a little liquidating, if necessary, to get rid of troublesome individuals. I do not think that the action of the Government in that particular strike will encourage the Communists at all.

Let me say to the Senator from Michigan, as I suggested on last Thursday when I made some remarks on the bill, that during the World War President Wilson set up a three-pronged labor arrangement. One prong was a wage board. President Taft, the father of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, was a member of that Board, which was commonly known as the Taft-Walsh Wage Board. It devoted itself to undertaking to stabilize and fix rates of pay in various sections of the country for a number of classifications of labor. That action tended to prevent sporadic strikes.

President Wilson then set up a mediation board. We now have mediation boards.

President Wilson then set up a "no strike, no lock-out" agreement, to which both employees and employers subscribed. There were to be no strikes and no lockouts. There were wage boards and mediation boards. If it should become necessary to take over any plants the President, by Executive order, could very appropriately set up some sort of wage board in order to prescribe fair wages in the various areas.

However, the main consideration in this legislation is that production shall not be delayed, hindered, or stopped. The strikers may take over the plant and tie it up, or the employers may declare a lock-out and tie it up. If the Government itself should step in, it would say, "This plant is going to operate. The Government is going to operate it. If employers who know their jobs want to continue to work, all right; but the Government is the boss. If employees want to continue to work, they may continue to work; but the Government of the United States will be their supervisor. If there are those who do not want to work, who have a yen for a vacation, all they have to do is to get their hats, walk out, and keep on walking.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield,

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Merely setting up boards to settle wage disputes and matters of that sort would not necessarily reach the crux of this situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There are other kinds of strikes. For instance, we have a strike in the city of St. Louis at the present time in a plant which has some $18,000,000 worth of contracts for the Navy Department, covering material which the Navy Department says is of the most imperatively necessary kind, and with respect to which time is of the essence of the whole matter. Production is held up by a jurisdictional strike. The plant has been 100-percent unionized for years. There is no dispute whatever as to wages or hours, or collective bargaining, or the fact that the plant is 100-percent unionized. There is not even any dispute between the two great labor organizations, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., because both factions are A. F. of L. affiliates. There is a jurisdictional dispute between the machinists and the carpenters of the A. F. of L. Vitally necessary Government work is being held up.

Unless there is some authority somewhere to see that Government work goes forward, as is proposed in the Senator's amendment, I do not see how setting up wage boards or anything of that kind can meet the situation, because in the case to which I refer, as I have said, there is no dispute as to wages. There is no dispute as to hours of labor, conditions of labor, or collective bargaining. The only dispute is a jurisdictional row between two local unions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I think his remarks are entirely timely and appropriate and go directly to the point. The reason why the Senator from Texas mentioned the wage boards was to show that we are not trying to ignore or fail to recognize the rights of labor or of the employers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Texas says. I am merely suggesting that there is another field outside what he mentions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to give employees every opportunity to present their grievances and troubles. I wish to afford the same opportunity to employers. But that does not answer the question. When we have a hung jury, we do not get any verdict. That is what happens in the case of strikes. So there is no other answer.

Whose business is it to produce war materials? It is the business of the Government of the United States to see that they are produced. Are we to have a sidewalk conference somewhere and let a picket line determine whether or not we shall produce national-defense articles? The responsibility is that of the Government of the United States. We assume that responsibility in this body. We called the young men of this Republic from their homes and occupations and said to them, "You must join the Army or the Navy." Those young men were not in a position to demand collective bargaining. We said, "We in the Congress will determine those matters. You are going into the Army at $21 a month."

Other men, whose military training had been deferred in order that they

might do skilled work, were relieved from going into the Army. Some of them held meetings in little groups and said, "We will not work unless you pay us what we say we shall be paid. We will not work unless you do what we say you should do."

Mr. President, is the Government of the United States to have its arm paralyzed by that sort of thing, or will it step in with some authority and emphasis on what it does and say, "This plant is going to operate; if you do not want to work, you can get out, but the plant is going to operate?"

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite see how the Senator's amendment would make anybody go to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not.

Mr. TAFT. Then I do not see how it would solve the problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not solve everything. The Senator from Texas does not say that it is a cure-all.

Mr. TAFT. If the men do not want to work, they will not work. If they are going back to work in California today, it is not because the Government has taken possession of the plant. It is because apparently they wanted to work all the time, and they were prevented from doing so by picket lines and violence. So it does not seem to me that there is as yet any evidence that taking over the plant was in any way an essential feature of the solution of the strike.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the Senator's solution?

Mr. TAFT. I think that if adequate protection had been given to the employees by the same soldiers, the same men who went back to work yesterday would have gone back to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are now affording them protection with 2,000 soldiers. If that protection is not adequate, we will send some more. I do not see the Senator's point. The Senator's point seems to be that instead of saying that the Government will take over the plant, we should send some soldiers out there.

Mr. TAFT. I do not intend to oppose the bill, because I think the Government already has the necessary power; but I still do not think that the bill affords a solution to the problem. If the men do not want to work, they are no more willing to work for the Government than for the owner of the plant. If they were being prevented by force from working, the soldiers who took possession of the plant could have seen to it that they were protected in their right to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says that the bill would not make them work. Has the Senator any bill or proposal which would make them work whether they wanted to work or not?

Mr. TAFT. The President had full power to send the Army there yesterday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about making the employees work. The Senator says that the bill is defective because it would not make them work.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's argument is that the proposed legislation is the way to make the men work, and that they should not be allowed to strike while other men are being paid $21 a month in the Army. I say that the Senator's amendment would not put anybody to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas did not say it would. If the Senator from Ohio had listened as well as he talks, he would have heard the Senator from Texas say that if a man did not want to work, all he would have to do would be to get his hat and walk out, and keep on walking. Was the Senator present when I said that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but the Senator's subsequent argument was somewhat inconsistent with that position.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, all right; let us see. If the Senator from Ohio heard the Senator from Texas say that, how can he say that the Senator from Texas has been contending that it would make them go to work? I did not make any such contention as that.

The Senator from Ohio is a statesman. He does not think this bill is any good, but he is for it. He just said he was going to vote for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to ask the Senator one other question. He suggested that there was a difference between Government operation and private operation because, as I understood him, the Government could refuse to employ Communists or other agitators.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Whereas, of course, private employers are required by the National Labor Relations Act to employ such people; they cannot turn them down, as I remember the law. In fact, the National Labor Relations Board insists that they do not turn them down, particularly if they are officials of unions. So I am wondering if the Senator feels that under his bill for Government operation, perhaps there is a difference, and that the Government can operate a plant without regard to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly; I think the Government can do so. That is the thought I tried to convey a moment ago.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment; I do not want to ignore the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Ohio poses that question. I think the Government can do so.

Another thing is that they cannot strike against the Government of the United States. They cannot strike against our Government. A few boys up there with a few implements of peace in their hands can stop all the pickets that come there.

Now I want to say this in answer to the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator to say that they cannot strike against the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, they can quit and go about their business; but they cannot put picket lines up there and keep other people from going to work.

Mr. TAFT. But a strike simply means ceasing to work.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, they can quit, and can go plumb to Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Therefore they can strike against the Government of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; they can strike.

Mr. TAFT. But the Senator just said they could not strike against the Government of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. They cannot tie up the plant. That is what I mean.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In just a moment. I want to make some observations in answer to the Senator from Ohio.

The Senator from Ohio says, "Oh, well, this bill does not amount to anything, but I am not going to oppose it"; and the Senator says, "The only trouble was that those men wanted to work all the time."

Granted that they did—why did they not work? Why did they not work all the time? The Senator said there was no trouble, that they wanted to work all the time, that all they wanted was a chance to work. Why did they not work all the time? Because those who were on strike would not only not work themselves, but they had 3,000 pickets massed in front of the gates, turning over the automobiles of those who wanted to go in to work, keeping out the men who wanted to go back into the plant, strongarming them. That answers the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I am afraid of the Senator from Oregon, but I will yield in a moment.

That answers the Senator from Ohio. He says they wanted to work all the time, that it is not necessary to pass the bill, but just let them go to work. It took 2,000 soldiers out there to make it possible for those who wanted to work to go to work. Under my bill anyone who wants to strike may strike, I say to the Senator from Ohio; and the Senator from Ohio has no plan that will prevent it. He has here no peonage bill that would make men work, whether they want to or not, except by putting them in the Army. That is all right; we will put some of these men in the Army, if they do not want to work, under the draft. We will remove their preference. The President has already issued the order.

No; they can strike. But this bill goes further than that. It is a constitutional right, we will admit, that if a man does not want to work he may quit. On the other hand, while that is a valuable constitutional right—to quit work if one wants to—there is another valuable constitutional right in this country; that is the right to work if you want to work; and no one else has a constitutional right to say that you shall not work when you want to work, and when there is someone ready to hire you and to employ you. This bill does say to these men, "If you are raising trouble and you want to

quit—quit; but you cannot stand out here at the gates of this plant and tell every other man who wants to work in a national-defense plant that he shall not work, and that you are going to keep him from work by force, violence, and all the arts of persuasion and coercion and intimidation that it is possible for men to exert."

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I want to submit an amendment aimed to be helpful to the objective of the Senator from Texas. Briefly, it provides that whenever the President has taken over any plant, and so forth, he is authorized to induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant, and so forth. I should like to send this amendment to the desk and offer it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot keep the Senator from sending it to the desk, but I hope the Senator will not press it, because under that amendment we would have to amend the whole Selective Service Act. The President already has issued an order to the draft boards throughout the country that with respect to any man who has gotten deferment by reason of being a skilled laborer; if he is on strike, the deferment shall be withdrawn.

Mr. HOLMAN. Briefly, it provides that he shall go to work in that plant under the direction of the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Everyone and anyone who is in the plant?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, who was on his feet first; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I approve of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, and I will support it.

In answer to the Senator from Ohio, who asks if a man can strike against the Government of the United States, I desire to say that a man can do so, but he should not strike against the Government of the United States; and in my opinion, when he does strike against the Government of the United States, he has taken his third strike and he is out. It is apparent that, under the order of the President, when the soldiers moved into that plant 2,000 patriotic men of this country went to work; and the patriotic men of this country are working in order to make materials for the boys who are in the military camps and who are receiving $21 a month.

I say that the Senator from Texas has a good bill which ought to be passed, and it ought to be passed speedily.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

I yield now to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the President's order to the Army to operate the plant, which, as I understand, means that an Army officer today is in charge of that plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so understand it. If he is not I hope he soon may be.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator feel there is any limit to the extent to which the armed forces might be used in the operation of the plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why, yes; I do.

Mr. BREWSTER. Where would the line be drawn between the officer who now is in charge and any of the men under his charge who might be engaged in mechanical operations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will explain the matter to the Senator. Is that all his question?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what I wished to know.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that the president of that company or of any other company does not go in there and run a machine, he does not go in there and sweep the floors. He directs it. He is the head, he is the executive. If I were an Army officer and took charge of one of the plants, the first thing I would do would be to call in all the superintendents and the heads of the departments and say, "You have been running this business, and you know your business, or are supposed to. You go right on. If there is any difficulty, you report the trouble to me. You go right on and do this job as you have been doing it."

Then I would call in the employees and the men in the laboring departments and would tell them the same thing: "I have no quarrel with you. This plant has got to operate. If you want to continue, report to your division foremen and your laboring chiefs, and the higher ups report to me if there is any trouble."

What is the harm in that?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am in entire accord with the Senator, but I want to know where it will stop. Apparently today there is a shortage of several thousand men in the plant; not all the employees are back. We have several thousand mechanics in the Army. Does the Senator feel that under the amendment the President would be authorized at this time to use those Army mechanics in the operation of that plant?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I think under the present authority, under the Draft Act, and under his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army, he can detail, if necessary, men having mechanical experience who are now in the Army; he could, if he desired, detail them to do this work.

Now let say to the Senator from Maine that that was done during the World War. During that war we sent enlisted men of the Army to the Northwest, to Washington and Oregon, to produce fir and other timbers for the manufacture of airplanes; and in France whole regiments of troops were detailed to perform labor in unloading goods at the docks and other places. They were still in the military service, but they were detailed to perform those duties.

Mr. BREWSTER. Could that be done under the existing law or under the amendment of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it could be done under the general control of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If I am Commander in Chief of the Army, I can tell the men in the Army to do anything that is not prohibited under Army regulations or by law.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it could be

Mr. BRIDGES. I am in sympathy with the objective sought by the Senator, and I think he has exhibited courage and patriotism in presenting the matter at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am wondering why, however, the result cannot be accomplished by sending the troops to protect American workers in their fundamental right to work and allow the operation of the factory or plant to proceed by private operation and still use the troops for protection in their right to work. Is there not an advantage in this method?

Mr. CONNALLY. In essence there is no distinction at all. What has happened in California amounts in effect to that. Troops are being sent to protect those who want to work. This is the practical reason: If we simply send in troops to protect the employer and say we are going to take his side and say to the employees "go on and work just as you have been working," immediately there would be raised a reaction on the part of many laboring people that we were taking the side of the employer and we were sending in troops to bayonet them or shoot them because they do not go along. That is not a very strong reason, I will say, but it is enough to make a distinction.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if he had listened to the Senator from Texas awhile ago he would have understood that the Government taking over a plant does not mean it is going to disrupt the organization at all. I dare say today that under the Army officer in charge of the plant in California the employees are the same as those who have been working all the time; the superintendents and heads of divisions are the same; they are going right on just as if they were still in the employ of the operator, and they are, in effect, still in the employ, in effect, of the owners of that plant. But the Government simply steps in and takes supervisory charge and control. That is all there is to it.

I am glad the Senator approves my bill, but do not let us hunt up any more ghosts than we can handle. The Senator wants done exactly what has been done at Inglewood; I assume he wants something to be done exactly in conformity with this amendment; and yet he wonders why it could not be done in some other way. If there is a way readily at hand, why go off and comb the bushes for some other way to do it? Why detour when there is a plain road straight ahead?

Mr. BRIDGES. If we want to follow the plain road, the straight road, it would not be what the Senator from Texas has suggested. He is taking a long detour to reach a given point. I prefer the straight road rather than the Senator's detour, but if we cannot get action by the direct route I will take the detour.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am very glad to have him come out for this amendment, because I know his support will carry a good deal of weight.

Mr. President, one other word and I am done. This matter was first discussed by the Senator from Texas on April 2, 1941, in the RECORD, page 2863, where I said:

> So, if I had my way about it, I would adopt a provision directing or authorizing the President, through the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, to take over any plant which now has contracts for the production of essential national-defense articles, or arms or munitions, where disputes between the employer and the employees, or other labor disturbances, or strikes are impeding and delaying production.

After making those remarks, I had this amendment prepared, and I have been waiting to present it for what I thought was the psychological time. So on last Thursday in this Chamber, I introduced this amendment in the form of a bill and made some remarks and submitted some recommendations and some statistics with reference to the delay in the production of essential defense articles.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up more of the Senate's time——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the Senator's judgment, would the adoption of this amendment obviate the necessity for the passage of the general bill which has been proposed enlarging the Presidential power to take over facilities?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator I have not examined that bill; I have not, in fact, read it, but I understand that those who are urging it would not be satisfied with this particular proposal.

I do not speak my own attitude, because I have not any attitude; I do not know at the moment where I stand on it; but let me say to the Senator that persons who are urging the general bill insist that the necessity for it arises because under the present law the Government has no power of requisition as to personal property. It can seize land and condemn it, but they claim—I am not urging the bill; I think it is too broad, to be frank—that in some cases persons who have raw material, such as scrap iron, copper, or nickel, which the Government needs and wants, will not sell it for a fair price; they will not give it up except at an exorbitant price, and the War Department, which is urging this bill, says, "We want the right to go and take that and pay the owner what the fair value is, through the court, if need be." That is their contention, and that being their contention, I assume they would not be satisfied with this bill. But my proposal has no relation to that bill, for I drew my amendment 2 months ago, long before the other bill was ever heard of in this Chamber. I am not offering it as a substitute or an amendment; it is offered wholly independently.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Probably there was some connection between the two, for, it seems to me, the Senator's bill is 95 percent of the justification that would have been urged in behalf of the other bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be. I will say that some enterprising newspaperman when I introduced this bill the other day immediately saw an effort to substitute it for the other bill. My bill, as I have said, was drawn on the second day of April, 1941. The other bill was only introduced a week or two ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said, I should like to read a dispatch in this afternoon's Washington Star, in which it is said:

> The War Department asked Congress today to sidetrack its so-called property seizure bill temporarily to permit speedy passage of legislation to give the President specific statutory authority to deal with defense strikes.
>
> Under Secretary of War Patterson told the House Military Affairs Committee that amendments to the selective-service law, such as proposed by Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, or Chairman VINSON, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, would "fill the needs as the War Department sees it."

So I presume that they have retreated from their position referred to by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have not seen the afternoon newspaper, but the Senator from Texas has correctly stated the situation, as I understand it. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas has absolutely nothing to do with the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from North Carolina. Hearings upon that bill will be held in the Senate beginning next Monday and in the House of Representatives beginning today.

There is no justification for the confusion between the two measures. As the Senator from Texas has stated, the questions raised by the bill introduced by the Senator from North Carolina apply, in great measure, to personal property not only to accumulated stocks of aluminum, say, but to privately owned airplanes, on the same theory the Senator from Texas has urged that if the Government of the United States may draft a human being for defense purposes and put him into camp for a year, when it calls upon an American citizen who owns a private plane and offers to buy the plane and he refuses to sell it to his Government, the Government should have power to take over the plane and use it for defense purposes. The same thing is true of a yacht owned by a man who refuses to sell it to his Government at this time, when the Government needs it. That furnishes an illustration—a plane, or an accumulated stock of raw material in the hands of some man who is seeking to speculate and make money out of the necessities of his Government. For that purpose this bill was introduced.

I agree, as I read it, that in drafting the bill unnecessary powers were granted; but whenever the committees of the Congress, in Senate and House, after hearing what it is desired to accomplish, sit down to consider the matter, they can draft legislation that the Congress certainly will approve and the country will approve, to require the individual citizen who has property that is demanded for the defense of his country to turn over that property and be paid for it, just as a citizen is required to go to camp and serve his country.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; then I will yield.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Michigan that the amendment which I now offer was prepared by me without any consultation with the War and Navy Departments. Nobody had anything to do with it except the legislative drafting counsel, Mr. Wood, who helped me prepare it and draw it; so it is not in any sense related to the other bill. It has no concern at all with the other bill, because I drew the amendment on the 2d of April 1941, 2 months ago, before I ever heard of the other bill.

What the Senator from South Carolina says about the attitude of those who are pushing the bill I think is accurate.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire. Then I shall have concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question about the language on page 2 of his amendment, where these words appear:

> Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged.

What I want to know is this: After a plant is taken over, when the emergency terminates, is the plant turned back?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that there would be no rule about it. The President announced in the newspapers, as I saw today, that the Inglewood plant will be turned back to the owners just as soon as normal production is resumed. Under this bill, in no event could the taking over last longer than the unlimited emergency. The language has been changed to read, "the unlimited emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27," instead of the one declared in 1939.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator object to a more definite termination being inserted in his amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what "definite" means in that connection; but I certainly think the language is adequate just as it is, because as long as this unlimited emergency continues, as long as it is necessary to get these war materials, I want this power to continue.

Mr. BRIDGES. Suppose, for example, certain words were used whereby the President must return the property to the owners within a certain given length of time after the emergency is over.

Mr. CONNALLY. The power is terminated when the emergency is over. The President then has no power under the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The other part of section 9 is terminated by the Selective Service Act on May 15, 1945. Does the Senator think the powers contained in his amendment will also terminate at that date?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, I think undeniably they will. Of course, they will, because this is an amendment to the general act; but this power can be exercised only during the existence of the unlimited emergency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago the Senator stated that the legislative counsel had drafted this bill. I have high regard for the ability of the legislative counsel, but sometimes they draft measures which it is rather difficult for me to comprehend, and I find that the courts also have some trouble in determining just what is meant.

I should like to give a concrete example with reference to the authority the President is given under section 2, or provision 2, in which he is given the right to take over—

any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials.

In my home city we have a small manufacturing concern which manufactures plow wheels. If the Secretary of War should determine that that factory should, we will say, manufacture tractor wheels as defense articles, instead of plow wheels as it is now doing, I wonder whether or not the President, under the language of this bill, would have power to take over that factory by simply authorizing some agency of Government to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that he must bear in mind all the time that under this amendment the President cannot exercise any of those powers unless there is a strike or a threatened strike.

Mr. LUCAS. That raises the very question.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator ought to do is to get section 9 of the Draft Act, which provides about the draft of employers' plants. That is in greater detail.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not section 9 before me. Perhaps that may be where I fell into error in attempting to analyze this provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Section 9 deals with taking over the plant when the employer will not make defense articles at the request of the Government, and provides for his compensation.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I puzzled for quite a while over the same question that disturbs the Senator from Illinois; that is, whether or not the President might take over a plant which was not engaged in defense production, but was making cosmetics, we will say, or, as the Senator from Illinois says, wheels for plows; but I think that question is answered by a careful study of the final sentence of the amendment. The President could not take over the plant to which the Senator from Illinois refers unless he found that production there was necessary to the national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Production of what?

Mr. BROWN. Anything; defense articles that are necessary to the national-defense program.

Mr. LUCAS. As I read this amendment, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, it occurred to me that all the qualifying language in that section primarily referred to provision 1, which says:

Any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith.

In other words, under provision 1, articles are already being manufactured for national defense. In that case, when there is a strike, there cannot be any question that under this amendment the Government would have a right to take over the plant. But when we get to provision No. 2 we say that the President is authorized to take over—

any plant which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, is capable of being readily transformed into a plant equipped for the manufacture of any such articles or materials.

I now come back to the original illustration that I gave. In my home town there is a little factory manufacturing plow wheels at the present time. Undoubtedly, with just a slight change in the machinery, it could manufacture tractor wheels, which would be defense materials for the Army. The point which worries me, under this language, is how the President of the United States, in the first instance, is to take over that factory. What kind of an investigation can he make under this amendment? In other words, it deals altogether with the question of strikes; it deals with disturbed conditions with respect to labor; and at the particular time that the President of the United States is interested in this factory which is manufacturing nondefense articles there is no strike. There is nothing at all there other than machinery and tools and equipment that can be used for manufacturing defense articles.

I just raise this question because in the discussion of it it disturbed me as to whether or not there is any power at all for the President to finally say in the decree he has to issue that he exercises this power and authority as desirable in the public interest. It seems to me there may be some question about it.

Mr. BROWN. I do not see how the President could take over the plant which is described in subsection 2 under any circumstances, unless he could make the finding, which would be a rather extreme one, that it was necessary to take the plant over to produce material for the national-defense program.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will permit me right there——

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not trying to take the Senator from the floor, but right on that point, if the Senator will get section 9 of the Selective Service Act, which is what we are amending, he will find that is the section which provides for the President taking over plants when the employers or the owners of the plants refuse to manufacture articles. The bill before us is drawn with the idea that we will apply to strike-bound plants under similar conditions rules that were applied to the refusal of the employer to go along. That is why this language to which the Senator adverts is used. Listen to the language of the Selective Service Act:

Any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the Army or Navy, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof.

That is the original draft act. In drawing my amendment I was merely trying to make the same conditions apply to a strike which would apply to the President's authority in section 9 of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the Senator's intention at all, and I am with him in the amendment; I intend to vote for it. The only thought that disturbed me was, as I stated before, as to whether or not under the language of provision 2 of the amendment the President really would have any authority to take over a plant such as the one I have heretofore described. The Senator from Texas just read a part of section 9 of the act, but when we go on from where he left off we find its says—

or who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of such orders—

And so forth. In other words, under this act there had to be a defiance of some kind, but under the amendment of the Senator from Texas, provision 2, as I understand it, gives to the Secretary of War the absolute right to take over a plant which is manufacturing any defense materials if, in his judgment, after an investigation, the War Department can use that plant to effectively manufacture articles of defense or other implements of war.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is done in section 9, which reads—

shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment.

What must the employer do?

Who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the

execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War.

Why, that would not apply to a plant that was manufacturing the articles the Senator specified, if the Secretary of War should so determine. After the Secretary of War determined it, nobody but the President could exercise the power of taking over.

Mr. BROWN. All that refers to the owner of a plant who refuses to permit it to be used for the production of defense articles.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. When we get down to subdivision 2, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, we are met with a different situation. We are not talking about the refusal of an owner to permit his plant to be used, we are talking about some condition—a strike being the condition we all have in mind—which prevents the use of the plant.

I say the answer to the question the Senator from Illinois propounds is that there is no conceivable condition where the President could make a finding that the production of the plow wheels, in the illustration used by the Senator, or the illustration I used, a cosmetic plant which might be converted into a chemical plant—there is no conceivable situation where the President could find that the failure to produce due to a strike or other cause threatened the defense program, because we are talking about a plant which might be taken over for the purpose of producing chemicals, or for the purpose, as in the Senator's illustration, of producing plow wheels. So while I thought at first there was some inconsistency in the bill, I came to the general conclusion that no power could be exercised under the last sentence of the Senator's bill which would apply to his subdivision No. 2. The power could only be exercised when the plant got into the production of defense materials. I do not think it amounts to anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike to disagree with the Senator from Michigan, but I think it amounts to a good deal. In other words, if the position of the Senator from Michigan is correct, then provision No. 2 can in no wise apply until the Government has taken over the plant. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. That is my view of it.

Mr. LUCAS. After the Government takes it over, then there must be the conditions which are laid down in provision No. 2 with respect to a strike or other disturbance around that plant which materially affect the manufacture of the defense weapons.

Mr. BROWN. My point is that the fear which the Senator from Illinois raises can never materialize, because the President would never have any authority to take over a plant described in provision No. 2 unless he should find that production in that plant was necessary to the national-defense program. Of course, he could not so find unless they were producing some of the articles which are described in the proclamation.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I am making is that he could absolutely make a finding, and I am questioning whether or not the authority is sufficient in this amendment for him to make a finding. In other words, if in the plant which I have depicted as an example they have machine tools which they can use in making tractor wheels instead of plow wheels, the President of the United States would have the power to authorize the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to take over the plant equipped for the manufacture of tractor wheels by a few little changes in connection with the machinery that is in the plant.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose the Senator's assumption is correct; if the President finds it is necessary to get those car wheels, and the employer is going to be guaranteed a fair compensation for his plant, why should he not take it over?

Mr. LUCAS. He should take it over.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. I think he should take it over. The only question I am raising as to provision No. 2 is whether or not the authority is sufficient for the President of the United States to take over that kind of a factory. In other words, provision No. 2 deals specifically with strikes, it deals specifically with disturbances and other matters around a factory which interfere with the manufacture of defense weapons. But in the first instance about which I am talking, under subdivision (2) here is a factory which is going along in a normal way, there are no strikes, they are manufacturing nondefense articles; but the Secretary of War sees an opportunity to use that plant for the purpose of manufacturing defense articles for this Nation and those other nations which are vital to our defense. So, he says, "I am going to take that factory over." The point I am raising is whether he can take that factory over under the language that is now in section 2.

Mr. CONNALLY. My contention is that he has that power under section 9 which I read awhile ago, strike or no strike. He has power to take it over under section 9, strike or no strike. Under my amendment he could not take it over unless there is a strike.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] that there are three different propositions here, as he explained awhile ago, and I have some fears as to the authority of the President to do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator on his painstaking and careful analysis.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In order perhaps to take care of that condition, at least looking forward to that very thing, I am wondering if the Senator would object to the addition of three words to his amendment. On page 2, line 14, after the words "or threatened failure of" would the Senator object to adding the three words "or interference with."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, so the language would be:

That the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of or interference with production at such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause.

When one says, "an existing or threatened failure of production," the words "threatened failure" cover almost as much territory as any garment one could devise. I would not object to his proposal. I will say to the Senator from Illinois, but this is a matter that has been canvassed around here, and there is quite general agreement on the matter, and I hesitate to change the text, because the Senator knows how easy it is to stir up a question about such language.

Mr. LUCAS. I will withdraw my suggestion. I thought the addition of those words would improve the Senator's language.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if he would object to the addition of certain language to the amendment which he has offered. My proposal is prompted by the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who read language from a newspaper which was supposed to have been included in the Executive order. After the word "interest", at the end of the Senator's amendment, the language which I offer or suggest is as follows:

Provided, however, That such power and authority with respect to any such plant shall terminate, and such plant shall be returned to private management, as soon as the President has determined that normal production at such plant has been resumed.

I know that the suggestion was made to the Senator previously. The amendment is in keeping with the expressed intention of the administration, and I am very hopeful that the Senator will accept the language as a part of his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is always a matter of regret for the Senator from Texas to have to disagree with the expressed desire of the Senator from Connecticut, but I think the language he has suggested is wholly unnecessary, and I think it would be the insertion of a provision or a command of law that might prove embarrassing some time or other.

The whole theory of this thing is that it is temporary, and the President has already publicly stated that this Inglewood plant would be returned as soon as normal production is resumed. But when you put in a statute a command that the President do something you are hampering his discretion, and many times there are considerations that the President knows about that others do not know about.

I am perfectly willing to trust the President to turn these plants back when the emergency ceases. He does not want them any longer than he thinks it is necessary to keep them. The President has not been hasty about this matter. The President has been very patient. He has not invoked this authority hurriedly or without due consideration. I hope the

Senator from Connecticut will not press his proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to advise him, if the Senator will further yield to me, that he seems to misunderstand my amendment. I am perfectly willing to trust the President. I have not any doubt about what the President might do. But we are writing the legislation. We have a responsibility. It is important that the people know how we feel about it. My language will, at least, afford a great deal of comfort to the people of the United States, because we tell them herein that it is our intention that when the President has determined that normal production has been resumed the plant will be returned to private ownership.

The Senator in his amendment provides for taking over plants for the duration of the emergency. The emergency might very well last for 10 years, but I do not think the Senator would insist that it would be the part of wisdom that a large number of important industrial plants in this country be operated by the Federal Government while things were normal in the plants.

All the things the Senator insists upon are covered in the amendment which I have offered. There is no questioning the President of the United States. The language is offered to set down a policy and to allay the fears which have been excited, and will be excited, should it unfortunately become necessary for the Federal Government to take over any other plant under any circumstances. I very sincerely believe my amendment will strengthen the Senator's amendment, if he will take this language, which does not in any way detract from his purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that his amendment is directed at the whole of section 9. His amendment is not so drawn that it would affect the strike provision. The way the amendment is drawn it would go back and affect plants which would not cooperate, and as soon as the Government got them running, the Senator's proposal would have the effect to turn them over again.

Mr. MALONEY. Assuming that is true, if the President determines that normal conditions have been resumed in any plant he has taken over under any circumstances, why should not those plants be returned?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will tell the Senator why. Here is an employer who will not manufacture for the Government, who will not take a contract at a fair compensation. The Government comes in and takes charge of that plant. Does the Senator think that as soon as the Government gets the plant to producing it should be returned? I do not agree with such a proposal at all.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not have the Selective Service Act before me. I think the act provides a penalty for failure to do the things the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. And the penalty is $50,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not in every case, but the penalty can go up quite high.

Mr. MALONEY. I think that in the attitude he assumes the Senator is going far afield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Connecticut voted for the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; and I spoke for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the Senator voted for the $50,000 penalty provision.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; and I am not complaining against it. I do not want to take it out.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Connecticut wants to go back and amend the prior law, very well, but I do not agree to that, so far as I am concerned. I know that with respect to these plants in which there are strikes, and which are taken over, the President has said that he is going to return them as soon as normal operation is achieved, and I am willing to trust the President to do that.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Texas is not willing to trust the President to do that, because his language provides for the duration of the emergency. The language of the President provides that the plants shall be returned as soon as normal production is resumed. So the Senator from Texas is at variance with the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have been at times, but I am not in this instance. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, if he will read the language, he will find that this amendment is simply a granting of the power to take the plant over. Of course, the power to take it over also includes the power to turn it loose. The President does not have to take the plant and keep it the rest of his life. He has the power under this provision to turn the plant loose at any time, and he has said he is going to turn it loose the moment normal production is resumed. I do not want to hamper him and try and direct him or hogtie him any further than the act does. I have every regard for the Senator from Connecticut, and I know he is prompted by the finest of motives, but I cannot agree with his proposal.

Mr. MALONEY. I respect the Senator's decision to disagree, but I certainly insist that he be clear about it. I am not trying to hogtie the President. I am borrowing the President's own language to perfect the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and I hope he will not misconstrue what I have said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not. That is the reason I am against his proposal. I construe it properly.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Connally amendment and to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Despite the dramatic events of the past week, and especially the past day or two, the problem of avoiding stoppages of defense production caused by labor disputes is not a new one. Many of us have been concerned about it for many months—in fact, almost since the inception of the defense program.

In view of our extremely leisurely procedure to date in attacking this problem, I fail to see the need for the precipitate action which I believe is involved in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas. I should prefer to see some speedy but careful committee work done on the subject within the next few days before action is taken in this body. But since the subject is brought before us by the Connally amendment, I feel impelled to express my views as to the solution of the basic problem involved, which is how to settle labor disputes without stopping production.

The Connally amendment would authorize the President to take over and operate plants closed or threatened with closing because of labor disputes. I believe that is placing the legislative cart before the horse.

What we desperately need today is a basic set of procedures for fair settlement of labor disputes without stoppage of production. The Connally amendment would write into the law a drastic penalty—a penalty on employers, whose plants would be taken over by the Government, and on employees, whose strikes would be broken by bayonets. A penalty for what?

The amendment does not say what the penalty is for, but presumably it is being imposed for failure of one or both parties to follow some nebulous or nonexistent policy or procedure in labor disputes which neither the administration nor the Congress has ever stated clearly and definitely.

I do not want to defend the strikers at North American Aviation for their refusal to heed the pleas of their own international leaders to return to work and submit their dispute to the Mediation Board. They should have done so. Yet I can understand why it was easy for the leaders of that local union, in defiance of their international leaders, to convince their followers that they should remain on strike, despite the President's statements.

After all, the men undoubtedly had read newspaper accounts of how one high administration official after another had appeared before congressional committees to oppose waiting periods or cooling-off periods designed to permit Government mediation of disputes before production was stopped. They opposed such proposals on the ground that such legislation would constitute compulsion, and we could not have compulsion on labor unions.

That was a fairly clear position; and I think those union members understood it. Then the Mediation Board came along and told them they should go back to work and provide a waiting period while the Board considered their grievances. When they refused to go along, that request of the Board was backed up by the President's order to the Army to take over the plant, and the union's strike was halted at the point of the bayonet. That is compulsion with a vengeance.

Mr. President, I think that in all fairness we must admit that there were some grounds for the employees being confused as to just what their country expected of them in this emergency. That is not to imply that I do not approve the President's action. I do approve it, heartily, and I believe he did the only thing possible in the circumstances. Furthermore, I call attention to the language in the President's proclamation. His remedy

was much less drastic than that proposed here. His order reads:

Possession and operation hereunder shall be terminated by the President as soon as he determines that the plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

In other words, the plant is not taken over permanently, but merely until such time as the dispute is settled and normal production resumed, when it is to be returned to private operation. I commend the President on that statement of policy.

But while this action was necessary in the North American case yesterday, the point I make is that if we develop and clearly state to all employers and employees the policy that we, the Congress and the administration, expect both of them to follow in an effort during this emergency to settle their disputes without halting production, then we shall be attacking the basic problem. We shall be striking at its root; and I believe that once such a policy, such a set of procedures, is fully understood by every individual employer and employee, they will follow those procedures, and it will be the rare exception when the Government will have to resort to such drastic methods as those invoked yesterday in order to assure continuous production of vital defense materials.

I believe that we should only further contribute to the confusion now existing if we should write into law this drastic penalty or remedy for the present unhappy situation, without at the same time providing a saner, more democratic method of solving the problem, which is still that of settling disputes without stopping production.

After all, there can be no strike unless a fairly substantial group of employees feel that they are being treated unfairly, and that they have a grievance, whether that grievance be real or fancied. The action of the Army at Inglewood yesterday has not removed the grievance those employees believed they had. And even if the employees do come back to work, until their grievance is adjusted to their satisfaction or they are convinced that they were and are being treated fairly and were misled by their local leaders, the North American plant will not have the wholehearted cooperation from its employees which is necessary for top-speed production.

So it seems to me that the real problem, that of adjusting the grievance, still remains to be settled at North American; and all yesterday's action accomplished was to assure resumption of some sort of production pending adjustment of that grievance.

Government seizure and operation of a plant should be the very last resort, after all other methods of settlement of the dispute have been exhausted. That policy can be carried out only if Congress clearly defines what the other methods and procedures are. After those procedures have been exhausted, or if one or the other party refuses to follow them, then we are justified in resorting to the more drastic remedy.

But I do not believe it is either sound democracy or sound legislation simply to "crack down" on both employers and employees with a drastic penalty for failing to do what Congress and the administration have never told them clearly they should do.

The amendment I am offering to the Connally amendment grew out of the so-called cooling-off bill which I introduced last February. A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee has held hearings on that bill over the past 5 weeks; and as a result of the ideas expressed and constructive proposals made in those hearings I have drafted a new bill.

I had intended to offer it in the subcommittee, and have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] of prompt consideration. If the subcommittee acts favorably, we believe it might be possible to report a bill for consideration in a week or 10 days. The proposal contained in the Connally amendment could be incorporated into that bill very easily as a final measure to prevent production stoppages in the event the more democratic procedures set forth in the bill are not followed or fail.

I, myself, prefer that method of procedure, and I believe that the President's action of yesterday shows clearly that there is not such tremendous need for haste that such procedure could not be followed. However, since the Senator from Texas has offered his amendment, I feel that in all fairness to both employees and employers we should, if we adopt this drastic remedy for production stoppages, offer them at the same time a more reasonable and sane method of settling their disputes.

The procedures set forth in my amendment are those which one union leader after another testified at our hearings are the ones they have urged and even instructed their locals to follow, and which employers likewise have endorsed. No compulsions and no penalties of any kind, other than that proposed in the Connally amendment, are proposed in my amendment. The Congress would simply set out in clear and definite terms the procedures which it expects both employers and employees to follow in this emergency in the interests of national defense and the security of our country.

I am convinced that in 99 cases out of a hundred, that would be all the compulsion needed, because I am convinced that all but a negligible minority of employees and employers want to do everything possible to expedite our national-defense program. But so far no one has told them plainly and clearly how they may do so. I propose that we tell them now in this amendment.

I have had placed on the desk of every Senator a mimeographed copy of the amendment which I have proposed. It would amend the final sentence of the Connally amendment to read as follows:

Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, (1) that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or other cause; (2) that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest; and (3) that either or both of the parties to a labor dispute at such plant have refused to follow the procedure set forth in section 25 of the Defense Industry Conciliation Act of 1941 in an effort to prevent stoppage of production at such plants or that the parties to a labor dispute at such plant have followed the procedure set forth in such section 25 but that a stoppage of production at such plant has occurred or is imminent.

Then I would follow that by title II, which simply would constitute the bill which I have drafted and on which our subcommittee has been working.

Section 21 of that title would simply provide:

This title may be cited as the "Defense Industry Conciliation Act of 1941."

Section 22, which is a declaration of policy, reads:

SEC. 22. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that employers and employees in defense industries who become involved in labor disputes shall exhaust every possible method of settling such disputes without stoppage of work, in order that the Nation's defense program may not be delayed.

Section 23 reads as follows:

SEC. 23. As used in this title, the term "defense industry" means any industry engaged in (1) the production, processing, or transportation of arms, armament, ammunition, implements of war, munitions, clothing, food, fuel, or any other articles or supplies, or parts or ingredients of any such articles or supplies, intended for the use of the United States or any agency thereof in connection with the national defense, or any materials used in connection with such production, processing, or transportation, except in the production of farm products on a farm, and except any industry subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or (2) the construction, reconstruction, repair, or equipping of any building, plant, or facility intended for the use of the United States or any agency thereof, or for the use of any producer or processor or transporter, in connection with the national defense.

Sections 24 and 25 are the heart of the bill. Section 24 (a) provides as follows:

SEC. 24. (a) The administration of this title, except as otherwise provided herein, is vested exclusively in the National Defense Mediation Board established by Executive Order No. 8716 of March 19, 1941 (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

Subsection (b) provides that the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor shall be transferred to the Mediation Board created by the President's order, and that all its personnel and its unexpended appropriations shall be so transferred for the duration of this title—which, incidentally, would expire on July 1, 1943. The subsection reads as follows:

(b) The Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor and all of its functions, personnel, records, property (including office equipment), and unexpended balances of appropriations and allocations are hereby transferred, for the period of effectiveness of this title, from the Department of Labor to the Board; and, upon the expiration of the period of effectiveness of this title, they shall revert to the Department of Labor. Any

transfer of personnel under this subsection shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate after the end of the fiscal year during which the transfer is made to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned and except that the Director of the Conciliation Service shall, upon his transfer to the Board, be given the title of Conciliation Director of the Board.

Subsection (c) of that section would create a Labor Standards Commission. The subsection reads as follows:

(c) There is hereby created the Labor Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), consisting of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms coterminous with the period of effectiveness of this title. Salaries of members of the Commission shall be $10,000 per annum, and the Commission is authorized to employ such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance as it finds necessary to perform its duties.

Subsection (d) provides as follows:

(d) During the period of effectiveness of this title, the Board shall be the exclusive conciliation and mediation agent of the Federal Government in labor disputes other than those with respect to which the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, are applicable.

The reason why I provide for the transfer of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor to the Mediation Board and for giving the Mediation Board exclusive jurisdiction in all conciliation and mediation efforts of the Federal Government is that before our subcommittee one witness after another told us that one trouble with the present picture and procedure is that there are too many different Government agencies and departments mixing up in this problem. The O. P. M. Labor Division, under Mr. Hillman, sends out a conciliator; the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, under Dr. Steelman, sends out a conciliator; the Mediation Board may intervene; and, then, there is a Maritime Labor Board which may intervene in cases affecting shipbuilding or the maritime industries. Mr. William Leiserson, of the National Labor Relations Board; Mr. William Davis, the vice chairman of the Mediation Board; Mr. Edward McGrady, the former Assistant Secretary of Labor, and who is now labor consultant to the War Department; as well as a number of labor leaders who testified, all said they believed it would help tremendously to eliminate the confusion now existing in this picture to have a single Federal agency handling the conciliation and mediation problem.

Section 25, title II, sets out the procedure which Congress would expect both employers and employees to follow in an effort to settle their disputes without stopping production. It is not very long, and I shall read it:

SEC. 25. Whenever a dispute arises between an employer in a defense industry and his employees with respect to wages, hours, working conditions or the terms or interpretation of an existing or proposed collective-bargaining agreement, it shall be the duty of both parties to the dispute, in the interests of national defense and security, to proceed as follows:

(a) Whenever a change is sought in wages, hours, working conditions, or other terms of employment in a defense industry, the party desiring the change, whether employees or employer, shall give to the other party 30 days' notice in writing of the change or changes sought. Within 5 days after receipt of such notice, the duly accredited representatives of the employees and the employer shall arrange for a meeting and proceed by direct negotiations between themselves to endeavor to reach an agreement on the proposed change or changes.

(b) Either party to the negotiations may call on the Board for its mediation services if at any time prior to the expiration of the 30 days it appears negotiations are deadlocked, and both parties shall request the Board's services if no agreement is reached by the end of the 30 days. The Board also may intervene in the negotiations on its own motion at any time if it has reason to believe a stoppage of production is imminent. When the services of the Board are invoked by either party or on its own motion, the Board shall immediately put itself in touch with both parties and proceed by mediation to endeavor to bring them to agreement.

(c) If the Board, within a reasonable time, fails to bring about by mediation a settlement of all points in dispute, it shall refer those points still in controversy to the Commission, which shall proceed forthwith to investigate and determine all facts pertaining to the points in controversy so referred and shall recommend to both parties a settlement of these points. The Commission shall publish its findings of fact and its recommendations for settlement in the Federal Register.

(d) The Board may at any time propose to both parties that they submit any points of their dispute with respect to which a settlement has not been reached to arbitration. Employees and employers are urged to agree to such arbitration as a patriotic contribution to national defense.

(e) Both employer and employees, during the carrying out of the procedures set forth in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, shall continue production or the other work in which they are normally engaged. Throughout the carrying out of such procedures the employer shall maintain the wages, hours, and other working conditions and terms current when the dispute arose (except for such changes as may be agreed upon with the employees), and the employees shall refrain from any action tending to decrease or halt production or the other work in which they are normally engaged.

(f) Whenever both parties to a dispute agree to submit points still in dispute to arbitration as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the employer shall agree in writing to make the wage provisions of any settlement reached through such arbitration retroactive to the date when arbitration is agreed upon.

I think we have had enough experience in this Government with conciliation and mediation to know generally what the procedures and steps should be. The first step, of course, is direct negotiation between the employer and employee. If they cannot get together in that way, then they should go to mediation: they should call in the Mediation Board, which may either send a conciliator out to the plant affected or may, if it is a sufficiently important industry, call the disputants in before the Board itself.

The Mediation Board, if it follows the procedure which has worked so well in the Railway Labor Act, should never be called upon to make findings of fact and make recommendations for settlement, for as soon as it does that the usefulness of the mediation agent is seriously impaired, because one or the other parties to the dispute will feel that it has been given an unfair deal and the parties will not thereafter have the confidence in the Mediation Board which they should have. I believe that right now the Mediation Board created by Executive order is getting itself into a very difficult position, because it is partly mediating and partly acting as a compulsory board of arbitration. It cannot be both at the same time and retain the confidence of both employer and employee.

Under the Railway Labor Act, if the Mediation Board cannot get the parties to agree to a settlement, there is one further step; they certify the dispute to the President, who appoints a special fact-finding commission, which has 30 days to investigate the facts and the dispute before making findings of fact and recommendations for settlement. That is its work. I believe that we need that sort of a fact-finding agency today.

There is under the President the office of Leon Henderson, which is attempting to keep prices from spiraling. About 75 percent of the labor disputes which arise are due to demands for wage increases, and such demands will continue so long as prices continue to increase.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reading the Senator's amendment, if I understand it correctly, it defines what constitutes defense industries. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It then limits the jurisdiction of the Mediation Board provided for in the bill to disputes in defense industries exclusively. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes. But I believe the definition of defense industries is broad enough to take in everything that is related, directly or indirectly, to national defense.

Mr. MURDOCK. If it does, then, of course, my apprehension about subsection (b) of section 4 might be uncalled for; but, as I understand subsection (b), the entire Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor is taken out of that Department and transferred to the Mediation Board.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Unless the Senator's amendment is comprehensive enough to include all industries, it would seem to me, if there are any industries left out under his definition of what is a defense industry, then, by taking over the entire personnel of the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department all industries that do not come within his definition of defense industry would be left without any mediation service. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct, but I believe the definition is broad enough so that it would take in virtually any dispute that might arise because I know of

very few that arise in these days that do not affect defense industries, one way or the other. As a matter of fact, the Conciliation Service is transferred to the Mediation Board, which I believe could take jurisdiction if it wanted to, anyway.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before taking my seat, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to make the observation that, in my opinion, the Senator from Minnesota is by his amendment making at least a proper approach to the problem which confronts the Government today. In my opinion, the taking over of plants by the Government of the United States is right in line with the intention of the Communists as to what should happen within the United States of America. I am satisfied that it is done in the name of national defense, but, if too many plants are taken over, if we adopt the policy of taking over plants on too large a scale, we are playing right into the hands of the communistic element in our labor organizations. I hope the Senate this afternoon, before voting on this question, if it shall vote on it, will give thorough and sincere consideration to the approach to this problem that is offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Utah. I may say that I have had the same feeling about this matter. I was impressed by the picture on the front page of the Washington Post this morning, showing helmeted soldiers with fixed bayonets going up against the picket line. Unless I am very much mistaken, from my observation of the tactics of the Communists and the Nazis, that picture will receive plenty of publicity in both Berlin and Moscow, and it will be used widely by communistic elements in this country to stir up more and more trouble for our defense efforts.

Section 26 of my proposal merely gives the fact-finding commission, the labor standards commission, the power of subpena.

Section 27 requires every employer in any defense industry who has any collective bargaining agreement or contract with his employees to notify the Mediation Board at least 60 days before the expiration date of such agreements or contracts. That is simply to give the Board a chance to intervene in a dispute before there is a strike or even the threat of a strike and to try to iron out the difficulty without coming right up to the point where production is stopped or threatened to be stopped.

Section 28 authorizes the Board to prescribe rules and regulations.

Section 29 authorizes an appropriation and provides that this title shall become effective on the tenth day after the date of its enactment, and, except for the provision about the reversion of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor, shall become inoperative after July 1, 1943.

To me it seems strange that the present administration, which admittedly has done so much to advance the cause of organized labor and to assure labor of a fair deal in the adjustment of their disputes, at the first sign of real trouble from labor disputes in the defense program comes forward with a proposal that the United States Government shall engage in strike-breaking with the Army. It does not "add up" to me; and I do not think we shall be fair either to the employees or to the employers if we enact into law this kind of authority without at least setting up the procedure and establishing the policy which in this emergency we expect both parties to disputes to follow before they resort to a strike, and before the Government is forced to invoke the drastic remedy which the President invoked yesterday.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have drafted language which I think probably will meet the objection heretofore expressed by the able Senator from Texas. I should like to read a new amendment, which I hope he will accept.

After the word "interest", at the conclusion of the Senator's amendment, insert:

Provided, That the power and authority exercised under this paragraph with respect to any such plant shall terminate as soon as the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

I ask the Senator from Texas if that language, which is the President's language, and which applies only to this paragraph, is agreeable to him?

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. Under his language, suppose the President should turn the plant back to the owners, and then the next day another strike should break out. I am in sympathy with the purpose of the Senator as set forth in this language; but he says:

Provided, That the power and authority exercised under this paragraph with respect to any such plant shall terminate as soon as the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

Suppose the President determines that that is the case and returns the plant to the owners today, and next week another strike breaks out: Under this language, the power to deal with the plant is exhausted. The President cannot reseize the plant.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator. It seems to me that is possible under the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I presume many things are possible under the language of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as I would amend it; but it seems to me it does not prevent the Government from following the same procedure again, and it seems to me the President would not return any taken-over plant until he was completely satisfied that the national-defense program was properly protected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except for that fear, I should not object to the Senator's amendment. I do not want to provide that the President's power shall be exhausted by one taking over. I want his power to continue, so that if the plant has another strike he may step back in and go ahead with the operation of the plant.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I interrupt to make one inquiry?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. In the amendment of the Senator from Texas is included the power to take possession not only when production ceases but when production is threatened or a strike threatens. I am wondering how the language of the Senator from Connecticut would fit into that provision. As the Senator from Texas said a while ago, his language is wonderfully inclusive. I am inclined to think it is too inclusive, because just who will be able to say when a strike threatens or when production is threatened? That is an anticipatory situation, and, of course, if the President may take possession before production is interfered with, merely because of a threat, I do not know when he will let go.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Colorado a question. Suppose a vote should be taken, and it should be announced that the workers were going to strike on the 20th of June? Would not that be a threatened strike? Ought the Government necessarily to wait until after the strike actually took place? Why could it not step in under those circumstances?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, suppose one labor leader should say, "I am going to agitate, and I am going to see that the workers in this plant strike."

Mr. CONNALLY. That goes to the weight of the evidence, and not to its admissibility.

Mr. ADAMS. In this amendment the Senator has a measure, a standard upon which the President takes possession, which is almost impossible of application. I am wondering if he has not gone too far.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is hard to lay down a rule. I will say to the Senator that, of course, when discretion is granted to anybody or any agency, it is necessary to take certain risks.

Mr. ADAMS. The cessation of production is a definite point. We know when that happens; but when we authorize taking possession when somebody threatens to cease production, that is another matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose, instead of absolutely closing the plant, there is a slow-down; the employees do not produce; they go into the plant and fiddle around and take up a great deal of time and do not produce. Is not that impeding and hindering and slowing down production?

Mr. MALONEY. If I may reply to that particular contention of the Senator from Texas—and I, too, am disturbed by what disturbs the Senator from Colorado—in line 15, on page 2—and I am now replying to the contention of the Senator from Texas—after the word "disturbance", the words "or other cause" seem to cover that particular situation. I quite agree that the words "or threatened" in line 14 go pretty far, much farther than I should want to go, and I think much farther than the Federal Government should go.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator concede that when there is an emergency, and extraordinary power is granted, there ought to be hesitation rather than undue expedition in exercising it? If there is a question, it should be resolved in favor of the Government staying out rather than of the Government going in.

Mr. MALONEY. I think so, and I also think the Senator from Texas is farseeing when he points to the fact that while there might not be a strike, production might be delayed and hampered and slowed up almost to the point where there would be no production. It seems to me, however, that he has covered that particular thing by saying "a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause," following the words "impeded or delayed." So I think the words "or threatened" ought to come out. I think he has more than covered what he had in mind.

However, I am drifting pretty far from the amendment with which I am at the moment so much concerned. I am hopeful that the Senator from Texas will accept my new language, which I am compelled again to say is the language of the President, and which, I am confident, does not do the thing that he fears it might possibly do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is one amendment pending.

Mr. MALONEY. I am asking the Senator to accept this language as a part of his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should want to study it just a little more. I agree with what the Senator has in mind, but I do not want to have the President's power exhausted by taking over a plant one time. He might have to take it over a second time. If I can preserve that power, I shall be glad to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not offer the amendment for the time being, because I am hopeful the Senator from Texas will accept it and do away with the need for a vote. I will offer it, if necessary, a little later.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I deplore the precipitate action occasioned by the immediate consideration of the Connally amendment to be followed by a decision on it. It seems to me inadvisable that we should act so hastily. We should proceed with greater deliberation by holding the hearings on this bill (S. 1508) scheduled by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to which the bill was referred.

For a few days we could observe and learn from the experience of the Government in taking over and operating an industrial plant engaged in manufacturing airplanes. However, the Connally amendment is now before us; and since the President has declared an unlimited emergency, each of us without exception is required to supply, at the descretion of the President, his own property, person, and services where and when they may be of the greatest service to our country.

Therefore, I offer the amendment which I earlier in the day sent to the desk, move its adoption, and request that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Oregon that at this time his amendment would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order. The Senator may offer his amendment after the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] shall have been disposed of.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that it be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks and at the end of the amendment to add the following:

Whenever the President has taken over any plant under any of the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant who thereafter willfully refuses or fails to perform, or to resume the performance of, his duties as an employee of such plant. Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the force into which he is inducted and may be assigned by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to the performance of such duties, whether or not of a military or naval nature, as such Secretary may designate. For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be an employee of a plant taken over by the President under the foregoing provisions of this section, if—

(1) at any time subsequent to the time such plant was taken over by the President he has been actually employed in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and his employment has not been terminated with the consent of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, or

(2) immediately prior to the time such plant was taken over by the President he was employed by the owner or operator of such plant in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant, or

(3) at the time such plant was taken over by the President he was on strike from the performance of duties which he had previously performed in connection with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to explain briefly why I think the Senate should adopt the Connally amendment and why I believe it should also adopt the Ball amendment to the Connally amendment.

Of course, we are considering one of the most serious and one of the most difficult problems before the people of the United States today. There is no more difficult problem. There are many remedies proposed. The Connally amendment, providing for the seizure of the plants, is one such proposal. Personally, I feel that in dealing with this emergency the President should have all the powers which conceivably can be used profitably to solve the problem. The manner in which this power is used is going to determine whether it will accomplish its object. It may not accomplish its object. But certainly I would not care to deny the President a power which conceivably may be a solution of the problem.

Furthermore, the Government has power to do most all the things provided for. It has power to do practically everything except what the President did yesterday in southern California. The Selective Service Act gives the President power to take over any plant when the Government gives it an order and the owners refuse to take it, or refuse to take it at a reasonable price.

Under the National Defense Act, which we passed last June, the Secretary of the Navy has all the powers the pending proposal gives, and more, but they are confined to the Secretary of the Navy. Under that act the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, whenever he deems any manufacturing plant or facility necessary for the national defense, and whenever he is unable to agree on a price with the owner for the whole plant, to take over and operate such plant or facility, either by Government personnel or by contract with a private firm. He can do it whether there is a strike or is not a strike, so far as the Navy is concerned. I see no reason why the Army should not have the same power the Navy has.

However, it is also perfectly clear to me that the President had no authority to do what he did yesterday. Since I believe it is a good thing, since I am willing to authorize him to do it, I think we should authorize him now so that no question will arise.

In that connection I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States in support of the President's power to take over the California plant yesterday. I ask that the opinion be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the President's powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

The Constitution lays upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lease-Lend Act.

For the faithful execution of such laws the President has back of him not only each general law-enforcement power conferred by the various acts of Congress, but the aggregate of all such laws plus that wide discretion as to method vested in him by the Constitution for the purpose of executing the laws.

The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are

placed in his sole command, and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by a failure to obtain supplies for which Congress has appropriated the money and which it has directed the President to obtain.

The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike. The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of governmental efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

There can be no doubt that the duty, constitutionally and inherently, rested upon the President to exert his civil and military as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this, in my judgment, is the most extraordinary opinion, outside of the destroyer opinion, which any Attorney General has ever rendered. He says:

The President's proclamation rests upon the aggregate of the President's powers derived from the Constitution itself and from statutes enacted by the Congress.

What those statutes are I do not know. I suppose if there were any such statutes, the Senator from Texas would not be offering another statute to authorize exactly the same thing. The Attorney General says:

The Constitution lay upon the President the duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Among the laws which he is required to find means to execute are those which direct him to equip an enlarged Army, to provide for a strengthened Navy, to protect those who are engaged in carrying out the business of the Government, and to carry out the provisions of the Lease-Lend Act.

If we can take a number of loose laws, pile them up, and say that in the aggregate they confer powers which are not contained in any law, then there is not much use in our staying here and making laws. The Attorney General proceeds:

The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I think there is a better legal argument for his power, as such Commander, in taking the plant, than there is under the general laws idea, which was first advanced in the Attorney General's opinion.

Having gone into it as completely as I could, I do not believe the President has the power, in time of peace, to requisition a plant to manufacture war materials, and I do not suppose the Senator from Texas would be offering his bill as an amendment to the pending bill if he felt that the President had such power already.

The Attorney General proceeds:

The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike.

It is a strike. The strikers are not going to be prosecuted for anything I know of. There is no insurrection. That is just using names. Of course, the President can always use the Army to repel invasion, or suppress an insurrection. But this is no insurrection. These men have simply struck, as many other men are doing throughout the entire United States.

I wish Senators would read the opinion of the Attorney General. I can only say that if that opinion is law, there is not much use in our continuing as legislators.

My difficulty with the Connally amendment is that I am afraid the country would regard it as a cure-all for the strike problem, and I do not think it is a cure-all. I hope it will work. There is no evidence yet that it will work. Its success in California will depend entirely on how affairs in California are administered during the next 3 or 4 days. If as a result of the action taken the men in the plant affected, or substantially all of them, return to work at wages determined by the Mediation Board to be just, and if at the end of 2 weeks the strike is abandoned, then I would say that method is successful, and will accomplish much in solving the problem. On the other hand, if the men refuse to return to work, or if they go back to work only with the Government giving them exactly what they have been demanding all along, then we are going to see this method followed in plant after plant, because the men will feel that the Government was much softer than their employers, that if they can get the Government to take over the plant they will be given exactly what they want. That is the danger in the situation, and I do not think we can tell for some time how successful this system is going to be.

The evening paper is not reassuring. It says:

A second walk-out by C. I. O. union members in the aluminum industry today tied up six plants of the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation at Detroit.

Yesterday the plant of the Aluminum Co. of America in Cleveland was tied up by additional strikes. They do not seem to be deterred by the use of troops in California.

Another strike threat came at the huge Consolidated Aircraft Corporation plant at San Diego, when A. F. of L. machinists voted all day on a strike call.

What the Army has done is to push back picket lines. That could have been done without taking over the plant.

The Army pushed picket lines back 1 mile from the plant, but the C. I. O. said its pickets would continue to march with placards in unforbidden areas.

Three thousand five hundred men have returned to work in the two shifts out of a total of 11,500 men who worked in the plant. It is not at all certain that by taking over a plant we can get the men back to work. There is no law which prohibits them to strike against the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says there is no way to get men back to work. There is no way of getting them all back to work, but has not what has already been done in California gotten half of them back to work?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but I am trying only to make the point that I do not think we should stop with the Senator's amendment. I think that is only one method, and it may not be a successful method. I am in favor of giving that power because I think the President ought to have the power to handle the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment is not a cure-all for every problem. It does not interfere with the processes of mediation and all the processes under the Labor Board. This proposal is simply in addition to all that and supplementary to it. I do not think it is a cure-all, but if we can cure one disease at a time we may get the old boy fixed up after all.

Mr. TAFT. There are still several hundred pickets on the picket line, although no pickets are permitted within 1 mile of the plant.

Soldier guards were promised for nearby residential districts, where most of the 11,500 workers live.

The Government is apparently not negotiating with the men.

Colonel Branshaw said he saw "no need for negotiations" with the C. I. O., and telegraphed nearly 9,000 workers an invitation to resume work.

* * * * *

Earlier, he had conferred with C. I. O. leaders, who reported "Colonel Branshaw was not prepared to discuss our demands."

So, in effect, the Government is suspending the right of collective bargaining, at least for the present. I trust that that may not continue and that we may be able to work the problem out.

I only want to call to the Senate's attention the fact that there is no assurance that this is any cure-all for the problem of strikes. Therefore, I think we ought to adopt a constructive measure, such as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

After all, the seizing of plants is an evading of an issue. If we do not want picket lines we could pass a law saying there shall be no picket lines in the neighborhood of plants. Then those who set up picket lines in the neighborhood of plants would be law violators, would be conducting an insurrection instead of a strike. The Attorney General says that these men are conducting an insurrection, although we have been afraid to enact any law prohibiting the things they have done. They are not doing anything illegal, because Congress has refused to set up any kind of labor code. In fact the Labor Relations Board has encouraged picket lines. The Supreme Court has said picket lines must be allowed. The Supreme Court has said that practically any kind of picketing is peaceful picketing unless the pickets actually slug someone in the head. We have supported the whole system of picketing. If that is not right, then we ought to say what laborers can do in labor disputes. We ought to face the problem directly. We are not going to evade that issue by sending troops in who simply say, "It is illegal to picket around defense plants." If anybody should say that, we ought to say it. We ought to face squarely the problem we have to face.

As a matter of fact the radical leaders on the Pacific coast have been hand in glove with the National Labor Relations Board members. Testimony given before

the committee was to the effect that while they were there, members of the Board conferred with the most radical labor leaders. Harry Bridges has been to a large extent protected, and he is telegraphing support to the strikers on the Pacific coast. The Government itself has largely encouraged the spirit which is behind these strikes, and until we declare a labor policy, until the Government declares a labor policy which determines what can be done in defense strikes, and what men shall be allowed to do under the present emergency conditions, we can hardly criticize these men for proceeding with that which they understand to be legal.

We have today four agencies handling the labor problem. We have Sidney Hillman's division in the O. P. M. We have the National Mediation Board, which is entirely independent of Hillman. We have Madam Perkins and the Conciliation Division under her, with Mr. Steelman, entirely independent of everybody else. And we have the National Labor Relations Board, which is independent of anyone else.

One thing which the Ball amendment does is to make it clear that the National Mediation Board is the centralized labor authority of the National Government, and will speak for the National Government, and it takes the Conciliation Division out of the Department of Labor and puts it under the National Mediation Board for the duration of the emergency.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have just learned, through an Associated Press dispatch from California, that the employees in the North American aviation plant at Los Angeles have voted to go back to work, with some provision providing that they shall not be discriminated against because of their having been on strike.

Mr. TAFT. I am delighted at the result, which shows that this method is going to be more successful. It justifies my support of the proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, and I want to say that that is the answer of the Senator from Texas to the statement of the Senator from Ohio, made earlier, that the men could not be made to go back to work. They cannot be made to go back to work, but they can be induced to go back to work.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am very glad to hear that the men have gone back to work, but I greatly desire to ascertain whether it is the intention of our Government, upon taking over a plant, to keep it. Is the Government going to turn the plant back to the employers? That is quite as important as is the question of the men going back to work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President announced in his original order that the plant would be returned as soon as he determined that the plant would be properly operated in a manner consistent with the national defense.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to read this language to the Senator from North Carolina. This is a proposal which I am making to the Senator from Texas, revised for the third time:

Provided, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this section, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of national defense.

With the permission of the Senator from Ohio I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if that is agreeable to him, and if he will accept that language.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to divert the Senator from North Carolina from the point he was making.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the Senator from Texas objected to the original draft of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut on the ground that as then drawn it would seem to exhaust the power of the President, and that in the case of a plant, if he should once take it over and then have to return it, he could not take it over a second time if another strike should break out.

My understanding of the language the Senator from Connecticut has now read is that it does not exhaust the power of the President, but merely provides that the plant taken over shall be surrendered back to the owners when the normal production in national-defense needs are met. I have no objection to that amendment. But I wish it to be shown in the RECORD that the construction we place upon that provision is that it does not impair the powers of the President subsequently to take over that same plant again if new conditions arise which warrant such action. I am perfectly agreeable to surrender the plant.

Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that my purpose is not to socialize industry and have the Government take over industry. My record here does not bear out any such idea as that. My purpose is to continue production as long as the plant is going ahead and being operated and can be operated by its owners. I am perfectly agreeable to turning a plant back to its owners and let them continue to operate it when it is being operated normally. But if conditions afterward arise which indicate that it should be taken over again I want to preserve that power in the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. We can draw the amendment so that that power can be preserved. I am interested in knowing whether the Senator accepts the principle.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am accepting the modification, which is drawn in a way which I do not believe exhausts the power. When once a plant is taken over and conditions become satisfactory, it will be turned back; but that does not exhaust the power of the President again to take it over if new conditions arise which demand such action. I want that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I join in the assumption of the Senator from Texas. That is what I intend. That is what I believe the language does, that is what it means. I thank the Senator for accepting the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield in order that the Senator from Texas may accept a modification of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield. Let me say that I also think it does not exhaust the power to take over a plant the second time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whatever doubts there may have been on the subject are now relieved. I accept the modification.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding and joining me, and I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I seriously mean what I said. We all realize that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is an eminent lawyer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification suggested by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this section, the plant shall be returned to the owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say only that, while I think the Connally amendment should be adopted, I hope the Senate will not stop there. Whether or not the Senate agrees to the Ball amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, we ought to adopt a complete, constructive labor program, administered by a single labor head who can speak for the Government and for the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays. I realize that I have offered a very lengthy amendment which most Senators have not had the time to study. I think many Senators would feel that they ought to vote against the amendment today, simply because they have not had time to study it, although they might be in favor of the principle involved.

I feel that if we are to invoke such a drastic penalty on employers and employees, the least we should do, in fairness, is to establish for them a policy and a set of democratic procedures which they can use, and which we expect them

to use, in order that it may not be necessary to invoke such a severe penalty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I recognize that he has been working and studying these measures very exhaustively. In all frankness I think that if we are to adopt a wholly new system his bill ought to be considered by some committee and reported to the Senate.

I notice the Senator's amendment sets up a new commission, the Labor Standards Commission, with three members at a salary of $10,000 a year each, and a great deal of new machinery. I am not prepared to vote on all this, because I do not have any conception of it. I do not think the Senator ought to press his amendment at this time. He ought to wait until his bill can be independently reported by a committee. As I have undertaken to say, my amendment does not interfere with any of the present procedures. It is not a long amendment setting up new procedures for handling labor disputes. Its purpose is simply to meet the one condition of strikes. The Senator would be perfectly free to prosecute his bill to set up any new machinery or agency which the Government may determine upon for the permanent treatment of labor disputes. I am offering my amendment as an emergency measure, simply to meet one situation. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I agree with him that my bill, offered now in the form of an amendment, should have committee study; but I believe it is no more far-reaching than, and by no means so drastic in its possible effects on our society and our economy as is the much shorter amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. The difference is that we can read the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas in a couple of minutes, and try to figure out what might happen under it. I do not think any of us knows. The seizure and operation of plants is a two-edged sword. It may work in one case, and it may produce the opposite effect in another case.

Let me add that I am assured by the chairman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor will continue work on the bill, and we shall try to report the bill as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as modified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment. I should like to bring it to the attention of the Senator from Texas and other Senators. On page 2, line 15, after the word "strike", I propose to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2 of the Connally amendment, in line 15, after the word "strike", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think a casual reading of the Connally amendment would lead one to the conclusion that it is aimed solely at labor and at strikes. We all know that there are other causes of labor disputes than merely a desire on the part of labor to strike. I believe that in the national emergency which confronts the Nation in this situation we should be most circumspect in drafting legislation dealing with the delicate problems of labor relations. I believe that the insertion of the language which I propose to insert would go far toward convincing labor that it is not the intent of the Congress to invoke the extraordinary power of plant seizure solely in cases in which labor has resorted to its recognized, legal, and constitutional right to strike. I am hopeful that in view of the Senator's well-known attitude he will find himself in a position to accept my amendment. I should like to ask him whether he feels he can accept it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with that amendment, would the Senator support my proposal?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. It is my intention, if my amendment is adopted, to support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, although, as has been stated by other Senators, I do not feel that this is an answer to the difficult problem with which we are confronted, insofar as labor relations are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no argument with the Senator on that score. Where does the Senator propose to insert the new language?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the printed copy of the Senator's amendment which I have it would be on page 2, line 15, after the word "strike." I propose to insert a comma and the words "or lock-out."

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the words ought to be inserted a little farther down. The language of my amendment, as now modified, is:

> As a result of a strike or threatened strike—

That is where the insertion should come. The amendment would then read:

> As a result of a strike or threatened strike, or lock-out, or other cause—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have before me the modified form of the Senator's amendment. I have only the printed form.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment suggested by the Senator should come after the words "threatened strike," in line 15.

Mr. President, I do not think the Senator's amendment is necessary because of other language in the bill. The language "or other cause" is very comprehensive and would cover a lock-out. However, out of deference to the Senator from Wisconsin, I do not object to the insertion of the words "or lock-out."

I desire to suggest, however, that although I do not think an employer would do so, yet it is possible that some employer who wanted his plant taken over could very easily, by locking out his men, present a situation, or might present a situation, in which the Government would come in and take charge of the plant. I cannot anticipate that such an event necessarily would occur. It was suggested by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio that my amendment might induce the employees to stir up a strike so that the plant would be taken over. On the other hand, the employer might want his plant taken over, and he might bring about a lock-out. However, I feel constrained to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to reserve the right to object. I want to get this thing clear in my mind. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered an amendment after the word "strike" on line 15. I want to know if that is the pending amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, after the amendment was printed the Senator from Texas modified his amendment by inserting the words "or threatened strike."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Therefore it would seem logical that my amendment should follow that language, so that it would read, if agreed to:

> As a result of a strike or threatened strike or lock-out or other labor disturbance.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; "or other cause."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. "Or other cause"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not know that that language had gone in.

Mr. MALONEY. I am wondering if there is a later copy of the amendment than the one I have.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, it has been changed today during the time the amendment has been under consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Connecticut give heed? The amendment now reads:

> Will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike or lock-out or other cause.

Mr. MALONEY. I presume, Mr. President, that it would be futile for me to ask the Senator from Texas to take out the words "or threatened", in line 14. The reason I have asked him to do so——

Mr. CONNALLY. I have accepted one amendment from the Senator from Connecticut, and the quota today is only one per Senator. One Senator gets one amendment. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas agree to the modification of his amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]?

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is so modified.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. In spite of the admonition from the Senator from Texas that the quota is only one amendment per Senator, I should like to point out to him that the thing he is endeavoring to do is covered under the language "impede or delay." I think we are going extremely far in this legislation, which, as Senators know, is entirely new. To write into the language of the law the words "or threatened," "a threatened delay," "a threatened strike," or "a threatened lock-out," it seems to me goes much farther than we need to go, and I think all the dangers we anticipate and all the fears we have are covered outside of that very unusual language.

I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Texas with or without the suggested change, because I think I appreciate the seriousness of the national situation, but I want to make a final plea to the Senator from Texas that he delete these two words.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have great receptive faculties for anything the Senator from Connecticut may say; but, seriously, I cannot agree to the amendment. Since the Senator from Connecticut has promised to vote for my amendment whether his amendment is in it or not, I hope he will do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks and at the end of the amendment to add the following:

Whenever the President has taken over any plant under any of the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, induct into the land or naval forces of the United States any employee of such plant who thereafter willfully refuses or fails to perform, or to resume the performance of, his duties as an employee of such plant. Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the force into which he is inducted and may be assigned by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, to the performance of such duties, whether or not of a military or naval nature, as such Secretary may designate. For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be an employee of a plant taken over by the President under the foregoing provisions of this section, if—

(1) at any time subsequent to the time such plant was taken over by the President he has been actually employed in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and his employment has not been terminated with the consent of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, or

(2) immediately prior to the time such plant was taken over by the President he was employed by the owner or operator of such plant in the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant, or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant, or

(3) at the time such plant was taken over by the President he was on strike from the performance of duties which he had previously performed in connection with the operation of such plant and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, has not consented to a refusal by him to return to the performance of duties connected with the operation of such plant or has not consented to termination of his employment at such plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified.

The amendment to the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the Connally amendment, it is proposed to add the following new section:

It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between the Government, management, and labor; and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in the national-defense industries throughout the United States which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate army and navy and to render effective aid to other democracies, the Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is merely a declaration of policy on behalf of Congress that at this critical hour and because of the critical conditions confronting the country Congress believes that strikes in national-defense industries are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

Mr. President, in view of the situation that confronts us, I think the amendment proposes a very temperate declaration of policy on the part of Congress. It says:

It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between the Government, management, and labor—

Certainly no one can challenge that statement—

and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in the national-defense industries throughout the United States which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate army and navy and to render effective aid to other democracies—

No one can question that; because today there exist in national-defense industries more strikes than have existed since the emergency started.

The Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

In the event the Senate should adopt this amendment it would be nothing new, because in regard to the sit-down strikes a very similar amendment was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 75 to 3. That amendment declared that:

It is the sense of Congress that the so-called sit-down strike is illegal and contrary to sound public policy.

Mr. President, I think this amendment would greatly strengthen the proposed legislation. I intend to vote for the Connally amendment. I believe we should have a gun behind the door in the situation which now confronts us, although I agree with other Senators that merely taking over plants is not a solution of or an answer to the strike problem.

We read in the newspapers this afternoon that the employees in six aluminum plants have gone on strike today, and that the employees of 46 tool plants in the city of Detroit have gone on strike. I think the Congress of the United States should have the courage, in unequivocal and firm language, to announce the position that strikes in defense industries are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

We now have mediation machinery whereby industry and labor can mediate their differences, if they choose to do so. We have already enacted legislation whereby the Government may take over any plant the management of which does not cooperate, and the pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Texas, provides that the Government and the President may take over plants in which there are strikes. I think, Mr. President, nothing would be more wholesome, in view of the critical condition that now confronts the country, than for the Congress to go on record and say that strikes are contrary to sound public policy and should be condemned.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I believe, without any question, the Connally amendment will be adopted this afternoon, but the big thing confronting the country today is the continuation of our great program for national defense. We are coping without question with some so-called labor leaders who may be communistic, who may be sympathetic to Hitler and to fascism, but, in my opinion, the great majority of American laborers are just as patriotic as is any other group in the United States today.

What will it do to the Connally amendment if we adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia? Is there any question in the minds of Senators today that there are in some instances justification for strikes? Is there any question in the

minds of Senators today that in some instances the industrialists of the country might be at fault? Is there any question in the minds of Senators today that the very root and cause of some strikes have their inception in the greed and unfairness of the industrialist himself?

I deplore, as much as does any other Senator, the fact that we have stoppages in national-defense industries; I deplore the fact that strikes happen, but they do happen, and they probably will continue to happen. We will hope and pray, of course, that they will occur to a lesser extent until this industrial problem is settled and settled right, and that then they should disappear; but it has been pointed out this afternoon on the floor that confronting labor today we have what? We have the National Mediation Board, established by the President; then we have the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor; then we have the Labor Service of O. P. M., under Sidney Hillman; then we have the National Labor Relations Board. Does any group of labor today know where to go to present grievances and ask for justice? It was recently reported that in a strike on the Pacific coast in the shipbuilding industry there was one mediator from the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, another from the National Mediation Board, and there was one group there grabbing onto this mediator and another group grabbing onto another mediator; so that, instead of mediation, instead of conciliation, there was nothing but confusion.

Now we come to the question of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. What would it accomplish? It would accomplish nothing. I believe the Nation, as a whole, the people as a whole, realize that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives are opposed to any stoppages in national-defense industries; but when we adopt an amendment such as this what do we do? Oh, we give a pat on the back to the industrialist and a kick in the face to labor.

I ask you, Mr. President, if we are interested in national unity, why the necessity of doing that? Why should there be any reason this afternoon, in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia providing that the Congress of the United States condemn strikes? Of course, we condemn every strike that is not justified; we condemn every strike that results from the agitation of the pro-Nazi and the Communist; but do we condemn the strike which is justified or which is simply an attempt on the part of honest laborers to get what they feel they are entitled to in the form of wages or labor conditions? I think it is a little unfair to condemn the only weapon that labor has, that weapon being the strike, in case of injustices or unfairness on the part of the industrialists.

If the amendment offered condemned the circumstances and conditions that precipitate strikes, thereby equally condemning the unfair industrialists and unjustified strikes, I would say that would be fair. But when we condemn the one weapon that organized labor has, which is the strike, regardless of why labor strikes, it seems to me, Mr. President, that that is uncalled for and accomplishes no good purpose.

Let us look at the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. It reads:

> It is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and they are hereby condemned.

In other words, not taking into account why strikes are called or the reason behind them or who is at fault in the matter, we arbitrarily come down with a meat ax and say to labor, "We condemn you for your strike, regardless of what the cause is."

I think that, instead of adopting an amendment of this type today, if we were in a position and would take the time to give sincere and earnest consideration to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] providing an orderly procedure of mediation, telling labor in the United States that here is the one agency, the one body that will control mediation from now on, and to which they can look for redress, provide for a 30-day period of negotiation, and then provide for the investigation which the amendment provides for, and, if mediation is impossible, then for arbitration; that is the type of legislation which should be adopted; that is the proper approach to a permanent solution of this problem. In my opinion, it would be much preferable to an amendment such as the one we are now considering, which condemns, without any facts, without any investigation, the only weapon that labor has, namely, the strike.

Before sitting down, I desire to say that I abhor and deplore, just as much as any other Senator does, any stoppage in the national-defense program; but I also desire to say that I know there is fault on both sides, and I am unwilling today to condemn everything labor might do in the way of protecting its rights and at the same time pat the other side on the back and say, "You are perfect," or "You are not at fault."

I hope, Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will not be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I very much regret that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has taken the view of this amendment which he has just stated. He states that a vote for this amendment is a pat on the back for industry and a slap in the face of labor. I do not think that position can be sustained in any view of the matter. I think to undertake to attach such an interpretation as that to this amendment is to evade the entire issue before our country—probably as grave an issue as the country has confronted in the lifetime of any man here—and utterly to belittle that issue.

What is the situation? Our country has found itself gradually becoming more and more involved in a tremendous world situation. Whether we have wished it or not, it has come upon us. At the present moment, I take it, everyone in America understands, whatever his views may be as to our involvement—whether he be a pacifist or an interventionist—that the country must arm itself. I believe that opinion is universal in our land. We must arm ourselves. Our industries are abandoning their normal activities. Our people are being called upon for sacrifices and self-denials. We are about to pass a great tax bill. We have enacted tremendous appropriation bills, and the President has called upon the industrialists and the workers over and over again.

He, himself—and I take it there is not a better friend of labor in America or on earth than the President of the United States—in his most recent address to the American people called upon the workers to abandon their right to strike under these circumstances. He asked in specific terms that whatever their grievances might be with regard to defense activities they should see to it that the work goes on, and he gave them assurance that they would be treated justly by the Board, which he himself has created, and which no one denies is a fair Board, and, if friendly to anyone, is friendly to the workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no question at all that the President feels worse probably than any other person in the United States whenever there is a stoppage in our national-defense industries. If the Senator from Virginia would include in his amendment not only labor but the industrialists, and would let the Congress condemn the circumstances and the conditions which result in a stoppage of industry, whether it is the fault of labor or the fault of the industrialists, I should be glad to join him in supporting the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. The industrialists are not striking. The munition manufacturers are not striking. The condition with which we are dealing is a reality and not a theory. Strikes are taking place all over the country, and it is the workers under the influence of unwise and misguided leadership who are striking—not the employers; and it is the strikes that this resolution condemns—not the workers.

I think the time has come for rather plain speaking in this land. We are either going to have a government that governs, or we are not going to have a government that governs. I rejoiced yesterday when the President stretched forth the arm of our Government and took charge of the plant in California and told the strikes to get out or go to work. I rejoice today that they have seen the light. When our Government governs, we shall have order and production. When our Government does not govern, we shall not have order and we shall not have production. We shall not have peace, either, nor can we have victory.

We are not dealing generally with a vague situation. There may be wrongs on the part of employers. There may be necessities of increased wages. Nobody will debate that now. What we are saying is that under these conditions a strike against the national defense is against public policy; and the wisdom and the

right of the Congress to say that under these circumstances is now challenged.

What have we had in this country since this emergency became intense? Strike after strike. It has gone over the country like a contagion; and it is not stopping, either. One of the Senators says we have had strike after strike throughout the world. I do not think so. There are not any strikes in Germany; none in Japan. I do not think there are any in England. There were strikes in France; and where is France?

Under these circumstances, is the Congress of the United States willing to say not that labor does not have to right to strike—we agree that it does have a right to strike—but that strikes under these circumstances are against public policy and ought to be condemned? For my part, I rejoice in the opportunity to say it, and I have not any question about how the people of North Carolina stand. Ninety-nine and forty-four one hundredths percent of them take the same view. I will leave the small fraction in order not to make an overstatement.

Mr. President, under these circumstances the Congress of the United States can say that it is against the policy of the country or against its welfare for men having the right to strike to insist upon the right to strike. If the Congress cannot condemn strikes which threaten the security and the welfare and the defense of our country, then what power has Congress; what has become of its moral stamina; what has become of its leadership in this land?

When all through our country evil men are appealing to the cupidity of less informed men, leading them to believe that while our country is in this extraordinary situation, when we have good reason to believe that the life of the Republic itself is at stake, they may improve their incomes, have we reached the point where it is possible that the Congress of the United States is incapable of making a record that such strikes and such conduct are against the public policy? Is it conceivable that men like ourselves, trusted with the welfare of the country, should hesitate to condemn such action?

Mr. President, I have another word to say about this matter. I agree that the worker has the right to strike, but I say this to the workers of America: if they insist upon their right to strike against the national defense, they are going to lose their right to strike at all, because the country must save itself. That is the first law of nature.

I will go a long way to maintain the Bill of Rights in America, I intend to go a long way to maintain the Bill of Rights in America, but I would give up the Bill of Rights to save America. I would give up every right I have to save America, just as I would have to give up my life to save my land and its people. I do not desire to, but hear me—if men who have the right to strike insist upon the exercise of that right against the defense and security of the American people, the American people will know what to do; and they will do it, too. We must save ourselves. We must rise to this occasion, or all will be utterly lost, the women and all others.

If I had a word to say to these labor leaders—I do not want any quarrel with them—I would ask them, inasmuch as they love their unions and love the workers and love the labor cause, to join with the President of the United States and call upon the workers of this land to go on with their work, and assert their grievances in the meantime in the tribunal which the President has set up to pass upon those grievances.

We are told that haste and time are the essence of this situation; and I think they are. We have delayed and delayed and delayed, and heaven only knows how much time has been lost, heaven only knows how many ships we might have built, no one knows how many airplanes and how many engines might have been built but for the strikes which have gone on throughout the United States.

We are either going to rise to this occasion or we are not. This morning we were talking about calling the boys. When we called the boys, the boys came. We called the baseball players, and one of them making forty or fifty thousand dollars a year laid down his bat and without saying a word he put on his uniform, and now he is a private in the Army at $21 a month.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the Selective Service Act, to which the Senator refers, apply just as rigidly to the sons of labor as it does to any other class?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and I am glad the Senator brought up that point. The sons of the workers are going into battle, and the leaders, of the workers are telling the workers not to furnish their sons the guns with which to fight.

Mr. MURDOCK. Wil the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator consider what has happened in creating the bottleneck in steel and the bottleneck in aluminum any less detrimental to the national-defense program than strikes? Is he willing this afternoon, in his condemnation of strikes, to condemn the men who have told us that we have plenty of steel and that we have plenty of aluminum? That is the point in which I am interested, that when we condemn the sabotage in our national-defense program, we should not limit ourselves to labor, but we should point the finger of condemnation also at the men here in the Office of Production Management who are telling us that we have sufficient steel capacity when they know we have not, and when they tell us we have sufficient aluminum capacity when they know we have not. All I ask for in the treatment of this question is you treat labor as fairly as you treat the other groups. Treat them the same, and then I will join in your amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator totally misapprehends me. If anyone in this country is causing a bottleneck or delay, or if anyone in this country—in politics, or in business, or anywhere else—is interfering with our program of defense, if the Senator will bring the facts to my attention I will draw the appropriate resolution and very gladly advocate it. I am dealing with an instant situation; I am dealing with facts; I am dealing with this reality of a contagion of strikes.

The Senator speaks about a shortage in steel and a shortage in aluminum. I do not care to go into all that. I read in the paper this afternoon, "Six More Aluminum Plants Hit by New Strikes." That is today's news; that is this afternoon's news, in the 5-o'clock edition of the paper. If there is a bottleneck in aluminum, these strikes are going to make it a great deal worse.

It happens that I know something about aluminum. The Aluminum Co. of America has quite a plant in my State. I think I can say to the Senator——

Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish this point, and I shall gladly yield. There may be a bottleneck in aluminum; I do not know. I have heard nothing whatever so to say. I read a while back that Mr. Stettinius was saying that we had plenty of aluminum. I read in the paper one day that one man says we have enough and another man says we do not have enough. This is the fact: The Aluminum Co. of America had 300,000,000 pounds of surplus aluminum on hand 2½ years ago, and it had created that surplus in order to keep its workers going. Did the United States call for that surplus? At that time the United States had not thought about needing a great number of airplanes. Then suddenly we discover that we need thousands and tens of thousands of airplanes, and that aluminum is the best thing with which to make them, and we give orders in tremendous quantities for foreign and domestic account.

I understand that the Aluminum Co. of America has already expanded its plant, out of its own money, and money which it has borrowed, to the extent of $200,000,000, and has increased its output from an average of about 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 pounds a year to about 800,000,000 pounds a year. I am speaking from memory, and I will get the correct figures and shall be glad to put them in the RECORD. The industries of America are cooperating. They want business. They are not striking, but they have been struck.

I think in all kinds of industry in America there are bottlenecks, and they are here, Mr. President, largely because this thing has happened to us and to the whole world with the utmost suddenness. We knew nothing about mechanized warfare, we knew nothing about the value of the airplane in warfare, we knew very little about the meaning of a tank in warfare until a year ago Germany marched across Belgium and then across France. Then we woke up to the fact that there was a country over there that for 5 years had been preparing for mechanized warfare, and we have been trying to do in 1 year what she did in 5.

Mr. President, there are bottlenecks, there are congestions, because the country is trying to move at a tremendous rate; but, Senators, hear me—shall we increase those bottlenecks by encouraging strikes? Shall we fail to condemn

strikes under these circumstances? If so, then you magnify your bottlenecks, for it is certain you cannot have full production without full employment of labor.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted—and I wish my friend to state whatever he wishes to state when I complete my statement—I was saying that we had called upon the American people for sacrifices. Very few of us have made any sacrifices. Many more of us will be making sacrifices next year than are doing so now. The taxes are going to come down upon us and they are going to be very hard upon millions of Americans. But after all that is a financial matter.

We called upon the young men of America to make their sacrifices, and I was just now referring to the famous ball player, Greenberg. I greatly admired the example he set to the young men of our land. He was on the Detroit baseball team, drawing $40,000 a year to play baseball. His country called him, and he took off his baseball suit and laid down his bat and put on his uniform, and is now a private in the ranks. In my eyes he is a bigger hero now than he ever was when he was knocking out those home runs.

All over this land the boys have been going. I have seen them going down in my part of the country. Their mothers have been bidding them good-bye, and have been bidding them good-bye with tears streaming down their cheeks, and the boys have seen that, too. Those boys are not feeling good about this thing. But the boys are going, and the mothers are not squawking, and they are not striking. They are setting that ancient example of courage that goes back to Deborah in the olden times.

But here we are, Mr. President. We do not have the courage to tell these strikers that they ought to quit that business and produce guns for their country and their sons. We cannot make any sacrifices, oh, no. Our boys can, but we cannot. Oh, no; we will shed the blood of a hundred thousand American boys, but when it comes to shedding a little political blood, we will not do it. Is that not a fine example to set to the country?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator deprive the worker of the right to strike?

Mr. BAILEY. In the Senator's absence I said I agreed that the workers have the right to strike. There are many things a man has a right to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator would agree that when the worker has a just cause the strike is his only means of enforcing it?

Mr. BAILEY. That is the ultimate test of strength, yes, but not the only means.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator know whether or not these strikers whom we now condemn here on the Senate floor have or have not a just cause?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the Senator that I was just saying that we have created a Board to deal with the situation, and we are not saying that the striker has not a just cause. We are simply saying to the striker, "Go on with your work and we will see that you get justice." There is no difficulty about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator——

Mr. BAILEY. Let me make this clear to the Senator from Nevada. Here is a workman and here is an employer, and between the two there may be a grievance, and the worker may be right, and the times are normal, and the striker has an absolute right to strike. I doubt if he has any right to keep anyone else from working, but I will pass that by for the present. He has a right to strike. But does the Senator from Nevada fail to see that we are dealing here with a situation in which the defense and the security of the whole American people is at stake, and when that occurs, the moral right to strike does not exist? There may be a legal right, but there is no moral right to strike against the welfare of your Nation and your people.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator, I take it, put a question to me, and I beg leave of him, not wishing to interrupt him at too great a length of time, to make an answer.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator let me sit down while he makes his answer?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not mean to be rude, and I do not intend to take up the time of the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. No; that is all right. Go ahead.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I do see what the Senator has said. I believe the American Congress has had the foresight to see it, in time of peace, when we had the calm of peace about us, we created the machinery with which to solve the difficulties that might arise between the employer and the employee. That was the voice of the American Congress speaking and setting up a means by which the greatest quantum of justice might be wrought out for the American worker. Has that machinery been put into effect? I say it has not, and I say that if it had been put into effect we would not be here taking up the time of the Senate considering the measure now before us.

I make this expression without fear of contradiction, that if the machinery set up by Congress had gone forward, and if it had taken hold of these matters in time, or if that machinery takes hold of the matter even now, this whole situation would be solved, without our intervention by the adoption of a measure such as is pending here now, which to my mind is one of the most unhappy and unfortunate measures that could come before the Congress. I only wish that the machinery which this Congress had created had taken hold of the situation, and had seen to it that fair play was wrought out between the employer and the employee, and then I would not have any hesitancy, but——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall not go forward now, but shall speak in my own time.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator.

The Senator referred to the machinery which has been set up. I thought I referred to the machinery which had been set up by the President; that is, the Mediation Board. Presumably that Board is just. Presumably it is intelligent. Presumably it was set up in good faith. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I think we can take it for granted that that Board will do justice. I think the workers of America can take it for granted that that Board will do justice. I have not heard from any source the intimation that that Board would not be fair to labor. That machinery is in existence. It is functioning, and it has functioned successfully in several cases. It has been defied and is now being defied by strikers and labor leaders. I am addressing myself precisely to that situation.

I am saying to the Senate, to the workers, and to the people of North Carolina who sent me here that we do have the means of arbitration of grievances. We do have a Board in which we rightfully have confidence, against which no accusation has so far been brought; and we do have a situation of the direst kind of emergency. I say that the least we can ask of the workers of America at this time is that when they have grievances they will go on with their work, with the assurance that they will receive justice. They are not dealing only with employers. They are dealing with the American people. They will receive more justice in that way than they will by going back upon their country in a time like this.

Mr. President, years ago I was reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I never dreamed that I would be here. I read a speech by the late John Sharp Williams, a most brilliant man, of greatly honored memory. He was making that speech in the period of the World War. He was talking about persons who were grumbling, grouching, and obstructing in that emergency, just as some persons are now grumbling, obstructing, and grouching. He was talking in the light of the sacrifices that the boys of America and the mothers and fathers of America were making.

He told the story of a soldier in Washington's Army at Valley Forge. When his comrades were freezing and starving, and when the Father of his Country was on his knees praying for the help of Providence to save the new land, the new people, and the new cause of freedom, this man was concerned about nothing like that. He cared nothing for the prayers of Washington or the sufferings of his comrades. To use the language of John Sharp Williams, his voice could be heard splitting the ear of midnight, night after night, crying, "Beef! More beef! Beef! More beef!"

I think we are painting that sort of picture in America. Some persons are crying, "Beef! More beef!" while the boys march off to man the ranks, the fighting airplanes and the bombers, and learn the art of tank warfare—while the boys go into camp to learn the most ancient of skills—the skill of a soldier. While the boys go forth to camp and sailors man the ships to defend their country, here at home, under misguided leadership—I will be moderate about it—we can hear all over the land the cry of

"Beef! More beef! Beef! More beef!" with our country in its present situation.

When we come forward with a modest amendment simply calling upon the Congress to say that under these circumstances that sort of thing is against public policy and ought to be condemned, we are told that we are giving labor a slap in the face and business a pat on the back. What we are doing is rising like men entrusted with a great trust, the welfare of our country, and a great leadership, the leadership of our Nation in legislative matters, and saying to the American people that this sort of thing ought to stop. We are trying to help our country.

Mr. President, let me conclude with one word. If we cannot stop these strikes, then we cannot defend our country. Talk about aiding England. We cannot even aid our native land unless we can stop this sort of thing. There are persons who think that this country is on the verge of war. If she is on the verge of war and we cannot stop strikes, then it is the part of wisdom to turn tail and flee like rabbits. A country that cannot deal with its domestic order and rule within itself, a country that cannot have the loyalty of its workers and its labor leaders in a time like this, cannot be fighting anybody's battles, not even its own, for the security of our people demands full and uninterrupted production of all the means of warfare.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not expect to consume very much time. Does the Senator wish to move a recess?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I understood another amendment was to be offered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I intended to offer an amendment to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Does the Senator expect to discuss it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I expect to discuss it. I do not expect to take long, but I doubt if we can finish within the usual period this evening.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, earlier in the day my hope was that we might conclude consideration of this measure and then take up the bill of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. From statements made to me within the past few minutes it appears that there is to be considerable debate on this question and on the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin proposes to offer. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada, if he would prefer not to be interrupted, I believe we should recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer to the pending amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment will be read for the information of the Senate. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nevada has yielded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it understood that I may have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far as the present occupant of the chair can control the matter, the Senator from Nevada will have the floor; but the present occupant of the chair may not be in the chair when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will take my chances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the pending amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the last line of the Byrd amendment, after the word "condemned", it is proposed to insert:

And that complete cooperation between government, management, and labor can best be achieved by the whole-hearted acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining and the recognition of the right of employees to designate representatives of their own choosing for purposes of collective bargaining, without interference through unfair or oppressive labor practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of light, in whom there is no shadow, with one accord we seek Thy guidance lifting our hearts in praise and gratitude. As Thou dost guard us day and night by Thy mercy, do Thou lead us by Thy unerring counsel and show us anew that wondrous power that makes men free. O Master of this troubled world, who hast the nations in Thy heart, O word and truth of God, unchanged and incarnate, make them the chart and compass over the surging seas of war and hate. We are weak, Thou art mighty; we know but little, Thou art all wisdom; we are selfish, Thou art gracious; do Thou make us magnanimous and altogether worthy of the spirit of the meek and lowly One. We pray that we may be of the simple heart, of the unpretentious mind and of the uncalculating soul which rises in majesty above injustice and wrongful criticism. Heavenly Father, somewhere behind the battle smoke and the clouds of dusty roadways; somewhere behind the winding mountainsides and along the valleys and the plains; somewhere in shop and office and in the deep precipices of the old earth is the toiling, tragically burdened world, rushing, teeming along the hard-beaten pathways. Almighty God, open our eyes that we may see and help them. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 9, 1941, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3368. An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes" approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; and

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 378. An act to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service";

S. 452. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka);

S. 456. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman;

S. 633. An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States;

S. 708. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas;

S. 1051. An act relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor;

S. 1052. An act relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims;

S. 1289. An act authorizing the Copper River and Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes;

S. 1488. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the Government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the Government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940), Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.);

S. 1508. An act to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3782. An act establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Labor.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.
8. Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an excerpt from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. C. B. Allen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a poem published in the Wilmington Suburban News of May 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years a number of Members of the Congress have made certain serious charges, wherein they claim that certain bankers are interfering with the White House and the Congress of the United States. Only as recently as a week ago such an occurrence took place. I am not trying to quarrel with anybody, but if these facts are true, we ought to have an investigation and these culprits ought to be brought to justice. This applies to any person who is seeking to undermine this Government, be it by influencing the White House or the Congress; whether such people are international bankers or bankers of any particular faith or religion, their work ought to be destroyed. I have introduced today a resolution asking the Congress to order an investigation and give the Congressmen and other persons in the country, who have made such charges, a chance to produce the evidence as to the facts in this matter. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial from the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two brief newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement from a group of constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the New York Times of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech on the maintenance of morale by M. H. Hedges, of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by David Lawrence on June 13, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'HARA addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRANSHAW

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, just a month ago it was my privilege to be escorted through the North American airplane plant by the president of that institution, Mr. J. H. Kindleberger, and Lt. Col. Charles Branshaw, chief of the western Air Corps production district in charge of inspection on the western coast. It is a fortunate thing for the Nation that a man like Colonel Branshaw was out there to take charge of the situation yesterday when the Army took charge of the plant; also Mr. Kindleberger, the president of the concern. I saw Mr. Kindleberger a year ago with a few gray hairs in his head; a month ago his hair was almost all gray, due to the strenuous job he has been performing for the Nation during the past few years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks twice in the Appendix of the RECORD, once to include a speech, and the second time an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, during a colloquy yesterday between the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and myself, this remark was made by Mrs. NORTON, and it was her concluding statement. I quote:

> I remind the gentleman that before the Labor Committee had any opportunity to act, the bills that should have been referred to it were referred to other committees. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Labor and should resent as much as I do the discrimination against the committee.

Mr. Speaker, that statement consists of 51 words. Following that the gentlewoman added 242 words. I have never considered it quite proper in a colloquy between Members that such additions and such bringing in of new matter in debate by extension of remarks should be permitted or placed in the RECORD. I am not going to ask that those 242 words be stricken from the RECORD, which I probably should do, but I want the RECORD to show that they were never spoken on the floor of the House and were not a part of the colloquy, and I want those words beginning with "I intend to vote against every amendment to this bill" and ending with the words "throughout the country," her statement complete, printed at this point in the RECORD, so that the RECORD will show that the statement referred to was no part of the colloquy but was added later, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Did the gentlewoman secure permission to revise and extend her remarks?

Mr. BARDEN. She secured permission to revise and extend her remarks, but I have never regarded it and I do not believe the average Member regards it as proper or fair debate to add any such statements in the middle of a colloquy between two Members by way of extension of remarks. If it was regarded as proper, without the consent of the other party, it would be unwise, so far as the RECORD is concerned, to yield to anyone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

> I intend to vote against every amendment to this bill. It is an appropriation bill and should not be used as a vehicle to carry amendments which, if considered in a separate bill, would at least receive the consideration of a committee and we would understand their purpose. This is an extraordinary method of considering labor legislation. It is unfair to the great body of American labor, the majority of which can be depended upon to serve our country, and should not be confused with that small segment of labor responsible for agitating against the national-defense program. I have the utmost confidence in the responsible labor leaders and believe they will do a good job in housecleaning within labor ranks. They will see to it that America is not "sold down the river" by the Communists and Nazis who are creating dissension within the ranks of labor. The amendments offered here today will not help the labor situation. If adopted they will do a great deal of harm. They are unnecessary. The President has already signed the order designating the United States Army to take over the North American Co. at Inglewood, Calif. If and when it becomes necessary to the defense of our country to act we can depend upon the President to do so. New legislation enacted in the heat of emotion and without full and deliberate consideration would, in my opinion, be a crime against the hundreds of thousands of honest, patriotic, loyal workers throughout the country.

UNIFIED AIR DEFENSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House passed an appropriations bill of virtually $10,000,000,000 to toughen our national defense. A substantial portion of this huge sum was earmarked for the production of additional war planes to protect us in a world in which air power is rapidly becoming the most effective and destructive method of either attack or defense. This House took a great forward step in developing the impregnability of the Western Hemisphere by yesterday's action.

However, planes alone are not enough, and even planes plus the best pilots in the air are not the whole story. In addition, this country must be sure it has the unified and coordinated control of its air, land, and sea forces, which has demonstrated its effectiveness again and again in the three-dimensional fighting of this war. To make such proof available to Congress, or to provide a method of securing such coordination of action, if it is lacking, I introduced House Resolution 228, which is now before the Rules Committee, asking the Speaker to appoint a nine-man committee to determine whether our present arrangements are satisfactory or whether our defense can be strengthened and modernized by the creation of a separate air branch or the consolidation of air, war, and naval divisions under a single Department of National Defense. This inquiry would provide an intelligent search for facts on one of the most vital problems of our entire national-defense program. Since introducing my resolution I have received much encouragement, both from the Members of Congress and other interested citizens. Today's mail, for example, brought a letter from Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, supporting this resolution. I am today sending a letter to the members of the Rules Committee requesting a hearing on my resolution, and I hope those of you who favor it will express your support to the members of the House Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee from Mr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4693), to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, lately I have been criticizing the C. I. O. for what I believed was the intent of a great many of them to hinder national defense. On Saturday night I listened to the radio address of Mr. Frankensteen, trying to get the C. I. O. to stop the strike that was in progress in California. I listened to that address with a great deal of interest. I want to commend him for the part he took in trying to stop the strike. I think it was a fine address. A man who would do what he tried to do then is certainly a good American citizen. I want to commend him for that address and the way in which he tried to prohibit these strikes now going on against national defense. Anyone who does that ought to receive some commendation from Members of Congress.

I am against them when they are wrong. I am for them when they are right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BEN WHITE ET AL.—VETO MESSAGE
(H. DOC. NO. 259)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval a bill (H. R. 2054) entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. D. Barkelew, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen."

The bill would authorize a suit for damages to be brought against the United States in the Court of Claims, in behalf of certain individuals against whom a decision was rendered many years ago by the Department of the Interior in respect to an entry made by them on public lands. Apparently, the basis for the legislation is that subsequently the Secretary of the Interior was in this instance overruled by the courts.

The bill under consideration would constitute an undesirable innovation in the law and might well form a dangerous precedent. The Congress has frequently passed and I have often approved bills which recognized a liability on the part of the Government for negligence or trespass on the part of Government officers or employees in the performance of their duties. The ends of justice require that the Government should in many instances recognize liability for tort in situations of this kind.

The bill under consideration, however, involves a situation of an entirely different character. It proposes to subject the Government to liability for damages in the event that a decision of a Government officer, acting in an administrative or quasi-judicial capacity, is subsequently overruled by the courts. Thus, the instant situation is entirely different from that presented by cases in which the Government subjects itself to the same liability as would be imposed on a private individual or corporation.

Public policy requires that Government officers and commissions clothed by the Congress with the authority to pass on rights of individuals may do so without subjecting the Government to liability for damages, if the courts later disagree with their determinations. Otherwise an intolerable financial burden might be imposed on the taxpayers, and the efficient performance of governmental functions impeded.

The foregoing considerations lead me to withhold my approval from this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal; and, without objection, the message and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has already been granted for general debate, confined to the bill, to continue through the day. I further ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally controlled and divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, with Mr. MCCORMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the House joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 193 carries the appropriation for the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1942 and for the administrative expenses of the Treasury Department and General Accounting Office in connection with accounting, disbursing, and auditing the W. P. A. expenditures, and for expenses of the Employees' Compensation Commission for payment of disability compensation to persons injured on the projects. The total amount carried by the joint resolution is $885,905,000, of which $875,000,000 is for the W. P. A. and $10,905,000 is for these other agencies. The appropriation of $875,000,000 for the W. P. A. is the smallest amount that has been requested of Congress for this purpose since the inauguration of the work-relief program. The peak was reached in 1939, when W. P. A. expended $2,230,000,000 for work and work relief. During the current fiscal year there was available for W. P. A. $1,350,650,000 for this program. The present resolution provides for a total amount of $875,000,000 for the W. P. A. program for the full fiscal year and is $109,000,000 less than the amount sent up by the Budget originally, the President having sent up on May 20 a revision of his Budget estimates for the work-relief program, estimating the amount for the next fiscal year for W. P. A. at $875,000,000.

The amount provided in this resolution for W. P. A. is $475,650,000 less than the amount for the current fiscal year, and in percentages it is 35 percent less in dollar appropriation.

From the standpoint of the number to be employed on W. P. A., it is a reduction of 758,685 in the average yearly employment, or 44 percent reduction.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. In your total of $875,000,000 for W. P. A., is it not a fact that $50,000,000 of that is transferred to the Department of Agriculture for surplus commodities and is not W. P. A. funds?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct. In the bill $50,000,000 is earmarked for the extension of the stamp plan for surplus food commodities and provision is made to transfer this sum to the Department of Agriculture. The committee feels, and I am sure feels unanimously, that if in the judgment of the House that $50,000,000 should not be transferred, then it would want the amendment inserted by the committee taken out of the bill. In other words, we do not want the total amount of this bill increased by $50,000,000, although I say I think the committee feels very strongly that the earmarking of $50,000,000 for the extension of this stamp plan will do a great deal toward relieving distress among people who need to be relieved; and that while it may decrease the actual number of people to be employed upon W. P. A. a slight amount, yet there will be very large benefits inure to that class of people. As far as I am concerned, I hope it will be the pleasure of the Committee and the House to leave the bill just as we have earmarked it. We have given for relief the full amount of the Budget estimate, making no reductions in it, but we earmarked $50,000,000 to go to the stamp plan. In order to keep the record clear, speaking for myself personally and individually, I should like to have seen this amount reduced still further.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HARE. Before leaving the $50,000,000 provision, as I understand, that is to be used to buy commodities for people on relief?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Is not most of that money for administrative work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Which money?

Mr. IZAC. The $50,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. It is for an extension of the food-stamp plan for the purchase of commodities. A small proportion of the money will naturally be needed for administrative purposes, but a very large proportion is for the purchase of surplus food products.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe the gentleman said that the number of people who will be taken off the rolls by this amount will be 35 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Forty-four percent.

Mr. DONDERO. And the amount in dollars is reduced 35 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. I was trying to correlate the difference, and wondered why they did not come down in the same proportion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is impossible to do that.

Mr. DONDERO. Is that on account of administrative expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is on account of the administrative expense, supervisory expense, difference in cost per worker on defense projects. and so forth.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Possibly in connection with the $50,000,000 food-stamp plan the gentleman would want to add that the conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill eliminated the additional $35,000,000 that was put in that bill by the Senate for that item, thereby making this amendment all the more imperative.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Exactly; and the conferees did that on the theory that it was a relief project and it ought to go in a relief bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No one is more in favor of the food-stamp plan than I, but it seems to me a little tough to take it out of the W. P. A. workers.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It simply means that you have so much for relief and work relief and you put it where you think it will accomplish the most good.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am extremely interested in the elimination of the 18 months' lay-off period in this bill. Has the committee given consideration to the matter of eliminating the 18 months' lay-off?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee did give consideration to the elimination of that requirement. We discussed it very fully.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would give me the figures of the reduction in W. P. A. employment. With the fund reduced to $875,000,000, what will be the reduction in the number of beneficiaries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The $875,000,000, if all given to W. P. A., would have provided for an average employment throughout the fiscal year 1942 of 1,000,000 against an average employment in the fiscal year 1941 of 1,700,000.

Mr. BOLAND. This $50,000,000 for the food-stamp plan will reduce it that much further, will it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it will affect 58,685 people and reduce the average employment for 1942 from 1,000,000 to 941,315.

Mr. BOLAND. In other words, if those people have been on the roll at $52 a month, you are going to put that many more in the bread line. That is the answer, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not like to put it that way. I would rather state that we are going to put them in the care of the State, on some State program where they ought to be. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I do not want one deserving person to suffer, but, after all, there is a very clear line of demarkation as to where the Federal Government ought to end and where the State government ought to begin. I think it is very apparent there are a lot of people on the Federal program who ought to be on the State program. In putting them back into the hands of the State, I would not say we were putting them back in the bread line, but we are putting them back on the responsibility of the local government where they rightly belong. I believe that by earmarking $50,000,000 of this fund for the food-stamp plan we are spending the money in such way as to reach the people who need to be reached.

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will permit a further inquiry, I would like to know just how the gentleman would differentiate between the State that is able to take care of these people and the State that is not financially able to take care of them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman means by differentiating.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman states he is trying to see that these men shall be transferred from the W. P. A. rolls to State rolls, and the gentleman is intimating that to the extent of $50,000,000 States should further take care of this relief problem. In the case of States not able to take care of them the people would still be in the bread lines, would they not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know what States the gentleman from Pennsylvania is thinking about, but certainly the States of Pennsylvania and Virginia are able to take care of their destitute people. There may be States not able to, States that have not felt the effect of the defense program, but certainly that situation can be taken care of in some way.

Mr. BOLAND. I should like to take the gentleman through the anthracite coal fields in my own district and let him see first hand what great hardships he is going to cause by putting this $50,000,000 into the food-stamp plan. This amount was recommended by the President and should not be diverted to the food-stamp plan. I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is just.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The food-stamp plan comes under the Department of Agriculture, does it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This will mean, to put the matter very concisely, that the Federal Works Agency for whom this appropriation was intended will lose all control of that $50,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This comes out of the people who can least afford it and gives it to agriculture.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The relief does not go to agriculture. It is not agricultural relief. It has to do with the purchase of food commodities that are given people who need food, and a class of peope who perhaps need it as badly if not worse than people who are on the W. P. A. program. I imagine the gentleman from Missouri is going to have something to say on the subject a little later because he is so familiar with it.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. If agriculture should get a slight benefit from the $50,000,000, relief gets an enormous benefit from the $200,000,000 carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for the same item?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BEAM. Now, has the gentleman given any consideration to the number of employables over 45 years of age who cannot qualify in some of the defense industries at the present time, and the number, if any, that will be affected by this lower sum?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman mean by the $50,000,000 reduction?

Mr. BEAM. Yes; in addition to the curtailment of the original amount?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will be in proportion. The committee has not given consideration to that particular group. It has considered the whole picture. Undoubtedly this will take certain people off the W. P. A.

Mr. BEAM. Then the gentleman will concede this is a very pertinent question at the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly it is a pertinent question.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke as though transferring this money will in some way or other bring a hardship on the people who are in need of employment or who are on relief. It should be borne in mind that every dollar transferred from this fund to the food-stamp plan represents $1.50 in food to people who are out of employment and possibly those who cannot even be employed; so instead of being a hardship on the people who are having a difficult struggle to get along, it actually amplifies the total amount of food that goes to those people?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is simply this, to state it a little differently: The President suggested $875,000,000 for W. P. A. The committee has set $875,000,000, less $50,000,000, for work projects and $50,000,000 for the purchase of food for people who may participate in any type of public-assistance funds. I think it is a legislative function and a prerogative that the committee had a right to consider.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I came before the gentleman's committee with this problem: We have continually had cuts in the quotas in the State of Florida. We have a good many defense projects down there. The order has gone down from the Administrator in Washington that these defense projects were immune from cuts. It simply means those cuts must fall on projects where people are in need, for instance, the sewing-room project, particularly. There are a great many women there that I know of who have big families or who are not qualified to do other work, but they can do this work. The cut in quotas falls on them. I asked the committee to consider this problem. I am wondering what consideration it gave to the problem.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee considered that problem along with many other problems. Many of the sewing-room projects should be State problems, not Federal projects. It is a rather wide stretch of the imagination to take some of these sewing-room projects and call them work projects under the theory you are taking a person who is employable in the ordinary sense of the word. They can earn their own living in industry or commerce.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the administration ought to consider not cutting these projects where they are in need and where they cannot get employment elsewhere.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is it not true that the food-stamp program is a program for the destitute in the city?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; but not exclusively. It will help them, wherever the plan can be instituted.

Mr. LUDLOW. They are the ones who are going to get the benefit of the program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Referring to the language of the bill which provides for the wage scale, I am anxious to ascertain whether or not there is any possibility of increasing the wages of the W. P. A. worker in view of the marked increased cost of living?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, if you increase the wages you decrease the number of people to be employed. You have so many dollars, which will employ so many people. You can increase wages but you will decrease the number of people to be employed. That is the discussion we are having now. The food-stamp plan diverts money and decreases the number of people who can be employed. The committee felt that while it is true there has been an increase in the cost of living, yet this is possibly the best approach to the situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. These national-defense projects give employment to a lot of people. Will the gentleman explain to the House what the opinion of the committee was in reference to breaking down the appropriation? As I understand it, 40 percent of this is based on unemployment, another 40 percent on the basis of population, and 10 percent discretionary.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Ten percent on the defense program.

Mr. STEFAN. And 10 percent on the defense program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. There are some States in which there have been continued droughts where there are no national-defense industries. Where would they benefit by this formula?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly the part of the formula relating to unemployment and the discretionary percentage are aimed to help such situations. The committee in the report on the bill has suggested that W. P. A. in administration of this money for the next fiscal year give this formula close study in order to integrate it with the defense contract letting. Some areas have received large defense orders and some have not. That situation with respect to the distribution of W. P. A. employment needs to be studied carefully.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. As I understand, the committee cut approximately 750,000 people off W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The reduction in average employment is from 1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1941 to 941,315 for the fiscal year 1942, or by 758,685.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Does the committee believe those 750,000 will be absorbed in defense industries? Does the gentleman have any data that would indicate that to be the fact?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Seven hundred thousand of that cut was not only favored by the committee but was made at the suggestion of the W. P. A. and the administration, and they think those people will be absorbed in industry or other private employment.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Has any census been taken that shows the age of the people on W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. The gentleman will find that in the hearings. I believe the average age of the people on W. P. A. is about 43.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The State of California has received a great amount of defense-industry money, but it is to be spent principally on airplanes and shipbuilding—two industries in which the owners of the plants will not employ persons of that age. Therefore, while there is a large increase in the employment generally, the State of California will still be left with a tremendous number of people over 43 who cannot get work in the defense industries, so I believe the cut at this time is most unfortunate because what we are going to do will break down the morale of thousands of people who ought to be encouraged at this time inasmuch as they cannot get work in industry.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. I believe the amendment is a perfectly logical one. As a matter of fact, it is a relief amendment. In reply to the suggestion that it will put people on the bread lines, I suggest that it will take them out of the bread lines by making it possible for them to acquire bread they could not otherwise purchase.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice that the language of the proposed measure with reference to how preference shall be determined is the same as that contained in the act last year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. With the exception of the addition of the blind. We put the blind in there.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did the committee give any consideration to changing that portion with reference to how preferences shall be determined on the basis of relative need?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee considered that very carefully. It had quite a number of representatives of veterans' organizations before it and some Members of Congress, and it went into the question very carefully. The committee felt that with the rapidly decreasing program such as we have had that the preference section should be left as it is now.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did not the administration really favor changing the language there and wanted to eliminate the words "on the basis of relative need"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. The administration favored that, and the administration favored taking out all the restrictions we had put in the W. P. A. bills since we started working on them 3 or 4 years ago, but the committee did not feel that it could do that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That language forces the administration to administer the act but makes it almost impossible to follow the intent of Congress or the way the committee wants it. It is an impracticable proposition to determine the preferences on the basis of relative need.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the gentleman's statement. I do not believe it is impracticable. I believe it is about the best formula you could work out on it. You cannot work out any formula that in isolated instances is not going to work some hardship on someone.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did not the administration state to the committee that it was impracticable to administer the act under that wording?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They stated they would like to have the restriction removed, yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They did not go so far as to state it was impossible to administer it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not believe they went that far.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN A. HALL. The gentleman may have covered this in his statement; I have not heard all of it. I know the gentleman will agree with me that there is evidence of growing public disapproval of expenditures in nondefense items. Will the gentleman tell me, if he can, whether or not it is going to be the general policy in connection with these projects to indulge as much as possible in defense or semidefense projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I recall it, expenditures this fiscal year for defense projects will run about $400,000,000 from W. P. A. funds and sponsors funds combined. They are carried on, of course, by taking people who are certified to W. P. A. from the relief rolls.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand, this $50,000,000 diversion to the food-stamp plan necessarily means that a good many people who have been on W. P. A. to get dollars for their employment are not going to get any dollars in the future because of the diversion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You can employ that many less people on W. P. A.

Mr. OLIVER. So, as a matter of fact, it is very little comfort and very little solace to those people to know that they can get $1.50 worth of food when they do not have the $1 to put in to get the $1.50 worth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But it is a whole lot of solace to the fellow who cannot get on W. P. A. and has not been on W. P. A. to get the $1.50 worth of food.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Does this not mean that there will be 58,685 men who will not have an opportunity to work if this $50,000,000 goes to agriculture?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right. It is likewise true that the President's estimate that were sent up here meant that 700,000 persons will not have the opportunity to work on W. P. A. in 1942 that had that opportunity in 1941. The program is pulled down, drawn in, and constricted. The committee felt it was fair as a relief proposition to give some relief to people who could not get on W. P. A. but who were yet just as much interested in trying to eat once or twice a day as the people who did have W. P. A. jobs.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to go along with my more or less rambling remarks, but I will yield to the gentlemen who are on their feet asking me to yield.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman tell us about the percentage of decrease in the W. P. A. appropriation under last year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In dollars, it is 35 percent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is 35 percent in dollars? I thought it was 40 percent.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Forty-four percent in the number employed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And 35 percent in dollars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will yield, I may say, further answering the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] that even a man on W. P. A. can take advantage of the stamp plan and increase what he gets from W. P. A. by 50 percent in food values.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. He cannot increase all he gets in wage from W. P. A. by 50 percent in food value, but if he spends a certain amount of his W. P. A. wage for food, then he gets 50 percent in stamps, in addition, to buy certain other surplus foods.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On this much controverted question about the stamp plan, would not the gentleman agree that the fair statement of the case would be that here are two different approaches to the problem of unemployment and human need, and that the real question is how much of a total, over-all program of both of these plans you are going to have. It does not seem to me that in this bill you can decide how much of a stamp-plan program you are going to have, because, primarily, that is in the other bill, and I would not quarrel with the gentleman about increasing the stamp plan at all, but I do think it is an open question as to whether or not the total, over-all amount is really going to meet the needs.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I imagine that the amount of the cut in the amount for W. P. A. purposes was due to our defense program. Is not that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it was due to the fact that private employment has increased and will increase further, and there are and will be more opportunities for private employment which, of course, is induced by the large expenditures for defense.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to how we are affected in my State. For instance, the only national-defense contract that has been let in Montana is $25,000 awarded to the Caird Machinery Co., of Helena. We have 10,000 families on relief in Montana, and if the amount that has been allowed in the bill is the final amount allowed by the Congress it will cut down the number that will receive relief under the program to 5,200, and I am just wondering what we are going to do with the other 4,800 families that will be in the same position they were in a year ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Answering the gentleman from Montana, I may say that, of course, some of them will have to go on State and community relief, where they belong.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, the W. P. A. is supposed to be set up for the purpose of taking care of those who cannot take care of themselves.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If they are employables—it is supposed to be a works program of people who ordinarily could support themselves except for the fact there are no jobs for them. If you apply that test, you eliminate a great many people on W. P. A. rolls, people who would, in the ordinary course of events, under any sort of improvement in business, be able to support themselves.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the difficulties under which the gentleman's committee has been working, and he is to be congratulated on the patience and scope of knowledge he has shown in connection with this bill. But we are going to be in the situation where, after this amount is passed, we are going to have want in the United States in many places just about the same as we had before.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that if, with a national income of $92,000,000,000, which is what we are supposed to have in the next year, the Federal Government still has to support more than 1,000,000 of its people, then there is something radically wrong with our economic system.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may say to the gentleman that that is exactly what we have been trying to point out here for some time. The statesmanship of this country has not solved our own economic conditions. It has not solved the problem of want. We have not a decent pension in this country today for old people who are too old to secure employment in any avenue of trade and too old to work and are in dire poverty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am just a little afraid that in some instances this attempt to spread the program by assigning some of this money to the stamp plan will curtail it, because, certainly, during a certain period of time it has been my understanding that only those could purchase these food stamps who were already on the relief rolls in some way and, of course, the allocating of this amount will mean that the $50,000,000 will be available to a decreasing number on the W. P. A. rolls, because the other people are not eligible to buy stamps or at least they have not been eligible to do so in my State.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point? If the gentleman does not care to yield now, I shall not press it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But I would like to say on that point, I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is correct and unless the stamp plan is extended to low-income groups that are not on relief, as has been done in one or two communities, that may be the effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] mentioned veterans' preference and I notice, in the committee report, at page 10, the statement—

> The committee also calls attention to the provisions of the law insofar as they affect veterans, so the State and local administrators may use the utmost care in determining that veterans' preferences are scrupulously observed.

Does not this language of the committee indicate the fact that the veterans' preference provision of the law has not been properly administered by the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I think in some instances it has not, I will say to the gentleman, but I think in those instances it can be traceable usually to faulty local administration and not to the law. The committee feels that it ought not to make this a veterans' relief bill and does not believe any gentleman here who is zealous in the cause of the veteran would take that position. We have given the veterans the preference, and we have provided also for relative needs; that is, if there is a veteran without dependents who is unemployed and a nonveteran without dependents who is unemployed, the veteran gets the job, but if there is a veteran without dependents who is unemployed and there is a nonveteran with a wife and hungry children who is unemployed, under the relative needs policy that person ought to get the job above the veteran, and I think that is a logical and reasonable position.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We understand that, but, nevertheless, the various State administrators make their own interpretation, and thereby have caused a wave of criticism from the lack of uniformity in extending veterans' preference. No doubt this discrimination is the reason why the committee was impelled to use the language referred to in commenting on veterans' preference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It wanted to impress the W. P. A. in Washington and through them in the States, that the Congress meant that the veterans are to have the preference, and when they do not do that, then Members of Congress, if their attention is called to it, will call the matter to the attention of the W. P. A.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that the only way that this question can be dealt with is by eliminating the necessity for the veteran being on that roll?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that would eliminate it, but I do not think that should be or could be done.

Mr. HOOK. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this preference goes to the supervisory positions, the administrative positions as well as just the ordinary relief work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It has nothing to do with the supervisory or administrative positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 5 minutes more, and I shall yield briefly to these gentlemen who are on their feet.

Mr. WALTER. Certainly the gentleman does not contend that a veteran will seek a W. P. A. job when he can obtain employment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not want to say that he would, but one would think that anyone would not seek a W. P. A. job when he could find work elsewhere. However, there are many instances where that has happened. I would not want to remove from this law the test that a person before he could ask the Government to furnish him a job out of the taxpayers' money certainly ought to show that he is in need of a job.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman think the veteran seeking a W. P. A. job is conclusive proof that he needs assistance?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I don't think that is conclusive proof on the part of anyone.

Mr. HEALEY. It is a fact that the W. P. A. has and is making a substantial contribution to national defense.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. HEALEY. On many of those projects the hours have been increased up to 48, and many of these men who are on the other projects where they work a much shorter week demonstrated their anxiety to be on the full 48 hours, so that they could earn whatever the difference was in time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. HEALEY. I think that ought to be emphasized to show that all of the W. P. A. workers are not merely people who want to loaf on the job.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not make that contention and I never have.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman knows that his committee has appropriated great sums for both the Army and the Navy. I have this fault to find with the W. P. A. program: Why cannot the Army and the Navy come in here and ask for an appropriation to do this defense work that has to be done, instead of taking these people off the W. P. A. and having them do the work for them in national-defense projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has exactly stated my position in the matter, that the three or four hundred million dollars in this bill will admittedly be used for defense projects and ought to be expended by the Department in the regular way, with the work let to contracts and people employed as they are employed in everyday affairs, and paid not W. P. A. inadequate wages but regular American wages.

Mr. IZAC. I think the Army and Navy are taking advantage of this situation. We need that $300,000,000 for the people who are needy and starving to death in this country and not for able-bodied men who can go out and get a job at five or six or seven dollars a day on national-defense projects.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am interested in the comment that has just been made by my colleague from Pennsylvania. I think he does not appreciate the circumstance of some of our communities. We do not have Army and Navy defense work up in northern Minnesota. We do not have any war industries up there. The W. P. A. is needed more there now than at any other time if you are going to take care of the unemployment situation. Otherwise you have to take the position that the Government should not furnish any money for relief projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have used a great deal of time, and I think I will yield the floor at this time because all these matters will be discussed when we take the resolution up under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in toto. I am opposed to it because I do not believe it is possible with such a set-up as we have in the Federal Government and the W. P. A., headed by Howard Hunter and David Lasser, to accomplish anything constructive toward the unemployed who may be left in this country. I do not believe that is the proper way to handle a relief program of any kind.

A year ago the amount of funds that was available to the W. P. A. during the fiscal year 1940 was approximately $2,200,000,000. In 1941 the amount of funds was reduced to a total of $1,375,000,000, or a cut of $825,000,000, approximately 37½ percent. The average number of administrative employees through the year was reduced from approximately 26,000 to an average of about 23,000. At the same time the number of supervisory employees upon projects was increased from 63,000 to 68,000. So that the total number of employees has averaged about the same for those who have supervisory offices as it did in 1940, with 37½ percent less funds with which to operate, and a 37½ percent less load.

Now, maybe that is the way to run a Government institution; never save a dollar; never cut down on foolish and ridiculous administrative expenses. I understand that someone even has the nerve to talk about increasing their administrative expenses when they are wasting money to a ridiculous extent at the present time.

In the fiscal year 1941, at the beginning of the year, they had in their Washington office 1,709 administrative employees with an average salary of $2,436, one of the very largest of any institution in the Government. The average is considerably below $2,000, but for W. P. A. it was $2,436. Now, what kind of progress did they make during the fiscal year 1941 down to the 1st of April? They reduced the number of employees in the office by 53. They increased the average rate of salary to $2,248 a year, making an average amount of upward of $400 above what the average is for other governmental outfits.

If this outfit were properly administered, they could assign the labor that they have available to the States where there is need. There is no provision in the bill anywhere which prevents the assignment of such numbers as are needed for employment in any particular State. The number that they have on their rolls at the present time, as nearly as I can tell from the latest date they gave us, was 1,496,000 on May 14. Of this number it is alleged that 239,000 are upon defense projects, subject to legislative exemption. In most no place I can find in the country, going through the whole situation, do I find a relief load from which any substantial number of people available for defense projects could be recruited. Once in a while in a town there is a larger relief load than the amount of workers upon alleged defense projects. On the other hand, there are many, many places where they have these so-called defense projects where the relief load is not equal to the number that are on the roll at the present time.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Relative to the gentleman's statement in conection with defense projects, has he given consideration to the State of Minnesota, especially the larger cities which have received but few defense projects, and also the availability of labor and the number of those on relief at the present time?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I have given consideration to that State, as well as every other State. There are in the State of Minnesota at the present time a total of 39,410 W P. A. employees. That is as of May 14. There is a total upon alleged defense projects of 4,100. That State has a far larger percentage of people upon W. P. A. rolls than New York State, up-State, which has a population three times as great, and has 27,000 on the W. P. A. roll, or 12,000 below the number that Minnesota has at the present time. New York State is being liberally taken care of, and Minnesota has a quota of practically four times as much for its population as up-State New York.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not true that the State of New York has generously received defense projects and therefore has received employment possibilities, while the Middle West has received few or no defense projects, and therefore their relief rolls are much greater than those of the eastern territory?

Mr. TABER. That may be so as to some places, but they are being taken care of very liberally along those lines and they are being taken care of in a ratio which, to my mind, indicates extreme liberality.

Frankly, I do not believe there has been much diminution in the number on the W. P. A. rolls in Minnesota. Minnesota employment is 39,000 as against last December of 43,000; while the number of relief cases was 36,000 last December and that dropped off steadily with an increase of employment on W. P. A. through the winter, and when it gets to the 14th of May they begin to cut down the number of relief cases in proportion. I am sure the Midwest has been better treated in connection with the number of people who can actually be employed than the Midwest thinks it has, as compared with the rest of the country.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. In addition to the Government defense projects which the State of New York has received—and, of course, I can see the reason for giving many of these projects to the East—is it not true that the industrial plants of the East have been filled with subcontracts while we in the Middle West have not received our share of these subcontracts?

Mr. TABER. I presume the Midwest has not received as many as some of the Eastern States. On the other hand, I am sure employment in the Midwest is very substantial.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Does not the gentleman feel that as long as we are not getting our share of defense projects and as long as we do not have the industrial plants as compared to the East, we in the Midwest should continue to benefit from a properly administered W. P. A. program while men willing and able to work are unemployed?

Mr. TABER. As long as there is need for it and as long as the money is provided. As a matter of fact, I know the situation in the gentleman's State could be better taken care of by an intelligent method of handling relief, by turning the thing over to the States with a proper amount of money rather than continuing it under Howard Hunter and David Lasser. I know it could be handled for half the money it is now costing.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I was glad to have the comments of the gentleman from New York in his answer to the gentleman from Minnesota but I would ask the gentleman from New York if he will not comment on one other provision of this bill, the 18 months' lay-off. Does the gentleman consider this a beneficial provision or does he feel it will be the cause of considerable suffering?

Mr. TABER. The 18 months' lay-off, in my opinion, is an absolute necessity unless you are going to develop a class of people to whom W. P. A. is life's objective, who never want to get off and never intend to get off. That is the only way anyone can justify striking that provision from the bill. At the present time better than half of those on W. P. A. could find employment, if they set out to, either on the farms, in the factories, or at domestic work. There is a tremendous shortage of all kinds of labor of that type because so many are on W. P. A. right now.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. According to the figures submitted by the Department, about 50 percent of those on W. P. A. at the present time are 50 years of age and over. Would the gentleman include those of 50 years and over in the 18 months' clause?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would watch the industrial situation and study it as I have, he would come to the conclusion, and he would find, that with the trend now in vogue and the situation we are now confronted with such as it is, a man over 50 years of age can find employment better and easier in a great many instances than the younger fellow. I do not believe that at the present time the fellow over 50 is under the handicap he was 2 or 3 years ago. I think most of the complaints come from people who have not investigated the facts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My district is one in which there are many steel mills. I know as a matter of fact that none of the large steel mills will employ any person who is over 40 years of age. I know the Pennsylvania Railroad will not employ new employees who are over 35 years of age.

Mr. TABER. When one sees so many cases where large corporations are adopting the policy of employing older men because they are more dependable, more ready, and more willing to work, much more so than some of the immigrants who come here with foreign ideas, who are not naturalized and who are subject to so many adverse influences, one cannot be terribly impressed by these complaints.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman made the statement that Howard Hunter and David Lasser were running the affairs of the W. P. A. In just what capacity is David Lasser employed? And is he the gentleman who formerly headed the Workers Alliance?

Mr. TABER. He is the same fellow who led the raid on the statehouse at Harrisburg—the same bird.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What is his salary?

Mr. TABER. Forty-four hundred dollars.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What is his title?

Mr. TABER. He is a sort of employment specialist, doing kind of lay-out stuff.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman give me the figures for Massachusetts?

Mr. TABER. For employment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I mean for W. P. A. aid under this bill.

Mr. TABER. W. P. A. in Massachusetts: The current figure is 59,866. The figure last December was 80,445, and that number stayed about the same until March.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from New York there are a great many women who can do the lighter work of W. P. A. but who cannot do the heavy work of industry.

Mr. TABER. Yes; there are a lot of them who could do domestic work, housework, and could get such work on a remunerative basis.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are not strong enough to do that either.

Mr. TABER. I am inclined to believe there are many of them who can.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. My distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL] called the gentleman's attention to a condition which exists, I think, generally throughout the Midwest. For example, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that we have this situation in my district and it pertains to some of the other country districts. You have a group of men and women who cannot compete in the industrial field. They may not have the physical ability; they have not the training; at least they have not the physical ability.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean they are not employable from a commercial standpoint?

Mr. O'HARA. From a commercial or industrial standpoint.

Mr. TABER. What could they do; what are they able to do?

Mr. O'HARA. They are able to work these shorter hours and do the work which the W. P. A. does in its program, and if they did not have this work, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they would be a responsibility upon their communities for relief? Some of these municipalities are small and cannot take care of these people. Will the gentleman not agree that the W. P. A. program does furnish a good field for that type of people who are in need of work?

Mr. TABER. There is a great deal in the W. P. A. for those who are unable to work because of mental or physical handicaps and for those who are unwilling to work because of their disposition, who have been catered to and who have been developed into a frame of mind where they expect the Government to provide them with funds for making motions rather than for working. In my opinion, I do not think it is the right thing for the Government to operate that kind of a program. If we have to handle a situation of that kind, we should make proper allotment to the States if they are not able to carry their own load. I do not think there are so many States that are not able to carry it. We should then let those States take care of it as they find it most fitting. For the Government to have a general program of that character has absolutely and totally demoralized a tremendous number of people.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I want to make myself clear on one point. I, too, am bitterly opposed to any waste or extravagance, whether it be on W. P. A. or any other governmental program. I, too, oppose the employment by our Government of persons with communistic leanings and beliefs and who will not subscribe to a 100-percent Americanism. I, too, believe that our relief program could be better administered if it were decentralized and handled by the States, but until that program can be decentralized, I for one must support a program to aid these men over 40 years of age who are today having difficulty in getting employment, whether it be in industrial plants or other places, and also those people who are incapable of regular employment because of some physical handicap. All of them desire to work, and I believe it is our obligation to take care of them until they can be provided with gainful employment.

Mr. TABER. I have called attention to David Lasser. You all know the kind of a record he has. Now I want to call your attention to the record of Joseph C. Ryszeleski, an investigator employed by the W. P. A. Here are a few questions that were put to the gentleman on an occasion:

Now, Mr. Ryszeleski, you studied law at the University of Pennsylvania?

Yes.

And you joined the American Army in the other World War?

Yes.

You were in France in the Army?

Yes, sir.

And you became involved in some gambling and fighting and were arrested?

Yes; I was court-martialed; yes, sir.

You were court-martialed and sentenced to prison for 3 years——

Yes, sir.

From which you escaped?

Yes.

And then joined the Polish Army?

Yes.

And came to Pennsylvania, after the war was over?

Yes.

And entered the practice of law?

No; I first received my honorable discharge from the American Army.

My comment: How did he get it?

All right; but after that you came back to Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia, and started in to practicing law?

Yes.

And you became Assistant City Solicitor?

Yes.

You became counsel to the Polish consul in Philadelphia?

Yes, sir.

And you became attorney for some building and loan associations that had a great number of Polish clients?

Yes, sir.

Customers. And your old custom of gambling and getting in debt caught up with you?

* * * * *

Well, you did become involved, did you not, Mr. Ryszeleski, in embezzling the funds of these customers of the building and loan association.

Yes, sir. I wouldn't say "customers." It was a building and loan association.

That is right, and you became involved in the embezzlement of about $5,000 of the estate of a certain Polish man who died and whose net estate was to be transferred, through the Polish consul, to Polish beneficiaries of his estate? You know you did, don't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Now, wait. I was in one case; yes.

In about a half dozen or a dozen cases of that kind, weren't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Not in estates.

Oh, not in estates——

No.

But in misapplication of funds?

That is right.

You were indicted in 1934 for embezzlement, weren't you, Mr. Ryszeleski?

Yes, sir.

You were listed for trial on the 4th of April 1935 in the City Hall, in Philadelphia, and entered a plea of not being willing to contest it?

Yes, sir.

And there were certain other bills against you, in February 1934 and September of 1934?

No.

Weren't you indicted for carrying concealed deadly weapons?

No, sir.

Well, on this charge of embezzlement, in the October term of 1934, your sentence was deferred and you were placed on probation? Isn't that right?

That is right, sir.

And then you were disbarred from the bar of Philadelphia or that court of common pleas and a great many other courts there, in a proceeding in 1934, in December, were you not?

Yes, sir.

And 3 years went by, a period when you—3 years went by and you applied for reinstatement, did you not?

Yes, sir.

And that was denied, was it not?

Yes, sir.

And all of those are matters of record in the courts of Philadelphia?

Yes, sir.

Now, you began the work as an investigator for W. P. A. about how long after you were disbarred from the courts in Philadelphia?

About a year.

And you were the principal investigator in working up the evidence for this case?

Yes, sir.

That is the kind of "critters" on whom they spend their money, the money that is appropriated by you for relief. What would you expect of something managed by Howard Hunter and David Lasser?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This is a good time.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman something to say?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I have something to say which I believe will interest the House very much.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yesterday the gentleman made a 1-minute speech. In view of the fact——

Mr. TABER. Yes; and I refuse to yield further because I know what the gentleman is going to say. I will tell it. He is going to say that it is immaterial.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Why does not the gentleman let me say what I want to say?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is immaterial, and I know that what I told was correct.

The gentleman made a statement that it was only a pebble. My Lord, if inefficiency is only a pebble, W. P. A. is a terrible pebble.

After having gone into a great many of these details, I have now called attention to some of the celebrities in connection with W. P. A. and to the situation with which we are confronted. On May 20, 1941, the W. P. A. in New York State, and I understand in other States, and this appears in a memorandum I put in the record on page 276 of the hearings——

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is making a most interesting contribution to the discussion, and I believe the Committee should be in order so that Members may hear the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I should like the RECORD to show at this point that the attention of the Committee was riveted on the gentleman from New York as he gave these very positive and informative statements. I know of no time when the Committee has been in better order than it is at this time, as it listens to the statement of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

On May 20, 1941, this was sent out by the W. P. A. New York office:

> We have received authorization from the State office to accept all male and female cases of persons on relief, whether they have a small budget and receive a small amount of relief weekly, semimonthly, or monthly; where they received hospitalization without any home relief; where they have received medical care without home relief or hospitalization or, where they have received clothing and surplus commodities without home relief, hospitalization, or medical care.
>
> If you have any such persons on your relief rolls, we now can accept them. Our interviewers will call on you with the necessary forms within the next day or two.

This was sent out to all the local welfare commissioners, and I understand the same thing has been done throughout the country, in an effort to bolster up and increase the number of people on W. P. A.

Under that proposition they could take on anyone who had received as much as half a peck of apples from the Surplus Commodities Corporation during the winter, regardless of anything else. It is becoming increasingly apparent that W. P. A. is unable to find enough persons to go on its rolls to satisfy the greed of Howard Hunter and David Lasser for opportunities to spend money.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment; I should like to get all of this information in together, if I may.

A survey was taken by the Scripps-Howard papers about 3 or 4 weeks ago, and this was the result. I am quoting from the Washington Daily News of May 21, 1941:

> 1. That it is becoming easier for W. P. A. workers to get private jobs.
>
> 2. That an acute shortage of skilled workers is bringing demands for more and better coordinated industrial-training programs.
>
> 3. That there is much room for improvement in efforts, through public-employment services, to place men and women from the relief rolls in private jobs.
>
> Full employment—a condition in which everyone who wants to work and is able to work will have no difficulty in finding a place on a private pay roll—is nowhere in sight. W. P. A. authorities and Government economists insist that expansion of the defense program will not bring that condition about.
>
> But in highly industrial States and cities—of which Ohio and Cleveland are typical—there is a decided and encouraging trend.
>
> A year ago Ohio had 136,562 persons on W. P. A. pay rolls and 53,593 others certified and waiting assignment. It now has 82,789 on the W. P. A. rolls and only 10,295—of whom about 60 percent are women—on the waiting list.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not now; I want to finish this first:

> In the same period the State's direct-relief rolls have dropped from 99,657 cases to about 66,000.
>
> In Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) workers on the W. P. A. roll have decreased from 31,868 to 15,363 in the last year; those on the waiting list from 13,962 to 4,421. The city's direct-relief cases have decreased from 21,270 to about 15,000.
>
> However, with business conditions improving and with their direct-relief loads decreasing, such cities will be much better able to take care of their own unemployed employables if Congress decides to reduce the W. P. A. rolls more drastically than the President proposes.

Here is another picture I want to call to your attention before I yield to anyone, and I shall yield in a moment. We have all these alleged defense programs. There is not one of them that could not be done for one-half the cost if the job were let to private contracts and regular wages paid, and this would tend to relieve unemployment a great deal more than to continue alleged defense projects through W. P. A.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree fully with the gentleman that one of the worst things about W. P. A. is the matter of administration. The cost of administration is entirely too great, and I should like to inquire how the gentleman would feel about an amendment to provide that foremen, timekeepers, and so on, of the administrative staff be taken from the relief rolls. I might add, if the gentleman will permit, that my observation is that as a rule foremen, timekeepers, and so on, are political pets. They are folk who do not need the jobs. For instance, I have in my possession an affidavit to the effect that a maiden of 77 summers, who is wealthy in her own name, for the last few years has been drawing $200 a month to head a project under the W. P. A., and as is usual with a person 77 years of age, she does not enjoy good health and really puts in no time. It is a political sinecure.

Mr. TABER. That is sabotaging the relief program.

Mr. BENNETT. And that is not an unusual thing. I think the bill should be amended to provide that these folk be taken from the relief roll, because I noticed a statement very recently from the State administrator who claimed that every profession was represented on the W. P. A. relief rolls, so they ought to be able to get them.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is right.

Just a little while ago the President submitted a new tax bill designed to raise $3,500,000,000. We have a debt now of over $47,000,000,000, and military expenditures are running at the rate of nearly $850,000,000 a month. At this time we ought not to take any chances on appropriating this amount of money for any such purpose as this. If we need to appropriate $100,000,000 and divide it up among those places where it is needed for relief, we should let it be administered honestly by the localities, and then we would be getting somewhere. But when we go on year after year with a wasteful, ridiculous program in charge of such "birds" as Hunter and David Lasser, and they employ such "birds" as the investigator I read about, I am rather inclined to feel that I have been right all these years in opposing the W. P. A. I do not believe it serves a useful purpose in this country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the last 8 years have witnessed here in the United States the most remarkable development in social and humanitarian legislation—the most notable progress in governmental philanthropy to be found in a similar period in the history of any nation.

Eight years ago the Nation faced an economic crisis unprecedented in severity and extent. The period of prosperity, which reached its peak in 1920, marked by the highest standards of living the American people had ever known, ended suddenly. Factories closed; furnace fires were drawn; banks failed; farms were sold under the hammer; and labor, which had been employed at high wages, was turned out into the street. Men who had never had difficulty in providing for their families were without work and for the first time American children lacked bread. Young men just reaching maturity ready to take their place in life, found neither work nor opportunity to get a start or become established. Destitution was widespread; the highways were thronged with men seeking employment. Armies of desperate men prepared to march on the Capital, and cities ordered machine guns and tear gas to meet the threat—for here in America men will no longer starve peaceably.

We proposed to meet that situation in two ways: First, through reassurance of business, encouragement of industry, resumption of trade, cooperation with labor, and enhancement of the national income; second, by providing work for the unemployed on Government projects, in the construction of needed public improvements, contributing to national wealth and the public welfare—through the Work Projects Administration. It was a method unprecedented in Federal activity, but as successful as it was unique. Bread lines disappeared; soapbox audiences melted away; in every community construction started, providing opportunities for honest work and

self-respecting support of dependent families. The W. P. A. was successful from the beginning.

It met adequately the needs of the hour. But recognition was slow and opposition was indefatigable. Born of conditions brought about through political and legislative maladministration, criticism followed inevitably. Of all of the agencies created to meet the emergencies of that trying period, none were so bitterly assailed as W. P. A. Here in the House opposition flowered in an ill-advised investigation in which $100,000 was spent in an effort to find some defect or culpability in its administration, its methods, or its expenditures and its integrity of purpose. Highly paid, high-powered investigators combed the Nation in an all-out drive to find something dishonest, dishonorable, or discreditable, all without avail.

The bill which the committee reports today is highly significant. This report marks the end of the baseless charges which have accompanied every bill to provide funds for W. P. A. in previous sessions. Each year when this bill came up for consideration the opening speeches were punctuated by unbridled charges of corruption, mismanagement, and reprehensible veniality. They charged diversion of funds, misappropriation of public property, partisan prostitution, subversive activities, communistic control, boondoggling, inefficiency, maladministration, and every other possible sin of omission and commission which the fertile imaginations of paid investigators could devise. This year the discredited and repudiated maligners of the W. P. A. have been forced to content themselves with vague references to one unimportant field employee who has no possible connection with any policy-forming branch of the service and against whom no specific charge of dereliction of duty of any kind or character has been made, much less sustained.

Out of all the millions of men who have been employed by W. P. A. in the current year they can find only one man to criticize and submit no basis for even that inferential criticism. I assure them now that if they will file and sustain any charge of culpability against this man—or any other man in the vast army of workers under W. P. A.—he will be promptly and summarily dismissed. And more significant still, out of all the thousands of projects under construction in every State of the Union, the cross-examination of witnesses before the committee, and the debate on the bill here today, has pointedly failed to develop any criticism, protest, or objection of record. The report and the discussion adduced here this morning constitute one of the most sweeping and convincing vindications of the efficacy of W. P. A. and the integrity of its administration that could be presented. The proceedings here today are a gratifying testimonial to the efficiency of democratic government, to the effectiveness of the remarkable program of relief devised by the genius of American statesmanship and the outstanding ability with which it has been so successfully administered.

When the W. P. A. was organized, it was understood that it was a temporary expedient designed to meet an emergency, and that as the need for it declined and private industry provided employment, there would be a corresponding decrease in the need for W. P. A. and the funds appropriated for its maintenance. That policy has been followed from year to year, and the amount carried by the bill has reflected the business and employment needs of the country. We have appropriated in past sessions as high as two and a quarter billion dollars for this purpose. This year, in keeping with the vastly augmented increase in industrial activity throughout the country and the corresponding decline in unemployment throughout the Nation, the President requests only $875,000,000. In other words, the W. P. A. has made good. It has been successful. It has achieved its objective. It has carried out every purpose for which it was created.

And, in doing so, it has added immeasurably to the wealth of the United States and the health and happiness and welfare of the American people. It has provided for every community in the land enduring and imperishable facilities which those communities could never have provided for themselves without the Federal aid contributed through the W. P. A. and which will benefit them and their people for generations to come.

They have included the improvement and extension of physical facilities for transportation, education, recreation, public health and sanitation, and welfare.

More adequate highway and street systems; new airports; thousands of new and improved school buildings; hospitals, and other public buildings; additional sewage- and water-treatment facilities; and many other tangible achievements have resulted from W. P. A. construction work. Significant contributions to the scope and quality of public services have resulted from the nonconstruction projects through which instruction, recreational leadership, personnel for planning and research have been made available.

As a result of the operation of highway projects the construction or improvement of 565,000 miles of roads and streets had been completed. Rural sections of the country have been the chief beneficiaries of W. P. A. road work in terms of mileage. Roads constructed or reconstructed by W. P. A. workers in rural areas totaled about 498,000 miles.

In urban areas, much of the project work has been directed toward the reduction of traffic congestion. Altogether, a total of 59,000 miles of urban streets and alleys were built or reconditioned. Sixty-nine thousand bridges and viaducts had been completed along with 880,000 new culverts.

Project operations involving construction and improvement of airports and air-navigation facilities have involved work on 90 percent of the air-line stops.

W. P. A. project workers have strung 3,200 miles of telephone and telegraph line. Through this work the fire-fighting efforts of the Forest Service have been greatly facilitated and communication at Army bases and on other federally owned property has been improved. These totals do not include the 3,000 miles of police, fire alarm, and traffic signal lines which W. P. A. workers have installed or reconditioned.

Four thousand eight hundred new school buildings have been constructed through W. P. A. project operations, 1,800 additions built, and 30,000 buildings renovated or modernized. That great need for construction and modernization of school buildings has existed in the United States for some time was indicated by surveys of the United States Office of Education and of the National Education Association which estimated that several million school children were improperly housed, and classes held in buildings condemned by public officials.

Numerous recreational facilities other than buildings also have been constructed by W. P. A. workers. Among them are 2,100 new or enlarged stadiums and grandstands, 1,700 new or larger parks, 2,800 school and city playgrounds, and 2,800 athletic fields; 143 new hospitals, 85 additons, and the improvement of about 1,700 others. Many of the newly built hospitals were provided for towns or communities which previously had been without hospital facilities of any kind.

One hundred and eighty new or enlarged water-treatment plants were completed; also 981 new or enlarged pumping stations, and 293 reconstructed plants, together with 13,000 miles of new and 3,000 miles of improved aqueducts, water mains, and distribution lines.

The drainage and treatment of mosquito-breeding swamps and improvement of drainage structures by W. P. A. workers has been a strong weapon in the fight against malaria.

Direct medical and health services for persons who could not otherwise afford them have been furnished by W. P. A. workers, most of them unemployed physicians, registered nurses, dentists, and chemists. Usually these services are supplementary to those provided by local health agencies at medical and dental clinics, but often they are extended in regions where such services are otherwise not available. During a 2-week period in January 1940 W. P. A. workers assisted in the examination and treatment of 243,000 children and adults. Some were treated in dental and medical clinics, others in their own homes or in public schools and other institutions. During the same period about 83,000 tests—such as the Schick test for susceptibility to diphtheria—and 17,000 immunizations against diphtheria, typhoid fever, whooping cough, and other infectious diseases were given.

Welfare activities of State and local governmental agencies, other than health services, have also been extended through the cooperation of the W. P. A. On sewing-room projects, operated in all States, W. P. A. workers completed 312,000,000 pieces of clothing and 85,000,000 other articles.

Projects on which lunches are served to undernourished school children result not only in better health but in better grades, better school attendance, and better attitudes on the part of the children. From the beginning of the program through December 1940, 575,000,000 lunches were served; currently about

25,000,000 lunches are served each month in about 18,700 participating schools.

For 20 centuries men have been futilly asking that the age-old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" It remained for this age, and for our people, and for American statesmanship to finally and adequately answer that question—"Yes; we are our brother's keeper. And we are making ample provision for him and his children."

I cannot close without giving credit to whom credit is especially due. And I am certain I express the appreciation generally of this body when I pause to pay a special tribute to Howard Hunter, now serving as Commissioner of W. P. A. No man ever stepped into a more trying position than did Howard Hunter when tragically and unexpectedly called to administer an office which had taxed the courage and ability of two of the ablest men to be found in the national administration. Harry L. Hopkins, now a member of the President's Cabinet first came to especial note through his able initiation of the work in this new and untried field. Along with Col. F. C. Harrington, who succeeded him he bore the brunt of virulent criticism the like of which has not been heard in Congress, at least in recent years. It is an eloquent commentary that in the hearings on the relief bill just closed, there was less criticism of W. P. A. and less personal reflection on the administrator and his staff than in any previous year of its operation. And in no previous year has the W. P. A. shown a finer record of accomplishment than under Mr. Hunter's administration.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the record show that Mr. Hunter had to return some seven or eight hundred dollars he had spent going to horse races?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it positively does not show any such fact, or any other fact which would justify any such conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for bringing out into the open that old and exploded canard which has been covertly circulated and which is without foundation or justification. If anyone desires authoritative information on the origin of this story and its complete refutation, I refer him to page 265 of the hearings before the committee, April 22, 1940, in which the matter was fully discussed and discredited.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will give the gentleman a few additional minutes to explain the $50,000,000 that is taken out of this appropriation for surplus commodities. I would like to know what the attitude of the gentleman is on that particular point, because the facts are, as I indicated to the gentleman from Virginia this morning, that this is an additional reduction of W. P. A. rolls, no matter how you look at it. The gentleman is very familiar with it, and I would like to know what his attitude on that particular point is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman raise the question, and fully share his interest in provision for the employment for as many eligible workers as possible.

The President sent down an estimate for $875,000,000 for relief, to be expended as the Congress deemed best. The committee in considering it allocated $825,000,000 of the $875,000,000 for jobs. Of course, that will not take care of everybody who is eligible for a job on W. P. A. No appropriation we have ever made has been sufficient to take care of all who were eligible, but the vital thing is that this $825,000,000 more nearly takes care of all those eligibles to W. P. A. than any previous appropriation for the purpose. It more adequately covers the needs of the day than any appropriation which this committee has recommended or the Congress has made in the past.

The committee then allocated the remaining $50,000,000 to those in need of relief which could not be otherwise provided. There are many in great need, destitute, in need of actual food—families who know not where the next meal is coming from, who have hungry children around a bare breakfast table. It is for these that the $50,000,000 is to be used. If we had used this for jobs it would have only paid for $50,000,000 worth of relief, but when we put it into food stamps it provides $75,000,000 for relief. In other words, we added 50 percent to the amount so provided for relief, and we provided desperately needed relief for those who could not have been helped if the entire amount of the bill had been devoted to the one class eligible under allocations for jobs alone.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The thing that bothers me is how we are going to get it to the people who need it. It is not going to be expansive because the general rule of eligibility to purchase foods under the stamp plan requires that the person be on W. P. A., or some form of relief.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. It is not required that a family be on W. P. A. in order to be eligible to receive food.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That has been the requirement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Anyone who is receiving Government relief of any character; who is on W. P. A.; who is on social security; who is on blind relief; who has dependent children; and especially those who are on W. P. A. where food stamps are not available, is entitled to an allotment out of the food provided by this $50,000,000 as carried by the bill.

It expands immeasurably the number of those who are eligible to receive allotments of food and it provides the most urgently needed relief and makes possible the widest distribution that can be arranged.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand about that, but this $50,000,000 was taken out of the appropriation for W. P. A. Why did not the Agriculture Committee let that stand on its own foundation? The gentleman knows, and I believe I have had sufficient experience around here myself to know, that the surplus commodities plan has been a great success, one of the biggest things that has ever happened in this country. It could stand on its own foundation today without taking it out of the $886,000,000 here provided for W. P. A. I do not think it should have been done in that way. The gentleman is a member of the great Committee on Agriculture. They should have stood by the recommendation that the $50,000,000 stay in that bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, this is a relief bill—the only relief bill. Food stamps constitute relief. Food stamps do not help the farmer. They are a disadvantage to the farmer.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman will admit that it helps the businessman in different localities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is certainly right about that. It helps the businessman but it does not help the farmer. Such appropriations have no place in the agricultural appropriation bill. They belong in the relief bill. Food-stamp purchases are a distinct disadvantage to the farmer, because the relief administration hammers down the price of the food bought and takes it away from the farmer at the lowest price level, with the unfortunate result that such prices fix the return on everything the farmer sells. If they would pay parity prices for it, it would be of some help to agriculture; but they buy at destitution prices and freeze the farm market at the price paid by the Government, and the farm organizations condemn the practice. I have letters from the American Federation of the Farm Bureau to that effect, which I shall be glad to include as a part of my remarks. I am certain the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has always been a consistent friend of the farmer, would not want to perpetuate a practice which will deprive the producers of the Nation's food of a fair wage for their labor.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I agree heartily with what he has said in reference to the purchase of these surplus commodities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the position of all friends of agriculture. The farm organizations have come out officially and say that it is not farm relief, it is poor relief. It belongs in the relief bill.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to advise my colleague from Missouri that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment to require that in the expenditure of this $50,000,000 for surplus commodities they shall pay 85 percent of parity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, with the exception

that instead of 85 percent of parity they should pay full parity.

Mr. KEEFE. They should pay parity, but with the advantage of soil conservation and these other farm-aid programs it would bring it up to about parity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I share and endorse the gentleman's statement that the purchase of surplus commodities does not aid the farmer. For my part I should like to see all of this authorization taken out of the agricultural bill and put where it belongs.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. No Member of the House understands the farm problem better than the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi—or champions his cause more effectively. In order to complete the record I shall insert the letter from President O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, once again we are confronted with the problem of providing relief for those who are in need. It is, of course, essential that this relief should be provided. It is, of course, right that the Federal Government should assume its fair share of the burden. It is not essential, and it is not right, however, in my judgment that we should be called upon to make provision for this relief through the same unfair and wasteful system that has been in force during the past 6 years.

I disagree fundamentally with various observations just made to the Committee by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. To me there is no justification for compelling the Congress to continue to provide relief by methods which in the past have proven themselves to be inefficient, to be wasteful, to be corrupt; by methods which have served to deprive the needy of millions upon millions of dollars appropriated for their benefit; by methods which have afforded ruinous competition with legitimate private industry; by methods which have harbored the subversive elements in this country; by methods which in my judgment find their chief justification in terms of practical partisan politics.

At the conclusion of the W. P. A. investigation a year ago, I had high hopes that constructive proposals would be made to this House, revising our whole system of administering relief so as to place it on a basis that would be fair to the needy and fair to the country as a whole. The intention to make such proposals was abandoned at the last moment, in my opinion, because of the fact that last year was an election year. There is no election this year; nevertheless no fundamental change is proposed in the method of administering our relief system. Apparently we must go on and on with the same old system, despite the glaring injustice which it has brought to the Nation as a whole and to the needy unemployed themselves.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the statement I have made on the floor of this House many times that in my judgment the situation calls for a thoroughgoing revision of our present system of relief, that it calls for decentralization and the substitution of grants-in-aid with proper responsibility, both financial and administrative, in the several States of the Union. Only in this manner, in my opinion, can we bring about a system of relief which is really fair to those in need and fair to the country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer briefly to a few matters brought out in the hearings in connection with the bill now before us.

As has been indicated, the bill on its face carries a total of $885,905,000. This compares with a Budget estimate of $886,000,000 and with an appropriation for the current fiscal year of approximately $1,368,000,000.

W. P. A., which of course receives the major portion of the appropriation, will receive under the committee recommendation $875,000,000. This is the same amount as recommended by the Budget, and compares with an appropriation for the current fiscal year of $1,350,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Briefly. I want to make my statement without too many interruptions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood the gentleman from Virginia to say that the bill carried $886,000,000, and I understood that was the Budget recommendation; but I notice, as the gentleman says, that in the bill it states $875,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The total of $886,000,000 carries with it $11,000,000 for administrative funds for projects operated by Federal agencies other than W. P. A.

W. P. A., as has been pointed out, under the committee recommendation will receive $50,000,000 less than recommended by the Budget. I call attention in passing, however, to the fact that there is an unexpended balance amounting to about $29,000,000 which will be available for those in need over and above the amount specifically carried in the bill, and also that there is a further item of about $4,224,000 which will be available to those in need not contemplated in the Budget estimate by reason of the fact that the committee has reduced the total available for administrative expenses to that extent without reducing the total carried by the bill as a whole.

If allowed, the sum recommended will provide for the employment of an average of something less than 1,000,000 persons a month during the next fiscal year, as compared with 1,300,000 on the rolls in June 1941 and with an average of about 1,700,000 on the rolls during the current fiscal year. The amount, if allowed, will bring the total appropriated for W. P. A. in a period of 7 fiscal years to the sum of approximately $10,404,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, as previous speakers have indicated, a number of recommendations have been made looking to abolishing the restrictions which have been thrown around the administration of W. P. A. by Congress in the last 2 or 3 years. One or two modifications have been allowed, but for the most part they have been disallowed in the belief, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has stated, that the restrictions have worked well in the main and that they are more important under present conditions than they have been in the past.

Just a word as to the relative-need clause, which has also been referred to. As the members of the committee know, Congress has provided that W. P. A. employment shall be determined, insofar as practicable, on the basis of relative need, and that where relative need is the same the veterans' preference shall apply. W. P. A. tells us that in administering this provision it has arbitrarily divided all persons into two groups. Group 1 contains those who have no income whatsoever. Group 2 contains those persons who have some income, but an income which is insufficient. Those representing veteran organizations of this country tell us that as a result of this arbitrary method of carrying out the intent of Congress veterans in many instances have been denied the preference that Congress intended they should receive. The committee has emphasized in its report its desire that those preferences shall be scrupulously observed. If this is not sufficient to assure the desired end, then, in my judgment, the legislation should be amended sufficiently to carry out the will of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak also of the types of projects embodied in the W. P. A. program. The record indicates that in the present fiscal year about 70 percent of the program has been devoted to construction projects, 27 percent being devoted to educational, recreational, and research projects, and 3 percent to vocational training. Four hundred and fifty thousand workers, or 26 percent of the total, have been employed on so-called national-defense construction projects. During the coming year it is intended to maintain approximately the same ratio, 70 percent being allocated to construction work, the amount of defense work increasing so as to absorb about one-half of that total.

I have no doubt that there are some national-defense projects which it is entirely proper to carry on under W. P. A. In my judgment, however, there is no justification for a policy which hands over to W. P. A. major elements in the construction work required for national defense.

W. P. A., as we know, has brought ruinous competition to private industry. The testimohy a year ago indicated that it had usurped something like 54 percent of the entire public-works construction program in this country. It has been notoriously inefficient. It has been notoriously extravagant. Expert testimony during the W. P. A. investigation indicated an efficiency of not to exceed 40 percent on road and highway work and a cost of something like 250 percent in building construction as compared with similar work done under private contract. It seems to me that in the main, projects within our national-defense program—particularly the large projects—should be limited to projects supervised by the Army and Navy and done under private

contract with the assurance of comparative economy and comparative efficiency.

As we look at the picture as a whole, Mr. Chairman, we find the same old story we have been over in past years. When it comes to fixing the total Federal contribution, there is no specific formula. It is just a hit-or-miss estimate in the light of estimated unemployment, in the light of the index of production, and such other factors as may be brought into the picture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We are told that in the next fiscal year we are going to have a national income of $92,000,000,000, the largest national income on record. We are told that the Federal Reserve index of production today is 28 percent above what it was a year ago and 31 percent above what it was back in the boom days of 1929. We are told that total employment is about 3,000,000 above what it was a year ago and over 500,000 above what it was in 1929. We know that the defense program is under way and due to reach its peak in the next fiscal year. We know that the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are expanding; that Mr. Knudsen is providing for the expenditure of billions of dollars; that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is spending hundreds of millions of dollars; and that Congress has appropriated many more millions under such acts as the so-called Lanham acts. Only yesterday the press carried the statement by various Federal officials in Chicago that 4,000,000 additional skilled workers will be needed in defense industries during the next 12 months.

The estimate of the W. P. A. of decreased unemployment against that background during the next 12 months is 1,500,000 persons. In the light of that estimate, it has recommended that there be a reduction of 300,000 below the number on the rolls in June and 700,000 below the average during the present fiscal year.

If we look at the matter of W. P. A. distribution between the several States, we find again the same hit or miss action. It is true that recently W. P. A. has been trying to work under the 40–40–10–10 formula, but there is still wide discretion in the hands of the Administrator. If anybody has any doubt as to the inequalities as between the several States, I suggest that he refer to the table appearing at page 206 of the hearings on this bill.

I suggest also that he look at the table on page 208 of the hearings, which deals with sponsors' contributions, and which shows that since the beginning of W. P. A. we have realized only about $495,000,000 from these contributions and only about $65,000,000 of that total in cash.

There is absolutely no uniform standard for the determination of need. The record indicates the widest variation in standards as between the several States.

The W. P. A. investigation brought out a lamentable lack of supervision in reference to such matters as the purchase of supplies, inventories, engineering, sponsors' contributions, and expenditures generally. How much that supervision has improved is not apparent. It is certainly far from encouraging, however, to find W. P. A. today in the hands of an Acting Administrator who, as appears from the hearings of the W. P. A. investigating committee a year ago, saw fit to falsify travel vouchers, to broadcast over the air false statements which he must or should have known to be false, and who today assumes full responsibility for appointment to the W. P. A. rolls of David Lasser.

Reference has already been made to David Lasser. As we all know, he was formerly president of the Workers Alliance. As such, he was a member of the national executive board. If you will refer to the W. P. A. investigation hearings you will find that at the time of those hearings, according to the testimony of former Communists, 15 out of 23 members of the national executive board of the Workers Alliance were known or admitted Communists. Twenty-two out of twenty-seven members of the board controlling greater New York; 17 out of 21 members of the board controlling New York City; 22 out of 25 members of the board controlling Harlem; and 80 percent of the State officials in Pennsylvania were said to be also known or admitted Communists.

This is the organization over which David Lasser formerly presided. He also helped lead the march on the capitol in Harrisburg, Pa., as photographs in the committee files will prove. He is today drawing $4,400 on the Federal W. P. A. pay roll as a labor-relations expert. The record makes it clear that he was sought out and offered his present position by the present head of the W. P. A., Howard O. Hunter, who has just been confirmed in his present position by the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee will recall that Congress has provided in the last year or two that no one shall be placed or retained on the rolls of W. P. A. unless he is willing to sign an affidavit indicating that he is neither a Communist nor a member of the Nazi Bund. The record in this connection indicates that during the past year 317 persons refused to sign this affidavit, being dropped from the rolls as a result, and that in 400 other instances persons who had signed the affidavit were accused of doing so dishonestly. About 50 percent of these 400 were dropped, the charge being substantiated after investigation by W. P. A.

The Committee will also have in mind the numerous types of irregularities developed in the investigation of W. P. A. The report of the counsel for the committee included about 35 different types of irregularities. A senior inspector from the General Accounting Office, with 37 years in the service, stated at the time that he would say without hesitation that W. P. A. was the "rottenest organization" with which he had come in contact.

W. P. A. reports for the calendar year 1940, 2,803 complaints investigated, of which 557 were pay-roll irregularities, 1,051 benefits to private property, 418 thefts and embezzlements, 164 material and equipment irregularities, and 593 other irregularities. The total was greater than that in 1939. It was greater than that in 1938.

For the first 4 months of this calendar year, W. P. A. reports 841 similar irregularities, 185 pay-roll irregularities, 199 benefits to private property, 143 thefts and embezzlements, 47 material and equipment irregularities, and 267 other irregularities.

W. P. A. also reports that these irregularities have been substantiated in the number of 1,940 and that they have resulted in 754 discharges, 32 demotions, 261 suspensions and reprimands, 42 vendors debarred from bidding, and 106 convictions through the Department of Justice. In 944 cases restitution has been demanded in respect to claims amounting to well over $4,000,000. Only 16 percent of this total has been realized to date in cash or otherwise.

The Committee will recall the major scandals developed in the investigation a year ago, particularly in Louisiana and Tennessee and Indiana and Pennsylvania. A partial report on these scandals, limited to Louisiana, will be found in the hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the current fiscal year at page 76. A further report was requested in these hearings. This report has not been furnished. It is significant, however, that State Administrator Crutcher, of Louisiana, State Administrator Jennings, of Indiana, and State Administrator Goodman, of Kentucky are still on the job and apparently in good standing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, your committee has reduced the amount available for administrative expenditure by about 20 percent to $36,466,000. Those on the rolls at the present time number 19,277 classified as administrative personnel, plus 65,850 classified as supervisory personnel, a total of about 85,000 persons to administer this undertaking.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has pointed out, while so-called administrative personnel has decreased, so-called supervisory personnel has increased to almost exactly the same extent. What percentage it is fair to attribute to administrative expenditure depends on your definition of that expenditure. A computation made sometime ago indicated that on the basis of so-called administrative personnel, alone, it amounted to 3.7 percent. On the other hand, including the so-called supervisory personnel, it amounted to about 11.16 percent.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWTHER. Previously, when we have had up the appropriation for W. P. A., there have been amendments offered to increase the amount. If I

recall correctly, they have generally been defeated and the amount has been allocated that the committee brought in, but following that and in the early days of the following Congress, nearly always in January, there has been a very large appropriation to carry them through to the 30th of June, the end of the fiscal year. Is there any anticipation in the minds of the members of the committee that an additional amount will be asked for to carry them to the 30th of June, as has been done in the past?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman is correct in his observation. I may say in reply that this appropriation is made on the basis of a full 12 months. So far as the committee knows, there is no intention or purpose to ask for more, as has been done in the past.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

M. O'NEAL. It is true, however, that formerly they appropriated for a period of 8 months for W. P. A. and it was specifically stated that the appropriation was to run for just a limited part of a year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That was done on at least one occasion, but I think the observation of the gentleman from New York will stand as a general statement.

Mr. CROWTHER. If the gentleman will permit, I think that is correct. As to one bill, the gentleman from Kentucky is correct, but I think on the other occasions the amount presumably was for the fiscal year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer, in passing, under the heading of "Administrative expenditure," to the well-known Division of Information. If you will look at the request in connection with this bill, you will find an actual increase in both personnel and dollars as compared with the present fiscal year. The request was for 160 persons, as compared with 149 in the present year, at a cost of $349,510, as compared with $303,800 in the present fiscal year.

The W. P. A. reports, among other things in this connection, during a period of 16 months, the preparation of 355 press releases, 75 speeches, 11 issues of a weekly bulletin, 478 articles for trade journals, miscellaneous articles for Government manuals, encyclopedias, and radio script, 37 exhibits, and weekly 15-minute transcription programs for 575 radio stations.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on administrative costs?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe that three and a fraction percent for administrative costs is a pretty good showing, even in private business?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is; but I think, as I have already indicated, that if you include the so-called supervisory personnel you get a figure that runs as high as 11.16 percent.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Why should they be included?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think a great many of those who are classified as supervisory personnel should be included in the administrative cost, because they are, in fact, doing administrative work and should be so classified. It has been very convenient, from my observation, to transfer them from one force to another so as to limit so-called administrative expenditure.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The supervisors, as I have observed, then, certainly do not belong under the administrative expenditures of W. P. A.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Some of them, certainly, do not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I care to take any further time. We have been operating under this W. P. A. system now for 6 long years. This appropriation carries the system on for a seventh year. It seems to me that the inefficiency, waste, corruption, damage to private industry, and unfairness to those who have been in need, resulting under W. P. A. must have become apparent in every part of the country.

Today we are confronted by a great national emergency. We need every dollar we can obtain for national-defense purposes. The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, have both emphasized the importance of cutting nondefense expenditure to the bone.

It seems to me a sad commentary that we cannot at this time revise a method of relief which has lent itself to such extravagance and such abuse; that we cannot take the system as a whole and put it on a basis which is sound, on a basis which is fair to those in need, which is fair to the national-defense program, which is fair to the 130,000,000 Americans in this land of ours. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I shall do the best I can to say some of the more important things I want to say in 10 minutes. What is national defense? I believe that national defense means strengthening the Nation. I think it begins with the spirit on the part of the people. I believe that the American people have got to think a little more deeply about what the United States really means and what it has done in the history of the world than we have ever done before, and I direct the attention of the House to a speech which I put into the RECORD today by Marian Hedges, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which I think, gentlemen, you will find inspiring on this point. Unless we have full use of all of the natural resources, all of the industrial resources, and all of the human resources in our Nation, we never can achieve a real balanced national defense, and, furthermore, unless every group in the population feels and knows that they are having an opportunity to do their part, unless they have that experience, the feeling that they are part and parcel of the national effort, we will fail to that extent.

When the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] had the floor this morning, there was a long discussion with many Members participating about the question of whether $50,000,000 out of this fund should be transferred to the food-stamp plan of the Department of Agriculture or not. I believe that the food-stamp plan is the most constructive method yet devised for dealing with the problem of our so-called agricultural surpluses. I think it is absolutely sound and I would like to see it extended, but the question is not a question as to whether it is a good plan; the question is how many people are there in this Nation who have not work, who cannot get work under the defense program or under the expansion which follows as a result of it, but who should be at work, and who, but for the W. P. A., would not have work. That is the real question. At the present time there are as many people duly certified in need of W. P. A. employment as there are employed. In other words, about 1,300,000 people are employed by the W. P. A. today, and as many more certified as in need of work and yet we find here a proposal is made to us that we should cut 700,000 people off the rolls. Who are those people?

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In a moment. The average age has been stated to be 44 years, and half the people on the W. P. A. program are over 45. I know a lot of them personally, and I know that they are not the same people who could go to work to build airplanes or ships, but are people who can do certain other things. They are people who need work, and they are people who if they are at work the United States will be better off than if they are not at work. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from California. I do not think there is any more sincere man in his interest in respect to the relief program. I am particularly interested in the concluding statement the gentleman just made. He suggests, what is the country going to do with these people who have attained the age of 40 years or over, and what is the situation which presents itself to us today, when they cannot obtain lucrative employment under the expansion due to defense work, and with W. P. A. cut off?

Has the gentleman given any consideration to the best method of approach to this problem for the Nation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am very glad the gentleman asked me that question. If it were up to me to decide the policy of the United States at this time I would tell you what it would be. It would be a policy of saying that we were going to see that every person in this Nation who is entitled and willing to work should be at work. It would be a policy of saying that we were going to make the fullest possible use of the labor of every single person. I am not saying, and I do not say, that I would do all of that by expansion of W. P. A.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] this morning said that it was a work program. I agree with him. I probably agree with him so much that

he would probably not agree with me. What I have always believed is that we should have a program, part of which could be run by means of contracts that would be let, but where you would be able to be sure that people otherwise unemployed would get work, and part of which where contracts are not feasible would be run on the general program that W. P. A. is run on now. But I would not go out and arbitrarily cut these rolls, when I know that people will go on direct relief if I did it. I would adopt a policy of saying, "Let the relief rolls cut themselves as people go to work in private industry," because I have yet to meet this much-talked-about individual on W. P. A. who likes to stay there. I would like to meet him, but I never have met him. The people on W. P. A. that I know are people who would give anything in the world if they could get a private job elsewhere. I feel that it is going to be difficult for some of these folks to understand why it is that on yesterday we passed a $10,000,000,000 military appropriation bill, which I voted for, and yet that we attempt to make a saving of a relatively small amount of money at the expense of 700,000 jobs. I just think that is going to be hard to understand, and I do not think we ought to do it. I believe the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] should prevail, and I earnestly hope that it will.

I want to read a few sentences from an editorial by David Lawrence in the United States News. It is in the issue of June 6. It reads as follows:

In the period just ahead. * * *

Many factories, without defense orders, will close for lack of steel or aluminum or rubber or copper or zinc or other defense materials.

Many workers with jobs in these factories will be out of jobs.

Many merchants selling goods that are made of materials useful for defense will find it more and more difficult to restock as the shelves are emptied.

Many consumers with dollars to spend will find it harder to obtain the goods they want; will be limited in what they can buy.

It's just that the defense honeymoon is coming to an end.

In other words, just as Great Britain discovered, although the defense program spent a great deal of money, and employed a certain type of people, you will almost certainly get a certain amount of correlative unemployment in other industries which cannot keep, because of large defense programs. That is a proposition that has to be met and met squarely, in view of the existing situation and in view of the fact that we are attempting to draw our Nation into one great unified, determined whole. Every American citizen has his part. Every American citizen must have his place and a chance to play his part.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] stated that if we were going to have a national income of $92,000,000,000 and still we would have necessity for the Government to have a work program for certain people, there was something wrong with the economic system. I agree with that, but I still think we will have this necessity and the conservative Industrial Conference Board has estimated that in the fiscal year 1942 the best that can be expected is a total unemployment of 5,000,000. That is less than it has been. But, because it is less, because those men are old fellows, getting a little gray around the temples, is no reason to turn our backs on them. In fact, the situation is likely to be much more difficult and much harder than it has been before. I would say that at least until two things are done, until you have constructive changes in the monetary system and until you have a method of distribution of purchasing power much more effective than it is now, you will have, even with a national income of $92,000,000,000, a certain considerable volume of unemployment. I am not saying that W. P. A. is the way to answer that because, frankly, I do not believe it is. There are better ways to answer it, but until such time as you bring in those other ways, or I bring them in, or we all do it, it is a matter of justice to see that the head of a family shall be able to have an opportunity to make bread and butter for his family by useful work for the benefit of the United States of America today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I had hoped earnestly that the 18 months' provision would be done away with in this bill. I have felt all along that it worked a great deal of injustice. I did not resent the committee imposing it in the first place. I think perhaps there were some good arguments for it in the first place, but today I just do not believe there are. I believe that by and large you will find mighty few people, as I have already said, on W. P. A. who want to stay there. I think it mixes up the program. People who are doing recreational work in some of our overcrowded communities, where because of defense factories, there is great need for that work, and it is most important, come to March or April or January in the middle of the school year and essential work has to be laid off. Usually they do not get back on again in the same place they were before. Very seldom does that happen.

I want to read a little portion of the Dies committee report for this year, because a great deal has been made by some of the gentlemen in opposition here about one David Lasser. I read from the Dies committee report, page 22, where it discusses the Workers Alliance. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], pointed out there were Communists in various positions in the Workers Alliance. That is true. All I want to say is that I think the situation was a lot less bad than it would have been, because you had at least one man who was not a Communist and who fought them from the beginning. Here is what the committee states:

Our committee kept the spotlight of publicity turned upon the Workers Alliance. Finally, its influence was destroyed when it became apparent to all that its control was in the hands of the agents of Moscow. Its non-Communist element withdrew under the leadership of David Lasser in June of this year, and today the Workers Alliance is a mere shadow of its former self—without influence anywhere and completely discredited.

It is all very well for political purposes to make accusations that cannot hold water. I do not expect people to agree with everything Mr. Lasser ever did, or with his point of view. In my judgment, however, he is not a Communist and, according to his lights he attempts to the best of his ability, in my humble judgment, to serve the patriotic interests of the United States. I will say this—that in the period of the greatest unemployment we have ever had I think it was a tough job for a fellow to stay in there and try to do his best in a situation that admittedly and according to even the speeches that are made purportedly against Mr. Lasser, was a very difficult situation.

I should like to conclude by saying this—and I will speak rather frankly—I have already indicated I have a very deep and profound interest in the stamp plan. I frankly think that the right thing to have done about this matter would have been to have added the $50,000,000 instead of cutting the W. P. A. I do not want to see the stamp plan taken out of the Department of Agriculture and placed elsewhere, because I think too much of it. I think it is the most effective approach to the problem of so-called agricultural surpluses we have ever had; but just as soon as it is taken out of the Department of Agriculture you are going to find it is going to be shot at just like every program that gets down to meeting the big basic needs of the people is always shot at; and I do not want to see that happen to it. It is not a thing, obviously, that I can go into in the few minutes I have left.

The purpose of W. P. A, as I see it today, is to do two things: To make such contribution as it can with the people on its rolls directly to national defense. I agree it would be better if those national-defense projects could be all regular projects handled in the regular way, but sometimes they cannot be, and we are dependent upon W. P. A. to build most of the airports in the country. As a matter of fact—and I think they should get credit for it; I mean the men who built them ought to get credit, the men who did the work. The other thing W. P. A. should do is to provide useful work for people who cannot get work any place else. We know from the figures that there are today in the neighborhood of about 3,000,000 such people who have already been investigated and found to be in need. I do not think it makes sense to cut them in the way this bill will. I am not blaming the committee because, as the committee has pointed out, it was a recommendation from the Budget. I am just stating what my position is. I believe now is the time we should hold the program where it was and, as we find people get jobs, then cut the program in accordance with the actual experience.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, until I heard the speech of my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I had always supposed that a eulogy was concerned with the dead. As I listened to his eulogistic efforts I could not help but think that probably he was fearful the time had arrived when W. P. A. was to draw the draperies of its couch about it and lie down to its eternal dreams. As I listened to the eulogy I could not help but remember a part of the examination conducted by my distinguished friend from Missouri, which examination is carried on pages 114, 115, and 116 of the hearings. It is a most illuminating effort on the part of a lawyer to put the best face on a sorry situation. I wish you would read this examination.

Instead of using the leading language of my friend from Missouri you might just take the trend of that examination and I believe you will agree with me when you have concluded, that the gentleman from Missouri realized that the charges that had been made against W. P. A. were pretty well founded. Instead of asking the question: "Have you had any charges of misappropriation of funds?" as my friend from Missouri did, he might have asked: "Has the misappropriation of funds continued?", or as he took another one of the conditions, either sins of omission or commission, he might have asked: "When did the use of W. P. A. funds or W. P. A. labor on private property stop?"

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, for the present I prefer not to yield. In due time I hope the opportunity will be available for me to be most courteous to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Or my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], might have asked: "When did W. P. A. cease to be under active communistic control?" Or, again, as this whitewash brush was used, he might have asked: "When did the undue political influence of W. P. A. come to a stop?" Mark you, he is examining the Administrator. He might have said, "When did the partisan use of funds by W. P. A. come to an end?" Then he might have summed up all of this splendid examination of his, this examination which reminds me for all the world of an examination by an old lawyer when he asked the question, "When did you stop beating your wife?" I say the gentleman from Missouri might have brought a splendid climax to this examination of his by asking, "When did mismanagement and maladministration of W. P. A. cease?"

But he did not do that. The very fact that he tried this W. P. A. whitewash method as he did; the very fact that he stoop up here in the well of the House and made this lengthy eulogy about the innocence, the virtue, and the blamelessness of W. P. A., seems to me to indicate some apprehension on his part. There must be some suspicion abroad that where there is so much smoke, which my friend was trying to blow away by that forensic effort of his, there must be some fire.

The fact of the matter is that most of us remember those days when W. P. A. was not as bold, not as brazen in its claim of the cloak of innocence. Many of us remember the splendid work of a distinguished and fearless Democrat, true to the best traditions of the great State of Virginia. Many of us remember the courage and fearlessness with which he took that record of W. P. A. and laid it bare. That record—oh, that record had its shame to it. It had shame which caused most of the adherents of the New Deal—yes; and most of its devout disciples—to blush. But my distinguished friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] took that record; he laid it bare, not only to the critical eyes of partisan Republicans; he laid it bare to the scrutiny and examination of every honest and every reasonable man in America. We remember W. P. A. We remember now that if there is any virtue in it; if it has any claim to innocence, it is due to the fact there was one Democrat courageous enough to lead the fight to try to bring the truth out of that deplorable condition which had so shocked and startled most of the American people that it bordered close to an incident.

W. P. A. stands convicted before the bar of public opinion. It stands so convicted, not by reason of its reform, not by reason of its belated effort at contrition, not by reason of the penitence it is trying to do, but it stands convicted before the bar of public opinion by reason of what its record was before an investigating committee of the House. Therefore my friend from Missouri could say, "You are not mismanaged any more. You are not maladministered any more. You are not permitting undue political influence to continue any more. You are not using the funds in a partisan way any more. You are not having any communistic control any more. You do not use public money on private projects any more. You do not have any misappropriation of funds any more." But I cannot help but wonder what would have happened; I wonder to what length this thing might have gone; I wonder what boldness and brazenness might have been resorted to, had it not been for the gentleman from Virginia who, I know, by reason of his courage, has merited the approbation of all right-thinking American people. I attempt no undue flattery of my distinguished friend over on the other side of the aisle who, as I said before, exemplifies those splendid traditions of the great State of Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, we have had some observations made about David Lasser. I am not going to detain the House with a lengthy statement about the gentleman. The fact of the matter is I am fearful that probably the references that we are making to him magnify him out of all proportion to his real importance. However, in order that the record might be kept straight I will, under the privilege to revise and extend my remarks, try to give the House just as complete, unbiased, unprejudiced a picture as I can of David Lasser. Then after you have read it, I want you to be honest with yourselves, as I know you will be, and determine whether or not you think his appointment to a $4,400-a-year job represents the type of management and control that, in your judgment, will bring the best results to this great army of administrators of work relief.

I am not going to frame the indictment; I am not doing to draw the bill of particulars; I am just going to give you the facts and then have you determine whether the present Administrator has discharged to the American people the great responsibility which rests upon his shoulders when he says, "I was the one to appoint this man to this very responsible position that he presently occupies."

In March 1935, at a meeting in Washington, D C., David Lasser organized the first Workers Alliance which is not to be confused with the present organization.

The present Workers Alliance of America was formed at a meeting in March 1936 in the Department of Labor auditorium in Washington through the amalgamation of the Workers Alliance Mr. Lasser had formed the previous year, together with national unemployment councils and the national unemployment leagues. The national unemployment leagues were organized by one Mr. Arnold Johnson, an avowed Communist. The national unemployment councils were originally organized by Mr. Herbert Benjamin, also an avowed Communist. In the newly organized Workers Alliance 48 of its affiliates were from the national unemployment leagues and 67 from the national unemployment councils.

It may be well at this point to say a few words about Mr. Herbert Benjamin. He was born in Illinois about 1896, the eldest of a family of 14 children. He worked for a short time in a Buffalo steel mill. Shortly after the first World War he became an active Communist. In 1929 he was first sent to jail in Philadelphia. In 1934 he spent another year in jail in the Southwest.

Upon the formation of the Workers Alliance in 1936, Mr. Benjamin made a report to the Third Internationcal, Communist Party in Moscow:

> On April 7 to 19, 1936, nearly 700 delegates representing all the major unemployment organizations in the United States met in joint convention at Washington and merged their forces into a single unified organization. The merger represented the successful culmination of a campaign conducted for nearly 4 years by the Communist Party of the United States of America and by the National Unemployment Councils which were organized also by the Communist Party since the time of the crisis late in 1929.

As created in 1936 the Workers Alliance was headed by Mr. Lasser as president and Mr. Benjamin was secretary-treasurer. There was also an administrative committee of 5 that met every 2 weeks and an executive council of 23 members that met quarterly.

The Workers Alliance held another convention in Milwaukee, Wis., in June 1937. It organized a so-called hunger strike on Washington in August 1937, and held another convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in September 1938.

The Workers Alliance is essentially composed of persons employed on W. P. A. projects and other unemployed persons. The national organization is a federation

of State and local organizations. The members of these organizations pay dues of various amounts, ranging from 15 to 25 cents per month for unemployed persons and from 35 cents to $1 per month for employed persons. A part of these monthly dues went into the treasury of the national organization. At its height, according to Mr. Lasser, the organization had about 260,000 members. Of this number, barely 130,000 actually paid dues. Mr. Lasser testified that 20 percent of the members were women, 10 percent were Negroes, and 5 percent were foreigners.

The Workers Alliance was recognized as a collective bargaining agency by the Work Projects Administration for persons employed on its projects. Thus Mr. Aubrey Williams, Deputy Administrator of the W. P. A., wrote to Mr. Lasser on September 3, 1936:

We recognize the workers' right to organize in such form as they wish to organize. Organization is their own affair. We do not recognize you as the only organization for the workers, inasmuch as such action might be construed as promotion by the administration of company unionism. We affirm the workers' right to organize and choose their own representatives, together with the corresponding obligation of administration officials to deal with such representatives in the adjustment of grievances and consideration of recommendations.

In these ways, we recognize you as a collective bargaining agency, and repeat that we do so and have done so formally and officially on several occasions in the past.

The Workers Alliance in 1937 and 1938 took great pride in organizing strikes and other disorders among workers on W. P. A. projects. Thus in an article appearing in The Nation for September 10, 1938, entitled "Lasser and the Workers Alliance," by Mr. Selden Rodman, it was proudly boasted:

The 4 years' growth of the unified organization has been marked by three significant developments. The first was the transplantation of labor's sit-down technique to the relief situation. The trial encounter took place in March 1936 at Madison, Wis. When the pickets arrived at the Capitol, Phil La Follette greeted them in person and advised them to turn the heat on the legislators. Ten days later, with the charges of rule by minority coercion growing, he asked them to leave. Early in May of the same year Governor Hoffman of New Jersey informed John Spain of the Workers Alliance that nothing short of invasion and insurrection could make him borrow money or divert State funds for adequate relief. The Workers Alliance took him at his work. "An insurrection is in progress," said Spain. And for 9 days a hundred workers made themselves as comfortable as possible among the oaken desks and brass rails. Three months later, inspired by this example, the Pennsylvania organization marched its tattered infantry into the galleries of the State Senate at Harrisburg and didn't get out until the startled legislators had promised an additional $45,000,000 for the coming 6 months.

Thus apparently they took great credit for the attack on the Pennsylvania Legislature in August 1936. Concerning this assault on the State Senate of Pennsylvania, the New York Times of August 2, 1936, says:

Just how the 2,000 hunger marchers who made news this week fit into the bizarre picture of the relief squabbles is a matter of some dispute. The last invasion of Harrisburg by the unemployed was the third to be promoted since the legislature went into session on May 4.

The question of who promoted the march assumed some importance after 500 or 600 of the jobless, armed with sticks and apparently unweakened lungs, howled and beat on the gallery railings for 2 hours to prevent the senate from recessing until long after midnight Tuesday morning.

When it was disclosed that Governor Earle had ordered $4,000 appropriated from a State fund to provide food for the "invaders" and when Lt. Gov. Thomas Kennedy, also a Democrat, announced at first a policy of noninterference with any demonstrations of approval or criticism of Senate tactics, Republicans openly charged that the Earle administration had sponsored the "march" for political purposes (August 2, 1936).

* * * * *

Final adjournment came 17 hours after the officially set time of noon yesterday. The "hunger marchers," who had occupied the galleries for nearly 3 weeks with the announced intention of forcing a relief appropriation of $100,000,000, nevertheless shouted "victory" after the $45,000,000 bill was passed. This is supposed to care for relief needs until January 31.

The unemployed left behind them damage to the senate gallery and rest rooms estimated at about $7,000 (August 8, 1936).

As an indication of the Communist nature of the Workers Alliance the following paragraph from an article by Mr. Stanley High in the Saturday Evening Post for December 10, 1938, entitled "Who Organized the Unemployed" is of interest. Mr. High describes the 1938 convention of the organization in these words:

In general, however, the Communists in the organization, up to now, have had good going. They no longer even take the trouble to cover their tracks. At the sessions of the September convention a dozen salesmen manned all the entrances and exits to hawk the Daily Worker. Bills were distributed, advertising a talk by Earl Browder. Tables were loaded with party literature and the available wall space covered with posters for all the variety of causes, from Spain to China, which are dear to the Communist heart. For the Communists themselves, a Workers Alliance convention is an old-home week. At Cleveland all the known party members for miles around came to revel in the congenial atmosphere and to fraternize with the delegates.

In the autumn of 1938 the Workers Alliance decided to try to raise $50,000 to defeat Congressmen who were opposed to increased funds for relief. Due to the fact that the Senate committee investigating campaign expenditures carefully pointed out that unless they filed statements with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House they were violating the Corrupt Practices Act, the national organization desisted from raising this fund but it is quite apparent that the local organizations carried on political activities in 1938. Mr. Stanley High points out their activity relative to the defeat of Mr. O'Connor:

The success in this year's primaries to which the Alliance points with the greatest pride is the defeat in the primary, in New York City, of John O'Connor and the registering thereby of one victory in the succession of Mr. Roosevelt's purge defeats. For that contest the Alliance gave its all. Its strategy is said to have been directed behind the scenes by those able confidants of the President, Tommy Corcoran and Dave Niles. The visible strategists were Sam Wiseman, the Communist veteran, and Moe Howard. Howard grew up in politics on the sidewalks of New York's East Side. He rose eventually to a place as Tammany precinct captain. The depression landed him on the W. P. A., where he gave extracurricular aid to the Workers Alliance. The Alliance eventually employed his political talents on a full-time basis.

The primary campaign which this board directed against Mr. O'Connor was in the best Tammany tradition. It left nothing to chance. The brunt of the leg work was done by a hand-picked company of 200 Alliance shock brigaders. Their work was facilitated by a list of relief and W. P. A. clients, and with that they made a door-to-door canvass. The 400 W. P. A. workers who lived in the O'Connor district were the objects of particularly persistent attention. On orders from Washington, all W. P. A. projects were shut down promptly at 2 o'clock on primary-election day to give a chance for all its good men to come to the aid of the party. In this district, at least, they did. Mr. O'Connor was beaten by something like 500 votes.

In 1939 the Workers Alliance protested vigorously because of reductions in appropriations for W. P. A. and because Congress provided that the money appropriated by it should be spent throughout the entire fiscal year and not for only a part thereof. In the spring of 1939 the Workers Alliance issued a press release which Mr. Lasser admitted he wrote. This press release stated in part:

We believe that the reactionary congressional group that imposed the $50,000,000 cut secured a majority only as a result of misrepresentation, outright lies, parliamentary tricks, bluffs, and threats.

The release went on to recommend that the W. P. A. violate the provisions of an act of Congress requiring that the funds appropriated should be used during the whole fiscal year:

In the meantime we will ask the administration to schedule the funds now available to last until June 20, 10 days in advance of the end of the period for which they were voted, and thus avoid the necessity of making further lay-offs.

In the fall of 1937 Mr. Lasser went to Russia on the invitation of the Russian trade-union movement as a representative of the Workers Alliance. Mr. Lasser admitted that approximately half of his expenses on the trip to Russia were paid by the Workers Alliance. He said that he also went to see the members of the Workers Alliance who were members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade engaged in fighting in the Spanish civil war. He admitted that he made various speeches in France and England before trade-union groups.

The following interrogation of Mr. Benjamin by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH in the hearings of the House committee for investigation of the W. P. A. is of distinct interest when it is remembered that the examination took place in the presence of Mr. Lasser:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are, of course, familiar with all the members of the board?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know them; yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Harold Brockway, from Washington?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would say about 2½ or 3 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He represented the Washington State Action Committee, did he not, at the same time that you were with the National Unemployment Councils of the United States?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Yes, sir; he represented this independent unemployed organization in the State of Washington.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is Mr. Brockway a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would be unable to say definitely. I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you not know that he ran for Governor of Washington on a Communist ticket in 1936?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I must say that I have no personal knowledge of that, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Arnold Johnson?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Oh, about 5 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is Mr. Johnson a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I believe he is, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about Mr. Chester Watson, of Minnesota?

Mr. BENJAMIN. To my best knowledge and belief, he is not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How long have you known Mr. Sam Wiseman, of New York?

Mr. BENJAMIN. About 6 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is he a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I believe he is, sir.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Just a moment, Mr. Wigglesworth; I would like to ask a question right at this point. Did I not this morning question you on this very matter and at that time you testified that you had no personal knowledge of the political affiliations of any of these members?

Mr. BENJAMIN. It is true, sir; I could not generalize about all of them.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I showed you the list of them this morning and asked you to look them over, and that was your testimony?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I stated, sir, that in this case I believe the man is and in case where I had doubts I could not say. I could not generalize on the question. I had no personal knowledge of each one of them. I could only say what I believed to be so.

Mr. MCMILLAN. It was my understanding of your testimony this morning that I showed you the list and you said that you had no personal knowledge of any of them, whether they were Communists or members of any other party.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Let me ask you, Mr. Benjamin, there is another Mr. Watson on the board, Mr. Russell Watson, of Pennsylvania. How long have you known him?

Mr. BENJAMIN. About 2 or 3 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He also is a Communist, is he not?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Would you say he did not run as a Communist candidate for magistrate in Philadelphia 2 years ago, in 1937?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I am not aware of that, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about Mr. Talbot, of Utah?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know him very slightly, sir, and I could not say.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not know whether he is a Communist?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have very little knowledge of Mr. Talbot.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many years have you been connected with the Communist Party, yourself?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Eighteen years, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If he had run for Governor on the Communist ticket out in Utah in 1936, wouldn't you have known of it?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I do not think I knew Mr. Talbot until the time of our last convention in 1937, and I would not have any occasion to know him, necessarily. I might accidentally have stumbled on information, but I would have no particular occasion to know.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not recall now that he did run for Governor of Utah in 1936?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge of that, sir; never heard of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How about the North Carolina member, Hazel Dawson; you have known her for some time?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Only since our last national convention.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is she a Communist or not?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I have no knowledge, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not know?

Mr. BENJAMIN. No.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When was this executive board appointed?

Mr. BENJAMIN. At our last national convention, in September 1938.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you have a copy of the proceedings there?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Turn to page 82, and indicate to the committee any names I have not referred to that, from your long association with those of the Communist faith, you know to be also Communists.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would say, with respect to the members of the board indicated here, other than those I have mentioned or that have been referred to already, I have no knowledge of any except those that I have mentioned.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as you know, your position before this committee is that there is no other Communist included in that list, other than those you have spoken of.

Mr. BENJAMIN. To my best knowledge, that would be so. Pardon me, have you called the name of Mr. Noral?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I know Mr. Noral has been a member of the Communist Party (pp. 169–171).

The Communist domination and control of the members of the executive board of the Workers Alliance is evident from this testimony.

Representative MARTIN DIES in his work entitled "The Trojan Horse in America," sums up the political affiliation of the executive board of the Workers Alliance as follows:

Numerous leaders of the Workers Alliance—as it is presently constituted—are avowed members of the Communist Party. With respect to many others, there is ground for belief that they, too, are members of the Communist Party although belonging to that large group of undercover members of whom the official publications of the party sometimes speak. One by one let us note the open party members who are on the small national executive board of the alliance.

Arnold Johnson, a member of the national executive board of the Workers Alliance, urged acceptance of the program of the Communist Party and of the Communist International, and during the current political campaign is Communist candidate for the governorship of Ohio.

Russell Watson, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for magistrate in Philadelphia in the elections of 1937.

Harold P. Brockway, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for Governor in Washington in 1936. He was also on the ballot as a Presidential elector in the same year.

Alex Noral, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for United States Senator from the State of Washington in 1932. Noral was also Communist candidate for Presidential elector for the State of California in 1936.

Wallace Talbot, a member of the national executive board, was Communist candidate for Governor of Utah in 1936.

Emma Tenayuca, a member of the national executive board, was associated with the American League for Peace and Democracy in Texas, and is the State chairman of the Communist Party of Texas.

J. Austin Beasley, a member of the national executive board, is international organizer for the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, a C. I. O. affiliate which the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found unanimously to have an entrenched Communist leadership. Donald Henderson, avowed member of the Communist Party, is head of this union, of which J. Austin Beasley is international organizer.

Sam Wiseman, a member of the national executive board, was candidate on the Communist Party ticket for State Assembly in New York in 1936. Wiseman is also State organizer of the Workers Alliance in New York.

Frankie Duty, a member of the national executive board, has been praised as a Communist leader in the Party Organizer and in the Communist.

M. Dean Weiner, a member of the national executive board, signed the Communist nominating petitions in Pennsylvania in 1940. Mr. Dean Weiner was until recently secretary of the Workers Alliance in the State of Pennsylvania. He was taken from that position and made secretary of the Communist Party of Pennsylvania.

Hilliard Bernstein, a member of the national executive board, was a member of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion in Spain—a fighting unit which Earl Browder declared to be made up predominantly of Communist Party members.

James H. Dolsen admitted on the stand before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that he was an official of the Workers Alliance in Pittsburgh.

In an official press release, the Workers Alliance of Greater New York publicized its endorsement of the Communist Party's candidates for the city council in New York (pp. 100–102).

In June 1940, Mr. Lasser resigned as president of the Workers' Alliance. He alleged that the reason for this was that he finally discovered that the organization was dominated by Communists.

I want to say a word or two about the bill itself. The easiest thing for us to do at the present time is to say that this program of relief should go on and on and on. Let us just recall one thing. When W. P. A. was started, it was started as a work-relief program. It was started to give employment to those unemployed who were employable. It was never intended as a general relief program. It was never intended as a disguised dole. It was intended for one thing, and that was to provide to the great number of Americans who wanted work, and who could be gainfully employed, the opportunity of gaining this employment. I categorically deny the lack of sympathy that is charged to those of us who did not approve of this W. P. A. program in toto. I believe there are a great many here who were critical of the administration of W. P. A. who were as much concerned about the needs of the employable unemployed, and as much concerned about those who required and needed relief, as the loudest apostle and defender of W. P. A. can possibly be.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I suppose when the gentleman states "we" he means the Republican Party. I want to ask him what the Republicans have suggested as a substitute for W. P. A., or what they suggested during the days of unemployment as a substitute.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the gentleman from Massachusetts would rise above the narrowing limitations of partisan politics. I heard him earlier in the day make every effort to impress upon the House a real, deep-seated and heartfelt concern for the unemployed. I felt that under no circumstances would he permit partisan politics, the limitations under which a partisan always looks at a picture, to so limit his views. I am not speaking as a Republican, I am not speaking for the Republican Party. I am sorry my friend from Massachusetts, for whom I have the greatest regard, should inject politics when this great question of human need is before us.

I repeat—and I answer my friend from Massachusetts—that I am not speaking as a Republican. I had hoped he would have a larger breadth of vision than would cause him to circumscribe his views on this question to the narrow gage of partisan politics.

I am speaking on behalf of a great number of American people who still believe there is a spirit of self-reliance in those still unemployed. I am speaking for the great number of citizens who believe paternalism weakens the character and self-reliance if not carefully watched and controlled. I am speaking for that great group who feel that there are men who want work. We should provide them with the opportunity to work. This great force of the Federal Government should be turned to stimulating private enterprise and private industry; to reviving the great dynamic force that has made America what it is. I speak for that group who still believe we do have a sufficient degree of self-reliance to be self-supporting; that we must be alert to prevent enslavement of some of our citizens in shackles of mendicancy by continually conditioning them with bounties from an administrator of W. P. A.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wish that I might yield further to my friend from Massachusetts. I refuse to yield further to him at this time only because I want to defend him; only because I feel confident that if I were to yield further to him, temptation, that has already manifested itself, would again come to the fore, and again he would take this problem of need and try to smear it with the brush of partisan politics. No; I want to talk about the bill for a minute.

I call the attention of the Committee to one thing that I believe is a most dangerous tendency. You and I have heard a great deal about vested interests. Many of us have been concerned about the vested interests that are abroad. As I heard the Administrator, as I listened to the pessimistic picture he painted about the possibility of reemployment, I could not help but feel that what the Administrator had, and what he was seeking to get was a vested interest in unemployment. As I say, that is a dangerous situation. Every figure he could marshal, every fact he could get together, every impression he could possibly get hold of, all pointed toward one thing, increasing to colossal size the figures of unemployment and minimizing as much as possible those factors that seem to indicate that reemployment is on the rise.

I think the Administrator fixed the number of unemployed as something like 5,500,000, and still, according to all of the statistics and according to the Secretary of Labor, practically all of the unemployed who can be gainfully employed will be absorbed by this defense program.

It depends on how you look at this thing. If it is your purpose to continue a great army of unemployed, if it is your purpose to increase as much as possible a sense of dependency on a political bureaucracy by our people, then, of course, W. P. A. should be given a free rein. Then Mr. Hunter's pessimism should be permitted to point entirely to what the W. P. A. should do.

On the other hand, if you feel that there is still some sense of independence in the Nation, if you feel that there are those in this land of ours who resent the suggestion of bounties and gifts in order to make them vassals and slaves, then I say you will join with us who feel that some limitation on this program is in order.

I am not asking you to eliminate W. P. A. I am asking you to take this relief problem and turn it back to the States. It is a problem, and there are some who cannot get gainful employment. Let us turn this problem back to the States. Let there be grants-in-aid for the relief program just as there are in the social-security program. Let us take this great army of administrators, these $10,000-a-year men and these $9,000-a-year men, and turn the money now paid to them over to the States. Why, when these administrators came before us, if you will read the record, you will find I asked that the record show at its very beginning the galaxy of stars that attended the Administrator as he came to make his justification. There was an army there—assistant administrators and assistants to the assistant administrators. There were so many assistants there that I wondered what they were all supposed to be assisting in. Let us take that group and the money involved and return it to the States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Let us clear up the inefficiency, the maladministration, the misadministration that my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] tried to defend. Let us eliminate those things by sending relief back there. Back among the neighbors is the place where you will be able to administer this relief program properly and intelligently.

I stand on the declaration today that the neighbors are the folks who know most about the needs of people in their communities. I believe it is the neighbors who can probably, with a fairer and more reasonable appreciation, estimate what the needs of those about them may be.

Let the expansion and acceleration of this defense program take as many as possible of the group who are presently on W. P. A. and let them get into the lines of private industry and private enterprise and put this defense program on its feet.

But let us do one thing more. Let us be fundamentally honest in our thinking. Let us acknowledge what W. P. A. has been in the past. The peak of this distress period is over. Let us be fundamentally honest in our thinking and let us say we are going to stand back of every move that is made to encourage and develop the great energies of private enterprise and private industry; that we are going to use the money of the taxpaying group where that money will mean the most; that we are going to set about clearing up and cleaning up our affairs which have had so much about them of disorder; that we are going to take this great problem of relief, as it relates to the unemployed, and be honest and say that probably there are no fields where they can fit in. Then let us go back into our several communities. Instead of boasting of a desire to make a great relief program a political vehicle, let us be real Samaritans and minister to those we find in need according to their needs and according to our ability to minister.

I ask today only a common-sense approach to this problem and with that common-sense approach, a common honesty on the part of this Congress to deal with the problem of work relief.

This appropriation of $886,000,000 for relief in 1942, of which $875,000,000 goes to the W. P. A., is welcomed by many since it is a sizable reduction from 1941 appropriations and $109,000,000 less than the original Budget request. To my way of thinking, however, the expenditure of $875,000,000 for Federal work relief in the coming fiscal year is unwarranted and unnecessary. It is not justified by the prospects for employment during the next year. The proposal suggests no change whatever in the basic conception and operation of the W. P. A. We are searching for ways to reduce substantially the nondefense expenditures of the Federal Government. The maintenance of an increasingly expensive system of work relief for the rapidly dwindling unemployed is indefensible. Now if ever the Federal relief program should be revised as a Federal-State cooperative program supported by grants-in-aid, along the lines of the social-security program.

In attempting to justify the continuance of the W. P. A. work-relief program without substantial change, Acting Commissioner Howard O. Hunter, of the W. P. A., testifying before the committee, painted a rather discouraging and, I believe, distorted picture of employment and unemployment conditions of the present and future. Industrial production reached a new high in March 1941, and the Federal Reserve index stood at

143, 25 percent above the 1929 high point. The continuance and expansion of the defense program will bring about still greater production and employment.

Mr. Hunter's estimates of the number of unemployed in the coming year are clearly too high and are unwarranted. He estimates that unemployment during the fiscal year 1942 will average between 5,500,000 and 7,500,000, depending upon whose estimates are used. The two most generally accepted unemployment estimates are those of the National Industrial Conference Board and the American Federation of Labor. The N. I. C. B. estimates unemployment in March 1941 to be 6,142,000 and the A. F. of L. estimate for March is 7,552,000. But both estimates are considerably below the January estimates, and in all probability the N. I. C. B. will show not more than 5,000,000 by July and the A. F. of L. estimate will approach 6,000,000 at the same time.

On December 29, 1940, Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins stated the defense program would create enough jobs "to break the back of unemployment before the end of 1941." She explained that the Labor Department estimated that between five and six million new jobs would be filled by December 1941. In part she said:

> The labor outlook for 1941 is bright • • • bright as to job opportunities, bright as to increased earnings for workers, and with every indication pointing to continued and hearty cooperation by labor with industrial and all other groups so that our defense program may be speeded up and carried through successfully for the safety of America, its democratic institutions, and all of its citizens.
>
> The completion of work provided for in present defense appropriation acts will require between four and five million workers. About half of these will be needed on construction jobs, in shipyards or in factories engaged in making finished products such as airplanes and engines, tanks, and shells. The other half will be needed primarily to supply contractors with materials.—New York Times, December 30, 1940.

Since that time increased appropriations have been granted for defense, and if we can believe Madam Perkins at all, the need for W. P. A. should be completely eliminated. If the New Deal cannot put practically all employables to work during the next fiscal year, then its all-out defense effort will be a failure.

Mr. Hunter also stated before the committee that total employment is now less than in 1929. However, both the N. I. C. B. and the A. F. of L. series of employment figures show that total employment today is in excess of 1929 levels. The figures are as follows:

	1929 average	March 1941
National Industrial Conference Board	47,925,000	49,373,000
American Federation of Labor	46,192,000	46,875,000

As employment increases, the most capable W. P. A. workers are taken into private industry. That means that as time goes on only the least capable, those verging on the line of unemployability in private industry, remain. How can these people accomplish anything in the way of constructive work?

The W. P. A. now contends that it is doing a great deal of important defense work and is trying to get as many projects as possible certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as being necessary for national defense. Some of the projects are of value to national defense, but the great majority continue to be of the made-work type, with a great deal of "boondoggling."

One result of this effort to use W. P. A. for defense purposes is to increase greatly the per-man month and year cost of W. P. A. A year ago the per-man Federal cost of W. P. A. was about $62 a month, or $744 a year. At that rate the proposed 1,000,000 W. P. A. workers could be taken care of for 1942 with the expenditure of about three-quarters of a billion dollars instead of $875,000,000. But during the current year W. P. A. wages have been raised so that the per-man Federal cost for 1942 is estimated at $71 a month, or $852 a year.

How has this come about, and what justification is there for it? W. P. A. workers ordinarily work 130 hours a month, but those working on the certified national-defense projects work 48 hours a week, or 208 hours a month. And since they work longer hours, their monthly security wage has been increased. At present about 240,000 W. P. A. employees are working the longer hours and receive on the average $74 a month, while the ordinary employee receives only $56 a month. Furthermore the nonlabor costs of the defense workers are greater, and it now costs $108.80 a month, or $1,233.60 a year for each one of the 240,000 employees on the certified defense projects. The total cost for the other workers is only $61.50 a month, or $738 a year.

So we are paying heavily for the W. P. A.'s contribution to national defense, and furthermore, the many inequities of the W. P. A. system are being intensified. Two persons equally capable and equally in need are on W. P. A. One works on a defense project and receives $74 a month, while the other is on a nondefense project and receives $56 a month. True enough, the former works more hours, but the latter would like the opportunity for more work. What justice is there in a relief system of that kind?

The person in need who is on direct relief and cannot get on W. P. A., on the other hand, gets on the average only $25 a month.

It is high time that we put an end to this farcical and inequitable system of so-called work relief. If airports and cantonments are to be built, let us have them built by private industry all the way through. It will be done better and in the long run cheaper. Return the care of all relief people to the States and make them work out an equitable system where relief is based on need.

It is interesting to note that with the reduction of the W. P. A. to the 1,000,000-man level the administrative costs are going up, viewed on a percentage basis. During the present fiscal year the W. P. A. has had $44,500,000 for administrative expenses, and that has been about 3.2 percent of the total expenditures. For 1942, $39,690,000 is asked, and that amounts to 4.5 percent of the $875,000,000 asked for W. P. A.

Two years ago we placed a requirement in the law that the average sponsor's contribution in a State should be not less than 25 percent of the total cost of the W. P. A. projects. That has had a salutary effect in increasing sponsors' contribution and getting the States and localities to pay a fair share of the costs. During the first 9 months of the fiscal year the sponsors have contributed 30.8 percent of the total cost.

Now the W. P. A. wants this restriction removed so that they will have complete discretion. They contend that $6 per man-month nonlabor cost requirement is adequate safeguard against the local sponsor's saddling more of the cost on the Federal Government. It should be noted in this connection, however, that the $6 limitation does not in effect apply to the certified national-defense projects and if such projects become more numerous, and that is what W. P. A. wants, no effective safeguard will remain.

The W. P. A. wants the 18-month layoff provision removed. But it would seem that the reasons for its retention are more valid today than ever. If it be true that there are many persons in need who are eligible for W. P. A. who cannot get on and have to live on direct relief, then why not pass the Federal largesse around. Persons equally in need should have equal opportunity for the $74 a month now being paid to W. P. A. workers on defense projects.

It seems that the W. P. A. never learns. Two years ago we knocked out the theater project because of the subversive activities which seemed to dominate its conduct. Now the W. P. A. wants to revive the theater projects with local sponsors. Now of all times seems to be clearly inappropriate for such a step. Subversive activities of the Nazis and Communists are not only rampant but exceedingly dangerous to our national safety. And now while the whole effort of the Nation is being devoted to defense should we worry about relief projects for unemployed actors, musicians, and writers? Employment in the armed forces is waiting for all who are unable to find constructive outlets for their efforts and talents.

Because of the dangers from subversive activities it would seem wise to retain not only the barriers against the employment of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists but of aliens as well. If nearly a quarter of a million W. P. A. employees are working on projects which either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy have certified as being necessary to national defense we do not want a lot of foreigners in position to commit acts of sabotage on such projects.

Mr. Chairman, for more than a year our attention has been focused primarily on national defense. Extraordinary expenditures, totaling billions of dollars, have been authorized by the Congress for the purpose of transforming an "on order" uncertainty into an "on hand" assurance. To carry out that program of changing promise into performance the appropriation of additional billions will be required. Almost every commu-

nity in the country reflects in its teeming industrial activity the emphasis which has been laid on putting into high gear the productive capacity of the Nation. Existing plants have been expanded. New factories and facilities are under construction. Further extensive developments are contemplated. Day by day the demand for men to man the machines of production becomes the more insistent as the woeful lack of machines and materials becomes the more painfully apparent. In many fields workers are at a premium, with every indication that even a more acute shortage of labor will confront us in the future. That fact is presently causing much concern to common-sense businessmen and to candid Government leaders. If ever there was a time when a promising picture of employment presented itself to the Nation, that time is now.

But the rearmament program has emphasized the dangers which inevitably come from a disregard of sound fiscal policies. I feel confident that many administration leaders—those who contented themselves with the fallacious philosophy that profligacy was the way to prosperity—realize today the peril which their policies have invited. An administration which has disregarded care and caution in the expenditure of public funds is now turning to the people to replenish the storehouse which it carelessly refused to protect. A campaign is being conducted to try to induce individual citizens to help underwrite by their investments the enormous costs for a defense program. That underwriting program would not be such an acute problem today had there been a reasonable regard for sound fiscal policies during the past few years. And what is even more to the point, there appears little, if anything, which would justify the hope that a change of policy—a change from reckless abandon to cautious common sense—will materialize. At the present time the Ways and Means Committee of the House is wrestling with the problem of finding additional sources of revenue. From what we have been able to learn, the new tax bill promises to be a very effective, although equally unpleasant, notice to men and women in all walks of life that economy in government is a virtue and not a vice.

With these facts before me, I confess that I find it difficult to understand the attitude of the administration toward the work-relief program and the costly agencies which it has created to administer that program. It can hardly be argued that the record of the W. P. A. is one which of itself commends favorable consideration for the perpetuation of its policies. The investigation which was conducted by the House some 2 years ago, and which many felt might have been more searching and complete, was sufficiently revealing of the W. P. A. that no claim should be made for its innocence and hardly any for its competency.

Of course, W. P. A., like all other Federal agencies, has seized upon the opportunity afforded by the defense program to entrench itself. Such a course was to be expected. The popularity which has attended the expansion of national defense was not overlooked as the increase in industrial activity made it plainer day by day that the uselessness of this administrative agency would become a hard, cold fact. Obviously some excuse must be found for the payment of salaries for the army of officials which has fastened itself on the public pay roll as relief directors. What we face here is the difficulty which will always be encountered when an effort is made to discontinue a governmental activity after its usefulness has expired. That which at the beginning is held out as a temporary creation is never willing to admit that its temporary status has come to an end. Bureaucracy always will seek to perpetuate itself, and, as a parasite, fasten itself permanently upon the living organism of a free government.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Would the Chair mind advising the Committee the subject under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

W. P. A. SITUATION IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in my State of Washington the average monthly employment on the W. P. A. for the fiscal year 1941 is estimated at 22,805 persons, and the estimated average for the fiscal year, if only $836,000,000 is made available for the entire Nation, will be less than 11,000 persons, a reduction of over 50 percent. This is too drastic a cut and will throw these people out of employment without any means of obtaining jobs or financial assistance of any kind. Many of these men and women are past the age when they can secure employment, most of them are unskilled, and the national-defense program is of no benefit to them. I have received vigorous protests against this action from the county commissioners of Thurston, Cowlitz, and Grays Harbor Counties, among the largest counties in my district and, in fact, from all my 9 counties.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to a fact of great importance. I am advised that 60 percent of those who are employed on W. P. A. in the State of Washington are working on projects which have been certified as essential to national defense, airports, cantonments, barracks, and projects classified as being related to national defense, directly or indirectly. I am told that this percentage of 60 percent in the State of Washington is the highest in any State in the Nation and is due to the vast national-defense program in our State, but it is already an established fact that the persons employed on these W. P. A. projects have not been and will not be employed on the national-defense program, either they are too old or they do not possess the technical skill. To throw so many of these worthy citizens into the streets is certainly not good for our national morale at a time when we should seek to keep our people contented and united and prove to them that democratic processes do function in the interests of their social and economic welfare. I question very seriously the soundness and wisdom of such a short-sighted policy as that, and I question whether it is sound economy. It appears to me to be the very contrary of that, and I do not hesitate to condemn such a policy as undemocratic, un-American, and detrimental to the spirit of our entire national-defense objective.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I therefore urge that you fix the appropriation for W. P. A. for the ensuing fiscal year at $1,250,000,000, the amount which Mr. Howard O. Hunter, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, states is necessary and needed to give this meager employment to the unemployed men and women of our country, who will otherwise have no source of income whatsoever and face starvation, destitution, and want, which would be criminal folly at this critical juncture in our national history.

I desire to call your attention to a statement prepared by the Division of Statistics, W. P. A., relating to the State of Washington, bearing date May 14, 1941, which I am inserting at this point.

The statement is as follows:

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
1941			
July	13,500	16,300	23,113
August	11,600	15,800	23,281
September	11,600	15,800	22,287
October	11,600	15,800	22,071
November	11,600	15,800	22,691
December	11,600	16,400	23,877
1942			
January	13,500	17,500	24,604
February	13,500	17,500	25,109
March	12,100	16,800	22,097
April	11,600	16,300	[1] 21,000
May	11,100	16,000	[1] 18,300
June	10,400	16,000	[2] 16,590
Estimated average for fiscal year	11,900	16,300	----------
Average for fiscal year 1941	----------	----------	22,085

Estimated need as of May 1, 1941, 24,185.

[1] Based on employment authorization.

[2] Based on tentative employment authorization.

Employment of Work Projects Administration projects[1] in Washington, by congressional districts,[2] Apr. 30, 1940

Congressional district	Number of persons
All districts	20,082
Undistributed by district	2,596
Districts 1, 2, and 6	10,764
District 3	3,064
District 4	1,803
District 5	1,855

[1] Includes Work Projects Administration projects operated by other Federal agencies and financed by allocation of Work Projects Administration funds.

[2] As the county is the smallest governmental subdivision for which Work Projects Administration employment is available, congressional districts are combined where a county is located in more than 1 congressional district.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Congress to an article, Capital Parade. It appears this morning in the Washington Post, writen by Joseph Alsop and Robert Kintner. Among other things they say:

> The report is that when urged to act, the President always recurs to the case of his former chief, Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson, he points out, was far better placed when he led the Nation into the first World War. A succession of incidents, in which American lives were taken and American property was lost, had inflamed public opinion over many months. The debate on the armed merchantmen bill had revealed an almost united Congress. There were only 12 in the little band of willful men whose Senate filibuster forced Wilson to arm the merchantmen on his own authority. In the end, when Wilson went to Congress and requested a declaration of war, he could be certain that every dissident voice would be drowned out by the roar of enthusiasm from a truly United States.

Now, get this and see whether or not the President of the United States should let or permit such charges as these to go unanswered. Among other things they go on to say:

> The President agrees that these are the alternatives, but still clings to the hope that his problem will be solved for him by the incident he so much desires.

Members of Congress, where was there ever a more serious charge uttered against a public official, to claim that he wanted American lives destroyed and American property destroyed so an incident would be created whereby he could plunge this country into war? That is what this charge is.

The President of the United States should deny this terrible charge. I cannot believe this is true because, my God, my fellow Members of Congress, I cannot conceive of any man, President of the United States, or any Member of this body who would want something to happen to kill your son or my son so that an incident would be created that would cause public opinion to become so inflamed that the people of this country would demand a war declaration from this Congress, or give the President an excuse, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to enter into an undeclared war, as Alsop and Kintner say, in full partnership with Britain.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Was that by Alsop and Kintner?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. That is the third time they have made the charge against the President of the United States, in three different columns, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, that makes it worse. Has there been any denial from any official source of it, so far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. So far as I know, there has been no denial. The final charge was made in this morning's columns of the Post, but twice before there was the same charge.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I read appears in this morning's Washington Post, issued right under the dome of the Capitol.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman realizes the President of the United States cannot go around denying these vile charges all the time that might be made in the press by some irresponsible writer.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the gentleman feels it would not be necessary to make denial but some person in authority should do so—particularly when these writers are assumed to have knowledge of what they are writing. We have a population in the United States consisting of white men, red men, and colored men, if you please, who are in want, old people who are living on $10 or $12 or $18 a month, and in the face of this we are seeking to plunge this country into war, if you please, to relieve want in other countries like China, England, Australia, Czechoslovakia, and every country on earth. We have talked pretty big lately. We want to establish everywhere on earth, if you please, freedom from want, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of fear, a pretty big order, when we have want stalking nearly every step you take right here in our capital city of Washington, and other large cities in the United States.

You can go into any city, into the slums, and see poor people suffering, see children in want, see aged people in want. Yet in our hysteria we see only want that exists 3,000 miles away in some other country. What is national defense? As was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] this afternoon, you can have national defense only when you have your people at home unified and satisfied. We better commence to look at home to see that they are unified by doing the square thing by them. We ought to have a decent old-age-pension plan whereby the aged people of this country, who have built our churches, schoolhouses, railroads, and every other public improvement, may be free from want. Many of them are living in want; the record shows that from 80 to 85 percent of those people over 65 years of age today are either partially or wholly dependent. Is it not about time that we commence to figure out something for ourselves? Again, I can take you into every State in the Union in which there are Indians, and you will find thousands of Indians throughout the United States that have not a foot of ground—a horse or a cow or a sheep or a chicken even with which to make a living. Can we get any money from this Congress for them? No. But every nation on earth that has made any pretense at all of having any kind of form of democracy has its arms into the United States Treasury clear up to the elbows. That is a fact. The gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, and I appeared before a committee to get some money for the Indians that I am talking about, and did we get it? Oh, no; oh, no. Yet $500,000,000 was sent down to South America and millions of dollars sent to China and other countries. We can send it to every other country, but we have nothing for our Indian people at home. When the Dies committee was before this House for a continuation of its life the first time, I tried to amend the resolution to provide that that committee find out the cause of communism in this country. We knew there were Communists. They were running for public office. What causes it? It is want; it is hunger; it is hungry women and children and idle men that cause communism.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does not the gentleman think it is psychologically the poorest kind of strategy to visit the first spasm of economy upon the poor in the United States? Does not the gentleman think that is the poorest thing that could be done in the interest of unity and morale?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. Let's not take it out of the hides of the poor. In 1937 I heard President Roosevelt, from the Clerk's stand, make the charge that there were one-third of the people of this country underfed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, and I say to you today that if it were not for this defense program the same condition would exist. The statesmanship of this country has never answered the question of unemployment or relieved the poverty. What an indictment it is against the statesmanship of the great United States that unemployment can only be solved by preparing for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. In this short time I want to say that charity begins at home. We ought to take care of our own needy and helpless people. The W. P. A. has rendered great service. Homes, churches, roads, parks, courthouses, and schools have been built under this program. It is one of the best services the Government has set up and it has gone a long way to help, but it has not been the answer and it will not be the answer when it has been cut down to the figure represented in this bill. We are spending billions and billions of dollars for armies, battleships, bombing planes, and guns. Remember all of those materials have to be used by men and we want our people satisfied and we want them to love their country. Then they will deliver the goods when the time comes. I am for these expenditures and have always voted for them upon the theory that we are defending America, and I want to go a step farther. I think we should do better than we have been in looking after our own people.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. One of the reasons advanced by the proponents of this reduction of W. P. A. is the alleged increase in employment as a result of so-called national defense. I point out, as an example of how this contention is un-

tenable, that so far as employment in the Army camps is concerned, back in February, 369,000 workers were reported as being employed on camp construction, but that employment in that construction had dropped by 145,000 by April, and it has since continued to decline.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. What is going to happen when this war business is over? It is variously estimated that this program will cost $116,000,000,000, and then what? Where are we when we get through? We are right where we started. Our unemployment will start right over again. We must commence to think of revamping our economy if we are going to survive as a free country.

I fear that in trying to defend what we choose to call democracy in Europe that we may lose the very thing we think we are trying to save in Europe, namely, we may lose our own democracy in this country.

Now, as to Montana. While the economic conditions are fairly good in Montana, there are still approximately 10,000 heads of families who cannot be gainfully employed in private industry. This unemployment is due to the changing conditions which occurred in Montana during the last decade. These can be summarized as follows:

Montana has large coal deposits and these have been extensively operated. However, during the last 10 years electric power and gas consumption have replaced coal consumption and thousands of coal miners have been thrown out of employment. For the most part, these miners have large families and have not been able to seek employment in other localities.

The use of modern machinery has replaced many laborers formerly employed in the mines, the smelters, and on the farms. For example, at the present time the copper mines in Montana are producing the same volume of ore as was produced in 1929 with but 64.64 percent of the workers. The same is true in the smelters in Anaconda, Great Falls, and East Helena. These machines have replaced unskilled laborers for the most part. Farm laborers have been supplanted by tractors, combines, and other machinery which have been put to use within the last 10 or 12 years.

The use of modern machinery on farms has also created the condition whereby many former farmers have been forced to abandon or sell their farms and move to localities generally on the outskirts of the larger towns. The increase in the population of Billings, Missoula, Helena, and Kalispell can be so attributed. Power machinery calls for larger farm units to make crop production cheaper and this is the cause for much farm migration. Many small operators have been forced out of business because of low prices and power-machine competition.

Another factor which has added to the unemployment in Montana is the purchase by the Government of approximately 2,000,000 acres of submarginal land. These purchases separated many families from their homes, many of which have located in the suburban areas of Montana cities and towns. The proceeds from these sales were naturally not large and, for the most part, were all taken for the liquidation of debts and encumbrances. Many of these former farmers are currently employed on W. P. A. projects and are not skilled in any line of endeavor.

Montana suffered severe droughts during 1934 and 1936 and since that time crops have not been too abundant. These conditions drove families from many farms and many migrated to the irrigated sections of western Montana. Also migrating to western Montana were families from the Dust Bowl in the Great Plains area. These migrators came to western Montana financially poor, and while they are being rehabilitated on lands which were formerly covered with timber, the process of stump pulling and cultivation was extremely slow, and it will be some time before they are fully rehabilitated, if at all.

This migration increased the population in western Montana counties approximately 25 percent, and thus increased governmental costs at least that amount, without any compensating revenue return whatsoever.

Many counties in western Montana depend almost entirely upon the lumber industry, and this industry has never recovered from the depression. Unemployment has also been added to by the fact that seasonal work in the forest, such as maintaining trails, building roads, and fighting fires, has been taken over by members of the C. C. C.

Although the employment condition is fairly good, Montana has a large population of older men and women in the industrial centers. These people are miners who are above 45 and cannot be employed in the mines because of the extreme hard work and hazardous conditions. The working life of a copper miner is short; thus, many widows have been left to be taken care of by relief agencies.

In agricultural sections these aged people can be accounted for by the following fact: The plains area in Montana was largely settled between 1910 and 1920. During that period it was possible to grow good crops of grain in Montana in the agricultural sections. These people were adventurers and probably were not the best of farm operators, and failed to meet the changing conditions occasioned by lack of moisture during the twenties and thirties of the century. Ages have been increased during this period, which causes an average age of 45 of those employed on the W. P. A.

We are reasonably sure that where private employment is available, all W. P. A. workers are anxious and willing to avail themselves of this employment. Reports coming to this office from Jay G. Diamond, agricultural statistician, advise us that farm labor is well balanced, especially where W. P. A. is operating at all extensively. We are aware that there is a great deal more employment in Montana than there has been since 1928. However, a large percentage of W. P. A. workers are not capable of doing this work. To cite an example, the railroad companies are doing a great deal of new work and maintenance, but the requirements are very strict and no one may be employed except those between the ages of 18 and 35, and only those who can pass a physical examination. There is a shortage of skilled workers in industrial centers, but here again only those well qualified will be accepted. We still have an overabundance of unskilled and semiskilled workers unemployed in Montana.

Montana has no national-defense contracts except the small contract of $25,000 awarded the Caird Machinery Co. at Helena. All increases in employment occasioned by national defense have been indirect and only as applied to strategic minerals.

In summarizing the situation, we believe that the work-relief program in Montana must be continued to take care of the aforementioned 10,000 heads of families who cannot be employed. We are sure that at this time Montana has reached a peak of private employment, and unemployment will raise as seasonal employment is discontinued.

Montana

Month	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,000,000 for continental United States	Estimated employment based on monthly average of 1,265,000 for continental United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year 1941
1941	$875,000,000	$1,150,000,000	$1,250,000,000
July	6,800	8,000	8,128
August	5,800	8,000	8,578
September	5,800	8,000	8,225
October	5,800	8,000	8,246
November	5,800	8,000	8,978
December	5,800	8,300	10,111
1942			
January	6,700	8,500	11,291
February	6,700	8,500	12,164
March	6,000	8,200	10,831
April	5,800	8,000	[1] 9,800
May	5,600	7,900	[1] 9,000
June	5,200	7,900	[2] 8,160
Estimated average for fiscal year	6,000	8,100	
Average for fiscal year 1941			9,459

Estimated need as of May 1, 1941, 12,043.

[1] Based on employment authorization.
[2] Based on tentative employment authorization.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, it has become almost a custom, whenever W. P. A. appropriation bills come before the House, for some of the men who take the floor on the subject to convert the debate into a regular field day for maligning the W. P. A. Charges of waste and maladministration, based on relatively small and isolated occurrences, fly thick and fast and serve to distract attention from the subject in its broad perspective. For that reason, I believe this time to be particularly appropriate for reading a splendid editorial which appeared in the Boston Post of last Sunday on the subject of the dividends which have accrued to the Nation from the W. P. A. program.

The tangible accomplishments of the W. P. A. and its substantial contribution

to the real wealth of the Nation have been singularly neglected by the press of the Nation. This is perhaps understandable because the fruits of the program have been a gradual growth rather than a spectacular development. Projects which have simultaneously dotted every village, town, and city in the land have individually been undramatic. But, in an aggregate, they represent an amazing contribution to the health, safety, and comfort of the people of the entire Nation as well as to the defense of the Nation. The Boston Post is to be highly commended for its penetrating article which dispels the mists of witticism and calumny which have too long served to obscure the genuine accomplishments of the W. P. A. program. I want to take this opportunity to read this enlightening editorial on the subject.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME HAS A WAY

Years ago when Charles Dudley Warner concocted his immortal saying, "Politics makes strange bedfellows," he did not envision America's all-out defense effort.

If he had, he would have used a word more embracing than politics alone. For it is totally inadequate for what we are witnessing—the economic royalists hobnobbing with the liberals, the intellectuals appealing to the industrial tycoons to speed up productions and the social-conscious zealots who would make America over, discovering that the George Babbits are not such bad fellows after all.

Yes, there is more to this defense effort than idle factories springing to life, idle men throwing back their shoulders as they get on permanent pay rolls again, soldiers and sailors filling the cities over the week end, more planes in the skies, more parades in the streets, civilians training on the village green, and the women folks learning to be air-raid wardens.

Beneath the surface, changes in attitude are sweeping America like a hurricane. The fellow travelers are now thumping the platforms in behalf of democracy. The authors who probed the lives of great Americans for faults, are now singing, God Bless America. Even a famous United States poet who some years back was marching in front of our statehouse condemning Governor Fuller, President Lowell of Harvard, and Judge Grant for their Sacco-Vanzetti decision, is now hoping the American people will have hearts of oak like the English if war comes to us.

A lot of folks are finding a lot of things they did not like, and were not bashful about saying so, were not so terrible after all. The liberals and the intellectuals are not the only ones who are recanting and jumping the fence. New light is also falling on the conservatives.

The proof of that is the growing realization that the money expended on W. P. A. projects was not wasted after all. Of all the Government's efforts to keep people from starving, to keep them from being evicted from their homes, and in the final analysis to keep them from actually revolting against privation, the W. P. A. was the most vilified.

Against that endeavor was hurled not only charges of rank, outrageous waste—and there was waste—but the hatred extended to a campaign of cheap humor against the people engaged in the work. Men with hardly strength to swing a putter on a golf course grew apoplectic every time they passed a project and saw some workers not swinging picks. Women who had chauffeurs to open the doors of their automobiles for them thrilled tea parties with the latest joke about shovel-leaning.

But what has happened? Thanks to the W. P. A., our defense effort is about a year ahead of time. Take the matter of airports. We need them badly even now. We need big ones, better ones. We need them everywhere around the Nation. Yet at the moment there are 545 airports in the country which we would not have had except for the W. P. A. For in 5 years' time that number of airports were either built or improved by people on Government funds.

We also need highways. We need them long and far in all parts of the Nation. For, if we are invaded we must have them for our mechanized armies. We must have them, too, for trucks to deliver our defense goods. In 5 years we have accumulated a number we might not have had. The number is so great that the W. P. A. figures it this way—180 miles of roadway were built for every county in the country.

The figures of the work accomplished by the alleged "shovel leaners" during half a decade, work which is vital as guns and gunboats to national defense, is staggering. More than 100,000 bridges and viaducts were improved or built. Improvements were made along more than 10,000 miles of our important river banks. The total playgrounds, parks, and pools built or rehabilitated by this same group was nearly 20,000 around the Nation.

Meanwhile, back to work in our factories, shipyards, stores, shops, are going men not softened by years of sitting around. They are going back at least physically fit and with their self-respect still retained. They are going back to help the same America in a crisis that helped them in a crisis. And people who laughed are soberly considering they did quite a job.

Time of stress and danger also makes strange bedfellows. But it is all uniting America into a harmonizing, impregnable front against any foe. And that's the greatest goal of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. My friend does not subscribe to the philosophy that all of this money appropriated by Congress has been wasted?

Mr. HEALEY. I have just taken occasion to read this editorial which lists the beneficial projects and the amazing amount of work that has been accomplished by W. P. A. funds.

Mr. HAINES. And all of this has added to the wealth of the Nation?

Mr. HEALEY. All of this has added to the wealth of the Nation. All this public work has contributed to the welfare of America.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Does not the gentleman regret the fact that Members of Congress themselves in a great many instances have not been educated to many of the benefits of W. P. A.? For instance, in this particular editorial which the gentleman read there was nothing which dealt with the food-lunch program that thousands of school children are benefiting from.

Mr. HEALEY. There are other features about which equally commendable editorials could be written.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to get this straight from the minority as well as the majority. Does not this cut represent a revised Budget estimate? Is not this cut recommended by the President? I think the Congress and the American people should know whether that is so or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me give a chronological history to my friend from New York. In the President's Budget message on the 8th of January he recommended $995,000,000 for W. P. A. In the Budget message which came from the President of the United States and which was read from this rostrum only 3 or 4 weeks ago he recommended a cut of $109,000,000, or a reduction to $886,000,000. The amount that is appropriated here, within $95,000, is the amount that was recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No matter what anybody says, that is the history of the situation and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is eminently correct.

Mr. Chairman, I sort of like this hour of the afternoon. This is the vesper hour. All the turbulences of the mind and spirit have been dissipated, and I think there is that spiritual glow and serenity that makes it possible to enjoy an informal fellowship. While the Chamber is slightly devoid of the full membership of the House at this hour of the afternoon, I think if I were privileged to select my time, I would rather talk now than at any other time of the day.

What I want to talk about a little is this matter of David Lasser. Presumably the casual visitor sitting in the gallery listening to the emphasis on one individual in the whole W. P. A. set-up, which embraces more than a million people, must necessarily wonder why so much importance is attached to a single individual. Yet I think it is a matter that is of far more importance than meets the eye.

Mr. Lasser is on the pay roll for $4,400. His job is to go around in 15 or 16 States and investigate the conditions under which people are taken from W. P. A. and reinstated in private industry. It is entirely conceivable that in the performance of these functions a man whose heart and mind is not exactly right and who may be lacking in that essential devotion to this country could do a tremendous amount of damage. Make no mistake about that.

The other thing before the committee is the whole question of policy relative to subversion in the United States of America at the present time. I sat here all day yesterday listening to this Chamber ring with discussion about party lines and the Communist front as this dignified and deliberative body devoted itself to the question of the North American Aviation strike; but I want to return for a moment to Mr.

Lasser and explain certain things with reference to him and several others, and to point out some matters the Congress is going to have to get clear in order to deal with this matter.

Mr. Lasser appeared and testified before the investigative committee of the Committee on Appropriations in April 1939. I was over there at times. He is a very handy gentleman. He is very fluent. He is educated, and he is extremely able. As I understand it, he is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and is an engineer by profession. I saw the gentleman parry questions and handle the answers, and I know he is a man of rare capabilities. When that kind of capability is coupled with a subversive heart—if it is a subversive heart—then you have a truly dangerous person in the American economy.

As I said, Mr. Lasser is employed at the present time at $4,400 a year. When he came before the committee in April 1939 he was president of the Workers Alliance. His testimony, together with that of Mr. Herbert Benjamin, secretary of the Workers Alliance, covered 150 pages in the record, and it is worth reading and rereading from time to time in order to pick up the stitches of American sentiment and see whether or not there is some un-American, radical, and subversive danger that is growing upon the horizon. At that time Mr. Lasser testified, as shown by page 42 of the hearings, testified himself that at the instance of the Workers Alliance he made a trip to Russia to be in attendance at the twentieth anniversary celebration of the Russian Revolution. He indicated that that was only incidental to his trip to Spain and to Great Britain, but a person does not go to Russia to sit in on the twentieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution unless there is something more than a casual interest in his heart. He is the same Mr. Lasser who got out a press release on the 13th of April 1937, and I believe Members of Congress will be very much interested in one portion of the context, because this is the statement that Mr. Lasser wrote into that press release:

> We believe that the reactionary congressional group that imposed the $50,000,000 cut secured a majority only as the result of misrepresentation, outright lies, parliamentary tricks, bluffs, and threats.

That was the language Mr. Lasser wrote into that press release on the 13th of April 1937, and then by a kind of tenuous and specious logic undertook to justify every one of those allegations hurled against the integrity of Congress. That is the gentleman who is drawing $4,400 a year. He goes around in 15 or 16 States. He investigates conditions in private employment in the transition of W. P. A. workers to private industry, and he holds a genuinely responsible job. According to the record, he was hired at the instance of Mr. Hunter, the Director of W. P. A., himself.

It is rather singular that Mr. Lasser was associated so long with Herbert Benjamin, the secretary of the Workers Alliance, and, oddly enough, could escape contamination. Or if he did not escape that, somehow there has now been a reconstruction of the spirit and a reformation of his political approach to national problems.

With respect to Mr. Benjamin, let me tell you what that gentleman testified—and you will find this on pages 135 and 136 of this record. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] asked this question of Mr. Benjamin:

> Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Here was Benjamin's reply:

> Yes, sir. I would say in connection with all this that my membership in the Communist Party, of course, is no state secret. My political affiliation and views have been a matter of public record for a good many years and are known to the membership of my organization, but insofar as expressions can be and are my personal opinions, they do not necessarily represent the point of view of the organization of which I am an officer.

But you see, he said, "Yes, sir; I am a member or have membership in the Communist Party." Mr. Lasser was identified with the Workers Alliance in 1935. Mr. Benjamin came into that organization in 1936. They worked in tandem, president and secretary, for more than 3 years, maybe 3½ years, before Mr. Lasser got out on the ground that Mr. Benjamin was delivering the Workers Alliance to the Communist Party.

Now, I am wondering somewhat whether or not Mr. Lasser has changed his viewpoint; and, of course, there is nothing in the law of the land to make him; but there is involved a question of policy for Congress to determine: Whether or not we shall keep somebody on the pay roll who is subversive in heart even though the lips may deny it and who is holding a responsible Government position whereby he can let this indoctrination manifest itself wherever his duty may lead him. The reason I am interested not only from the standpoint of Mr. Lasser but others is that there is a responsibility here for the Congress.

I told this Congress a few years ago when they were complaining about the certain activities of the National Labor Relations Board that there was a lawyer whose name was Nathan Witt who really ran the National Labor Relations Board. That is very important, because the first thing that happened when Mr. Leiserson took over down there was get rid of Nathan Witt. The reason Mr. Witt was so important was because he was the executive secretary. You could not run a thing from any regional office through the National Labor Relations Board unless Mr. Witt got a look at it. When the testimony was finally taken from the files of that Board before the Smith committee it would have made a far more resolute gentleman than Mr. Witt leave the service of the Government. He had no choice except to sever his connection.

Where is Mr. Witt today? This is rather an interesting query and a very pertinent query. I am going to tell you what the gentleman is doing and I am going to read to you from the May 27, 1941, issue of the Daily Worker. There can be no quibbling or controversy as to the policies of this newspaper. Everybody in the United States knows them. I want to tell you what Mr. Witt is doing at the present time. He is engaged in the law business up in New York and he has taken for himself a case very recently in connection with Harry Bridges. Mr. Witt has filed a petition very recently with the Federal Communications Commission. He thinks that Mr. Bridges is being crucified and is not getting a fair deal. So Mr. Witt is now in charge of a committee in New York that is filing a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission in order to open up the radio channels to Mr. Harry Bridges, well-known alien and west coast glamour boy. Here is what Mr. Witt said, and this is reasonably fresh because it is only 2 weeks old:

> As a result the newspapers are free to print all sorts of malicious misstatements. Further the radio news broadcasts are largely written by the press services, so that what does go out over the air is no improvement on the newspapers themselves.

Mr. Witt, who had industry within the cup of his hand for many years, is today heading an organization in New York for the purpose of giving Harry Bridges a chance to capture the ear of the American public in order to stay here longer and resist the procedure that is pending against him at the present time in California.

You will remember we criticized and complained severely about Mr. Witt and the responsibility that he exercised. Those criticisms and complaints fell on deaf ears until he was in a fair way to ruining a great segment of the industry of the country. Mr. Witt today has taken off the mask after he severed his relationship with the Government of the United States and identifies himself with a committee to assist Harry Bridges, the alien Australian, who has provoked so much disturbance in the land.

Here is another thing in connection with this Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, as it is officially styled, that is seeking to get Mr. Bridges' story to the American public. There is another gentleman whose name is Robert Morse Lovett who serves on that committee.

We had the Interior appropriation up here I think about the time I left for a little jaunt into the great prairie country where I live. This appropriation bill contained an appropriation for the Virgin Islands. Mr. Robert Morse Lovett, who serves on the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, is the Government secretary of the Virgin Islands. He is a Government employee. I just went over to the Appropriations Committee and checked the justification, and he is on the pay roll for $5,600 per year of the taxpayers' money. Nobody is going to laugh that off, because I like to document my facts a little as I go along.

Here in the Daily Worker of May 27, 1941, they list the name of Robert Morse Lovett, Government Secretary, Virgin Islands, as a member of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges. Mr. Chairman, we have been fussing with this thing for a long time. Why do we have that sort of thing in the Government? I am wondering whether we must not after all go back and take a course in semantics and in the fine discriminations and refinements of word definition for this very

good reason: Are we running into a blind alley? Is communism subversion, or is it not? If it is not, why all the shooting, why all the noise, why all the smoke and fury if it is not? If it is, why are these boys on the pay roll? Why not do something about it now, not only including Mr. Lasser but Mr. Lovett and many others as well?

I will tell you how Mr. Lasser got around it. This printed hearing from which I shall read is a great document.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bound copy of the W. P. A. investigation I will read from, and I quote from page 178. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] proposed this question of Mr. Lasser:

Do you consider the Communist Party a subversive organization?

That is a very fair question. It is going to have to be decided because it is legalized. It gets its name on the ballot in a great many States. Here was Mr. Lasser's answer:

My impression from reading the material that Mr. Benjamin has furnished is that it is not.

Note that. Mr. Lasser says the Communist Party is not subversive. Well, I do not know whether Mr. Lasser can prove that statement or not. There is no need to read the rest of the context.

It seems strange to me he could work in close cooperation and harmony with Mr. Benjamin who stated he was and had been a Communist uninterruptedly for 18 years and still Mr. Lasser finds a very responsible job as an investigator and a semipolicy maker, as I see it—although that is denied—in the whole field of the transition of W. P. A. workers to private industry.

Now, just by way of summary, down in the Virgin Islands we have Robert Morse Lovett on the pay roll of the Government, and this body appropriated for him 2 weeks ago $5,600 a year. This man is serving on the Harry Bridges citizens committee. We have a man who was executive secretary of the National Labor Relations Board practicing law today in New York and appealing to the Federal Communications Committee to get a hearing for Harry Bridges. What are we going to do about it? The Attorney General stated on the front page of the papers this morning that the difficulty out in California was aggravated largely because of the activities of the Communist line and Communist front. But what has this Congress done about it? Has it come to grips? Has it found a square definition of the whole problem that is agitating the people of the country? Has it invoked any kind of definite program or action to meet the situation? We have had a million disclosures and revelations of one kind and another. They make fine reading on the front page of the newspapers. We have had dissident resolutions and legislation of one kind or another, but still the thing goes on. It is bad enough to have it on the outside of the official rolls of Government, but it is infinitely worse when it is on the inside of Government. I would like to meet the situation if I can.

I do not know what is going to be done, and maybe nobody else will do it, but I am going to offer an amendment to this bill when the time comes, unless somebody else does, to deny use of any part of this appropriation to pay a salary to our friend, Mr. Lasser. This is a very humble effort, I know. It is rather singular that you have to tack a little rider on a tremendous appropriation bill in order to meet a given situation, but I believe there is involved here a great question of policy that transcends the individual fortunes of Mr. Lasser, and that is why I propose to do it, and for no other reason than to direct the attention of the Congress and the country to it and to the fact that the time for vigorous action is at hand.

Finally, the Bridges trial is going on now. We came to grips with it once. I never will forget all the great constitutional logic that was spun out on this floor as to whether it was a bill of attainder or an ex post facto act. I am going to throw my effort into that hopper, too, because this afternoon I am going to drop this bill in the hopper:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the tenth day following the enactment hereof, it shall be unlawful for Harry Bridges, defendant, in the deportation proceedings pending on June 10, 1941, before the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice, to be and/or remain in the United States or any other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

There is no attainder to that, and no ex post facto. That is going to make it unlawful for Harry Bridges to be anywhere within the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction. If we are going to deal with this thing, we may just as well deal with it now, and take the gloves off. While this is only a drop in the bucket, at least I want to back up what observations I made here this afternoon by some kind of concrete action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] such time as he may desire.

STATEMENT ON W. P. A. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES—AMENDMENT WILL BE OFFERED TO RESTORE BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends a total limitation on administrative expenses of $35,466,000. This constitutes a cut of $4,224,000 from the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and a cut of over $9,000,000 from the limitation in this year's act. The limitation this year is in itself a reduction of $9,000,000 from the amount used last year.

COMMITTEE REDUCTION TOO MUCH

If the committee's recommendation is approved, it will mean a reduction of over 5,000 employees from the 21,450 employed as an average this year. The administrative limitation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would permit an average administrative employment of approximately 18,350 persons for the next fiscal year. This is certainly not an excessive number when the work they are required to perform is taken into consideration. The W. P. A. is operating over 23,000 work projects in more than 3,000 counties throughout the country. It is responsible not only for seeing that all of the work is properly and efficiently executed but also for carefully reviewing the need status of all of the W. P. A. workers, checking to determine whether they violate any of the provisions in the act with respect to membership in the Nazi Bund or Communist Party, assigning each worker to his proper project in accordance with his capabilities, preparing pay rolls, and carrying out many other functions imposed on it by Congress.

Members of Congress will have an increased number of complaints if the W. P. A. does not have sufficient help to iron out the many differences, disputes, and complaints. Members of Congress will be confronted with many problems that they cannot satisfactorily cope with.

MAJORITY OF DISTRICT OFFICES TO CLOSE

Although the reduction in the total appropriation for the W. P. A. will cause some decrease in the administrative work, the decrease will be very small in comparison to the total reduction in the appropriation, since the basic administrative functions are the same. If the limitation recommended by the committee is not changed, the W. P. A. is going to be forced to close a majority of its district offices and consolidate most of the work in the smaller States into regional offices. Action of this type will unquestionably mean that the officials handling matters will be far removed from local problems and will be less able to give prompt and understanding consideration to local problems. In addition to these consolidations, the program will have to be abandoned in many areas in the country because there will not be sufficient administrative personnel to supervise the work. It is poor economy for us to vote nearly a billion dollars to an agency and then to so limit its administrative cost that it cannot do an adequate job in seeing that the money is properly spent. I know it is the desire of this House that the W. P. A. projects be efficiently supervised and that the W. P. A. carry out all the provisions in the appropriation act in the most thorough way possible. To do this they must have a reasonable amount of administrative funds. The limitation on administrative funds in the act should be restored to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; that is a total of $39,690,000, with a limitation of $32,240,000 for salaries, $600,000 for communications, $3,600,000 for travel, and $400,000 for printing and binding.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in his farewell address George Washington with prophetic vision declared that the time would likely arise in this country when groups of men would seek to undermine what they could not overthrow in our governmental system.

That time has come. Subversive elements are scattered all over our land

endeavoring to undermine our institutions and our ideals, with the ultimate object of overthrowing our system of government.

We have imported most of our troubles and most of our problems. It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of real American workers are intensely patriotic. The recent troubles in our program of production for national defense have been due in practically every instance to the activities of un-American workers whose destructive schemes are planned by dictatorial direction from abroad.

Agents of these subversive elements have worked their way into key positions in many localities where defense industries are in operation, and they have become so potent with their nefarious machinations that they no longer heed the counsel of the leader of either of the two great labor organizations of this country. We have read in the press of the recommendations to return to work in the defense plants which have been made by Mr. Green and Mr. Murray, but in many places certain communistic agitators have assumed the guiding role and have made such recommendations of no avail.

No longer ago than this morning we read in the local papers the statement of the Attorney General of the United States that in most cases these strikes against our defense production have been fomented by Communists. That this statement placing the responsibility on subversive groups is true, is attested by the fact that already, since the President has strengthened our confidence and courage by giving the North American Aviation Co. in California the protection of the Army, more than 70 percent of the workers have returned promptly to their labors.

Such strikes are the initial technique of these communistic schemers. They are frequently based upon mere flimsy subterfuges to cloak the real intent of weakening our country by preventing the production of the things needed for our defense. They are just the starting point on the way to the goal at which these agitators hope to arrive. In my judgment, such strikes are not in accord with the desires of the great majority of the workers. They are not based upon the fundamental right to strike. They are based upon the dastardly schemes of these communistic leaders who have wormed themselves into key positions. If true American workers had the right to a secret ballot, I do not believe that they would be casting their votes to disrupt industry and interfere with the production so vitally needed to defend the blessings of liberty they enjoy.

For years the great labor organization which has been longest in existence in the United States has been one of the dominant forces standing firmly against unrestricted immigration, in order that we might not allow within our borders the very class of people who are primarily responsible for the unfortunate conditions that now impede our progress. The subversive agitators who seek to lead labor astray are un-American at heart and un-American in principle. They are trying to undermine what they know they cannot at once overthrow. There is no place in our American system for these hostile groups. Their activities have so aroused public opinion that the recognized rights of honest American labor have become imperiled, and it behooves all patriotic workers in their own defense to take note of this situation. Anyone who raises his voice against the continuance of these communistic outbreaks is speaking in the interest of the American people and of real American labor.

We have been assured by various executive departments that no further legislation is necessary to correct the unfortunate conditions which exist, yet these subversive strikes have continued, and the Congress is being censured, in spite of the fact that such assurance has been given us. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the measure making appropriations for the War Department which was before us for consideration on yesterday, this branch of the Congress wrote into the bill some provisions designed to give relief from the deplorable state of affairs in our defense production. The executive departments are now giving more active and vigorous attention to this situation, and I am sure are receiving therefor the commendation of those who have the honor to serve in these legislative halls.

Where are these strikes in the United States? In the United States News, which came to our desks yesterday, I find this statement:

> Fifty-three strikes involving more than 57,100 employes held up work on defense projects for part or all of last week. The totals are the largest recorded for any week since the beginning of the defense program.

And where are these strikes? They are shown to be in the following States—and I am not reciting this from any sectional standpoint, because I realize that these subversive troublemakers naturally go to the industrial sections where they expect to find a more fertile field for their destructive efforts—there are seven in Missouri, three in Illinois, five in Pennsylvania, three in Connecticut, five in California, six in New York, four in New Jersey, five in Ohio, four in Michigan, three in Washington, and one in each of the following States: Rhode Island, Indiana, Wisconsin, Maine, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

It is naturally gratifying to me to note that we are not having any of these communistic strikes in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, or in the States in that particular section, or out in the great body of the Midwest. As I have stated, that is likely due largely to the fact that they are not sections of great industrial concentration and have been more free from the insidious influence of hostile agitators. But I must confess that I have wondered sometimes if it would not have been a little bit wiser to have assigned more of the defense production to these areas where no such strikes are occurring. We do have considerable defense work in those States, but it has been carried on in a fine American spirit and uninterrupted by spurious propaganda of foreign agents.

Of course, we know that these agitators either come from abroad or get their instructions from some dictatorial regime, and we know also that they are concealing their final desire for the overthrow of this Government by finding excuses to foment strikes that curtail the output of much needed matériel. Just pause and contemplate what this stoppage of work has meant not only to our own country but to England and to the democracies that are fighting for principles of freedom we Americans cherish. There might have been supplied enough of munitions and equipment in some places to have turned the tide of battle. There would have been 40 more bombers available from 1 plant alone. And there are plenty of good and capable Americans who were ready and longing to provide the needed matériel, but in many instances they were hampered and restrained by the technicalities and subterfuges of subversive agents who had acquired places of control within their ranks. Loyal American workers want to have their labor devoted to the protection of our beloved land without interference, and it behooves all in positions of authority to free them from the hostile influences that seek to deny them this opportunity.

Think how many lands of free people have lost their liberty through just such a course as we have been witnessing in this country. Take France, for instance; poor, deluded France. Through the insidious endeavors of these subversive elements, they have now come under the domination of the Nazi yoke.

It is a peculiar thing, injected for persuasion to false conclusions, that from the very beginning these communistic and other subversive groups have termed the efforts of Great Britain and France an imperialistic war. I wonder what France, under the subjection of Germany, thinks today of that accusation. Why, it has been but 2 or 3 years since the Members of this Congress received letters threatening them with defeat if they did not vote in a certain way on certain measures, and those letters were signed by the president of the Communist Party and by its secretary, Earl Browder. And the accompanying document they sent was berating England and France for conducting an imperialistic war. Never one word comes from them to indicate that Germany has been conducting an imperialistic war, in spite of the fact that a dozen conquered countries now feel the pressure of the Nazi heel. And, strange as it may seem, I have heard that same word "imperialism" used in a similar way on the floor of this House.

It is time for American citizens to wake up and it is time for American labor to wake up and protect the interests of this country. If we follow the same system that humiliated and subdued France and other nations of free people, American labor and the American people may eventually find themselves in the same deplorable state as France and all these other conquered lands: serfs and slaves with no social gains, no rights, no protection, no liberty. And whatever legislation may be necessary to stop the

nefarious work of these communistic and other hostile agitators and to allow American labor, unfettered by spurious propaganda and agents from abroad, to have its rightful place and do its proper work in our defense production, I shall gladly support.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on the question of France?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I will yield briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to make an observation in connection with the fall of France, and it is that repressive legislation against labor was passed before France went into war under the guise of France's so-called national defense; that the same people who were responsible for the enactment of that legislation against labor in France were the same people who plunged France into war; and this is indeed remarkable for, despite the fact that Hitler has conquered France, these same people still own the same mines, the same banks, the same factories, and own the same monopolies that they owned before France went into war and before France lost. The reason for it was that they were interested in smashing labor and not in the defense of their country.

Mr. LANHAM. I must decline to yield further, because I need the time; but I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from New York that labor certainly has not been repressed in this country of ours. It has had more legislation enacted for its benefit than in any country under the sun.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. And what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is an opportunity for American labor to be permitted to work in an American way. American labor has stood opposed to the immigration of these rascals from abroad who are here trying to disrupt our defense program, and I do not want to see American labor or any American citizen reduced to serfdom and slavery through the domination of dictators across the seas, whatever their particular and peculiar brand of hostility to democracy and freedom may be.

We have not yet been called upon for much in the way of sacrifice. The greatest sacrifice has been made by these fine American boys who have gone to the various camps. You know and I know that many of them have given up for the period of their training lucrative positions in the various trades and professions to serve Uncle Sam for $21 a month. Are we to allow communistic and other subversive agitators to prevent American labor from having the chance to work in order that these boys in the camps who do their jobs without complaint in spite of their sacrifices may have the equipment with which to defend themselves and this great free country in which we live?

Mr. Chairman, America is at the crossroads today. The situation is critical, and we must think and act as Americans worthy of the name and the heritage. It is imperative that our program for national defense go forward.

A year ago I quoted on this floor words of an eminent American poet that seem peculiarly appropriate today. In bidding our ship of state sail gloriously on, he said:

> Humanity with all its fears,
> With all the hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

Upon the fate of this country, upon the preparation that this country makes for its own defense and for such production as it can spare for the democracies struggling for the preservation of institutions and ideals and principles in which we believe, does hang indeed the fate of humanity. Upon you and upon me and upon the American people rests a great responsibility and, in appreciation of the blessings of liberty which have become our boon in this land of the free, let us be worthy followers and successors of the patriots who made possible this glorious American Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, throughout my entire lifetime I have always stood as a sponsor of the philosophy of living within income, a philosophy which, unfortunately, has not prevailed during the past few years as far as governmental expenditures are concerned. At the present time, we are called upon in this national emergency not only to appropriate for domestic needs but, in addition, make available other huge appropriations for our preparedness effort.

In many of these so-called defense appropriations, we have appropriated for items which do not come under the classification of defense. We have had urged upon us the necessity of drastically reducing appropriations for nondefense items, but the fact remains that such reductions have not been made to any substantial degree. The administration has resisted every effort to cut down the spending by the vast bureaucracy it has created. Here is where economy should be practiced first of all. In view of the fact that the administration has not seen fit to reduce its expenditures for operation of the general government, I rise to support this appropriation for continuation of the Work Projects Administration during the coming fiscal year.

I realize that there are many sections of the United States which are greatly benefiting by the billions of dollars we have appropriated for defense. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the relief load in those sections can be materially reduced. I am sure you all recognize, however, that there are many sections of the Nation which are not and cannot be the beneficiaries of this huge defense expenditure, therefore, the relief problem within these non-defense-production areas has not been materially changed.

I represent a State in the Plains area in which the defense contracts awarded can probably be counted on the fingers of one hand. As with other States in this Midwest agricultural area, we must look to the Federal Government for a continuation of the relief programs inaugurated in past years. The incomes and purchasing power of our people who have been on relief in the agricultural States will not be materially increased because the unemployment problem still remains a problem in those areas.

I recognize on the part of my colleagues, particularly those from industrial regions, a growing concern in regard to these continuous huge appropriations for relief. I share with them the hope that the day will come when such appropriations will not be necessary. At the same time, I recognize that that day is not here simply because defense expenditures have greatly reduced the relief and unemployment problems of our industrial centers. I would like to suggest to you that a contributing factor to the need for continued relief appropriations throughout the Plains States can be traced directly to the unwise land policy adopted by the Federal Government back in the days when this region was new.

That policy was to open these areas for settlement without due regard to the soil and climatic characteristics of the area. Farm practices which have been successful further east and along the Atlantic seaboard were encouraged. For a considerable number of years when the land was fertile and rainfall ample, these farm practices proved adaptable to this new region, but with the gradual depletion of the soil and a growing deficiency in the annual rainfall it soon developed that this region was not well adapted to intensive cultivation with the result that hundreds of farm families had to leave their homes. Much of this area is now undergoing a transition—from grain farming back to livestock and grazing and also a considerable development in irrigation. That adjustment to new conditions cannot be made overnight nor can the problem be considered as a purely local one. It is a national problem involving many States. Until that adjustment has been made, we cannot neglect to give reasonable consideration to the relief needs of the people in these areas.

The President, himself, realized that not all sections of the Nation could participate in the expenditures made for national defense. I quote from his Budget message:

> An additional factor militating against as great a reduction in unemployment as might appear possible is that there are many of the presently unemployed who have little chance to be absorbed by the defense effort. Certain regions of the country are not affected by defense activities, and many types of workers are not in demand.

The big factor in the unemployment and relief situation in North Dakota, which the public does not generally appreciate, is this: In practically all of the towns of the State, we have what may be termed a "stranded population." These people, for the most part, are persons formerly engaged in agricultural pursuits but who have had to leave the land because of depression and poor crops. They have gone to the smaller towns to make their homes under rather desperate conditions. There was no place else for them to go, and in these towns there is little possibility of their ever getting jobs of any kind. In fact, in most of them there simply are no jobs.

I am not so concerned about reduction of the W. P. A. appropriation at this particular time or during the summer months when our agricultural industries will absorb many of the unemployed if the crop comes through. What I am concerned about is the conditions that will prevail next winter. There is little in sight at this time to indicate that there will be any great reduction in the relief and unemployment rolls in North Dakota next winter. During the winter months there is a general suspension of all seasonal work, such as highway construction and agricultural activities. On the other hand, the needs of the people during the winter months are greatly increased—they must have fuel and warmer clothing. Where the heads of families cannot be employed by W. P. A., it means that the relief load is thrown back upon the county or the municipality, which are already in such straitened financial circumstances that they cannot be of much assistance.

Despite the increased unemployment and relief needs during the winter months, the proposed reduction in W. P. A. funds will mean that the heads of the 3,000 needy families must be taken off the relief rolls with the approach of winter.

At the present time, there are quite a few people leaving the State for those sections of the country where there is defense-industry employment. Such migration, however, can only partially relieve the situation, because the greater part of the W. P. A. load is made up of persons who are unable to do this. Forty-three percent of all persons employed by W. P. A. in North Dakota are more than 40 years old, and more than 17 percent are more than 45 years old. People in this age group are obviously reluctant to leave the State in search for employment elsewhere—employment for which, in many cases, they have not the skill or background to qualify. Their only hope is to get back to the land as soon as conditions warrant a reasonable prospect of staying there.

Summarizing the situation, our State W. P. A. director, Thomas H. Moodie, has this to say—and I quote:

> It is my conclusion that unless we are able to maintain W. P. A. employment on about the same basis as it was carried on during the fiscal year of 1940–41, there will be inevitable suffering and hardship among a great group of people in North Dakota.

In conclusion, it seems to me, then, that it is time to restudy the efforts of W. P. A. Surely these areas that are so substantially benefited by the spending of defense funds have no rightful claim for the same ratio for continuation of W. P. A. relief, and it should accordingly be reduced. But in sections such as the Great Plains States where there is no possible benefit to be derived from the defense spending, it seems to me only reasonable that the same ratio of W. P. A. relief that has prevailed in the last year should continue again for the coming year. And, therefore, if it cannot be done within the limits of this bill as it prevails, I urgently support the adoption of pending amendments that will make this possible.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, on the 3d day of April the Secretary of Agriculture asked the farmers of this country, certain groups, to increase their production. At about the same time they went on and announced certain prices in relation to the Chicago market. My colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] introduced a resolution, as he could see what would happen to this price structure unless we had producer, consumer, and distributor committee to advise on this matter. Up to this time nothing has been done about that resolution.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I have been informed that as soon as the majority leader can find time this week, the resolution will be given a place. The Rules Committee has already voted it out.

Mr. MURRAY. I am very glad to know that. Lat Friday the Secretary of Agriculture called upon the people of this country to reduce their consumption of cheese. In connection with this W. P. A. appropriation bill, we will either have to increase the W. P. A. appropriation or else have to adopt some more carefully thought out agricultural programs than the ones that are being suggested at this time.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. This will be rather hard on the cheese makers of Wisconsin because I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin will admit the best cheese in the world is made in Wisconsin, is it not?

Mr. MURRAY. I admit that. I wish to say that as far as Wisconsin is concerned, I have a telegram that came today showing that the farmers of the State of Wisconsin have done exactly as the Secretary asked them to do. This telegram says:

> MADISON, WIS., *June 10, 1941.*
>
> REID F. MURRAY:
>
> Indicated Wisconsin milk production first 6 months of 1941 about 9 percent above last year. Last month about 11 percent higher than same month of 1940.
>
> WALTER H. EBLING.

Wisconsin has most assuredly done her part on this dairy-production request. Anyone who knows anything about the dairy business knows you cannot simply turn on an electric light and make the cow give more milk. It takes a little time to get the cow to cooperate with you and perform her duties. Now, we have the Secretary of Agriculture going out and telling the people of this country we should cut down on our cheese consumption.

Mr. Chairman, the recent announcement by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, in which he asks the American public to reduce their consumption of cheese is unnecessary, unwarranted, and unfair to this industry.

First. It is unnecessary because, if an increase in the American cheese production is deemed desirable it can be accomplished by the Government providing cooperative creameries with a few cheese vats and equipment so that these creameries will have a flexible plant. If the present administration can furnish millions of dollars to business interests to expand their plants, why cannot they provide these cooperative creameries with equipment to increase the cheese production if it is a national necessity? As only 6.6 pounds out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States is made into cheese and over 42.1 pounds out of every 100 pounds goes into butter, a small diversion from butter to cheese production would double the amount of cheese available.

Second. This request is unwarranted because, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, there are about 35,000,000 pounds of surplus Cheddar cheese in New Zealand, 15,299,000 pounds in Canada, and 44,180 000 pounds of various foreign type cheeses in storage in Argentina. There are no available figures for Australia. The United States has a total annual production of about 600,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese, and in Wisconsin in 1940, 314,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese were produced. Warehouses in New Zealand are bulging with dairy products, but they say they expect them to be as long as England can get dairy products free from the United States.

Third. The request is unfair as it will undo the splendid work the cheese industry has done in the past 50 years in creating a demand for this incomparable product. The per capita cheese production has been increased from 3.5 pounds per capita to 5.3 pounds per capita during the past few years. The State of Wisconsin and the cheese industry have spent enormous sums in an effort to advertise this great product, universally known as poor man's meat. How much time, how much effort, and how much money will the American cheese farmer have to spend to recover this domestic market if the American people follow Secretary Wickard's advice and reduce their consumption?

The New Deal reduced the tariff on cheese in the first Canadian treaty by 2 cents per pound. The price dropped from 17 to 12½ cents per pound between January 1 and July 1, 1936. The imports in 1936 were 14 times as great as the 1935 imports. The tariff was again reduced 1 cent per pound in the second Canadian treaty in 1938, and the price dropped from 12.7 cents per pound in December 1938 to 11.8 cents per pound in January 1939, or 1 cent, about the amount of the reduction in the tariff. The 1939 imports were over three times as much as the 1938 imports. Cheese has averaged 13.4 cents per pound the 8 years of the New Deal, and butter has averaged 27.6 cents per pound during this time. The 8 years before the New Deal cheese averaged 18.1 cents per pound, and butter averaged 38.1 cents per pound during this same time.

The official price jugglers of the present administration pegged the price of

butter at 31 cents per pound on April 3, when it was 33 cents per pound the day they pegged it, and the parity price was 37.1 cents the same day. The price of 92-score butter averaged 31.5 cents per pound at Chicago under the Hoover administration, and now the New Deal wants to peg a 2-year price of only 31 cents per pound. The New Deal price jugglers have been running and ruining the butter market for several years. They just cannot conceive that the old law of supply and demand can really work again in America. They evidently feel that this dairy market is to be continually and forever manipulated in the interests of the consumer group. There is no evidence of any effort to help the producer get a fair price for his butter and cheese. For 2 weeks I have heard that the price jugglers of the New Deal were very concerned about the recent advance in prices of dairy products. At the same time I was informed that they were going to try to break dairy prices. I knew that we purchased 233,772 pounds of butter in 1940 at 17.2 cents per pound from Argentina, at the time that domestic butter was on our surplus list, but I could not believe that the administration would intentionally try to ruin the dairy market or harm any group of our society after so many protestations of humanitarianism and social gains. Is the removal of butter from the surplus marketing list an effort in this direction? Is this new request to disorganize and disrupt the cheese industry a move toward this? Could this be a method of getting cheese farmers more kindly disposed toward war? If 45,000,000 Americans are now undernourished, will not this number be increased if the domestic consumption of dairy products is to be decreased?

I cannot help but hope that the Agricultural Department's request that the domestic consumption of dairy products be reduced will meet with failure as fully as have its efforts in selling the war to the farmers of America. [Applause.]

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman on the power of his representation of his district, in calling the attention of the Congress to these situations which exist in the country and which exist in his district in the State of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the gentleman would be able to get some of that influence down here in Washington to those who would curb the use of cheese in this country. It is my understanding that it is excellent food for our soldiers and sailors who are in the service. What would be the gentleman's observation in that regard?

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman and I will say that within the last week one of my good colleagues on the other side complained because I was working too hard and said that was not the way to do. He said the main thing to do is to watch around and grab something for your district. He said that is really the best way for a Congressman to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURRAY. I have never criticized Wallace. I do not criticize the present Secretary of Agriculture, but I do say to my colleague from Minnesota that the time has come when the real farm people of this country surely need somebody in Washington who thinks about the producer once in a while and is not continually giving the viewpoint of the consumer of agricultural products.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, no one can gainsay the claim that the unemployment situation throughout the country has been considerably benefited by the great volume of jobs offered in countless industries through the projection of the national-defense program. No one with an ounce of common sense would endeavor to state to this body that inroads into the vast number of unemployed have not been made during the past year.

This is especially so, I think, among those unemployed who are fortunate in having in reserve a skilled trade; and it is so in countless instances in the cases of those unskilled but being under 40 years of age and able and vigorous are therefore given an opportunity to work in our national-defense production plants and factories.

But in considering this relief appropriation bill we must not be so greatly encouraged by these auspicious figures of unemployment reduction that we foolishly come to believe that we are over the hill, the problem is solved, the sun is in the sky, and all is well with those unfortunates who have been struggling for an existence during the past decade. With all the billions of dollars that are being spent in national-defense production there are still several millions of unemployed in this country who must continue to depend upon us for their well-being until such time as they are able to adjust themselves properly into our economic life.

These millions should not be suddenly cut off from such meager protection as they now enjoy through sudden, unreasonable, drastic cuts in appropriation. Rather should the matter be considered carefully, and only such reduction in appropriations be made as are consistent with the relative reductions which are gradually occurring in unemployment.

There are certain groups of these unemployed throughout the Nation who, being over 40 years of age, find it impossible, no matter how hard they try, to secure work in most of our industries today. The man over 40 is an "old man" these days, and youth has first call, whether it be in our armed forces or in the great industrial plants of the country. What is to become of these men and women over 40? Many have had their boys taken from them for the armed service, and are therefore totally dependent upon themselves for support, and in many instances have additional small mouths dependent upon them. If they are suddenly cast out from the relief rolls, where they have sought refuge, where are they to turn? It is inconceivable that any one of them would remain an instant on W. P. A. rolls at the mere pittance they receive from that source were they offered or could they secure a job in private industry.

It is for these unfortunates that we must carefully consider these reductions in appropriations. And it is for these that we must consider if it is not the time right now to eliminate from the provisions of this bill the enforced 30-day lay-off period after 18 months' consecutive service. If we allow that provision to remain in the bill we are legislating a month or more of distress and privation for those who are forced unwillingly to accept the beneficence of the Government for want of an opportunity to find employment in private industry. We should immediately discontinue this awkward and unfair penalty.

The Appropriations Committee has seen fit to cut by an additional 10 percent the administrative appropriation, which had already been reduced 10 percent by the Budget Bureau. This is eminently unwise; an incomplete, insufficient administrative personnel can but result in an inefficient W. P. A. organization from top to bottom. At the present time, without any reduction similar to those proposed, less than 3½ percent of the entire W. P. A. personnel is in administrative. Any businessman readily recognizes that this is indeed an extremely low percentage.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that when the bill is opened for amendment tomorrow the Members of the House will join in advocating and supporting a reinstatement of those slashes which are carried in this measure and will see to it that a fair, just, and worthy relief bill is passed.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, in his special message to Congress asking ratification of the St. Lawrence project agreement with Canada, President Roosevelt said:

> I am advised that we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time. I should like to agree with the people who say that the country's danger will be over sooner than that. But the course of world events gives no such assurance, and we have no right to take chances with the national safety.

Under the agreement—article II—Canada agrees "to complete not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links" in the seaway.

It is further provided in article II that the two Governments "may by exchange of notes, arrange to defer or expedite their completion as circumstances may agree."

Insofar as the United States share of the work is concerned, it is set forth in article III that the United States agrees to complete the works allocated to it "not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway."

Thus the agreement as it stands obligates Canada to complete its share of the work by December 31, 1948, and the United States to complete its share not later than that date.

Furthermore the work may be delayed or expedited by agreement stated in an exchange of notes.

Therefore it is obvious the work could not be completed in 4 years except Canada agreed to expedite its share of the work. There is no statement from Canada indicating she would agree to modification of the present obligation of the agreement.

The President did not indicate there had been any discussion with Canada regarding her obligation under the agreement when he said, "I am advised we can build the St. Lawrence project in 4 years. Under emergency pressure it may be completed in less time."

There are only two courses under which the work could be completed in the time specified by the President—

Either Canada would agree to expedite its share of the work, or the United States would undertake to do all the work on each side of the boundary line, at its own expense.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. He and I have in common the fact that we represent dairy farmers. I like his rugged espousal of the cause of the common man and woman of this country. Since it is a sort of a lazy afternoon, drawing toward its close, and time is not of the essence, I would like to talk a little further about the espousal of the causes of the common men and women. You know, whenever men and women have grouped themselves together in order to formulate rules and laws to govern themselves, strangely enough, they have fallen into two classes. That has been invariably the rule. They fall either into class No. 1, those who mistrust and are contemptuous of the people and who wish to withdraw all the powers they can from the people and place them in the hands of the few whom they think, because they are largest stakeholders in property, have almost a divine right to rule and govern others. Or they fall into the other class, No. 2, who cherish and trust the people, who believe the people are the wisest repository of power. I believe it is the second class that has made this country great. Hamilton, of course, belonged to the first class. The Declaration of Independence, however, was taken from Jefferson's words.

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is the foundation stone of American democracy.

I maintain that whenever a public figure has been held in esteem by the American people it is because he has espoused the cause of the people.

It is not a matter of party. We have men—I see them here today—who are rugged protagonists of the rights of the people. I am glad to see them—from the Middle West, the great Northwest, and from the Western States. And so it has been since the very beginning of this country, the truly great have trusted the people, have guarded their interests, and have identified themselves with the people. Lincoln believed in this philosophy. Remember, "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." There was Teddy Roosevelt. Remember, his big stick was the weapon with which he beat back the invasion of the rights of the people by the great trusts and combinations of his day. There was President Wilson. Remember his words:

> The great Government we love has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes and those who used it had forgotten the people.

So I am glad to state here that I believe a majority of this Congress belong to that class that has the interest of the people at heart, who trust them, who cherish them, and love them. We need to have that class represented here. They are weak, they have no lobbyists, they have no pressure groups; and certainly it is a great thing to dedicate yourself to the cause of the weak, because the strong do not need such great support; they take care of themselves pretty well, as you and I have learned during our experience here in Washington. I now approach the problem of unemployment bearing in mind the two different classifications that men in public life have fallen into from the beginning of time, and I want to approach it from the viewpoint of the second class.

Unemployment was a great problem here before we got into this present emergency. Sometimes I think there are those among us who welcomed the emergency because it enabled them to dodge the problem of unemployment. I introduced legislation or amendments predicated upon the proposition that we should appropriate the sum of $3,000,000,000—it was an astronomical figure—in order to take care of all the unemployed who were eligible for work and who were able to work, but who could not find work in private industry. I stand upon that as a principle and I have not deviated from it. There were men in this Congress who threw their hands up in horror at the thought of spending $3,000,000,000, and so the amendment was lost. Year after year I put in an amendment increasing the amount that would enable those who were without work, who could not find work in private industry, to find employment on W. P. A. I did so because I thought the words of Jefferson—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—were empty phrases unless a man had an opportunity to work and provide for himself, his wife, and his children, and give them at least housing, shelter, food, and clothing. What life is worth living unless a man has that opportunity?

My amendments were predicated upon that proposition, yet they were shouted down because of the amount involved. I say we were too cowardly; we were afraid to meet the problem of unemployment. We put our foot in the water and then withdrew it because it was too cold. We did it half-heartedly, and that is almost as bad as not doing it at all. Yet today we find that meeting a problem of defense we have either appropriated or authorized $47,000,000,000 without so much as raising an eyebrow. There was a time when we had the opportunity of solving the unemployment problem for $3,000,000,000, solving it, wrestling with the problem of making democracy work, and we should have been vitally interested in it. The cry was we could not afford it, and yet, without a thought of affording it, we have appropriated and authorized $47,000,000,000, all to defend our democracy, I know, but, nevertheless, to destroy rather than build.

Private industry, due to the stimulus of all this great defense acivity, has absorbed from W. P. A. rolls and given employment to millions of people. It has not completely solved the problem, but it has brought us so close to it that if we meet the issue squarely in this bill we can solve it. We should not run away from it now. It is not so insurmountable now as it was a few years ago. We should meet it and settle it. There are at the present time 2,500,000 people out of work who are not taken up by defense programs. Many of them do not live in areas where defense contracts are being carried out.

Sixty percent of them are over 40 years of age. Fifty percent are over 45 years of age. Now, you and I know that private industry is not going to absorb them. You know that the insurance companies that are predicated upon hard facts do not allow in many instances, or else charge higher rates, to industries which employ men over 40 years of age. I am going to offer an amendment which I will ask all of you to consider and to support.

I ask you to read first of all the report of the committee that has been studying this proposition. If you will read the first few pages of that report you will find the greatest argument for my amendment that I have ever seen. It far more eloquently argues in favor of my amendment than I can. I want you to read the report of the committee. It sets up facts but sidesteps the logical conclusion which is that we ought to appropriate the sum of $1,250,000,000 in order to take care of 1,300,000 people who will not be absorbed by these defense programs.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I wonder if the Members of the House realize that if $50,000,000 of this bill for food stamps is taken the number of people who will be stricken from the W. P. A. rolls will be about 45 percent of the present number on the rolls?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because we had a lot of logrolling on the W. P. A. bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman who was interested in agriculture was also considering

the W. P. A. bill in committee. He saw an opportunity to get for agriculture $50,000,000 out of W. P. A. We want to assist agriculture, we want to assist the food-stamp plan, but he puts this proviso in the W. P. A. bill to take out $50,000,000 and put it over in the Department of Agriculture for the food-stamp plan—a little bit of logrolling to take from those who can least afford it $50,000,000.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would not call that logrolling. I would call it grab and take.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is what it is—grab and take.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think it is only fair to say that the Department of Agriculture did not ask at any time that this $50,000,000 be taken from relief funds for the food-stamp plan.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Of course, that is true. The Department of Agriculture would not be a party to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And I favor the food-stamp plan. It has done a marvelous job. But we should not take it out of the hides of the poor unemployed people of the country.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. May I say that, of course, the Department of Agriculture did not ask for it. I am willing to give the Department of Agriculture what is necessary to put through that food-stamp plan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand it, at the other end of this Capitol another body has added $35,000,000 for the food-stamp plan in another bill. If we want to be fair about it, and if we are interested in the food-stamp plan, we still have an opportunity to put it in another bill.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. You take this money out of the W. P. A., and you will put 58,000 men out of work who will not be able to buy under the food-stamp plan, and, what is more, they will not be eligible for it, because they are not the recipients of any relief.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am in favor of the food-stamp plan, but I am not in favor of getting the money by this method. My home county is the first county in which it was tried out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I had the idea that there was a real chance of a fighting minority, with the aid of some of our Democratic brethren, being able to cut down some of these vast Government appropriations which run into the billions of dollars. A lot of wind has been taken out of my sails. I have seen these appropriations go through with the utmost speed, despite the fact that we have vigorously fought practically every one of them. I have no idea that we are going to be successful, even if we were so disposed—and I am not saying that I am so disposed—in cutting down this appropriation of $886,000,000. We are dealing with a vast sum of money, but unquestionably this money will be appropriated.

Sometimes I am reminded by our experiences in trying to reduce these appropriations of what Matthew Arnold said about the poet Shelley:

> A beautiful, ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous wings in vain.

I do not mean to imply that there is anything beautiful about any Member on the Republican side, and certainly nothing angelic, specifically excepting the five gentlewomen who grace our benches; but I think you will get the general idea that we come here and we fight vigorously but in vain for economy in the spending of the hard-earned money of the taxpayers. Consequently, our chief purpose now should be to address ourselves to the matter of conducting the Work Projects Administration so as to obtain the maximum benefit therefrom for the people it is devised to aid and for the country at large.

Let us, first of all, consider the fundamental ground for bringing it into being back in 1935. Confessedly, we were in the depths of a great depression; something had to be done. So, entirely as an emergency measure, relief was taken out of the hands of the local communities and taken over by the Federal Government. But let us see now what the situation is in reference to employment.

I read from the monthly digest of the United States Department of Labor for the month of May 1941 that in the month of April 1941 the total of nonagricultural employment reached an all-time peak of 37,617,000, which was 147,000 above the previous high of September 1929.

That same situation is borne out in the report of the committee on this bill. On page 7 we read that in March 1941 the nonagricultural employment was 37,218,000, which was 1,541,000 more than such employment in March 1929.

The natural question that would enter the mind of a man from another planet is that if we have a higher employment peak in the months of March and April of 1941 than we had in the corresponding months of 1929, then why the continuance of W. P. A.?

I think the basic reason is that in 1929 we still adhered to the thesis enunciated by Grover Cleveland when he said that the Government should be supported by the people and that the Government should not support the people. Back in those days when a man did not have a job he got out and really tried to find one, and he did not go home until he had some sort of a job or had made a job for himself.

In these days we say that a man is unemployable because he comes to the W. P. A. office and says, "I cannot get a job." The W. P. A. office then looks him over and says, "All right; that is too bad. We will put you on the rolls and try to find a place for you."

In other words, we have a system that is pernicious in its very foundation in that it places a premium on indolence, it stifles ambition and initiative, and exacts a penalty for adherence to those traditional American concepts that a man should carve for himself by his own hands and by his own labor and ingenuity a place for himself in the community, and that there is no substitute for personal thrift and industry.

I admire greatly the exposition made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], in his opening remarks this afternoon when he advocated that the proper place for our relief problem should be in the local communities, with the Government helping those States where help is needed. What a myriad of problems that would solve. Would we have the taint of communism if relief were administered by the local authorities? Would Mr. Lasser and this Mr. Lovett, of whom we have heard so much this afternoon, be given very much rope in those situations where the localities themselves were spending their own money?

I maintain that it would go far toward solving the entire situation if the Government of the United States would say to the States and the municipalities, "This is your problem. We are giving it back to you. We stand on the sidelines ready to help."

Coming down to the wording of this bill, we read, in line 8 on page 1, that it is for the purpose of continuing to provide work for employable needy persons on useful public projects—and I emphasize the word "useful." It has been brought out in the debate this afternoon that approximately $300,000,000 of this $886,000,000 has been, or will be, earmarked for defense projects. Let us look at a few of the projects that are coming up and see just what sort of defense they are building for us.

This is a dandy. I read from an authorization that was issued by the Federal Works Agency under date of January 24, 1941:

> Compile specific data of the 1880 census. Work includes transcribing, verifying, indexing, and filing data on all families in the 1880 census in which there were children of 10 years or younger; compiling a master index for a limited representative area from the 1900, 1910, 1920, and 1930 censuses by transcribing information from these censuses to a single master card for each individual; making a study of relative fertility by age, race, locality, and other factors.

And so forth. What do you think that great defense measure is costing the people of the United States? Fifty thousand dollars? Wrong. Five hundred thousand dollars? Wrong again. It is costing the tidy little sum of $1,680,321.

Here is another beauty:

> To salvage, sort, index, microfilm, and preserve records of discontinued Federal relief programs for New York City, including C. W. A., F. E. R. A., and Works Progress Administration records.

That is sponsored by The National Archives. It is a project that no doubt has Messrs. Hitler, Goering, and others trembling in their boots. That is a great defense endeavor, and what do you think it is costing the people of the United States? Just the mere sum of $700,356.

These frivolous and worthless projects are not localized to my home city of New York and they are not localized to your respective communities. It is all over the country. Here is one that just came out in the April W. P. A. release, Bulletin No. 16:

A history of the Kansas National Guard, now in training at Camp Robinson (Ark.), is being prepared by the Writers Project under the sponsorship of Adjt. Gen. M. R. McLean.

I could go on ad infinitum citing similar useless and nonproductive W. P. A. projects from all over the country. The record is honeycombed with them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I could go on and on here pointing out the graft and the water that has been as much a part of W. P. A. as the name itself. I am not saying that the many worthy people on W. P. A. in my district and in your districts should be cut off. No; they have to be taken care of. But let us give them useful work. Let us see that every dollar is spent for their welfare and their benefit, for which it is intended. Let us try to rehabilitate them so that they can get jobs. Let us try to help them to become again self-respecting and self-supporting American citizens. This self-respect can come only with independence, the right to earn their own livelihoods, and the right to devote their energy and talents to useful and constructive work.

Let us do this realistically. Let us consider the whole problem of relief in its true light; not as a barnacle permanently affixed to our economic structure, but as an emergency measure. Let us take steps to extract the roots of the emergency at the earliest possible time. Let us, in brief, treat this legislation as it should be treated, and not make of it a political football.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] who preceded me a few moments ago, is rather confused between what are known as the old white-collar projects and the national-defense projects. By no stretch of the imagination can the projects that the gentleman referred to be classified as defense projects. The gentleman will find some day that one of the most valuable projects of the Work Projects Administration has been taking the records of the old censuses and making a card index so that unfortunate people throughout the country who have reached the age where they are now entitled to old-age assistance can secure proof of their correct age. This is one of the oldest W. P. A. projects that we have. There come to my desk dozens of requests every week from people in my State who have been unable to prove to the satisfaction of the State social security commission their age, because at the time they were born vital statistics were unknown throughout this country. There is no record of my birth in the State of Missouri. Vital statistics were not kept at that time and it has only been in recent years, through the efforts of the Federal Government, the Bureau of Public Health, that vital statistics are now kept throughout the Nation. The national-defense projects for which this money is going to be earmarked will be projects in camps, posts, navy yards, and so forth, making roads, repairing property, and matters of that character rather than such projects as the gentleman referred to.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment.

Of course, we are exercised in the large cities over this situation, or at least I am. The gentleman stated that he wants to see every worthy person kept on W. P. A. I may tell him that under the provisions of this bill as brought to the floor, you are going to have 758,658 fewer people on W. P. A., starting July 1, than you have had during the present fiscal year. That is the reduction in the number of individuals as a result of the reduction in the amount of this appropriation. The appropriation as brought in here carries $886,000,000, and one of the things I just cannot get into my head is why, when the full committee was considering this bill yesterday, it voted to earmark $50,000,000 of relief funds to carry out the provisions of the stamp plan. This has never been done before. Fifty million dollars was carried in the relief bill as a separate item for the stamp plan last year, but in this instance you take $50,000,000 more away from W. P. A. and transfer it to the Department of Agriculture.

We want the stamp plan in the large cities, but we also want a sufficient appropriation for W. P. A.

The Surplus Commodities Corporation that administers the stamp plan gets 30 percent of the annual customs receipts. This is automatic. It is a recurring appropriation that does not have to be made each year, and it amounts to approximately $100,000,000. Now, what happened this year? When the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill was before the House it included an item of $100,000,000 additional, above the customs receipts, for the Surplus Commodities Corporation. As the bill was passed by the Senate it carried $135,000,000 for the Surplus Commodities Corporation, or $35,000,000 over and above what we passed in the House. This measure is in conference, and it has been sleeping in conference for weeks. I do not know why. Why do they not bring it in here? We are getting close to July 1. They have another item in the bill that is causing some little concern, I presume, and that is the amendment of the Senate appropriating $450,000,000 for parity payments.

I cannot understand how a man or woman representing the farmers of this country can stand on the floor here and say that when the Government of the United States buys millions and millions of dollars' worth of surplus commodities it is harming the farmer rather than benefiting him. When you reduce the supply or when you reduce the surplus, surely the price to the general consuming public should increase. This appears to me to be common sense. Therefore I cannot get it into my head how a man representing the farmers can get up here and say it is of no benefit to the farmers. As I understood it, that is what we set up the organization for in the first instance. That is the reason I voted for it. I might say I have voted for every piece of farm legislation that has been before this House in 15 years with the exception of one, and that was the McNary-Haugen bill.

Under the rules which govern conferees, in the end the Surplus Commodities Corporation will get an amount somewhere between the $100,000,000 carried in the bill as it passed the House and the $135,000,000 as carried in the bill as it passed the Senate, and on top of this, if the provision I refer to, taking $50,000,000 from the Work Projects Administration is transferred to the Agriculture Department, then they will have that much additional.

The point I am trying to make is, that under the guise of taking care of administrative expenditures for the stamp plan you make a further reduction of $50,000,000 in the appropriation for W. P. A., which will automatically cause a further reduction in the number of men and women who can be employed on W. P. A. from July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942.

If you want to take care of the administrative expenditures for the stamp plan in this bill, then the proper way to do it is by appropriating the $50,000,000 for that purpose and not by earmarking $50,000,000 of the W. P. A. appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have been listening with much interest to the gentleman's discourse and I agree with some of the things he has said. When I first rose to interpose a question, it had to do with matters concerning that portion of the appropriation that will be devoted to defense projects. Now I fear the gentleman has gained the impression from my remarks that preceded his that I was objecting to using any part of it for defense projects.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; the gentleman does not have to go any further. I know he does not oppose defense projects. I may say that I did not make any suggestion of that kind, and if the gentleman will read my remarks he will find I made no such suggestion. What I did say, and what I say now, is that the slips which the gentleman read here referring to projects that he specified as defense projects are not defense projects. That is what I said to the gentleman. They are what have always been termed "W. P. A. white-collar projects" where they employ men and women who cannot handle a pick and shovel.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I agree with the gentleman, but does the gentleman not think that these vast sums of money, in one case $1,600,000 and in another case $1,700,000, could be used to

better avail with defense projects than for these boondoggling projects?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, we had projects of this kind long before we had the defense program. They are really valuable. I know something about the W. P. A. and I know something about unemployment. Right now we have hundreds of thousands of men working on defense plants, constructing them. I said on defense plants, and not in defense plants, and when those men get through building those defense plants, and they are ready for operation, those particular men who built them are not of the type who will run them, but mechanics will go inside those plants which have been constructed and use the machinery that they put in and operate those machines and manufacture the airplanes, the tanks, and the arms and munitions we need for defense purposes. The class of people, when they complete those buildings where they are going to manufacture what we need for national-defense purposes, are going to find themselves out of a job. Where are they going to get a job?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. LYNCH. The fact of the matter is that instead of the appropriation bill being for $885,000,000 for purposes of relief it is for a sum $50,000,000 less than that. Is that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; by taking the $50,000,000 and applying it to the stamp plan, and transferring it to the Agricultural Department—taking it away from the W. P. A. entirely. You are taking $50,000,000 away from the sum appropriated for W. P. A., thus reducing the number that can be employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, there are many other items in this bill that I do not agree with. I have opposed them before, and I shall oppose them again. The 18-month furlough provision was put in there by the committee, opposed by the W. P. A., and I think I read where it is opposed by the President. It has created nothing but hardship.

Coming as I do from a large city, of course, I am rather exercised over the situation that is going to confront us as a result of this reduction in appropriation. We have by no means in St. Louis reached a period where such tremendous reduction is justified. True, national defense expenditures have placed many people to work. Production has increased, but statistics show that despite this enormous increase in production, goods are produced with less labor, due to the installation of improved machinery.

Let it be remembered that the Federal Government alone is not carrying on a social-security program, nor the aid to the unemployed. The legislature of my State only last week appropriated $63,347,625 in what is known as the social-security appropriation bill, including $9,000,000 for direct relief to which the Government does not add one cent. True, the greater amount of this goes for old-age pensions which are matched by the Government. Likewise, $7,000,000 is for aid to dependent children matched by the Federal Government. As I say, the $9,000,000 for direct relief is a burden upon the State alone.

I now draw attention to one of the provisions of the current E. R. A. Act regarding sponsorship of Work Projects Administration projects. Section 1 (d) of this act requires projects sponsors to bear at least 25 percent of the total cost of all non-Federal projects approved after January 1, 1940. This provision, while not applying to each individual project as such, does apply to the average of all projects actively operated by each State.

An examination of the records and reports of the Work Projects Administration reveals that they have executed this mandate of the Congress with exacting care. However, this has caused unnecessary difficulties in dealing with situations of certain kinds, and in other situations works injustice on certain locations, types of projects, or classes of unemployed persons.

In many situations the types of projects desired and needed require local sponsors' participation over and above the available W. P. A. participation to a considerably greater extent than 25 percent of the total cost. In many such cases project sponsors are in a financial position to participate to this greater extent. Although the provision of the act was not intended to place an upward limit on sponsors' contributions, it is only natural for some sponsors to feel that no further contribution should be required when they have provided only the specified 25 percent. The provision thus comes to be regarded as a maximum limit, as well as a minimum, and difficulties are created in connection with the establishment of the higher types of projects which are much to be desired

In contrast with situations of the nature just mentioned, there are those where the sponsors' financial ability is greatly limited. The inability of a local government to provide 25-percent sponsorship costs may frequently be directly related to distressed employment conditions. Low-wage-earner income and poor business conditions result in deficient tax returns. Consequently, despite the greater relative need for Federal employment assistance in the community, projects from this locality are apt to be disapproved in favor of those communities where the 25-percent contribution is forthcoming due to larger tax collections from a more favorably employed populace.

During recent months, I am informed, many urban centers which have until recently been bearing the larger share of the sponsors' contribution load for their State have been the recipients of large defense orders. These orders have produced sizable increases in private employment in these communities, and at the same time have decreased the need for providing employment on Work Projects Administration projects. This has tended to throw a larger proportion of sponsors' contribution effort onto those municipalities which have not received defense contract awards. I can visualize this dislocation becoming even worse as our defense effort expands.

There are many types of useful projects, such as soil conservation and the like, as well as white-collar work, which can be successfully executed with sponsors' contributions at rates lower than 25 percent. In localities where such projects are needed there may often be relatively little need for projects of the nature requiring a higher rate of sponsors' contributions. The legislative provision makes it necessary in such cases, however, to curtail the operation of the less expensive projects to a point where they will not outweigh the more expensive kinds in the average, thus limiting the very kind of work which may be most needed.

I direct your attention to a congressional provision with which I am in complete accord, and which I believe will alone provide all the control necessary for the proper balance of the sponsors' contributions, since these must cover all required items not available from the W. P. A., consisting largely of nonlabor items. This provision is the limitation of $6 per worker per month that may be spent from Federal funds for nonlabor purposes. Here the approach is specific in its implication that for the most part the Federal funds appropriated to alleviate unemployment must be spent for labor costs. This limitation provides a safeguard against excessive Federal expenditures for nonlabor items and yet is sufficient to permit the operation of inexpensive improvement projects with low nonlabor costs where such improvements are needed in those communities that can ill afford to assume a full 25 percent of the total cost. On the other hand, sponsors who desire and can afford projects requiring large nonlabor expenditures, can secure them through proportionately larger contributions without feeling that they are thereby supporting the projects of other poorer communities.

To go further than this requirement governing Federal nonlabor expenditures is tantamount in my mind to saying to these communities that if you are well enough off to assume a portion of the burden of unemployment, we will assist you; but if you cannot help yourself to the extent we require of more fortunate communities, then the Federal Government can do nothing for you.

I earnestly recommend that the Congress rescind the 25-percent sponsor contribution requirement from the act appropriating funds for the Work Projects Administration for the coming fiscal year.

When the proper time comes it is my purpose to move to strike out that provision.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUDOW. The sponsor's contribution the gentleman will recall is a flexible matter now. It is a 25-percent average. The State W. P. A. administrator will make it lower than 25 percent to satisfy particular conditions in particular communities.

Mr. COCHRAN. But on the basis of what the administrator says himself, I think we will be in a better position if you take the provision out. You will get just as good results.

Mr. LUDLOW. I merely wanted to say to the gentleman that it is not a hard and fast 25-percent rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I presume I am supposed to make this bill perfectly clear to the membership here in 5 minutes, something others have been unable to do in half an hour. I'll do my best and will not ask for more time. All some Members have to do is to hold up five fingers and 5 additional minutes to speak is given. I have not yet mastered the technique of this finger movement.

I am going to limit this to 5 minutes. First of all, I want to say to you that the administration of relief in North Dakota has been honest. It has been good. It has been thorough. There is nothing wrong with it at all. There is no instance of mismanagement or dishonesty in the whole State of North Dakota. While we are supposed to be one of the radical States of the Union, we have no trouble with Communists, not in the least. We just let them speak, let them say anything they wanted to; let them run on the ticket, and in a State that casts about 300,000 votes they get on an average of about 6,000 votes.

The situation in North Dakota has been so well presented to me in a letter from the administrator, Thomas H. Moodie, that when I ask permission to extend my remarks I will also ask permission in the House to insert that letter as a matter of record.

We have in North Dakota a certain group of people that you do not have anywhere else, who are members of the unemployed organization today. You do not have them in the East. Those are farmers who have been foreclosed and they have moved with their families to town. It does not make any difference what happens, whether you have defense operations or whether you have harvest in North Dakota, which it seems we shall have this year, those men are from 45 to 65 years of age and there is not very much they can do after the harvest season is over. Foreclosures have taken away the only profession they knew anything about. As a result of these foreclosures, which have been wholesale and not individual examples, we are met with the proposition of trying to undo what this Government itself has done. Conditions and the lack of congressional action have wholly unprepared those people to take care of themselves. These tables in the Moodie report will indicate that the amounts you are appropriating this year are not enough for North Dakota, nor enough in any farm State in the West. This House, at times, takes peculiar action. We refused one time to pass a billion-dollar-relief bill and in 3 months we came back and were glad to vote for a four-billion-dollar-relief bill. So this thing is not going to get away with just one sitting of Congress. I anticipate we will be in session right along and as soon as people get hungry enough, at least when enough people get hungry enough, they will get something to eat.

I wish I had as clear a conception of the situation on relief as the junior Member from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER]. His ideas of relief seem to be about as clear as mud. He seems to think it is somebody's fault if he has not a job. When farmers by the wholesale fail through no fault of their own, it cannot be charged that it is the fault of the individual farmer. We have to meet that situation as it comes up, but I want to assure this Congress that there is not anyone in North Dakota, Republican or Democrat, who has anything but praise for the administration of the Federal works program that has been carried on in North Dakota. The administrators here in Washington are most considerate and patient. I am not asking too much to ask you to carefully read the report of the administrator, Mr. Moodie, and you will see from that report and from the telegram from the Governor, who is a Democrat, you will see that there is not enough money to take care of the situation in North Dakota, no matter what happens, because you have that population that has been deprived of their only profession, who will be public charges just as long as time lasts or until they are rehabilitated on farms. Let me say if it had not been for this defense program of ours, instead of having two million out of employment today, you would have fifteen million. Just as soon as this war program ends, unemployment will mount in numbers to more than it ever was. We had better get acquainted with the relief problem now while there is a breathing spell. This bill, after fifty million has been turned over to the Department of Agriculture, is at least one hundred million short of what will be actually needed. If we must save money, is there no place to make a saving except to withdraw work from the poor, the needy, and the hungry? [Applause.]

LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM THOMAS H. MOODIE, STATE ADMINISTRATOR OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION IN NORTH DAKOTA

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Bismarck, N. Dak., June 6, 1941.

The HONORABLE USHER L. BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I am submitting to you a general report on conditions in North Dakota, the probable effect of the new appropriations bill in this State, and other matters pertinent to this whole situation, which I believe will be of interest to you at this time.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. MOODIE,
State Administrator.

W. P. A. AND THE FUTURE IN NORTH DAKOTA

As of this date, June 5, several conditions complicate the W. P. A. picture as to future needs in North Dakota, which are most difficult to estimate.

The general crop prospect as of today is one of the best in the history of the State. There has been sufficient moisture. Small grain crops are well rooted, and the condition of pastures has never been better at this time of the year. One thing is definitely determined now: The feed crop, which is always the most important first consideration in the crop situation, is already assured and will be bountiful in all sections of the State. Two weeks ago there was for a short time a threat of damage in limited areas because of hot winds, but this has been entirely overcome within the past 2 weeks.

The farm-labor situation is causing some anxiety, but up to this time there has been no shortage of farm labor, and few requests have been received by W. P. A. for assistance in providing men for this type of work. If the crop comes through on the present basis, there is a very good prospect that practically all of the W. P. A. projects in North Dakota may have to be shut down during the harvest season to meet this demand for harvest labor. This, of course, can be done without any great inconvenience except in the case of a few of the larger projects, such as the Buford-Trenton Irrigation Project at Williston and the National Defense projects. The North Dakota State Employment Service does not view the prospective labor situation with any great anxiety since it feels that cooperation between the Federal agencies and the public will result in taking care of the harvest labor needs in pretty good shape.

My understanding is that the present W. P. A. appropriations bill provides for an estimated monthly employment, for the continental United States, on an average of 1,000,000 persons. Assuming that the quota will be distributed on the same basis as in the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, it is quite apparent that there will be a heavy cut in W. P. A. jobs available for North Dakota. I have made a compilation of just what this will be and I am herewith submitting it to you.

Month	Estimated employment on basis of 1,000,000 jobs per month for the United States	Average monthly employment during fiscal year of 1941
	1941-42	*1940-41*
July	8,200	9,204
August	7,600	9,173
September	7,600	9,516
October	7,600	10,553
November	7,600	10,773
December	7,600	11,694
January	8,700	13,267
February	8,700	13,847
March	8,300	12,794
April	7,400	12,500
May	6,800	10,500
June	6,500	9,460

Statistical compilations by the Public Welfare Board, through its county organizations, and the Division of Employment of the W. P. A., indicate that at the present time there are in need of employment in North Dakota at least 15,089 persons. The need for employment in North Dakota, of course, is largely governed by seasonal conditions. During the crop planting, tending, and harvesting season, there is a good deal of work on the farms for W. P. A. clients. For instance, the seeding season makes jobs for quite a few men. There is a lag between the time the general seeding is finished and the beginning of harvest, of approximately 30 days, when the people who go to the farms are again for the most part unemployed. How much employment will be necessary during the harvest season is, of course, a factor governed entirely by the size of crops, time of maturity, and methods used in harvesting the same. The harvest season, of course, represents the peak of available jobs in North Dakota. When this is ended, with the exception of those sections of the State where sugar beets

and other root crops are grown, there is a heavy decrease of jobs available on farms.

The big factor in the unemployment situation in North Dakota, which the public does not generally appreciate, is this: In practically all of the towns of the State we have what may be termed a "stranded population." These people for the most part are persons formerly engaged in agricultural pursuits who have left the land, either because of discouragement or because, in a limited number of cases, they were dispossessed for their delinquent obligations. These people have gone to the smaller towns in a rather desperate condition. There was no place else for them to go, and in these towns there is little possibility of their ever getting jobs of any kind. In fact, in most of them there simply are no jobs. Defense industries are not providing any employment in North Dakota at this time outside of that being given on the W. P. A. defense projects.

A typical example of the conditions that exist in some of the smaller North Dakota communities is the village of Strasburg, in Emmons County, where our information indicates that last year more than 90 percent of the people of the town depended entirely upon W. P. A. employment.

While there is under way in North Dakota quite a "back to the land" movement, the fact is that, while well intentioned, it lacks implementation and a sense of direction assuring its effectiveness.

There is nothing in sight at this time that would indicate there will be any great reduction in the number of unemployed in North Dakota next winter. Experience in this program has indicated that there 's a complete change in the general employment situation about October 1 of each year. About that time there is a general suspension of all the seasonal work conducted during the summer by the State highway department and private concerns, and general preparations are being made for North Dakota's long winter. The needs of the people during the winter months are greatly increased. They must have fuel, warmer clothing, and the fact that children in the relief families are going to school increases the average family expense for schoolbooks and other things. All these things contribute to the general anxiety of the unemployed relief workers. Where they cannot be employed by W. P. A., their needs must be met by the welfare board, which is pitifully circumscribed for funds, and faces, if anything, a much greater problem than W. P. A. does in discharging its obligations to the distressed and needy.

Quite a few people are leaving the State at this time for those centers of the country where there is defense-industry employment. However, the greater part of the W. P. A. load is made up of persons who are unable to do this. When it is remembered that 43 percent of all persons employed by W. P. A. in this State are more than 40 years old, and more than 17 percent are more than 45 years old, it can be readily realized why so many W. P. A. workers are reluctant to leave the State and search for private employment elsewhere, especially when they have lived many years here and still have the hope of getting back to the land. This hope, perhaps, is not now based on anything concrete, but is one of those things that spring eternally in the North Dakota breast. Our people love the land, and they would make a great many sacrifices, most of them, to stay here if they could be given any assurance whatever that they could be gotten back on the land with a reasonable prospect for success.

It is my conclusion that unless we are able to maintain W. P. A. employment on about the same basis as it was carried on during the fiscal year of 1940–41, there will be inevitable suffering and hardship among a great group of people in North Dakota.

We have appreciated the consideration given this State by the central office in Washington and by the regional office in St. Paul. However, both are necessarily limited in what they can do for us by the funds made available in W. P. A. appropriations We have the hope here, based upon current newspaper reports, that the defense industries will take up enough of the slack of unemployment so that we in North Dakota can be assured of something like the quota we ought to have. You are perhaps better able to judge of this situation in Washington than we are here. One thing is certain: The proposed reduction in W. P. A. quotas in North Dakota as carried in the proposal of 1,000,000 jobs cannot but work a serious hardship not only to the unemployed people but to the State itself, and cannot but bring additional poignant responsibilities to all those who are connected in any way with any phase of the general relief program.

THOMAS H. MOODIE,
State Administrator.

TELEGRAM FROM THE GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *June 9, 1941.*

USHER L. BURDICK,
Member of House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you support amendment to correct W. P. A. appropriation bill which will remove requirement 25 percent sponsor's contribution for W. P. A. projects. I also urge that you support action to put the administrative budget of W. P. A. back to the figure recommended by Bureau of Budget. I understand that it is proposed to cut administrative funds approximately four and one-half million dollars. This would curtail services needed and appreciated in State from State W. P. A.

JOHN MOSES, *Governor.*

TELEGRAM FROM E. A. WILLSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE STATE WELFARE BOARD OF NORTH DAKOTA

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *June 9, 1941.*

HON. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge your support amendment to W. P. A. appropriation act to eliminate the requirement that sponsors of work projects contribute 25 percent of total costs of projects. Many North Dakota political subdivisions unable to sponsor projects needed to provide employment for unemployed persons if required to contribute 25 percent of costs. Also respectfully urge your support for administrative budget recommended by Budget Board to insure continuation of efficient administration of W. P. A.

E. A. WILLSON.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will talk for 2 minutes. Incidentally, I come from a country where they say all the "Okies" went to California; however, I wish to state that the cream of the crop still resides in Oklahoma. I represent the small businessman, the little farmer, and the little laborer. I want to say that in our section we have not received one benefit at all from the defense program, except the satisfaction of knowing that our country is going to be defended. We are proud of the sacrifices we have made for defense. We have received no other monetary benefits.

Right now I want to compliment each and every one of the 350 Members who voted yesterday for the $10,000,000,000 defense program. I want to say I feel sorry for the one man who did not.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am very sorry. I have been here 2 months, and I have only 2 minutes to talk.

Our country has had 10 years of drought. We do not have any defense projects in the whole territory 300 miles long and 150 miles wide. My people, who are on the W. P. A., are poor people. I am not necessarily defending the State administration of the W. P. A. in Oklahoma. I have not had one bit of cooperation out of them, insofar as nonrelief appointments are concerned. But, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] said, there is not a more honest bunch anywhere than the W. P. A. officers in Oklahoma; and the W. P. A. officials and laborers have rendered valuable service to the district. At this time I want to commend the work done on the schools, the sewing-room program, the road and bridge work, the hot-lunch program, and anything connected with the defense work by the W. P. A. I believe at this time the W. P. A. should continue the defense work and build some military highways, train some mechanics, welders, electricians, and so forth, and that we should allow the sewing rooms to make clothing for the defense projects and continue to work full time on the defense program.

Most of the men and women on the W. P. A. in the Seventh District of Oklahoma are there not of their own wishes and accord but by reason of being forced off of their little farms by droughts, foreclosures, low prices, and large-scale farming. What we need, most of all, is a program that will return the little farmers to the family sized farms where they may be permitted to raise their chickens, hogs, cattle, milk, butter, eggs, gardens, cotton, wheat, feed, and so forth; but until this legislation is granted these laborers we must not take away from them their only means of livelihood.

At this time I desire to point out to you Members of the House the inequality of the W. P. A. wage scale in Oklahoma, especially in my district, and I urge you, in the name of fairness and decency, that it should be remedied and our laborers paid a rate equal to that of other workers in other States.

With reference to laborers working on defense programs who strike, I wish to state again that I am 100 percent for 100-percent American unions, but that I am against these foreign-born, un-American racketeers who foster discontent among our laborers, holding up defense industries when our young men are sacrificing their positions to serve this country at $21 per month. My constituents, consisting of businessmen, laborers, farmers, W. P. A. workers, the aged, the widows and orphans, the ministers, the teachers, the clerks, the doctors who minister to the sick, and all other red-blooded Americans who constitute my district do not strike.

Furthermore, I believe it would be wise for this body to strike from this bill the provisions which would compel laborers to have to lay off after each 18 months' service.

And, furthermore, I believe there should be some adjustment in the provision requiring sponsors to furnish 25 percent of the cost, especially since many

cities and counties in my district are heavily in debt, and especially since our section is not receiving defense projects. May I point out that the cost of living to my people is going up and that a hardship is likewise worked upon the old aged whose income is limited.

Gentlemen, there are no picket lines in my district, and——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, but I think this bill is one of the really important bills that have come before this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the district I represent is known as the iron-ore section. The popular answer to my protest against reduction in W. P. A. expenditures is that everybody is working—the iron mines are there and they are going to ship 80,000,000 tons of ore. Let me tell you what the real circumstances are on information I am sure is correct. In World War No. 1 something like 20,000 people were employed getting ore out of those mines. At this time 5,000 people are doing what 20,000 people did then, and we have an unemployment situation there that is just as acute as it was when this national-defense program started. Under the national-defense program practically no new jobs have been created in that territory and the W. P. A. finds itself carrying just as heavy a load as it carried at that time.

I believe the Casey amendment ought to be adopted. I have figures from the State administrator, Mr. S. L. Stolte, and also from Mr. A. P. Gilbertson, the district manager, which show so far as my particular district is concerned, that out of about 6,000 people employed on W. P. A. over 2,000 will be laid off under the present proposed appropriation, and you have got to add to these 2,000 whatever number will be affected by the $50,000,000 that is to be taken for food stamps.

In the State of Minnesota as of May 1 there were 40,000 employables on W. P. A.; and W. P. A.—based on an appropriation of $975,000,000, even if all of it is used for W. P. A.—can take care of but 27,000. What does this mean? It means that in all these communities—St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, the Iron Range, and other sections—the people who are laid off will be forced back on relief and the relief load will become all the greater. The Casey amendment ought to be adopted.

This furlough, after 18 months on W. P. A. ought to be done away with. The 25-percent sponsors' contribution should also be discontinued. We are making a mistake when we try to cut down on unemployment relief at this time.

I have a protest from a number of small contractors, who say that W. P. A. continuance will injure them. They have been opposed to W. P. A. for a long time; but I want to say to them and to other folks that regardless of the virtues of W. P. A. or regardless of its vices which we have heard so much about this afternoon, this is the method of relief the administration has determined we should have, this W. P. A. method. And we take this method or we take nothing. As a Member of Congress I consider it my duty to the unemployed to try and make this bill a better bill and to work matters out so that until private industry or national-defense industry can take up the slack, the people who want to work, who need work but cannot find it, will have the help of the Government. The administration is not going to let the small contractors do the thing they would like to do.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it not true that some of the cities in the State of Minnesota have practically reached their bonded-debt limitation because of the tremendous relief loads of the past few years?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is especially true in the larger cities.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. And would the gentleman agree with me that the administrator, S. L. Stolte, in the State of Minnesota, as well as some of his assistants, have attempted to do an honorable and a clean and efficient piece of work in administering W. P. A.?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have heard no criticism of Mr. S. L. Stolte, the State administrator. I think he is doing a good job. I know from personal investigation that Mr. A. T. Gilbertson, the district manager in my district, is carrying on his work in a very fine way.

Let me add that we are considering only an appropriation of $875,000,000. Mr. Stolte tells me that, based on this figure, the number who can be employed in Minnesota will be reduced from the May quota of approximately 40,000 to 26,000. Now, with $50,000,000 of this amount to be used to buy food stamps, the number to be taken off the W. P. A. roll will be still further increased. In my particular district, it means that where about 6,000 are now on W. P. A. rolls, between 2,000 and 3,000 will be laid off. Congress should not adopt this procedure. While we are spending money to send supplies to the people in Europe, and elsewhere, the least we can do is to deal decently with the people of the United States. We cannot do so with this reduced appropriation. In the district I represent, in addition to W. P. A. workers, there is a relief list of large proportions. In my county alone, St. Louis County, Mr. A. J. Erchul, executive secretary of the County Welfare Board, advises me that 5,249 persons were on direct relief as of May 1, 1941. I have already indicated that all workers taken off W. P. A. will have to go back on relief rolls. The administration has a direct duty under these circumstances to increase the appropriations for W. P. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, today we hear on all sides the plea for national unity. We are told that unless we are united in our effort to help England and her allies, democracy will become extinct throughout the world.

This stress on national unity, unity of purpose to establish peace and contentment throughout the world is a real and vital issue, not only of today, but every day if civilization and the better things in life are to be preserved.

We do not take issue on giving England material aid with the exception of our manpower. We place our resources, without restriction, at the disposal of England in her war to preserve democracy.

But while we are making our resources available to foreign nations we must be mindful of the needs of the men, women, and children of our own Nation. To me this is just as vital, if not more vital in establishing unity of purpose, than any other action that can be taken by our Government.

The resources of the United States belong to the American people first. If we cannot preserve our own unity, why attempt to preserve the unity of other nations?

Democracy means economic security and opportunity to make a living if the rights guaranteed under our Constitution are to be preserved. If England occupies the first line of defense of this Nation, as we have so often been told, then even before today the first line of defense of our own democracy is the establishment of the vitality of our own people on a firm foundation.

From the vitality of our own people come all plans of defense and the vital bodies and minds to man the guns to ward off aggression. The right to live must be established at home, as well as abroad, if we are to be preserved as a Nation. We cannot hope to preserve democracy abroad if we do not preserve democracy at home; and economic security at home is the foundation of democracy. If we stand by England with our resources, surely, we must be true to ourselves and afford the same resources to our own people.

The idea of taking care of a foreign nation and not equally taking care of our own Nation will cause the world to question our sincerity or to smile at our stupidity.

While we have and will appropriate billions of dollars to aid other nations, let us not lose sight of our own domestic problems.

With our great preparedness program getting under full steam the administration is hopeful that there will be a decrease in the number of unemployed. This may be true in the great industrialized areas of the country, but in my district in Pennsylvania—the anthracite-mining area—it is not true. The defense program in my district, to date, has resulted in many of our people migrating to the industrialized areas, thereby separating families and causing a great deal of confusion. But the relief rolls continue just the same and with little or no decrease.

Therefore, while this condition exists, I am for the relief of our people.

I have for the past year and a half brought to the attention of our officials in the various Government departments

details on the great number of idle factories and vacant floor space in my district that could be utilized for some of our defense projects. We have had these facilities listed for over a year, but it all seems to be of no avail. And yet, in the four great anthracite-coal-producing counties of Pennsylvania, namely, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Schuylkill, and Northumberland—the latter two being in my district—the W. P. A. expenditures and general assistance—relief—has averaged approximately $40,000,000 per year for 1938, 1939, and 1940, or an approximate total expenditure for the past 3 years of $120,000,000. A break-down of this amount follows:

	1938	1939	1940
Work Projects Administration expenditures	$44,398,863	$26,480,557	$14,018,114
General assistance (relief)	7,316,122	14,068,006	12,515,916
Total	51,714,985	40,548,563	26,534,030

These are facts from which we cannot escape, and since my district is dependent almost entirely on the production of anthracite coal, the program of preparedness has not benefited us to any appreciable degree. We have plenty of available unemployed that could be an asset and help in our national defense, if only given the opportunity.

At the present time there are 8,300 families comprising 19,800 persons who are receiving aid from the board of assistance in Schuylkill County. This includes general assistance, or unemployment relief, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and blind pension. Of the 8,300 cases, 3,436 comprising 8,767 persons are general-assistance cases.

It is estimated that at the present time there are approximately 5,000 workers on W. P. A., who at an average wage of $42.50 per month are responsible for about 20,000 persons. During the 12 months ended April 30, 1941, the Schuylkill County board of assistance has disbursed $2,775,226.76 to families in Schuylkill County. This sum is broken down by type of assistance as follows:

Old-age assistance	$504,393.60
Blind pension	96,078.20
Aid to dependent children	651,165.75
General assistance	1,523,589.21

With an average of 5,000 cases on W. P. A. during the past year it is estimated that W. P. A. paid $2,664,000. This would make a total figure for the principal relief agencies of $5,439,226.76.

In Northumberland County during the month of March 1941, the average number of persons dependent upon public assistance was 22,846 or 18 percent of the population of the county. The total expenditures by the Northumberland County board of assistance for the same month were $193,479.90. It is estimated that during the current month 11,025 persons were supported by the employment of 3,125 persons on W. P. A.

From the afore-mentioned figures it can be seen that there are almost 43,000 persons dependent upon some form of relief in my district of Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties in Pennsylvania.

Certainly an unemployed people is not in the best interests of national unity. This condition is aggravated in my district by discriminatory wage cuts by the Work Projects Administration which resulted in September of 1939 in the W. P. A laborer being given a cut of 27 percent, or from $60 a month to $42.50.

Despite the high cost of living in my district—which cost is rapidly rising—and the increase of wages throughout the country in general, the W. P. A. cut in my district has never been restored.

An unjustified cut in the W. P. A. worker's wages of $16, or 27 percent a month, is certainly not conducive to national unity. Such a cut in wages is absolutely unfair and discriminatory. Such wages are starvation wages.

Let me reiterate that while we are appropriating billions to aid other nations, let us be mindful of the needs of our own citizens, men and women who through no fault of their own are still among the Nation's five to nine million unemployed.

March estimates of unemployment and preliminary figures for April as published by three private organizations are as follows:

	March	April
Congress of Industrial Organizations	9,062,000	8,350,000
National Industrial Conference Board	6,117,000	5,412,000
American Federation of Labor	7,540,000	6,923,000

I have persistently tried to have the wages of the W. P. A. workers at least restored to their former levels, and in this respect have already addressed the House on several occasions, as well as offering legislation for this purpose to establish a prevailing rate of wage.

When amendments are being considered to the bill now under consideration I propose to offer an amendment to establish a basic wage rate for the W. P. A. worker. It is the duty of every Member of this House to at least restore the basic wage previously paid the W. P. A. laborer, so that our unemployed—Americans like you and I—are at least given a sustenance wage until men and women are back to normal employment.

This cannot be denied if we are to have domestic peace and contentment. We cannot deny this to our fellow Americans if we are sincere in trying to establish national unity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the distinction falls to me of being the last speaker before the House this afternoon, and for this reason I will not undertake to present more than one or two observations that I feel are worth making.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill, and although, frankly, I was adverse to doing so last year, I did finally vote for it. Since then, having seen billions of dollars appropriated for the defense of the Nation which I assume are absolutely necessary, and also after having seen some $7,000,000,000 appropriated for the defense of a foreign nation, I feel it is high time and proper that we scrape up a few dollars here today for the urgent relief of our Nation's needy.

It is not my purpose to discuss the administration of relief as provided in this bill, because I do not pretend to be a judge of the proper administration of relief. I have gone on record many times as favoring as near as possible the handling of relief by local officials and by persons who are cognizant of local problems; but, as one of the gentlemen who spoke before me mentioned, if we do not take this we will not get anything. For this reason I believe it is absolutely necessary to accept this bill in its entirety. Earlier in the afternoon I asked the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] if he felt that a certain proportion of these millions of dollars should be used for the defense projects of the Nation, and he answered that there were plans afoot to utilize at least $300,000,000 for this purpose. I heartily agree with him in this matter, and I am glad to see this amount being used for that purpose.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I cannot forget that, despite the fact billions of dollars are being poured into the national-defense program, there are sections of the country which are not getting what they ought to out of the defense program. I am not satisfied by any means with the defense orders that have been given to my particular locality. I feel more of the deserving firms and contractors within my district could have been more adequately considered. This leaves in my section a condition of unemployment which can only be remedied by the appropriation of millions of dollars at this time for W. P. A. As I have tried to emphasize, I cannot be reconciled to the Federal administration of relief because it represents an impersonal approach to the problem, but since we have no alternative we must accept this. The administration of even that form of relief, at least so far as my particular locality is concerned, is certainly better than no relief at all. There is a vast group of citizens which will be included in this program and cannot be included in defense work. Lest untold sufferings and hardship be brought upon the unfortunate and needy at home, I urge the House to pass this work-relief appropriation now, not only as a necessity but as insurance against trouble and misery among our own fellow Americans who should by all means have our first consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD two statements by Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the benefit of the Members the program for the remainder of the week. Tomorrow will be Calendar Wednesday, and the Committee on Agriculture will have the first call. That committee will call up the crop-insurance bill. Then there is a wildlife bill introduced by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] that will be called up. Those are the only bills to be called up by the Committee on Agriculture.

If there is time left, the Committee on Foreign Affairs will have the call, and I am informed that that committee will call up S. 1544, the inter-American highway bill, and H. R. 4973, a bill which relates to the control of travel to and from the United States.

The W. P. A. bill will come up again on Thursday. If the consideration of that bill is concluded early in the afternoon, it is my intention to call up a bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs relating to the temporary promotion of warrant officers, petty officers, and officers called back to service. The calling up of this bill depends upon whether or not the opportunity exists on Thursday. If not, I doubt whether the bill will be called up this week.

On Friday the District appropriation bill will come up for consideration, instead of on Thursday, because the pending bill will be considered on Thursday.

I just wanted to make this announcement for the benefit of the Members of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein a table of statistics relating to the W. P. A. in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, June 16, 1941, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein two short tables on the W. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the administration of poor relief in the Virginias, and to include therein an article on that subject by Charles McCamic, of Wheeling, W. Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein certain documents to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. RABAUT submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter under date of May 19 from Mr. S. L. Stolte, Administrator of the Work Projects Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by J. Adam Bede. I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the article exceeds 2 pages in length. It is a little over 2 pages. I now renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an account of a patriotic meeting in my district in Pittsburg County, which I have the honor to represent. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCRUGHAM, for 3 weeks, on account of military training, Army antiaircraft artillery school.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 378. An act to amend the act of October 6, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 452. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 456. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 633. An act to amend the Criminal Code in respect to fires on the public domain or Indian lands or on certain lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 708. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 1051. An act relating to the payment of fees and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1052. An act relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of judges and retired judges of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1289. An act authorizing the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

S. 1488. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940, Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1508. An act to provide for the pay of aviation pilots in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite

the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, June 11, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. Mr. Littell will appear.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will continue public hearings on the subject of royalty payments and the freezing of funds, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, Executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

626. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to $393,000 (H. Doc. No. 254); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

627. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1941, aggregating $100,075,000 (H. Doc. No. 255); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

628. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $5,600,000, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 256); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

629. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and administrative expenses for the Electric Home and Farm Authority for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $600,000 (H. Doc. No. 257); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

630. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942, for the District of Columbia, involving an increase of $525,000 (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

631. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Supplement to part 2 to accompany H. R. 4854. A bill facilitating and simplifying the administration of the Federal reclamation laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4276. A bill making appropriations for the Department of State, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 760). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 5014. A bill to provide for the development of electrical power from coal in southern Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 5015. A bill to provide for the registration of labor organizations having members engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and to impose duties upon such labor organizations and the members thereof and to impose liability for unlawful acts upon such organizations and the members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 5016. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5017. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of all streams in San Diego and Imperial Counties in the State of California, which flow into the Salton Sea for flood-control and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5018. A bill making it unlawful for Harry Bridges to be and/or remain in the United States or any other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 231. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate charges against the Jewish race; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Hogan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 5020. A bill granting a pension to Mary Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5021. A bill for the relief of Capt. Alex Papana; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 5022. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Houghlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 5023. A bill to authorize cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of James Leo Shannon; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 5024. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Winston Cann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1356. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of Walter Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., and other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 3852, which would authorize the District of Columbia Board of Barber Examiners to establish opening and closing hours and a day on which barber shops shall remain closed after an investigation as to the preference of a majority of the licensed barbers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1357. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N. Y., memorializing Congress to oppose any change in the existing law for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry in the State of New York that would add additional burden on the American consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1358. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 citizens of Bruin, Pa., urging the reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 for the protection of young men of 1941 and for the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1359. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Rev. Wallace B. Johnson and other residents of Youngsville, Pa., opposing convoys or moves

toward war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1360. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of certain citizens of Marinette, Wis., requesting support of House bi'l 2475, to protect the health and morale of the youth called to training under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1361. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition signed by Nellie M. Osmun and 21 other residents, of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1362. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the Townsend Club of Platte, S. Dak., asking that House bill 1036 be brought before the House of Representatives for consideration and vote; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1363. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of the Basin Miners' Union, No. 23, John Wallin, financial secretary, urging an investigation of labor policies of industries engaged in defense work before curtailing the freedom of labor, an investigation of money being spent by manufacturers on antilabor propaganda and that the results of these investigations be made public; to the Committee on Labor.

1364. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Wisconsin State Junior Chamber of Commerce convention, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to standing behind the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1365. Also, petition of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, who hast taught us in Thy Holy Word that Thou art an ever-present, loving Father from whom no secret place is hidden, and to whom every thought, word, and action is known: As we meet together to bear anew the responsibility of making decisions in the name of our Nation, help us to realize Thy Presence and, through renewed consecration to Thee, to find comfort and happiness therein. By Thine indwelling Spirit, O Lord, make us truthful in all our words, holy in all our thoughts, honest in every deed, that our whole life may reveal Thy Presence, and the people of America, knowing that we are led of Thee, may be knit together in unity of purpose. May they manifest great zeal in righteousness and in fervor of spirit, that they may serve Thee in all things until Thy most sure promises have been fulfilled and all nations have brought their glory and honor into Thy Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 10, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Caroline Janes;

S. 1438. An act to extend the operations of the Disaster Loan Corporation and the Electric Home and Farm Authority, to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Adams	Burton	Gerry
Aiken	Butler	Gillette
Andrews	Byrd	Glass
Bailey	Byrnes	Green
Ball	Capper	Gurney
Bankhead	Caraway	Hayden
Barbour	Chandler	Herring
Bilbo	Chavez	Hill
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Holman
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Houston
Bridges	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Brooks	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Brown	Davis	Kilgore
Bulow	Downey	La Follette
Bunker	George	Lodge
Lucas	Overton	Thomas, Idaho
McCarran	Pepper	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tobey
McKellar	Rosier	Tunnell
McNary	Shipstead	Tydings
Maloney	Smathers	Vandenberg
Murdock	Smith	Van Nuys
Norris	Spence	Wallgren
Nye	Stewart	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Taft	White

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the illness of his mother.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FIRST REPORT UNDER LEND-LEASE ACT (S. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 5 (b) of Public Law No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by me on March 11, 1941, provides in part as follows:

> The President, from time to time but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act except such information as he deems incompatible with the public interest to disclose.

In compliance with this provision, I am submitting this report.

We have supplied, and we will supply, planes, guns, ammunition, and other defense articles in ever-increasing quantities to Britain, China, and other democracies resisting aggression.

Wars are not won by guns alone, but wars are not won without guns. We all know this full well now. Beginning with the outbreak of the war, the American public began to realize that it was in our own national interest and security to help Britain, China, and the other democratic nations.

Beginning with the outbreak of the war, British and French orders began to be placed. But dollars could not be immediately turned into airplanes and ships and guns and ammunition.

In those dark days when France was falling, it was clear that this Government, to carry out the will of the people, had to render aid over and above the matériel coming off the assembly line. This Government, therefore, made available all that it possibly could out of its surplus stocks of munitions. In June of 1940, the British Government received from our surplus stocks, rifles, machine guns, field artillery, ammunition, and aircraft in a value of more than $43,000,000. This was equipment that would have taken months and months to produce and which, with the exception of the aircraft, cost about $300,000,000 to produce during the World War period. Most of this matériel would not have been usable if we had kept it much longer. This equipment arrived in Britain after the retreat from Dunkirk, where the British had lost great quantities of guns and other military supplies. No one can appraise what effect the delivery of these supplies had upon the successful British resistance in the summer and fall of 1940 when they were fighting against such terrific odds.

Since June 1940, this Government has continued to supply war matériel from its surplus stocks, in addition to the matériel produced by private manufacturers. The 50 over-age destroyers which Britain received in exchange for the defense bases were a part of the aid supplied by the Government.

By the turn of the year 1941, the British commitments in this country for defense articles had reached the limit of their future dollar resources. Their striking power required the assurance that their munitions and equipment would steadily and certainly be augmented, not curtailed.

The will of our people, as expressed through the Congress, was to meet this problem, not only by the passage of the Lend Lease Act but by the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 made on March 27 of this year to carry out this task.

In the 90 days since the Lend Lease Act was passed, and in the 74 days since the funds were appropriated, we have started in motion the vast supply program which is essential to the defeat of the Axis Powers.

In these 74 days more than four and one-fourth billion dollars out of the $7,000,000,000 have been allocated to the War, Navy, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments and to the Maritime Commission to procure the aid authorized. Contracts have been let for long-range bombers, ships, tanks, and the other sinews of war that will be needed for the defense of the democracies. The balance of less than two and three-fourths billion is being rapidly allocated.

To be effective, the aid rendered by us must be many sided. Ships are necessary to carry the munitions and the food. We are immediately making available to Britain 2,000,000 gross tons of cargo ships and oil tankers.

But this is not enough. Adequate shipping for every day to come must be reasonably assured. Since the Appropriation Act was passed, $550,000,000 has been allocated for the construction of new ships under the Lend Lease Act. Contracts have been let, and the new ways required to build these ships are now nearing completion. Allied ships are being repaired by us. Allied ships are being equipped by us to protect them from mines and are being armed by us to protect them as much as possible against raiders. Naval vessels of Britain are being repaired by us so that they can return quickly to their naval tasks.

The training program of 7,000 British pilots in our schools in this country is under way. Valuable information is being communicated, and other material assistance is being rendered in a mounting benefit to the democracies.

Millions of pounds of food are being and will be sent. Iron and steel, machine tools, and the other essentials to maintain and increase the production of war materials in Britain are being sent and received in larger quantities day by day.

Since September 1939, the war goods sent to Britain have risen steadily. The over-all total exports to the British Empire have greatly increased in 1941 over 1940. What is more important, the exports of those things which are necessary for fighting have increased far beyond our other exports. In the first 5 months of this year, we have sent more than 12 times as many airplanes to Britain as we did in the first 5 months of 1940. And as the rate of aircraft production increases, relatively more and more heavy bombers and medium bombers are being sent. At the same time, we have sent more than 10 times as many aircraft engines in the first 5 months of 1941 as we did in the first 5 months of 1940. For the first 4 months of this year, the dollar value of explosives sent to the British Empire was about 17 times as much as for the first 4 months of 1940. Ninety times as much in dollar value of firearms and ammunition was sent to Britain during the first 4 months of this year as for the first 4 months of 1940.

With our natural resources, our productive capacity, and the genius of our people for mass production, we will help Britain to outstrip the Axis Powers in munitions of war, and we will see to it that these munitions get to the places where they can be effectively used to weaken and defeat the aggressors.

In the report that follows, facts and figures are given to the extent advisable without disclosing military secrets to benefit the Axis Powers. These facts describe the past and portray the present status of our aid to those nations so gallantly fighting the aggressors. They do not present the most important fact of all—the strong will of our people to see to it that these forces of aggression shall not rule the world.

We have before us a constant purpose not of present safety alone but, equally, of future survival.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1941.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and the accompanying report will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed, with illustrations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefore entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEGISLATION BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the municipal councils of St. Croix and St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

VICTOR M. LENZER

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former Special Disbursing Agent, Department of Labor (with an accompany paper); to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 25

"Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to extend the provisions of the United States Social Security Act to include State, county, and municipal employees, and employees of nonprofit religious, charitable, and educational institutions

"We, the members of the Senate of the Eighteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma recognizing that in all its phases, the United States Social Security Act has been a bulwark of the American family and the American home, establishing itself as a stabilizing influence on our economic system, and a powerful safeguard against subversive forces that would undermine our political institutions; and above all, represents for all of us the proud expression of our faith in the processes and the ways of democracy in combating the ever-present enemies of poverty and insecurity in our midst; and that no other single act of Congress embodies such enormous advances in the security and dignity of the individual citizen, do hereby

"*Resolve*, To memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of the act to include State, county, and municipal employees, and employees of nonprofit religious, charitable, and educational institutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate be ordered to send copies of this resolution to the United States Congress and to the Members of the Oklahoma delegation to Congress.

"Adopted by the senate the 21st day of May 1941."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for

the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Farlington and Hiatville, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Wakarusa and Scranton, Kans., remonstrating against participation by the United States in foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Turon and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 419).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 201. A bill for the relief of Henry Kotila; without amendment (Rept. No. 420);

H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Roche, Connell and Laub Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 421);

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette; without amendment (Rept. No. 422);

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley; without amendment (Rept. No. 423);

H. R. 3399. A bill for the relief of Tom Gentry; without amendment (Rept. No. 424); and

H. R. 3520. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schmidt; without amendment (Rept. No. 425).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Elinor Leugers; without amendment (Rept. No. 426);

H. R. 241. A bill for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts; without amendment (Rept. No. 427);

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Rinzo Takata; without amendment (Rept. No. 428);

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy; without amendment (Rept. No. 429); and

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston; without amendment (Rept. No. 430).

By Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 431);

H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum; with an amendment (Rept. No. 435);

H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of James A. Mills; without amendment (Rept. No. 432);

H. R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime; without amendment (Rept. No. 433); and

H. R. 4459. A bill to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 434).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck; without amendment (Rept. No. 436).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, June 11, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1622. A bill to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 1623, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1624. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the estate or next of kin of United States citizens who die as a result of certain warlike operations outside of the territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1625 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations"; and

S. 1626. A bill to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1627. A bill to provide for a quinquennial census of industry and business and for the collection of current statistics by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1628. A bill for the relief of S. R. Brackin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1629. A bill for the relief of Catharine Schultze; to the Committee on Claims.

PHILIPPINE EXPORT TAXES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce, by request, a bill which touches on Philippine matters and the Philippine Independence Act. I am doing this at the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, Delegate ELIZALDE. He asked me to do it in order that the matter may be heard. The difficulties between the United States and the islands and between the islands and the rest of the world in this emergency have thrown on the Philippines certain burdens which he asks to have adjusted.

I ask that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the letter which the Delegate has written to me explaining the need for the bill, together with a copy of the bill, so that Members may be advised.

I am doing this by request.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1623) to suspend the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a period of 1 year commencing July 1, 1941, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and, with the accompanying letter, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.:

SECTION 1. That the imposition and collection of the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes" (48 Stat. 456), as amended by the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1226; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 48, sec. 1236), shall be suspended for a period of 1 year, commencing on July 1, 1941.

SEC. 2. Commencing July 1, 1942, the imposition of such export tax shall be resumed, the tax rate effective for the remainder of said calendar year to be the same as the rate in effect at the time the tax was suspended; on each succeeding January 1 thereafter the export tax shall be increased progressively by an additional 5 percent of the United States duty, except that during the period January 1, 1946, through July 3, 1946, the export tax shall remain at 20 percent of the United States duty.

SEC. 3. All laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1941.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Concerning my conversations with you on the subject of Philippine export taxes and the proposal to suspend their collection for a time, I beg leave to summarize herewith the reasons which, in the opinion of the Commonwealth Government, justify such remedial legislation by the Congress:

(1) The Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, as amended, having been enacted in normal times and designed to effectuate an economic readjustment program predicated on a world at peace, could in justice be amended to meet the altered conditions now prevalent and afford needed relief to the Filipino people.

(2) The war has completely thwarted all our plans of stabilizing our export trade by easing out from complete dependence on the American market. We have lost the bulk of our European commerce and are resigned to its virtual extinction as the ravages of war are accentuated.

(3) The extension to the Philippines of the export-control law has dealt practically a

death blow to our export trade in the Orient. As a result of the loss of our European markets, we have found ourselves in the immediate past increasingly dependent on certain countries of east Asia for the disposal of some of our main commodities. Considering the nature of these exports, it is a certainty that their control—not to say curtailment—will paralyze important Philippine industries of recent development which depend for their existence entirely on oriental markets.

(4) The very lifeblood of our national economy, our trade with the United States, is immediately threatened by an acute shortage of ships in the Pacific. As a necessary consequence, freight rates and insurance charges are rising to prohibitive proportions; because of the disproportionate increase in distribution charges, the net prices accruing to our primary producers are distressingly low.

(5) Every dollar we can spare and originally intended to fortify the economic structure of our country—as in the case of the still unappropriated moneys accruing from sugar excise taxes and the so-called gold devaluation profit funds amounting to approximately $53,000,000—must now be utilized exclusively for defense purposes;

(6) The security provided for the redemption of the bonded indebtedness, even if reduced by the loss of 1 year's collection of export taxes, would still be amply sufficient. Assuming that the export taxes would be suspended from July 1, 1941 to July 1, 1942, the total collections by July 4, 1946, would amount to $25,682,323, while the net bonded debt of the Commonwealth at that time, after deducting sinking-fund reserves, will amount to only $20,238,975;

(7) Under these conditions, the export tax weighs heavily on our economy. If relief is not forthcoming, the inevitable outcome will be reduction in Government revenues, widespread unemployment, social unrest, and human suffering.

I am enclosing herewith a draft of a bill proposing the export-tax suspension, which I hope will meet with your approval and deserve the invaluable interest you have always had in the affairs of the Philippines. Specifically—and following your suggestions—the proposed amendment would suspend, for a period of 1 year, the imposition and collection of the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the independence law, the said tax to be resumed at the same rate as when suspended and increased progressively by 5 percent every year thereafter.

So as to prevent any misconception on the motives and purpose of this legislation, I should like to affirm categorically that this temporary adjustment for relief in no way contemplates any alteration in the program of ultimate independence for the Philippines in 1946, nor even a change in the philosophy underlying the 10-year economic-adjustment plan charted for the Commonwealth by law.

Thanking you for your generous assistance and assuring you of my high esteem and consideration, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

J. M. ELIZALDE,
Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States.

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment submitted by Mr. CONNALLY to the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION PERTAINING TO INJURIES AND DISEASES OF RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 128), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Railroad Retirement Board is authorized and directed to make an immediate, thorough, and complete investigation of the incidence of injuries and diseases incurred by employees through employment in the railroad industry and the social and economic consequences of such injuries and diseases, and to report to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce at the earliest practicable time the results of its investigation.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I present the report of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, 1941, and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1941

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated in January this year to constitute the 1941 Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

Senators: Hon. CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, appointed by the President of the Senate; Hon. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, appointed by Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and ex officio member of the Board of Visitors, to serve in his stead; Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; and Hon. RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, member ex officio; Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York; Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia; and Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, all appointed by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Hon. WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, of Connecticut, and Hon. LEWIS D. THILL, of Wisconsin, appointed by the Speaker, House of Representatives.

In accordance with previous arrangement, a special car was available on the Colonial Express, leaving Washington at 9 a. m., May 2. Senators HATCH and PEPPER and Representatives CULKIN, RAMSPECK, FITZGERALD, and THILL departed on above train and arrived at New London at 3:38 p. m. Those present witnessed a special evening parade and review of the cadet battalion at retreat. Later in the evening, at 8:32 p. m., Senator BREWSTER and Representative BLAND arrived, they not having been able to leave earlier in the day. The Superintendent of the Academy, Capt. James Pine, entertained the Board at a dinner at the Mohican Hotel, which was attended by a number of Academy officers and other senior officers located in New London. Senator BREWSTER and Representative BLAND were able to arrive before the dinner was completed.

The next morning, May 3, the Board met at 9:30 a. m., and, following the custom of choosing a chairman alternate years from the Senate members and House members, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, was elected Chairman. Commander (E) Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, continued to act as secretary to the Board.

The Chairman invited Capt. James Pine, Superintendent of the academy, to be present at the meeting. The meeting was also joined by Prof. G. E. Russell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dean J. W. Barker, Columbia University; and Judge T. W. Swan, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, these three gentlemen being members of the advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy and representing a quorum of said committee.

Captain Pine addressed the meeting and explained that of the five recommendations made by the previous Board of Visitors, each of said recommendations covering the need for appropriations for new construction, four of the items had been authorized, and that the items for extension of the library and extension of the cadet barracks appropriations had been set up, contracts let, and work already commenced; and that in connection with the proposed new infirmary and ordnance buildings and boathouse and wharves, the appropriations had been made and the contracts were in the process of being let. He stated that no funds had been made available for item 5, which recommended a sailing vessel to replace the schooner *Chase*, of $200,000. He stated, however, that the magnificent gift of the schooner *Atlantic* by Mr. Gerald Lambert had supplied the academy with this need, but due to the present conditions of emergency there would not be available this year any Coast Guard cutters to take the majority of cadets on the very necessary summer cruise. The *Atlantic* would be satisfactory for handling the second class, which makes a short cruise in a sailing vessel, but could not possibly be used to accommodate the major portion of the corps. He explained to the Board that the Coast Guard had entered into negotiations with the Danish Minister tending toward the purchase of the *Danmark*, a Danish training sailing ship. This vessel, he explained, was ideally suited for the purpose of training Coast Guard cadets and could accommodate 120 cadets. It was further developed that the *Danmark* could probably be purchased for $350,000, but could not be replaced in this country for less than several times such amount.

The Superintendent then explained to the Board the need for a chapel at the academy, which had been provided for in the original plans but which had not been built due to the shortage of funds. He explained that at present chapel services were held in McAllister Hall, and that said auditorium seated a maximum of not over 306, which would not be large enough for next year's cadet corps.

The Board expressed the desire to meet the chaplain, and Commander W. J. Moore, Chaplain Corps, United States Navy, entered and gave a short talk, explaining that he was detailed to and serving part time at the academy and part time at the submarine base. He went into the matter quite extensively explaining the very great need for a suitable chapel, to be built as such and not to be in any way a makeshift arrangement. He especially emphasized the tangible advantages to a cadet corps in having such an institution part of their cadet life, and the advantages that the chapel would serve in memorializing outstanding events in the history of the school and the service. He complimented highly the solidarity of the battalion of Coast Guard cadets, and spoke from

experience and knowledge of the other two Government military academies. He left with the Board a memorandum, which is attached hereto.

A number of the members of the Board questioned the Superintendent, and it was developed that a suitable chapel would probably cost in the neighborhood of $250,000 or $300,000, and that in the case of the ship *Danmark*, said vessel would be of sufficient size to handle all of the cadets this year, and would be of definite permanent value to the Coast Guard. Some discussion was had as to whether or not the *Danmark* could be purchased under the terms of H. R. 4466 should it become law. It later developed that the provisions of said bill would probably not provide for the purchase of such a vessel.

The advisory committee was invited to explain to the Board its origin, and the part it had played in developing the curriculum now in effect at the Coast Guard Academy. This was done, and the Board was much impressed with the splendid contribution this group of prominent educators had made in raising the Coast Guard Academy to its present high standing, which includes accrediting by the Association of American Universities, and authorizing the granting of bachelor of science degrees. A copy of the committee's recent report to the Commandant of the Coast Guard following its spring meeting was produced for the information of the Board, and is attached hereto.

Appreciation for the high type of educational institution maintained by the Coast Guard for the instruction and preparation of its young officers is expressed by the Board, a majority of whose members had not previously seen the academy. The Board is pleased with what it finds as regards the administration of the academy, with the curriculum so ably and intelligently supervised by the advisory committee, with the maintenance of the buildings and grounds, and with the splendid type of American youth composing the Cadet Corps.

The Board recommends—

That the Danish training ship *Danmark* be acquired through proper procedure from the Danish Government for use in national defense as a training ship by the Coast Guard Academy.

That there be constructed with all reasonable dispatch a suitable and appropriate chapel at the Coast Guard Academy.

That, because the Coast Guard Academy offers an excellent opportunity for an education and career to qualified young men throughout the country, and because better material obtained insures a more efficient operation of the academy and a higher-class product, the Coast Guard make a thorough study to reach a still larger number of prospective suitable candidates with information regarding the opportunities in the yearly competitive examination held throughout the United States, and refer this study with recommendations to the committees of Congress having appropriate jurisdiction.

The following motion was passed unanimously:

That the chairman of the Board be authorized to appoint subcommittees of this Board to make recommendations for the promotion of the welfare of the Coast Guard Academy and of the Coast Guard, and to deal with any other matters within the jurisdiction of the Board.

Robert Ramspeck, Chairman; Carl A. Hatch; Claude Pepper; Ralph O. Brewster; Schuyler O. Bland; Francis D. Culkin; Lewis D. Thill; William J. Fitzgerald; Josiah W. Bailey; Ellis Reed-Hill, Secretary.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY,
New London, Conn., May 3, 1941.

Memorandum from the academy chaplain to the Congressional Board of Visitors.

Subject: Necessity of an academy chapel, report on.

1. The Congressional Board of Visitors is informed that the United States Coast Guard Academy has no chapel, designed as such, for the service a chapel affords to such an institution as the United States Coast Guard Academy is.

2. The use of the McAllister Engineering Building auditorium as a chapel is a makeshift, and within the calendar year may be found to be very inadequate even as to seating capacity for the academy personnel and authorized visitors to the academy.

3. Far more important, however, than as to seating capacity in the need of a chapel is its service to morale, direct recognition of religious belief, and the stimulation of esprit d'corps of the entire United States Coast Guard Service, ashore and afloat, to be had only through memorial channels fixed in a carefully designed chapel. We need a real chapel at the United States Coast Guard Academy.

4. A site is in mind. Ground work as to preliminary planning is in existence. The temper of the entire battalion of cadets is ripe for making varied and constant use of a real chapel. At West Point and at Annapolis the Army's and the Navy's great regimental chapels are indispensable to the esprit d'corps of those services.

It is particularly important that in such an organization as is the United States Coast Guard, an organization founded and maintained to enforce the law of the land, to save life, and with a record as inspiring as it is long, should have a chapel second to none in significance and beauty of construction.

J. W. MOORE,
Commander,
Chaplain Corps, United States Navy.

APRIL 17, 1941.

Rear Admiral R. R. WAESCHE,
Commandant, United States
Coast Guard Headquarters,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL: The advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy held its annual meeting in Washington on April 10 and 11, 1941, and herewith makes its report to you, as follows:

ITEM NO. 1. CRUISE

This appears to our advisory committee to be one of the most important educational problems now facing the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Academy. The transfer of 10 lake-class cruising cutters to British control and the probable unavailability of other cruising cutters makes the assignment of Coast Guard cutters for the practice cruise an impossibility. From the educational viewpoint we have always considered, and we now strongly reaffirm, that the entire curriculum contemplates practical work in deck and engineering duties, and the discipline and indoctrination in seamanshiplike qualities which can only be given on the practice cruises. There is no substitute. Conditions at the academy during the progress of construction work will make the use of the academy a practical impossibility this coming summer.

The suggestion for sending the first-class cadets in small groups of five or six to the remaining cruising cutters has certain possibilities and certain draw-backs. The adequacy of the training to be received by such small groups would depend entirely on the sympathetic understanding of commanding officers. Certain questions also occur to us as to the possible supervision which would be given to the development of the cadet notebooks on engineering and deck exercises under such divided responsibilities. The consequent dispersion of the cadets would tend to defeat one of the objects of the cruise, namely, the development of esprit de corps under the leadership of the first class.

Another suggestion has to do with securing from the Maritime Commission the complete assignment to the Coast Guard of either the *American Seaman* or the *American Sailor* for the period of the usual academy practice cruise of 10 weeks. Although the engine-room equipment of the converted cargo ships is not by any means equivalent to that on a Coast Guard cutter, we believe that this suggestion offers the only acceptable substitute for a cutter cruise. We recommend that immediate steps be taken to secure the assignment of one of these vessels.

As to the second-class cruise which has previously been made with the *Chase* and certain 175-foot Diesel cutters of the *Argo* class, we believe this to be an invaluable training complementing the practice cruise. The following quotation from a memorandum of the academy staff, entitled "The Need of the Coast Guard Academy for Sailing Training Ships," is endorsed by the Advisory Committee:

"It is the considered opinion of the Superintendent and faculty of the Coast Guard Academy that training in sail is essential to the proper instruction of cadets in preparation for their future duties as commissioned officers of the Coast Guard. This opinion is based upon the considerations of the duties that these officers will be called upon to perform.

"The Coast Guard cutters are relatively small, ranging in size from patrol boats to ships of about 2,000 tons. Most of the work of the Service is performed in coastal waters, where shoals are treacherous, currents swift, and violent storms with heavy seas are to be expected. Since calls for assistance are usually a result of severe weather, the cutters must be prepared to perform their duties under difficult circumstances. Under these conditions ability in seamanship is essential not only to the safety of the boats and ships of the Service but to the adequacy of the protection afforded to ships in distress. The reputation of the Coast Guard in the final analysis depends upon the ability of its officers in seamanship. This ability can only be acquired through training in handling all types of boats and cutters and a thorough knowledge of the causes of disaster to ships in distress. The specialized knowledge required of officers of the Coast Guard is thus broader in scope and more detailed in character than that required of any other seagoing group of men.

"While it is true that steamers have largely replaced sailing ships in commercial trade, the fact remains that there are several hundred thousand small boats, yachts, and sailboats in operation, and that from these vessels come most of the calls for assistance to which the Coast Guard must respond. The responsibility of the Coast Guard for the safety of this class of vessels has recently been emphasized by the creation of the Coast Guard Auxiliary. It is now most necessary that Coast Guard officers should know more about the operation of yachts and small craft generally than ever before, because they are required to instruct small-boat operators in seamanship and navigation, upon which the safe operation of their boats so largely depends. In this, as in other phases of Coast Guard work, the duties performed by naval officers are fundamentally different. Whereas the average naval officer must be prepared for duty aboard large combatant ships, operating in fleets and squadrons, Coast Guard officers act in a field where ships of relatively small size perform independent duties in which they are thrown upon their own responsibility under the most severe conditions.

"The training of cadets in seamanship begins in the small boats of the service propelled by oars, by sail, and by motor. Each cadet must become a proficient oarsman; he must learn to handle a small boat under sail and he must understand how to run a motorboat engine and be able to handle all types of boats under all conditions of wind and

weather. This work continues during the 4-year course at the academy.

"The next phase of a cadet's training in seamanship is learning to stand a watch at sea. Cadets are taught to stand lookout, wheel, and lifeboat watches, to act as officer of the deck, and to handle vessels of the service underway and in coming to anchor. In the performance of these duties alertness is of the utmost importance. It has been found through years of experience that unremitting observation of changes in wind, sea, and weather are more necessary in a sailing ship than in a boat or ship propelled by machinery. The constant attention required in a ship under sail instills a habit of alertness that can be acquired in no other way and that once acquired will never be lost.

"For this reason, as soon as cadets have become proficient in handling pulling boats they are placed in small sailboats and when when they have been taught the elementary principles are encouraged in racing tactics until their proficiency becomes sheer instinct.

"The next step in their training is to accustom the cadets to larger vessels both under sail and under power. In these more extended cruises are possible; piloting and navigation are introduced and the cadets begin to apply the theoretical knowledge acquired in the classroom to practical uses.

"It has been found both practicable and economical to extend the benefits, already outlined, of training in watch standing under sail to ships approximating in size the larger cutters. This can only be done in larger sailing ships, and while there is a certain artificiality in continuing training under sail in these larger vessels it has been found that only by this means can the alertness that is the basic characteristic of a competent watch officer be carried over to the more complex routine established on a cruising cutter. It was noticeably apparent that when cadets were sent on summer cruises on board cutters having no sails there was a tendency among them to stand watch in a perfunctory manner. The benefits of their training under sail in small boats were lost before they were able to adjust themselves to the duties of watch officer on steam cutters.

"This condition was remedied when the Gloucester type schooners *Chase* and *Dobbin* were obtained to supplement the practical training on steamers during the summer cruise. The loss of these two vessels during the hurricane of 1938 has caused a notable decline in alertness on watch, and it is urgently hoped that this deficiency may be remedied by the acquisition of the square-rigged sailing ship *Danmark*. The availability of this fine modern sailing ship built for training purposes appears a practicable solution to the problem of training in sail at a reasonable cost.

"It has been estimated that it would cost at least $750,000 to duplicate the *Danmark* at the present time if suitable building facilities were available. The possibility of obtaining this ship at less than half this cost is one that should require no further arguments.

"The experience of the Coast Guard Academy of the desirability of training in sail is amply confirmed by the opinion of other nations in training seamen. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and numerous other countries have reverted to training in sail after having tried with less satisfactory results to substitute steamers for this purpose."

The Advisory Committee agrees with the statements contained in the above memorandum and strongly recommends the purchase of the *Danmark* for assignment to the academy for use on practice cruises.

ITEM NO. II. ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTORS AND PERSONNEL

Because the prospects of obtaining additional Regular officers as instructors for the 100 additional cadets are extremely small at the present time, it is apparent that needed additional instructors will of necessity be temporary or Reserve officers. A minimum of 4 will be required to meet the known additional teaching load:

Mathematics	1
English and Spanish	1
Engineering	1
Navigation	1

If Mr. Smith, who was recommended by the Advisory Committee, be appointed, the work in mathematics would be provided for. The committee met Mr. Santa Cruz and has a very favorable impression of him with nothing unfavorable except possibly his desire to accept appointment for but 1 or 2 years. He seems suitable for the English and Spanish assignment. The committee understands that the superintendent has met another possible candidate but the committee has not met him. It is possible that a retired officer could handle the engineering, and a Reserve officer the navigation.

In previous reports the committee has pointed out the need for revision of the act of April 16, 1937 (professors' bill) in order to remove the restrictions on the number of civilian instructors to be appointed to the academy. The present fixed numbers of five professors and three civilian instructors should be revised to include the other well-known ranks of associate professor and assistant professor without regard to the number in each grade, and the law should state merely the total number of civilian teachers allowed. The difficulties of undertaking further revisions of this bill at this time are recognized, but the urgency of the present situation requires that these revisions be made at once, and the Advisory Committee so recommends.

In earlier reports the Advisory Committee pointed out the necessity of relieving part of the extra load now to be placed on the teaching staff by the detailing of additional technical and clerical enlisted men as assistants. Further study of the present situation makes it apparent that something must be done soon to detail the necessary ratings (or civil-service personnel) which the Superintendent will list, after completion of the study by the academic board, of the individual loads to be placed on the members of the teaching staff. We recommend serious consideration of this matter and the appropriation involved.

ITEM III. COURSE OF INSTRUCTION

The basic features of the course of instruction as presented in this committee's report of 1934 are still sound and in operation. Some revision of the details will be necessary because of (a) the present emergency and (b) changes in the duties of the Coast Guard. These revisions are:

(1) The desirability of including special instruction relating to aids to navigation. The basic sciences serve as foundation material in this field but it is desirable that illustrative examples and numerical problems be drawn from the practices of the lighthouse engineering section. We note with approval the assignment of a subboard of the academic board to study this phase of instruction; but we recommend against the introduction of a special or additional course in aids to navigation.

(2) The Coast Guard officers assigned to the teaching staff are heavily overloaded in the summer, and there is need for equalizing the staff load between the summer and academic terms.

(3) The desirability of closer coordination of English and history throughout the curriculum has been suggested. The committee would welcome recommendations from the academic board.

(4) Both the shortage of available officers and the probable increase in the Cadet Corps to about 350 during the present year emphasize the desirability of simplifying the course of instruction wherever practicable in order to employ all instructors and plant facilities to the best advantage. Larger sections in some subjects and the use of assistants in laboratory work are examples of revisions in the schedule, but not in the course, which should not reduce the value or the content of the curriculum, but might well increase its effectiveness.

The Advisory Committee notes with approval the present procedure of the academic board and the superintendent in studying these problems.

ITEM NO. IV. COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Three suggestions relative to the commencement exercises at the academy are made by the committee:

(a) That diplomas be presented by the Superintendent. It is normally the function of the president of an educational institution to present degrees and the certifying diploma. The position of Superintendent corresponds to that of president, and it is fitting that this ceremony be peformed by him.

(b) That the Commandant of the Coast Guard administer the oath of office to the graduates as a group before the presentation of diplomas and commissions.

(c) That the Secretary of the Treasury, or his representative, present the commissions.

It is also suggested that a slightly different method of handling diplomas and commissions be followed. It is desirable that each man receive his own diploma and commission from the hands of the awarding officer. This may be done by placing the certificate in a simple wooden rack consisting of a baseboard with vertical dowels inserted to act as separators. The diplomas may occupy the right end of the rack and the commissions the left end. They are so placed in the vertical files that the order of their removal is that of the order of their presentation. As a double check, each certificate may have a small slip of paper, inserted beneath the ribbon, on which the recipient's name is typed. The executive officer may preside at the rack, handing to the Superintendent and the Secretary in turn each man's diploma and commission.

The administering of the oath to the graduates as a group forms an impressive ceremony. The executive officer orders the graduates to arise and receive the oath of office from the Commandant. The latter administers the oath in sections of such length as may be easily repeated, each individual, at the start, inserting his name after the opening word "I."

ITEM NO. V. PROBLEMS OF "ADAPTABILITY"

The selection of cadets for admission to the academy and the retention under instruction only of those who give promise of general fitness for a career in the Coast Guard service present problems grouped under the heading "Adaptability." They should be considered under two classifications: (1) Selection of candidates for cadetships; (2) adaptability of cadets under instruction.

(1) The selection of candidates involves (a) the character of entrance examinations to test the candidate's scholastic attainments and (b) some attempt to appraise his general fitness to become an officer. The records show that since 1932 less than 40 percent of the candidates admitted to each fourth class have been graduated. Academic failures and low adaptability marks account for most, though not all, of those who drop out of the academy. Hence, the desirability is obvious of devising, if possible, some method of selection which will eliminate at the outset as many as possible of those who are doomed to fail. The suggestion that our entrance examinations might be improved by the addition of a test on the combined subjects of physics and chemistry is approved by the advisory committee.

In principle the Advisory Committee believes that the entrance examinations should be prepared by an independent group of ex-

perts such as the college entrance examining board. This would prevent "cram" schools from coaching candidates of indifferent mental attainments so that they can pass with high marks; it would also tend to greater uniformity in the entrance examinations of different years. It would probably entail expense. Prof. George W. Mullins, of the college entrance examining board, has expressed the desire of the board to cooperate with the academy and his expectation that the board would furnish its services at cost, which he roughly estimates at four or five dollars per candidate examined. Whether the necessary funds for such expense can be found or whether it would be feasible to require each candidate to pay a $5 examination fee, are matters upon which the Advisory Committee expresses no opinion. In any event any arrangement with the college entrance examining board could not be put into operation before 1942.

A subboard of the academic board has recommended "That prior to appointment as a cadet each candidate be examined by a traveling board consisting of at least two Coast Guard officers and one senior medical officer who are serving, or have served, at the academy." The Advisory Committee understands that this proposal contemplates that the traveling board will pass upon the candidate's "adaptability" and that its judgment will be in addition to the adaptability mark provided by the present examination procedure. In principle we approve of the recommendation of the subboard. Commander Ellis Reed-Hill has expressed the view that it is impracticable to combine with the present procedure an additional examination by the proposed traveling board. Lack of opportunity for thorough consideration of this objection has prevented the advisory committee from reaching any conclusion as to it. This subject, as well as other recommendations of the subboard, will be taken up for further consideration at the next meeting of the Advisory Committee.

(2) Adaptability of cadets under instruction: The lack of any reliable objective method of measuring traits of character and personality essential to officer personnel makes the solution of this problem most difficult. The Advisory Committee notes with gratification that the subcommittee of the Academic Board is giving the subject careful study. Its recommendations will be considered by the Advisory Committee at the next meeting.

ITEM NO. VI. CONSTRUCTION

The report on progress of building construction at the academy, as presented by the Superintendent, was received with much interest. With the early completion of the barracks extension by September 1, the present crowding of cadets will be greatly ameliorated, although the committee notes the fact that the quartering of three men in a room will still be necessary to a considerable extent.

The plan to give preference to the barracks construction over library construction is commended.

The authorization, recently received, to proceed with plans and construction for a building to house a new infirmary and armory is very gratifying to the committee. The space now devoted to infirmary and gunnery should furnish much desired space for classrooms, and gunnery will be placed where it belongs, in the armory.

The proposed plans for the water-front development, as presented by the Superintendent, appear to provide unusual and excellent facilities for boating and sailing.

The need for improvements at the athletic field is appreciated and, as future construction when appropriations are available, these improvements are recommended. The present conditions at the field are dangerous to players and spectators by reason of the extreme narrowness of the field and the presence of the bleachers. By the removal of the bleachers and the construction of a field house and grandstand combined, this dangerous condition would be removed and a real need met. The field house can be placed to advantage on the lowland to the east of the field, permitting the erection of a welded-steel grandstand on the roof of the house. A plan similar to that adopted by Waterbury, Conn., at the high-school athletic field is recommended.

The committee considered in detail next year's requirements for auditorium facilities. McAllister Hall, now used for this and chapel services, seats 306 at the present time. By adding movable seats, the capacity may be expanded to 340 seats. Even then, the hall will be inadequate for chapel services. As a tentative arrangement, the committee suggests that a plan be studied by which the present stage would be moved backward into the present roof space above the engineering laboratory, allowing additional seating capacity. Such a step should be considered as an emergency provision, and the committee feels strongly that the erection of a suitable chapel should be seriously considered as soon as present emergency conditions end.

The chapels at the other two Government academies play a very important part in academy functioning and a similar edifice at New London is much needed and to be desired. The crypt beneath the chapel could furnish opportunity for the housing and protection of service memorials.

No educational institution of the size of the Coast Guard Academy can operate efficiently without the use of a suitable auditorium. With McAllister Hall now inadequate for next year's enrollment, studies of possible extensions or new construction should be undertaken at once. Any proposed plan should be made with a view to providing an auditorium that will be satisfactory for years to come.

J. W. BARKER,
H. E. CLIFFORD,
G. E. RUSSELL,
T. W. SWAN,
H. L. SEWARD, *Chairman.*

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS ON STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator TYDINGS on June 9, 1941, on the subject of strikes in defense industries, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAWARE IN PARADE OF STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator TUNNELL on June 10, 1941, on the subject Delaware in Parade of States, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO SAYS IT CAN'T BE DONE?—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by David E. Lilienthal, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered on May 27, 1941, on the subject Who Says It Can't Be Done?, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SIDNEY HILLMAN ON INGLEWOOD STRIKE

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management, concerning the Inglewood strike, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL EMERGENCY—EDITORIAL FROM AMERICAN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the American Agriculturist, the issue of June 7, 1941, by E. R. Eastman, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, addressing myself to the question before the Senate, I hope that I may have the attention of the Senate, to the end that we may approach this subject calmly, judiciously, fairly, and fearlessly. I doubt if anything more important to the great mass of the American people will come before us for some time than that which is involved in one way or another in the pending amendment. I say that because the workers of the world constitute the red blood of activity. When the workers of the world cease to operate, the world will cease to go forward commercially and actively. If I might put it in a homely way and in an uncontradictable way, if the workers of the world in all the nations of the world should cease to operate at noon today, the war now in progress would come to an end very promptly. It continues because the toilers of the world are not united in an effort to put a stop to war. But the toilers of the world have united, and especially the toilers of America have united, along lines for their own welfare and upbuilding.

I say without fear of contradiction that no administration has gone further along social welfare lines than has the Roosevelt administration, extending over the years while it has been in control of the Government. I am wondering whether the Congress of the United States now wishes so to express itself as to drive a dart into the very heart of every worker in America. Are we now going to press the crown of thorns on the workers of this country because, forsooth, some group, somewhere, believing, undoubtedly, that they were right, caused a pause in some industrial activity? Are we going to indict the workers of America by the pending amendment and say that strikes shall not be countenanced; that they are contrary to public policy, when the strike is the only weapon left to the worker, and when, as a matter of fact, the legislature of almost every State in the Union and the Congress itself have placed the stamp of approbation upon the strike as a method by which grievances which the workers believe to exist may be brought forward into public view, so that the public and public agencies might settle them for the welfare of the toilers?

Mr. President, that is not all. What we have said legislatively was only a part of the program that has gone forward in this country during the last century. The courts of the land have recognized the right of labor by recognizing the right of peaceful picketing. More than that, when there have come before this body for confirmation the nominations of men whose records did not ring true to the principles which I am enunciating,

this body has in the past refused to confirm. It has sent out word to the world that the American worker, the American laborer, would have the right to protest in the only way that was available to him, namely, by the strike.

In order that there might be the least number of strikes, in order that reconciliation might be brought about between the employer and the employee, we have enacted labor-relations laws, we have appointed labor-relations committees and labor-relations commissions, we have appointed supercommissions, we have even brought to the attention of the Department of Labor the essential activity which we believe should be carried forward by that Department looking to the welfare of our industrial life. That being true, when a group on the west coast, in central United States, on the east coast, anywhere, some group believing that they have a just cause of complaint, walk out so that the world may know what their cause is, will we, looking through the labyrinth of laws we have enacted, say now that we condemn that group without ever hearing what their cause was, without ever bringing to the attention of this body what their complaint might be, without ever bringing to the attention of Congress facts from which to determine whether they were right in their activity?

Mr. President, strikes are not always carried on by the toilers. Acts which were not under the name of strikes have been perpetrated by great, powerful influences in this country, which acts might have been typified as unpatriotic, just as we are trying to typify as unpatriotic the actions of labor groups who now seek to be heard. We have today prevalent in this country the production of commodities essential to national defense on the cost-plus basis, into the contracts for which, as a part of the cost, is written every cent that labor gets and a guaranty of the plus by way of profit, so that whatever labor may be paid, whatever enjoyment may come to labor in the way of lessening the hours of toil, is all written into the contract and paid for by the taxpayers of this country. So it is in California where there occurred the strike which was so widely brought to public attention. The contracts existing there are on a cost-plus basis.

I wonder who within the sound of my voice can tell me what the controversy was between the toilers in that plant in southern California and the employers. Was it for increased wages? If it was, was it a justifiable demand? Was it for shorter hours? If it was, was it a justifiable demand? Was it for better working conditions? If it was, was it a justifiable demand? Does the Senate know what the controversy was or what the merits of the demands may have been? Yet, without knowing, is it possible that the Senate would pass a bill not alone condemning that particular strike which has been brought to our attention, but condemning strikes everywhere, and thus condemning labor in using the only instrument of defense it has?

By passing such a measure we would not be condemning the workers of that particular plant out there alone; we would be condemning the great mass of the toilers of America; and if we condemn them, then I say we are condemning the lifeblood of this country, we are condemning that which will produce the things which will be used to defend America when America needs defense.

We hear much said about sending boys to the front, and the statement is made that they are going there to die. Unfortunately, we are sending them to the front, but unless labor goes forward to produce the things that will arm those boys, then of what avail are they at the front or anywhere else? Labor needs the moral support of the Congress of the United States just as much as the boys who are called to military service. The two must go arm in arm. To send forth word that we condemn strikes means to say that the machinery which we have set up in the past is a failure, that we recognize it as a failure, and that, therefore, we "take the bull by the horns," to use a homely expression, and say, "War or no war, we condemn the action of the toilers of America in striking for their rights."

Mr. President, if we take that position I shall be exceedingly sorry. Perhaps my ardor in this respect is due to the fact that in the past I have seen visited upon leading men in this country what I think is about to be visited upon the Congress by the passage of this measure. We saw the most popular men, as Governors of States, call in troops to put down strikes. We were sorry they did it, because, although up to that time there may have been a name beloved, thereafter it seemed to fade out. We saw one of the great Presidents of the United States call out the Army of the United States and place soldiers on the pilots of engines that went across the United States over the transcontinental railroads of the country. I saw the A. R. U. strike broken by the efforts of the Army of the United States, and I was sorry that a great democratic President by his action in that regard permitted himself to be let down in memory as he was.

I do not want this administration to take such a fatal step. It is not necessary, Mr. President; it is not right; it is not fair. Let us as calm, considerate men take this matter home to our hearts. I appeal to the Senate today, do not pass this measure. Do not, by passing it, drive a sword into the heart of every worker in America. Give the workers a chance to work out their problems. They have problems just as intricate as ours. There may be those among them who may be condemned because they do not follow along with our form of government, but if that be true, I say without fear of contradiction it is not with the good will nor the wish nor the consent of labor as a body.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. By the adoption of an amendment such as that proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] do we not furnish those elements in the ranks of labor with one of the most potent weapons we can furnish them with which to carry on their agitation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I had hoped to come to that thought. I am grateful to the Senator for furnishing me with that thought, because it is true. As I understand, we are today arming this Nation and marshalling our forces to put down dictatorship in the world. As I understand, we are marshalling our forces to the end that democracy shall prevail here and everywhere. If we go forward with the spirit of this proposal then those who seek to destroy our form of government can point to it and say, "We told you so. Today your Government is turning the bayonet upon you in order to make you furnish bombs. Today your Army, for which the taxpayers of the country are paying, is being turned upon you. We told you so." That will be the cry of those who seek to destroy this democracy which, I hope, is beloved around the world.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada that the adoption of this amendment, at least in its present form, would be a very serious mistake. Of course, the Senator from Nevada is much concerned with this subject, and he is so well informed about it that I shall impose upon him by asking him to give us his opinion of an amendment I intend to offer to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and shall ask him to accept. Does the Senator have before him the latest copy of the Byrd amendment to Senate bill 1524?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have before me an amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the Connally amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. That is it.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is another one offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the Byrd amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I am talking about the Byrd amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have it.

Mr. MALONEY. I am going to offer a suggestion, upon which I should very much like to have the opinion of the Senator from Nevada. On page 1, line 11, I propose to strike out the words "such strikes" and to insert "that strikes which ignore the advantages of arbitration and mediation and the decisions reached thereby are hereby condemned."

Mr. McCARRAN. I like the phraseology of the Senator's suggestion. I like the thought that is involved, as I understand it. I may be mistaken, but I am inclined to think that the same principle is involved in an amendment submitted late yesterday afternoon by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. MALONEY. I have not seen that amendment. I shall talk with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator that his amendment seems to me at least to tone down what appears

to me to be the vengeance in the original amendment, if I may so express it. I am not one to stand here and advocate that men may, without rhyme or reason, lawlessly tie up a nation from defending itself. Let it be understood that that is the last thing I would advocate. But, having set up the machinery of law, having provided the way, having proclaimed the idea, let us not now repudiate the law which we ourselves created; let us not repudiate a policy, a principle, and a philosophy which we then thought worth while, and still think worth while.

It is my privilege, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to pass on appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out the very thing which is involved in the laws which we enacted to settle and iron out labor disputes. With all those millions appropriated, are we to say that the laws which we have enacted shall be swept away, and that we condemn strikes anywhere and everywhere because a national emergency is upon us?

Mr. President, a law which will not work under trying circumstances is in itself a poor law. If it is only a fair-weather law, if it is a law which will work only when the sun is shining, then it is a doubtful law. Today is the time to test the things which we worked out by months of study. Let us see if we cannot test them out fairly and frankly. The delay will not be so great that we need worry about it. The results will be so much better, so much more worth while, that we can well afford to pause and judicially look upon an important question.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate much longer. I say again that I doubt if any more momentous question will come before this body. It involves the lives of the laborers of America and of their families.

Returning to the homely way in which I tried to bring the thought to the attention of the Senate, we do not know what the controversy at Inglewood was. We do not know whether there were in the midst of the strikers men who held subversive views. That is an easy thing to say. The charge is being hurled broadcast. It is not difficult to say of one who disagrees with us that he is a Communist. We hear the charge made every day. If someone who does not agree with us makes a speech over the radio, or elsewhere, we say, "Oh, he is a Communist," and condemn him first, last, and all the time. So, when prices are jumping by leaps and bounds, when men walk out for a purpose to bring to their families and dependents the food to sustain them, shall we cold-bloodedly say that they are all Communists? Not I. The rank and file are not Communists.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am interested in the Senator's plea. As always, he is sincere, and very effective. I wish to ask him a question. A few moments ago he made a statement—I think in these exact words—"We are arming in this country to put down dictatorships in the world." I do not believe the distinguished Senator realizes the implications of that statement. I cannot accept it at par. I do not think he does. That statement implies another A. E. F. It implies aggressiveness on the part of this Nation with the armed forces which it is building up. I had assumed—and I thought the Senator agreed—that in voting for defense measures we were taking the President's words at par, that the measures were for national defense, and not to go overseas and put down dictatorships in the world. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator; but I am taking the most advantageous position in this argument, because our President has said that we are arming to put down dictatorships.

Mr. TOBEY. The President also said in his campaign speeches that we are arming for defense only. He is on record to that extent before the people of the country and the Members of the House and the Senate. On that basis Congress has voted large appropriations. So far as I am concerned, my vote went for national defense, and not to put down dictatorships in the world. Such action means positive participation in foreign wars.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the spirit of the expression of the learned and able Senator, because my thought runs along the same line. I would vote every dollar we could raise for national defense. I would enlist every soldier we could enlist in the ranks for national defense; but I would not send an American boy on a battleship, on foot, or in a tank, into a foreign land unless our safety were endangered.

Mr. TOBEY. I honor those sentiments and share them with the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me leave one last thought with the Senate on this question. I say it by way of appeal. I am entirely content with every statement which has been made here. I take no issue with the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] or with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the Senator is in favor of my amendment. He is speaking against the Byrd proposal.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am addressing myself to the Byrd amendment at this time. I have not studied the Senator's amendment, and I am not saying whether or not I am in favor of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he said he was in agreement with the Senator from Texas. I assumed from that that he was in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may have said too much. I understand that yesterday in my absence the Senator from Texas addressed himself in favor of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I am in error, I apologize.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas did not speak on the Byrd amendment. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] spoke on the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Texas spoke only on his own amendment. I concluded from what the Senator just said that he was favorable to that amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not given to that amendment the study I should like to give in order to answer the Senator categorically.

Mr. President, an amendment has been proposed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] which attracted me very much. If the Senate is intent upon passing the Byrd amendment, certainly the La Follette amendment should be a part of it. But aside from that, the Byrd amendment, condemning strikes indiscriminately, should not have the approval of this body.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I find that such a parliamentary situation has been created, by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offering his amendment as an amendment to the Connally amendment, that no amendments to the Byrd amendment can be considered, because they would be in the third degree. So the Senate must first either swallow this thing as it is or reject it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my mind goes back to an expression yesterday by my good friend the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. In the course of his able and forceful discussion he made this statement:

> There are no strikes in Germany.

That is true, because the German Army puts a stop to it. Are we going to bring the German practice into this country? Are we going to marshal every industrial plant in America with the American Army, and thus incorporate the German policy, the German program, and the German arrangement into our national life? If we are, then I have to say only that I regret it; because, if that is done, I think our country will have receded many years from the great strides of progress we have made in the 8 years the present administration has been in office.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the last statement of the Senator that he is condemning the President of the United States for what he did day before yesterday in sending troops into California?

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator wishes to use the word "condemn." I do not use such a harsh word; but I do not approve of the action of the President in sending the forces of the United States into that strike situation.

Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator have done under the circumstances?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would have used the machinery the law provides; I would have brought the strikers around the council table; I would have ironed out their differences; and I would have gone the limit to see that their demands were accomplished.

Mr. LUCAS. That has been done over and over in the last 6 months in many strike situations. For example, did not the Government conciliators try for 76 days to do that in the Allis-Chalmers strike, without being able to accomplish very much?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that to be so. Does the Senator know it to be so?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I understand the men were on strike for 76 days.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know they were on strike for about the 76 days.

Mr. LUCAS. And the legal machinery set up by the Congress and by the President of the United States was attempting to iron out the differences existing in that situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. That was the Allis-Chalmers situation?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. What became of the Allis-Chalmers situation?

Mr. LUCAS. It was finally settled after 76 days; but there were lost 76 days of valuable time in making defense materials.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be so, but we lost more than that in the Inglewood strike. We lost a national dignity which is more important than anything else. When the Nation loses its dignity, when the workers of the country come to a realization that they do not have the protection of the Government, when the workers of the country get the idea that the Army will be pitted against them every time they make a demand, then we shall have lost one-half of our national strength.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I would rather lose a little national dignity than lose production in this vital hour.

In my opinion, the President of the United States was more than charitable in the length of time he took in connection with attempting to mediate and settle all the strikes which now are impeding the national-defense program. The very fact that the labor leaders themselves joined with the President in condemning what certain individuals have done in the California strike seems to me to place the President of the United States on very high ground in what he did. I, for one, approve it, and I hope he will continue to follow the course he is following so long as certain communistic leaders, as we have been told, are the source of what is going on in connection with these strikes. If that be true—and I do not believe the Attorney General of the United States would make the statement he made unless he had the evidence upon which to base it—the Senator from Illinois hopes the President will continue to employ the Army of the United States, if it is necessary after mediation fails, to insure that in this crisis we continue to have the maximum amount of production of national-defense materials. Certainly the American people are entitled to that.

Mr. President, whether the present condition is due to labor or whether it is due to management, or a combination of both, I think is utterly immaterial. I care not to place the fault or the blame. That does not produce planes, tanks, and guns. But what I do say while I am on my feet is that in this crisis the American people are entitled to a continuous and uninterrupted flow of the maximum production of the materials necessary for the defense of this Nation and of the nations whose defense we deem vital to our defense; and if it takes the Army to do it, I, for one, am ready to approve such a course.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me ask a question of the able Senator. Does he think the Army could do it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Army did it day before yesterday in the Inglewood strike.

Mr. McCARRAN. Suppose the Army had to take over the plants and run them: Does the Senator think the Army could do it?

Mr. LUCAS. I say to the Senator that the Army is doing it in the California plant.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. At that plant labor is going back to work and is going on to work. The Army is not doing anything except standing there with fixed bayonets.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Army is the cause of the men going back to work. If the Army were not there, no one would be working in that plant.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator mean to say that the Army forced those men back to work?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly not.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing the Army had to do was to remove the group of selfish and communistic leaders who had most of the men cowed and intimidated, in order that they could return to peaceful defense labor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have been entirely misinformed. I do not understand that the Army removed anyone. I understand that the Army kept away from the plant the pickets who were there helping the strikers and refusing to allow any persons to pass the picket lines.

Mr. LUCAS. The Army merely drove the pickets back a mile, so that the men who wanted to work could go to work. That is exactly what they did. The Army obtained results; and, much as I dislike to see such action, yet to me such a course is imperative if we are adequately to defend the security of this Nation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. But to come back to the Senator's assertion, once we tried to have the Army carry on the work of a great industry in this country. We lost 11 lives in less than 11 days, and we set aviation back 10 years. If we put the Army in charge of industrial plants, they will not get anywhere. Labor, and labor alone, can do the work. If we say to labor that every time it has a grievance it is to be confronted with a bayonet, then I say that is not Americanism along the lines of my training or my idea of what a great nation should do.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I did not intend even to hold the Senate so long as I have. I conclude with an appeal to the Senate that it may not strike a blow at its own work, the legislation which it has enacted in times past. I appeal to the Senate not to strike at the heart blood of this country by driving terror into every worker's heart, so that when he has a grievance he will say, "I had better swallow my grievance than to go out and be confronted with the bayonets of my country's Army."

Let us be democratic even in an hour when our country is in an emergency. Let us prove that democracy is a success, that it can prevail under the most trying circumstances. Let labor and employer and the Government, through Government agencies, settle the differences which may arise; and then let us go forward for the national defense. If we tear down the confidence that rests in the hearts of the American workers, we shall have done more than all Hitler's bombs could do in a year. A nation rests upon the confidence of its people. A government relies upon the confidence of its toilers. When they lose confidence, their government is jeopardized. Let that never come to this country, with its history and its people.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] a moment ago stated what he thought was the parliamentary situation with respect to the Byrd amendment, and I am inclined to agree with him; but I should like to have a statement from the Chair as to whether he correctly stated the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin correctly stated the parliamentary situation.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote against the Byrd amendment. As I am one of the Representatives of the State of California, in which the controversy now before the Senate arose, I conceive it to be my duty to express my opinion upon the issues that are here being debated.

I desire first immediately to confess to the Senate of the United States that I am biased in favor of union labor. While I shall endeavor to be fair and impartial in my judgment and my statements, nevertheless over a long period of time I have been committed in many ways in the State of California and in the Senate to the cause of labor; and I have no doubt that I have become a partisan, as most men become when they have over many years been sympathetic to a particular cause. Consequently, I ask that the statements which I shall make be carefully scrutinized as they are made by a person who is strongly committed to the existing rights of union labor in California and in the United States.

Mr. President, let us for a moment draw this discussion out of the realms of political philosophy and generalities and bring it to the world of realities, the world of toil, of wages, and decent living. I say to you that had the workers in the aircraft industry been given a wage such as they should be given in this wealthiest economy, a wage necessary to maintain a decent standard of living for men, women, and children, there would have been no

strike in the North American Aviation Co.'s factory.

I am not defending that particular strike. I believe it was largely precipitated by men fanatically believing in the communistic philosophy, who are attempting to capitalize the wrongs of labor in an effort to precipitate disorder and revolution. I am fearfully apprehensive of what may come if Communists are ever able, through proclaiming the misfortunes of the workers, to bring about disorder and revolution in this country. So I do not defend the position assumed by the leaders in this strike, but I do maintain that that strike would not have been possible had proper wages been paid to the workers in that industry.

Mr. President, let us take a simple case of a worker in that industry. I know personally scores of them. Who are they? They are loyal, kind, industrious American citizens. Many of them have been out of work or have had only spasmodic work for the past 5 or 10 years or since they left school. They have been denied the right to work in this civilization not through any fault or failure of their own but because they are the victims of a complicated industrial system for which they are not responsible and whose operations they cannot guide. Many of the men in the North American Co.'s plant have been working in past years at $60 or $70 a month on W. P. A. or spasmodically working at their trades. Most of them have wives and children whom, Mr. President, they love just as much as high officials of the Government love the members of their own families. For many years they have had insufficient funds upon which to live decently; they have now entered the defense industry, most of them, burdened with debts to the doctor, the baker, and the candlestick maker. Yes, you say, but now they are at work making high compensation. Let us see about that.

What is the average wage now being paid in the aircraft industries in California? For a 40-hour week it averages perhaps $110 or $115 a month; but many of the workers are receiving substantially less than that. I say that no man with a wife and three or four children can live in Los Angeles with any degree of decency on such an amount of money, and no worker in this wealthy land should be compelled to live upon such meager wages.

Mr. President, I am not indicting the leaders of the aircraft industry; I think they are doing a miraculous job in building airplanes for the United States Government; but I should be naive if I did not proclaim that they are not doing badly in the profits they are making; I should be blind to the facts if I did not proclaim that the aircraft industry in California and elsewhere in the United States will make hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars, of profit in the era that lies ahead. It is my deliberate opinion that a substantial portion of these increased earnings should be diverted to the workers.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Representative VOORHIS of California has inserted in the RECORD figures showing the earnings of North American Aviation, Inc. According to those figures, in the year 1939 they made 74 percent on their investment; in the first quarter of 1940 they made 22 percent; in the second quarter of 1940 they made 77 percent; in the third quarter they made 41 percent; and in the fourth quarter they made 47 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his contribution, verifying the statements I have just been making to the Senate; and I proclaim, Mr. President, that there is ample money now being paid by the United States Government for defense work to give to the workers in the aircraft industry the very moderate demand which they are asking. I say they are entitled to increased compensation and that if the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and other Senators on the floor desire to assure to our people a vast and expanding flow of defense supplies they can do that most certainly by convincing the American workmen that the Government of the United States is determined to bring to the workers of America a decent and just compensation for the defense work they are doing. For, Mr. President, let me say that the cantonments which are springing up like magic on the deserts and the plains and the hills of America, the airplane, powder, and other military factories, are not being built here in Washington but by the toil and sweat of workers; and let me say further that the success or failure of revolutionaries to disrupt the defense work will not be settled by the ipse dixit of any Senator of the United States, however eloquent, powerful, or persuasive he may be.

Mr. President, I venture to say that during this week there will be tens of thousands of labor-union meetings in the United States. These issues will be there discussed with no less intelligence than is displayed here on the floor of the United States Senate, and in some respects with a far greater degree of understanding of the fundamental rights involved, and that, because labor knows that the right to strike is one that was gained not through the assistance of statesmen but by agitation, by toil, by strife, by a lifetime of effort; yes, in some cases, by death itself. Labor believes that if it had not developed the right to strike it still would be held in degradation and poverty in the United States; and when labor sees any limitation upon the right to strike, any condemnation of that right, it becomes apprehensive and on guard.

Mr. President, I do not want to be understood as advocating any doctrine that will increase strikes in America. Quite the contrary. I believe that every effort should be made to reduce the number of strikes, and to settle all labor controversies by mediation; but I say that that battle will be fought and decided not in the Senate of the United States but in the labor unions of the country. I say to you that the great majority of union men and their leaders are honest, intelligent, loyal American citizens, and want to be unified with the rest of the United States; and I am optimistic that we shall emerge from this crisis a unified nation so far as labor is concerned.

I should be naive not to admit that in my own State, perhaps more so than in any other State except possibly Michigan and New York, there are fanatics who, for one reason or another, despair of this civilization, and desire by revolutionary means the destruction of our present Government and our free economy. I believe these men are wrong, but I think they are sincere. I know they are energetic. Given the opportunity, they will capitalize every wrong, every slight, every affront to union labor, endeavoring to turn their members to disorder and insurrection wherever possible. I say it should be the wise policy of the Senate of the United States to uphold and encourage those members and leaders of labor who are opposed to improper strikes and dangerous conduct. I say there is no respect in which that can be done so readily as by our Government and the Senate and the House undertaking to see that men are paid decent and reasonable wages under our standard of living.

I now see upon the floor the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who offered this amendment, and for whom I have the highest respect. I desire now to make a statement. If he believes I am incorrect in the statement, I should like to have him challenge me on it. It has been heralded throughout the press of the United States and by men of conservative leaning that we cannot increase the wages of workers without inducing an upward spiral in the cost of living, as a result of which we shall be caught in an inflation of prices under which the increased incomes of the workers will buy them less than they could buy before. No more unsound and fallacious economic doctrine could be enunciated.

Why is that? you ask me. How could we possibly substantially raise the wages of workers without raising the cost of the product? Well, let us see, Mr. President.

Most great industries in America have set up their financial structure and their price structure so that they are able to operate and break even, or make a small profit at 50 or 60 percent of capacity. The great industries of America—steel and aluminum and automobiles and textiles—have accommodated themselves to this period of depression; and, operating at 25 or 50 or 75 percent of capacity, they have fixed their price structures so they could operate at that degree of capacity. But, Mr. President, just as soon as such a plant begins to operate at full capacity under the existing price structure it begins to make tremendous profits; and I challenge any Senator to deny the statement that practically every great industry in the United States, perhaps with a few notable exceptions, could raise the wages of its employees out of the additional profits that come from added business without increasing prices to the public.

Mr. President, under the tremendous pressure of this war the airplane industry

within 2 or 3 years will advance to a degree that ordinarily would have taken 20 or 30 years. In the tremendous business that will be entailed, the airplane companies not only should be allowed to, and undoubtedly will, make reasonable profits for themselves, but should be able to pay decent wages to their workers and still reduce the cost of their product to the Government of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Is the Senator able to tell us how much the cost of living has gone up in the past month? We do not see anything published about how much the cost of living has increased; and yet, when workers ask for higher wages, they are immediately condemned because they do so, regardless of the fact that the cost of foodstuffs and of many other things is going up at a very rapid rate.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are about a million persons working for the Federal Government. Most of them are members of the white-collar class. If all the other prices keep spiraling, it probably will not be very long before they, too, will want an increase in salary so that they can meet the higher cost of living.

All these things are cumulative, so that when everyone gets upon the same plane, after the cycle has gone through its entire evolution, they will practically be relatively in the same position in which they were before the first person left the lower roost and got on the top.

Another thing, the farmer of the country is having a very difficult time in many localities getting anyone to help him get the crops in the ground or to get them off the ground, because he cannot pay labor the prices which labor can demand in other lines of activity. I happen to know that in my own State the farmers are having a very difficult time getting men necessary to help them operate the farms. I do not refer to people who have farming as a side line, but I refer to the man who works on his own farm. It is getting to be increasingly difficult.

I make these observations merely because we must always remember that when any group, no matter how just may be its cause, gets compensation to which it may be entitled, it correspondingly affects every other group, even though they are not employed in the line which is directly affected.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should say that what the Senator from Maryland has stated would be true if we had a free economy; but, as the Senator from California has pointed out, we do not have a free economy in the United States at the present time; we do not have a free economy when some one big company fixes the price of its products, as the big corporations have been fixing the prices of the various products with their monopolies and trusts.

As the Senator rightly pointed out, in many of the large industries in the United States, notably some of them with which we are very familiar, the industries fix the price, and the price is fixed regardless of what the cost of labor may be; and no one has anything to say about it. They can automatically raise the price or lower it to suit themselves. When the price of wheat to the farmer goes down, when wheat is 50 cents a bushel, we do not see the big companies lowering the price of flour to the consumer or the price of bread to the consumer. When the price of raw copper goes down, we do not see the price of many finished articles manufactured from copper going down. The same thing applies to aluminum and to steel. The price varies regardless of what the wages of the people working in the mines and the factories may be. So there is a great deal to be said on this subject.

The American people are united upon the question of defense; they want maximum production, and they want it to defend and safeguard our democracy.

We are not obtaining maximum defense production. Most informed people realize this. What has caused it? Today labor baiters and haters are having a field day. They attribute production shortcomings to labor. This is an unfair charge. Strikes are not the principal cause of slackened defense production.

Let us look at hard, cold facts. The major causes of our slow defense production are evident to unbiased students of our defense efforts.

First. The aluminum shortage is seriously hampering airplane production. Yet a short time ago defense officials declared there was and would be no shortage of aluminum.

Second. The Government has failed to utilize vast facilities for the manufacture of tools for the production of airplane parts. This phase of defense production has been placed in the hands of the toolmaking industry whose long-time view encompasses the post-war period, which is, of course, antagonistic to immense development of facilities required for defense production now.

Third. Greatly increased building space and facilities have been and are needed. Conversion of existent plant facilities into airplane-production facilities has been slow. Little has been done. The construction of new facilities has been slow because many manufacturers have insisted that the Government bear in one way or another much of the financial burden of construction. Thus, the Government and the manufacturer delayed production for months while the question of future losses was being slowly argued. Eight aircraft companies were ready to act in July 1940, but large companies objected. The National Defense Commission did not authorize this expansion for 3 months—until October 1940. Reliable estimates indicate that a delay of 2½ months meant the loss of 150,000,000 man-days. All strikes in the United States since war broke out do not involve a loss of time that aggregates more than a fraction of that.

Fourth. Failure of those in charge of defense production to use the tremendous facilities of the motor industries. These facilities have been and are being used principally for the production of pleasure vehicles—of luxury articles and not defense material.

Fifth. Confusion in the direction of defense production has resulted in defense losses. Then, too, charges that the power over priorities in aluminum were in the hands of certain officials who used this Government power to play favorites for nondefense needs of General Motors and Du Pont were made before a Senate committee.

All these factors have caused defense efforts to bog, and these factors are matters over which labor certainly has no control.

Again, let me say that many of these companies today are drawing down big profits, but we do not hear anything about it, we do not hear them criticized. I was in Honolulu, and workers came to me and complained that three or four big companies controlled all the cement that came into Honolulu; that they controlled practically all the lumber that came in; and that they got all the contracts from the Army and the Navy. In fact, the workers charged these were the only companies able to get any such contracts at all. There are two sides to this question.

Everybody knows that the big companies have been making tremendously increased profits during this emergency period. The dividends paid by many large companies have been substantially increased. They have been setting aside larger and larger sums for all kinds of bookkeeping purposes. These have served, of course, to diminish the income taxes the companies must pay. But let us not be blind to the fact that the real profits of some of these big companies have soared. I ask that a memorandum handed me on North American Aviation profits be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS RECORD OF THE NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION CORPORATION

While the workers of the North American Aviation Corporation were being paid a minimum of only 50 cents an hour, the corporation was reaping an annual profit which amounted to about 200 percent on its original investment. It paid annual dividends which amounted to 125 percent on the original cost of each share of stock and it paid its president a salary of approximately $14,000 a month.

All the figures on profits and the salaries of executives are filed annually by this corporation with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The following information was taken from the corporation's S. E. C. reports of 1939 and 1940.

The North American Aviation Corporation profits in 1939 and 1940 were over $7,000,000 each year on an original investment of approximately $3,500,000. In other words, the profits each year were equivalent to 200 percent on the original investment.

The annual profit was enormous even when figured on the basis of net worth, which includes all outstanding shares of stock as

well as capital surplus and earned surplus. In 1939 the net worth of the corporation was estimated at $9,570,000; the net profit was $7,088,000, or approximately a 79 percent annual profit. In 1940 the net worth was estimated at $12,366,590; the net profit was $7,090,000, or an annual profit of approximately 58 percent. (See attached table No. 1 on net worth.)

(The above profit figures are net after all deductions for depreciation, amortization, idle-plant expenses, labor costs, Federal and other taxes, etc.)

DIVIDENDS

In 1940 the corporation paid a cash dividend of $1.25 per share of stock. The original cost of the shares was $1 a share. This dividend is equal, therefore, to 125 percent return on each share in 1 year. The total paid out in dividends in 1940 was $4,293,791. Notwithstanding this huge dividend payment, the earned-surplus balance was increased by $2,800,000 in 1940.

SALARIES OF EXECUTIVES

J. H. Kindelberger, president and director, received in 1940 a salary which was equivalent to about $14,000 a month.

His total salary in 1940 was $166,350.

His total salary in 1939 was $186,110.

J. L. Attwood, vice president and director, received in 1940 $78,533.33.

J. Stanley Smithson, works manager, received in 1940 $28,975.

Chief engineer (name not given) received in 1940 $26,050.

EQUIPMENT AND PLANTS SUPPLIED BY GOVERNMENT

The corporation's report to the Securities and Exchange Commission includes information showing that the Government is providing space and equipment for the company. The report states that during 1940 the company made arrangements with the Defense Plant Corporation, an agency of the Federal Government, whereby it "will in large part supply equipment required for floor space added to the company's California plant."

Similar arrangements were made by one of the company's wholly owned subsidiaries, North American Aviation, Inc., of Texas, with Defense Plant Corporation for erection and lease of a plant in Dallas. Also arrangements were substantially completed during 1940, whereby Defense Plant Corporation will construct another plant in Kansas City, to be operated under company direction on a management basis.

Source: North American Aviation Corporation reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission covering the years ending December 31, 1939, and December 31, 1940.

From report of North American Aviation Corporation to the Securities and Exchange Commission

Stocks:	*Shares*
Capital stock par value $1, issued and outstanding at the close of 1940	3,435,033
General Motors holders of 29.11 percent, or	1,000,061
Cost—Property, plant, and equipment (at cost):	
California plant (on leased land)	$3,100,329.38
Maryland plant (not used in business)	277,055.66
Total	3,377,385.04
Profits:	
1940 profits before Federal and other taxes (but after all other expenses, including depreciation and amortization)	10,082,335.78
All taxes	2,992,000.00
Net profit	7,090,335.78

TABLE 1.—*Capital stock and surplus of North American Aviation Corporation*

	1939	1940
Issued and outstanding 3,435,033 shares capital stock (authorized 6,000,000 shares of the par value of $1 per share)	$3,435,033	$3,435,033
Capital surplus	3,109,938	3,109,938
Earned surplus since December 1934	3,025,075	5,821,619
Total	9,570,046	12,366,950

Mr. WHEELER. I remember what happened during the World War. At that time I happened to be a United States attorney. When prices went up to very high levels, and when the people asked for higher wages, neither President Wilson nor anyone else found it necessary for the Government to send in the Army to take over a factory. Any disputes which arose were settled. The men who undertook to settle strikes did not sit in Washington; they did not call in the labor leaders from Arizona or Montana or from some other place to Washington. They went to Arizona and to the various other places throughout the country where labor disputes were occurring. One of the difficulties at the present time is that there is incompetence in Washington. Persons have been brought from New York, from some of the great Wall Street concerns and Wall Street houses, including their lawyers. In my judgment, many of the persons sitting in Washington attempting to settle labor disputes are incompetent for the jobs they hold; many of them do not know anything about labor, or anything about the conditions affecting this country, outside the city of New York.

Whom has the Secretary of the Navy hired as his attorneys? They are some of the biggest Wall Street lawyers. Who are his assistants? Investment bankers from Wall Street. Who have been brought into the Office of Production Management? Some of the greatest opponents of labor in the United States. Who have been brought into some other places? During the Wilson administration the President had as his Attorney General Mr. Gregory. No one ever heard Mr. Gregory, in all the labor disputes which occurred, denouncing persons who went on strike as being controlled by the Communists. No one ever once heard the War Labor Board, headed by ex-President Taft, denounce laborers as Communists when they asked for higher wages. Never once in all that period did the Government of the United States have to use the Army to settle labor difficulties. Regardless of how much I deplore some of these strikes, and regardless of whatever legitimate criticism may be made of some labor leaders, nevertheless, in my judgment it is not possible to make people work by law, and it is impossible to make them work by using the Army to try to force them to work. Productivity is dependent upon the worker's morale. The use of the whip, troops, or any form of compulsion reduces morale and production. Bayonets will not produce airplanes. This is a bad precedent to set.

I was in the city of Los Angeles when a strike took place in one of the airplane factories—I have forgotten which it was. Statements were made to the effect that the reason the strike was not settled was that the leaders were Communists. The truth was, as the Senator from California probably well knows, that the man who was sent out to settle the strike from the War Department became incapacitated.

I do not believe the War Department has exercised good judgment in handling labor matters. Take the North American Aviation strike. At the same time the Government announced that it was sending in troops to smash the strike the Secretary of War spoke to the press in high praise of the management of the company. Only a person utterly unacquainted with the process of industrial relations, of the mediation of disputes, would have made such a glaring error—even if the assumptions of fact had been correct.

A New York proadministration newspaper makes this comment:

> First, the employers' precipitation of the strikes seems unnecessary and unpatriotic. What business had North American Aviation Co. paying its men 50 cents an hour when the going rate for the industry is 62½ cents? The Aluminum Co. of America is the company whose monopolistic practices are responsible for one of the most dangerous bottlenecks in national-defense production today. Now, the Aluminum Co. of America cannot even get on with its own employees.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> I do not like the Secretary of War giving out a statement eulogizing an employer who takes his responsibilities to his fellow men as lightly as Mr. Kindelberger.

One of the stanchest administration supporters, which follows the President in his foreign policy, is the weekly magazine, the New Republic. Earlier this year it published the charge that the Department of Justice has been engaged in playing the employers' side against that of the employees, has been investigating strikes by investigating strikers and not investigating managements at all, and has been a one-sided partisan. A few weeks ago the same magazine cited chapter and verse to prove its case. How different this is from the manner in which the Department of Justice was conducted by Attorney General Gregory during the World War years.

The record of the present administration in handling labor matters is not good enough during the present critical days. The management of North American Aviation stalled the unions' request for a wage increase and then the War Department itself apparently became a party to this delay. Anyone who knows anything about labor unions knows that there are periods of crisis in the organization work of labor unions. Everyone who knows anything about the subject knows that one of the methods of interfering with the organization work of a labor union is to stall its officers from week to week when they are trying to obtain wage increases and adjustments. News accounts indicate that this was done in the North American Aviation Co. dispute. What business did the War Department, or any other agency of the Government, have to join hands with the company in those stalling efforts?

Week after week the management of the company doled out an hour here and an hour there for a discussion with labor-union representatives. When the union representatives were finally called to Washington by the Mediation Board for negotiations to begin May 26 they arrived on that day. It was not until June 2 that the Mediation Board provided a panel of its members to take up the negotiations. For verification one may refer to the news accounts.

Even after that the conferences were only occasionally held and at some conferences the company representatives failed to appear, giving as their excuse the claim that they were tied up with the War Department in connection with production matters. Meantime the situation on the west coast was becoming more and more difficult.

No matter how high the motives of the War Department officials were, they did not show the greatest efficiency and competence in dealing with this situation. It was far different during the World War years.

The Government has not called out troops against officials of the Defense Commission and of the O. P. M. who have failed to promote production and have actually stood in the way of maximum production. The Government has not called out troops against the tool makers who have taken official positions in the Government and failed to use the facilities available for manufacture of tools. The Government did not call out troops against the manufacturers who have been doing business as usual instead of using a part of their plants for airplane manufacture. The Government has not called out troops against manufacturers who refused to produce until many months of negotiations had been lost on the subject of amortization.

The only element of our population against whom the Government has shown any inclination to call out troops is the working population. Anyone who knows anything about life in a free country can draw his own moral.

If we want to have maximum production, it is high time that the Government learned from the lessons of the past and did a much more efficient job than it has been doing. At the same time and until it has done such a job we should put aside novel proposals untried and unsafe for cracking the whip over workers and their unions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with 90 percent of what the Senator from California has said. I rose merely to say that the pay of a particular group of persons cannot be increased without eventually having it felt by every other group of persons in the country. That does not mean that sometimes a certain group is not entitled to an increase in wages, but certainly there is no provision in any of these laws for the great unorganized groups, such as the agricultural group, and my opinion is that unless some thought is given to that group, very serious damage will be done to it and to the country.

Let me point out to the Senator from California, without taking issue with him as to the merits or demerits of a particular labor difficulty, that some time ago the Department of Commerce made a very detailed study of the labor content, in dollars and cents, in the manufacturing dollar. It made a survey of all the industries, and it was shown that the average content for labor in the manufacturing dollar was about 72 cents. When one buys, for example, a steel rail, he does not merely go to the steel mill which manufactured that rail and find out how much labor added to its cost, and how much other things added to its cost. In the mining of the ore, the transporting of the ore, the handling of the ore from ship to shore, the smelting of the ore into ingots, its transportation to the mill, the manufacture of the ore into the rail itself, its transportation to the place where it is to be used—in all those operations labor is a very integral part, and the labor content is a large part of every dollar.

The Senator may be exactly right. I do not say he is not right in the case he mentioned, and I am not arguing with him about that. I simply rose to point out that we must not lose sight of the fact that when we legislate for a particular group we indirectly, either adversely or favorably, affect every other group in the country, and one of the groups we cannot legislate for as a group per se in the matter of wages is the agricultural population. Why? We have already acknowledged that, from the standpoint of parity, that group has been put down so low in the economic scale that we must appropriate over a billion dollars a year to pull it up again and place it on stilts. We first put the other groups on stilts, and then we must reach down and pull up the agricultural population and put it, theoretically, at least, on a parity with the others, the result being that, relatively speaking, the various groups are, in the end, exactly where they were in the beginning. That is the only point I want to accentuate, and I believe it should not be lost sight of in discussion of matters of this kind.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator to comment after I get through with my statement, and I shall take 2 or 3 minutes to finish my statement. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I have heard him many times expound his economic philosophy on the floor of the Senate. I admire the precision and logic and ability with which he defines his concepts and makes his illustrations. I am compelled to say that I am totally in disagreement with his basic economic theories. However, if I were to assume, like the Senator from Maryland, that in an economy in which we have a productive capacity of men, material, and machines of $100,000,000,000 or $125,000,000,000 or $150,000,000,000 of annual wealth, we are so stupid that we can only operate our economy in peacetime at $60,000,000,000 or $75,000,000,000, then I would agree with the Senator.

I heard him very ably make one of his last important statements upon the floor of the Senate in relation to the public debt and the work that his committee was doing on it, and, as I recall, the Senator, in the course of that statement, took the position that we could not hope to have a tax income for the Federal Government of more than about $6,000,000,000 a year after this war economy was over, because during the past 10 years we have made every effort to increase the national income and we have failed.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that he may be right. We may be lacking the energy and the ability under this capitalistic economy fully to utilize our men and machines, and if that is true, if when this war emergency is over we sink back to a national income of $60,000,000,000 or $75,000,000,000, the distinguished Senator from Maryland is exactly right, that whatever we give to one class we must take from another class. But what I like most to do is to draw these arguments down out of the clouds of generalities into the details of particularity, and I see here before us one of our most distinguished Senators from the South, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] who knows far more about cotton than I will ever hope to know. So let us take cotton as an illustration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Which is sold mostly outside the United States in normal times.

Mr. DOWNEY. It is true that we endlessly seek to enlarge our cotton exports while our own people sleep cold for want of blankets and sheets, lack rugs in their homes, and even decent overalls to wear. We frazzle our nerves, we subsidize, we preach, we ask: How can we save the South and help her market her vast cotton crop? Well I can take the distinguished Senator from Maryland into tens of thousands of homes in his own State where the unfortunates do not have a cotton rug, do not have curtains to keep out the wind and rain, do not even have clean and decent overalls in which to work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator let me continue for a moment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is making his point very well, but, if the Senator will allow me, I should like to make one statement, and then I will sit down and permit him to conclude his remarks. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am glad to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us apply the Senator's theory. Let us raise the wages of all the people who work in the cotton-fields, people who work for the lowest scale of wages in this country; let us raise their wages first, let us raise them up to the point where the wages of other workers are now, and then let us see where the price of cotton will be after that is done.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I should like to have the opportunity at some appropriate moment with him to clarify this great issue upon the floor of the Senate which he is now raising. I will not do it now, because to do so re-

quires considerable time, and it would be inappropriate to do it in connection with the present discussion.

Mr. TYDINGS. All I wanted to point out was that, if the Senator desires to begin where help is most needed, he will, in my opinion, and I think in his opinion, find that there is no lower paid labor in this country in dollars and cents than the average cotton hands. The reason cotton is cheap, the reason its price is so low is that the labor content is cheap. Because they clothe the Nation, those workers are more deserving of our effort to bring them up to parity with other labor, before other labor leaves them at a greater disadvantage by making the things the cotton farmer has to have cost more, when he has so little to spend to buy the things he needs.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with that, but let us again deal in a few concrete facts. Despite the fact that one-half of our people have been in despairing need of manufactured cotton goods, this wise and wealthy Nation has laboriously, at great expense, stored 12,000,000—yes, 12,000,000 bales of cotton, and in spite of the fact that this year we are going to have an unprecedented consumption of cotton due to war prosperity, we are going to put another 2,000,000 bales in our warehouses, when there are factories to manufacture that cotton into the finished product, when there are workers in New England and in the South that want to work in those factories, when one-half of our people, living on a subnormal income, urgently need those manufactured products.

The Senator from Maryland asked how it would be possible in effect to give more manufactured cotton products to one segment of our people without taking those manufactured cotton products away from the others. I say to the Senator that we could easily consume twice as much cotton in the United States as we do consume. I say we can easily raise that amount of cotton. I say that right now we have laboriously set up the textile mills that will manufacture that cotton into the finished product, and I say that when we utilize those manufactured products in our own country they will bring to our own people at least eight times as much in the national income as if we shipped them abroad, because the manufactured cotton product is worth approximately eight times at retail what we get for the raw product when sold abroad.

Let me call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maryland another fact. If a textile factory is set up to manufacture 2,000,000 pairs of overalls a year, and has been breaking even in manufacturing 1,000,000, it can manufacture the additional 1,000,000 overalls—not at double the cost. No. Aside from the cost of the raw material, the additional million overalls would not cost more than 10 or 20 percent of the cost of the first million.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that in his last campaign Wendell Willkie uttered at least one truism. He said that we have the resources, the men, and the material in the United States to generate within a few years a national income of $150,000,000,000. Of course we have. I will admit to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that certain difficulties now exist in our capitalistic economy which prevent the functioning of our economy at full capacity. I know that the Senator realizes, perhaps better than I do, what those difficulties are. I have no opportunity now to discuss with the distinguished Senator the removal of those difficulties. I hope that at some future time, upon some more appropriate measure, we may have the opportunity to continue this discussion.

In conclusion, Mr. President, if the Senate desires to stimulate labor in the production of war material it can do so far more effectively by showing its sympathetic concern for the problems of labor than by passing a blanket condemnation of all strikes in defense industries, however intolerable their conditions may be.

The Chief Executive has proclaimed that hereafter we shall consent to live only in a world consecrated to four freedoms, one of them being freedom from want. Today somebody handed me a copy of the Philadelphia Record of June 10, which contains an item which will be duplicated thousands of times in the United States this year, not on the front page, as this is, but hidden away in some obscure line or two. Let me read this item, and then ask my colleagues what they believe of a society that permits conditions to exist that drive to despair, misery, and suicide thousands of American citizens.

GRANDMOTHER DROWNS BOY AND SELF—"WE HAVE BEEN LIVING ON NOTHING"

BRIDGETON, N. J., June 9.—Grandma Eva Coulter, 63, couldn't take it any longer.

In the brilliant sunshine of yesterday afternoon she quietly put her house in order She wrote six notes. She took her purse and her 6-year-old grandson, Harold, out to Sunset Lake.

And there she ended her life and Harold's life by leaping with him into the raceway at the south end of the lake.

BODIES RECOVERED

At dusk authorities found the bodies. They looked in the tiny house at 32 Mount Vernon Street, Bridgeton, but they found nothing—not even food.

"We have been living on nothing—nothing but a little bread, milk, and coffee," read one note.

"Countless times I have tried for relief; countless times I have been refused. Now you have ordered us out of our house."

That was part of a note to Earl C. Wells, director of relief in Bridgeton.

NO MONEY FOR FUNERAL

"We'd like a simple funeral—and to be buried together," another pleaded to Allison J. Kruse, Vineland undertaker. "But there is no money, of course * * *."

Other letters asked authorities to get in touch with Alex Coulter, of Alivine Road, Elmer, N. J., who presumably is her son, and with Holbrook W. Coulter, 160 Kings Highway, Lewes, Del., also believed to be a son.

Mr. President, in America today, in the rich and generous economy of which we love to boast, millions upon millions of people between 60 and 65 years of age, and above the age of 65, the men and women who have builded this Nation, are jobless, desperate, despairing, harrassed. They have no way to live in decency, dignity, and comfort. Yet we boast of the great Social Security Act, which gives to those people $5, $10, $15, or $20 a month upon which to live in this land in which cotton, wheat, corn, and fruits decay unused in the fields and factory capacity is only half used.

Mr. President, my discussion has gone far beyond what I anticipated or desired. At a later but I hope an early day I shall further address this body on the pension issue.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator if there has ever been a time since he and I have been in the Senate when the W. P. A. appropriation has even approximated reaching the number of people certified by the regularly established certifying agencies of the several States?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that contribution to my statement. I am not familiar with the figures, but I assume that the implication made by the Senator from Florida is correct.

In conclusion, let me say that, like all other Senators, I want to see the maximum output of defense materials. I know that that must be accomplished by labor. It cannot be done by anyone else. I know that it must be done by union labor and union-labor leaders, who have intrinsically the same viewpoint on the defense question as we have. I say that we will strengthen their hands to a far greater extent by showing our sympathy and concern for the just rights of union labor. We will weaken their position by any blanket condemnation of the sacred and vital right of labor, the right to strike which has been attained and maintained only after decades of brave and vigilant struggle. I shall vote against the Byrd amendment. I hope my colleagues also will do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to return to the immediate issue which is presented by the amendment submitted by the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

It is exceedingly difficult to register one's total attitude toward labor's right to strike by a simple "yes" or "no" vote upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia. I do not see how any realist can deny the Senator's preamble. Numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries, "which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy." In many aspects the situation is intolerable.

To vote "no" upon the Byrd amendment would be to ignore these facts and this challenge. It would be interpreted in some quarters as actual approval of recent and instant episodes, which the Attorney General of the United States has officially and correctly branded as "more nearly resembling insurrection than a labor strike." That would be an unthinkable role for the Senate to occupy.

Yet there is an alternative extreme which it seems to me would be equally unthinkable, namely, that our condemnation of all strikes in industries that affect the national-defense efforts, without reservation and without specification, should be interpreted in other quarters as a condemnation of labor's general right to strike.

That right is the legitimate cornerstone of labor's legitimate and indispensable bill of rights. Within its legitimate sphere the right should never be impaired. I hope I shall never impair it; but its legitimate sphere stops when it provably collides with essential public interest.

In numerous recent, dangerous situations, it has overstepped its legitimate sphere. Leaders of organized labor themselves have not hesitated to say so, and I commend them for their bravery in doing so. I am saying nothing they have not said. It is in this spirit and with this distinct limitation that I am inclined to vote "aye" on the Byrd amendment; but I could wish that its language were more specific, I may say to my able friend from Virginia, and that its definition were more confining in respect to the violation of legitimate collective bargaining and mediation and arbitration and the necessity to maintain national-defense production. I could wish that its language were not so susceptible of an interpretation as a general condemnation of the general right to strike. I repudiate any such condemnation. I am simply saying that in a moment of total national emergency, as the President proclaims our present status to be, the public welfare must come first, just as much in a munitions factory as in an Army cantonment or on a battleship.

But what I wish chiefly to say, Mr. President, is that I think we would make a more constructive contribution in this critical situation if we were to direct the Senate Committee on Education and Labor judicially to explore existing law to see whether specific legislation may be available to protect not only the public interest but also the legitimate rights of organized labor. I am throwing out one or two suggestions to illustrate what I have in mind. They are not conclusive. I am making no conclusive recommendations, but I am very briefly presenting some facts which it seems to me ought to challenge the Senate to proceed constructively to explore the possibilities of constructive legislation, actual legislation, rather than mere resolutions—legislation which would protect not only the public interest but the legitimate organized-labor purposes as asserted by its own leadership.

Mr. President, the thing which most disturbs me in this situation, and the thing which it seems to me should primarily challenge our attention is the fact that subversive elements in this country—Communist, Nazi, and such—are clearly using legitimate labor as a smoke screen to hide their undertakings to overthrow this Government by force and to sabotage our defense effort. I think the time has gone by when that can be gainsaid. Many of the panzer divisions in some of these labor strikes are nothing more or less than the American fifth column on the march, and I think it is time that the Senate took a realistic view of that phase of the matter. I am speaking of a very small minority of labor. The great and overwhelming mass of American labor—and this emphatically includes organized labor—is completely patriotic and wholly dedicated to the flag and wants to do its full part in this emergency. I am speaking, however, about closely knit minorities which are scientific saboteurs and nothing less, and which are using these strike situations to promote their subversive and sinister purposes.

Let us see if there is not some truth in that statement. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the leaders of the C. I. O. themselves bravely went into this recent California situation and declared that the strike is one in which—

> The infamous agitation and underhand maneuvering of the Communist Party are clear.

That is not my statement. That is the statement of the leadership of the C. I. O., which was brave enough to recognize its own hazard and the hazard of the country in this common menace. I think we owe that leadership our cooperation in cleaning up the situation.

What did the Attorney General of the United States say? On his responsibility as the chief law officer of the land—and certainly Mr. Jackson has been no labor baiter; Mr. Jackson is one of the great liberals of the Nation—what did he say?

> The situation at the North American plant more nearly resembles an insurrection than a labor strike.

That is what I am talking about—insurrection.

> The President's proclamation recites the persistent defiance of governmental efforts to mediate any legitimate labor differences. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe.

That is the distinction I am making, and I am seeking to stand by the loyal labor leaders, but I am seeking to find out whether the Senate can constructively attack the others, and not be content merely to pass pious resolutions.

Continuing with Mr. Jackson's statement:

> Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes.

They are the ones I am talking about.

> That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.
>
> There can be no doubt that the duty, constitutionally and inherently, rested upon the President to exert his civil and military as well as his moral authority to keep the defense effort of the United States a going concern.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Government has to clear the track of all subversive activity which is colliding with the essential public interest, if it finds it within the labor movement; if it finds it outside the labor movement—wherever it exists. Eternal vigilance has come to be more than ever the price of our liberty and our security and our peace. The Government will never reach the crux of the defense problem in respect to strikes until it reaches Communist "fifth column," or Nazi "fifth column," or any other subversive "fifth column" which uses legitimate labor against its will as a smoke screen to hide its treason and sabotage; and legitimate unions will never be safe from internal poison until they succeed in the splendid efforts which they themselves are making to purge themselves of all subversionists.

Mr. President, what happened at the recent Ford strike in Detroit? Let me read a paragraph of a letter written by one who is reporting factually upon the damage done within the Ford plant. I am reading from a letter from Mr. I. A. Capizzi, who was the attorney for the Ford interests. It it an ex parte statement. It may be discounted on that score, but it appears to be totally sustained by the exhibits submitted in connection with it. I read:

> I am enclosing herewith a copy of a report prepared for me by one of our investigators who went through the plant at the time of the strike. It is apparent, after reading this report, that whoever committed this sabotage at the Ford plant knew where the nerve centers of production were, because the greater portion of the damage was done in the tool and die building, where most of the delicate machinery destined for the airplane-engine plant was located. Many gages were destroyed or damaged. While these gages are not of tremendous value in dollars, they do control the production of many other machines, and they cannot be replaced for many weeks; and, of course, nothing can be made on the other machines until these gages are available. It is difficult to ascertain at this time the exact amount of the damage to machinery and equipment as the result of this strike. It has been estimated as totaling between $350,000 and $500,000.

Mr. President, the thing I am emphasizing is not that the strike involved the destruction of half a million dollars' worth of property—a contemplation, however, which certainly no law-abiding American citizen can condone—the thing I am emphasizing is that the saboteurs who created this half million dollars' damage knew exactly where to go in these plants in order to create a maximum destruction at key points in the defense machine of the United States. They went straight to their chore; they knew how to go and what to do after they had arrived. It had nothing whatever to do with the labor movement. It had primarily to do with an effort to destroy the self-sufficiency of America in its own defense, and I am saying that not only is it the responsibility of the legitimate labor unions—and they have accepted the responsibility and are endeavoring to purge themselves of these influences—not only is it their responsibility but it is the responsibility of the Congress, in general, and the Senate, in particular, to explore this phase of the strike problem for the purpose of determining whether or not definitive legislation cannot protect us in greater degree from this hazard.

Is there anything that I have read that advances the cause of legitimate organized labor? Not a thing. Quite the contrary, and every responsible labor unionist will say so.

Here [exhibiting] is the famous picture, which has been sent up and down America, of a part of the picket line at the Ford plant. Here is this poor chap with his overcoat drawn up over his head; he is about 22 years old; I believe he is still in a hospital, fighting for his life; he is being attacked on all sides by assailants. The picture is so good that each one of them can be identified, each one has been identified, and not one of the assailants is a Ford employee. Here [exhibiting] are the photostats of the Communist Party membership cards of two of the chief assailants in this assault. That is what I am talking about.

Has legitimate labor any interest in the maintenance of conditions of that character? Mr. President, do you call that peaceful picketing? Do you call that America?

Mr. President, I think that effective legislation respecting picket lines would go further to stabilize the problem which confronts us than all the resolutions we could pass. I think that the picket line as maintained in modern strike technique by those subversionists who have learned their art in Russia and have gone to school there to learn it, is the greatest practical menace not only to law and order but the greatest practical hazard to defense production, and to universal American acceptance of the great labor-union movement.

I have here a report of Army inspectors who sought to discover to what extent the Ford strike had interfered with defense production. This is a report dated April 10, 1941.

War Department.
Air Corps, Matériel Division.

Prepared by Major Irvine; approved by Major Schulgen; approved by Lieutenant Colonel Chapman, chief, inspection section.

Factual data.

This is a report of the War Department.

1. During the transaction of Government business in connection with engine production with the executive personnel of the companies referred to above, a number of interesting facts relative to delays in production due to strikes has come to life.

2. When the undersigned approached the factory of the Ford Motor Co. on April 7, it was quite apparent in a conversation that ensued with personnel on the picket line that they were not employed by the Ford Motor Co.

Please bear that chief fact in mind as we proceed, because it is the thing I am emphasizing. I think the key to the situation is the fact that the picket lines, where all the difficulty arises, are too largely manned by imported squads of pickets; that often those imported squads are just such groups as are pictured in the amazing exhibit which I have just laid at the bar of the Senate—groups that are engaged in what Attorney General Jackson calls insurrection against the civil law rather than actually and primarily engaged in legitimate efforts to promote labor welfare.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Is the Senator advised whether the union involved in the Ford strike directed the importation of these men, if they were imported, or how they came to be in the picket lines? They certainly must have been there through some official activity of the union, or, if they were not, how did they happen to be there?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry to tell the Senator I cannot give him that detailed information, but, in defense of my own status, I may say to the Senator that at the time this situation arose I asked, first, the Governor of Michigan and, second, the President of the United States himself through his competent representatives to make an authentic census of this picket line, abstractly and academically, so that we could have all the facts to lay upon the laboratory table as a basis for our action and activity. I want no snap judgments.

I fully realize that some of these things may be prejudicial. I said in the beginning, or, if I did not, I intended to say, that I know how easy it is to create prejudicial opinions at a hysterical time such as this and to defame legitimate labor interests because of the malfeasance of a few minority representatives of the wrong faction. I want to absolve myself from any desire to do that sort of thing. I am simply presenting all the facts that are available to me, with the suggestion not that they are conclusive but that they represent the sort of an exhibit which the Senate Committee on Education and Labor ought constructively to explore in cooperation with legitimate representatives of labor unions themselves, for they have displayed the same interest in this that I have, to the end that we may see whether or not this particular hazard cannot be controlled.

Mr. BONE. I had wondered if local authorities had made any inquiry into that particular aspect of the problem and sought to determine whether the men in the picket line were or had been bona fide employees of the Ford plant. I should think they would have checked on that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I asked for such an investigation, but did not get it.

Mr. BONE. There is one other aspect which interested me. I was going to ask the Senator if the prosecuting attorney of the county had caused the assailants of this man to be indicted. Are they being put on trial?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is my understanding that the assaulters in this picture were identified, that felonious assault warrants were issued against them, and they are now awaiting trial.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. It is an amazing disclosure the Senator has made. May I ask if, in addition to Communists, his information leads him to believe that any of these imported racketeers were Germans or bundists?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no information, and prefer to express no opinion, because I am trying to confine myself to what seem to be the facts at my disposal, lest I be unduly prejudicial.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Of course, the Senator understands that the present foreign policy of the administration is not only to cultivate Russia but also to cuddle up to Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And that the impression has been freely given by the administration that the chief disturbers were bundists and Fascists and other people allied with the Axis Powers in industrial strikes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To what extent this inspiration is Russian, I can tell the Senator there is no blood on my hands, because I was one of the two Senators who opposed the original recognition of Russia before the able Senator from Idaho arrived in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And after the Senator from Idaho arrived, the Senator from Michigan was in the forefront in opposing probably the most vicious dictator on earth, which the present foreign policy of our country seems to want to establish. Does the Senator care to comment on that statement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. I am in great sympathy with the Senator's general attitude toward the subject which he discusses, but I am really trying at the moment to keep on the single track upon which I approached this subject; and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to stay there, because I think it is of sufficient magnitude to warrant concentration.

Mr. President, let me return to this very illuminating report to the War Department Air Corps, Matériel Division, showing the extent to which the use of external pickets on a picket line not only involves the question of peace and order on the picket line itself but also involves the withdrawal of essential union members from other plants which are also at work upon defense contracts, but who are called out for the purpose of manning picket lines elsewhere.

I continue to read:

3. The undersigned—

These three high Army officers—

was reliably informed that at the time the strike took place at the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co., over 1,000 individuals, who were union members but not Ford employees, were actually in the plant using illegal passes, and that these individuals cut off power, shut off machines, and damaged equipment in general.

That is the thing I was saying a few moments ago. There we undoubtedly identify the primary source of the sabotage to which I referred. This statement almost absolves Ford employees themselves from that sabotage. I am talking about this importation, and the danger and the menace of it.

4. The undersigned is reliably informed that at the time of the inception of the strike and during subsequent picketing a large number of cars bearing out-of-town licenses formed a part of the traffic block.

5. A serious delay in preparation for production of pistons, rocker arms, etc., by the Hudson Motor Co. for use in Wright engines

on Army Air Corps contracts has been caused by the fact—

Now, mark you—

has been caused by the fact that the workers in this and other departments of the Hudson Motor Co. have been called out by the union for use as pickets at the Ford Motor Co.

There we get collateral interference with and interruption of national-defense production.

6. The progress of defense work at the Budd Manufacturing Co. on Navy contracts has also been curtailed as a result of men being withdrawn by the union from subject defense work and placed on duty at the Ford Motor Co. as pickets.

7. While direct information was not available, the undersigned was informally advised that men had been withdrawn for picket duty by the union from other plants in the Detroit area as well.

Then, Mr. President, after several other specific paragraphs upon the same subject, this official document comes to the following conclusion:

1. That the present practice of the union of taking personnel from plants which are still in operation for use as pickets in striking plants tends to seriously cripple the defense program. In many cases work is not only stopped at the plant at which the strike occurs but may seriously hamper other plants under the control of the same union in that general area.

Recommendation:

This being the recommendation of these three representatives of the War Department:

1. It is recommended that drastic action be taken to prevent the withdrawal of workers on defense contracts from plants that are not in any way affected or concerned with strikes now in progress.

Mr. President, briefly, that outlines the proposition which I again say I think the Senate Committee on Education and Labor ought to explore for the purpose of determining whether there is not definitive and actual and specific legislation which, in complete fairness to legitimate union rights, yet in elementary acknowledgement of the public welfare, can be put upon the statute books to minimize this particular hazard. I think we should be doing far more to stabilize the public welfare and its interest in national defense, I think we should be doing far more for the legitimate leaders of legitimate labor who themselves are struggling with this problem, if we were to mutually undertake a constructive exploration of that sort through our proper committees rather than to confine ourselves merely to the passage of a resolution, no matter how righteous.

My own view is that it may be possible by law to confine the pickets on a picket line either in whole or in part to the employees of the struck plant; and, from the evidence which comes to me, I am unable to believe that a simple corrective of that nature would not go far toward stabilizing the situation and answering our major strike problem, plus a general outlawing of all violence and all terrorism by anybody connected in any way with a strike under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, the things I have said, I repeat, are not conclusive. I am not attempting to be dogmatic. I realize the danger in presenting ex parte evidence. I have sought to get other evidence. I think I have submitted enough to show that a realistic problem exists, and that this problem goes to the very heart and center of the thing which is now disturbing the country. I am expressing the hope that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, without any prejudice of any nature, and with a full recognition of the complete necessity for maintaining without impairment the right of collective bargaining, will inquire into the possibility of a few simple amendments to the existing law so that what seem to me to be the obvious points of hazard may be in some degree ameliorated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished Senators who have spoken both for and against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I have been moved by the oratory both for the amendment and against the amendment; but I desire to say that the conditions confronting the Nation today demand cool, deliberate consideration of every proposition presented to the United States Senate. I say that it is our duty at this time to analyze the effect of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] had to say in regard to the preamble. I think that is good; but let us come down to the substantive part of the amendment, which reads:

The Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

To ask the Senate to pass upon this amendment is like asking it to pass upon a lawsuit before the evidence is presented. If we vote "no" upon the amendment, we give the impression throughout the United States that we favor strikes. If we vote "aye," we say to labor that if industry should reduce the wages of its workers to $1 a day, it would still be contrary to public policy for the workers to strike.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. If we vote both ways, we get a double infliction of penalty and misunderstanding; and if we vote twice on each side, no matter how the vote comes out, we have not defeated a law or passed a law; we have not put anything on the statute books which technically is a law; and technically and legally our action would have no effect whatever on anyone.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Arizona, because the language employed in the amendment is so phrased that it would compel the Senate to prejudge the merits of every strike regardless of the basis for it.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. BONE. The Senator from Arizona has brought that out in saying that an employer might pay only a dollar a day, but we would have to condemn the strike which might be called against such wages, although the cost of living was increasing. There may be a good deal of sympathy with the objectives sought in many of these amendments, but we should not be enmeshed in the web of language which compels us to do something which we do not want to do, that is, utterly condemn every strike protest against what might even be a rank injustice to labor.

I know that a great many people, a great many members of organized labor and unorganized labor, have ultimately reached certain conclusions on war profits in the picture as it presently presents itself. Congress has stripped off the last restriction on profits, by allowing the Army and the Navy and Procurement Divisions to make contracts of any kind without effective restriction on profits. They have said, in effect, "Go get the goods regardless of what they cost;" and that is also the program in Britain today.

Of course, the stern necessities of the case require the procurement of these goods as rapidly as possible, and everyone knows that, but it has left the impression in many quarters that we are presently not really seriously attempting to limit profits. This view is widely held and it has excited workers to feel that they want to have a fair share in these war profits. It is a reaction we should have anticipated. We will attempt to recapture excessive profits by taxation, but to many people that program does not present an acceptable answer to the problem we face. That is one of the problems implicit in proposals like that of the Senator from Virginia. They do present the angles the Senator from Arizona has suggested.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I say that to ask the Senate of the United States to vote upon this amendment is like asking a witness upon the witness stand, "When are you going to stop beating your wife?"

If parliamentary procedure would permit me to do so, I would offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia which would adopt the preamble of his resolution, and, in my opinion, accomplish more. The resolution would read as follows:

It is the sense of Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and, in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee composed of 10 members, 5 members, including the chairman, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, be forthwith created to study the cause of such strikes in defense industries, and to recommend to Congress, at the earliest possible date, appropriate legislation to prevent the slowing up of production in any manner in national-defense industries.

Mr. President, I say that the committee to make such a study should be a

special committee, composed of Members of the Senate and Members of the House, and should have no other duties. It is for this reason that I am suggesting that a special committee be created.

I am unwilling to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia for the reasons I have stated. I am in accord with a great deal that has been said here on both sides; but, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, this kind of a declaration of policy does not get us anywhere. We must depend upon labor, and we must depend upon capital. Let us call them around a table and ask that they suggest what we can do to help them solve their difficulties. I am a believer in our democratic government. I believe that labor is patriotic enough to help us solve these problems, and I likewise believe that capital is patriotic enough to help us solve them. But I do not believe this kind of an amendment would solve anything. Therefore I shall have to vote against it, and I hope the Senate will vote against it, and if it votes it down, I shall offer the amendment I have suggested.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I have read be substituted for the Byrd amendment, in the hope that the distinguished Senator from Virginia will agree with me, and will allow it to be substituted.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator asking that I consent that his amendment be substituted for mine?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection to the amendment being read, but I could not consent to what the Senator suggests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that one word in the amendment which I offered yesterday and which was accepted by the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] be changed. The word "section" should be changed to "paragraph." The change suggested is completely in accord with the wishes and the understanding of the Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the word "section" in my amendment be changed to "paragraph."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed change.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment it is proposed to change the word "section" to "paragraph", so as to read, "The provisions of this paragraph," and so forth.

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection. That is the way the amendment was intended to be drawn when it was offered.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I read an amendment to the so-called Byrd amendment which I hoped might be considered by the Senate. I understand that in the parliamentary situation, unless I can get unanimous consent, I am denied the opportunity of offering the amendment. I am about to ask unanimous consent, and I send the suggested amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, of the pending amendment, it is proposed to strike out "such strikes" and insert "that strikes which ignore the advantages of arbitration and mediation and the decisions reached thereby."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in its present form I shall be among those voting against the so-called Byrd amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish the Senator would ask that the Byrd amendment be read as it would be if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut were agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. I make that request, Mr. President.

Mr. BONE. Before the reading may I be advised whether the Senator from Connecticut has offered an amendment which has been printed?

Mr. MALONEY. No. My proposed amendment is merely in my own handwriting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as proposed to be amended by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States, which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies, the Congress hereby declares that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and that strikes which ignore the advantages of arbitration and mediation, and the decisions reached thereby, are hereby condemned.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I repeat that in its present form I shall be among those opposed to the Byrd amendment. If I correctly understand the aim of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, he wants to condemn unlawful strikes, he wants to condemn strikes which are in a sense vicious and against the national interest. I do not understand, I do not want to believe, and I do not believe, that the Senator from Virginia desires to condemn a strike which is brought about by reason of unfair treatment of labor or a strike which might be justifiable in that employees are underpaid or otherwise unfairly treated. A strike might be the only real way workingmen would have to bring about fair treatment.

I agree, of course, that there have been great abuses in the field of labor. I agree that in at least a few instances there has been racketeering. I am satisfied that in some instances a communistic and foreign element has assisted and been successful in fomenting strikes, with the purpose in mind of disrupting our national defense. But, Mr. President, I have the feeling that if the amendment as drafted by the Senator from Virginia were accepted, instead of assisting in the rapid development and advancement of our national-defense program it would hinder that program. It would permit alien influences, or communistic elements, or others who are anxious to hamper the defense program, to stir up and promote in the minds and hearts of the men who work, and particularly those who are probably in a distressed situation, an excitement that would do us great harm.

The American workman alone does not strike for the sake of striking. He realizes that when he temporarily abandons his job, in seeking fair treatment and what he believes to be more nearly just wages, he endangers his own family and fireside. He realizes that he will be without his pay possibly for a long period of time. I cannot believe that either the Senate of the United States or the House of Representatives is willing to make a blanket condemnation of all strikes under any sort of conditions or circumstances.

Mr. President, I seem to recall that a long time ago, in making a speech on the lease-lend bill, I said the dangers were not so great as they seemed to be, or, if they were great, they might be avoided if we remained calm and kept our feet on the ground. Now, in my judgment, as the result of a serious strike, and one which I myself think was unfair, we are feeling the effect of a world-wide convulsion. The hysteria, it seems to me, has reached into the membership of the United States Senate. In my opinion, we are not legislating with as much care as those charged with the responsibility of the office of Senator should exercise.

I realize that we have spent a long time on this bill, and I am very hopeful that I can get the unanimous consent of the Members of the Senate to have a vote on my amendment, which, I insist, does no less than the Senator from Virginia wants to do. It merely provides that there shall be a condemnation of strikes only when men engaged in strikes on defense work have refused to arbitrate and mediate, and accept the results of the decisions of the Mediation Board, in which the Federal Government would participate. I do not believe that labor should be as strong as the Federal Government, but neither do I believe that the all-powerful Federal Government should take an advantage of labor, even though it be but a psychological advantage, by condemning without reservation every single strike under any and all circumstances.

While the rules of the Senate deny me the chance to offer this amendment on its merits, and while the rules of the Senate deny the Members of the Senate the chance to vote on this perfecting amendment, without unanimous consent being obtained, I cannot believe that any such thing was in the minds of those who wrote and established the Senate's rules.

In my judgment, there are Members of the Senate who are tormented to some

extent by the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, because there may be a natural feeling—although it does not disturb me, Mr. President—that some folks outside will misunderstand our action and think that a vote against the Byrd amendment as drafted indicates a reluctance on the part of the Senate of the United States, or on the part of a Senator so voting, to condemn unfair strikes. Such is not the case.

I think that what the distinguished and very able Senator from Virginia has in mind—and I should like to say in parentheses that I have applauded his great efforts and am very proud of his friendship—is a desire to condemn lawless strikes, unfair strikes, strikes which sabotage, strikes which are purposely brought about by men of evil intent, which would hamper our national-defense program.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I am in sympathy with the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, but, as I read it, his amendment would still condemn, as being contrary to sound public policy, strikes in industries which affect the national-defense efforts. If he would accept the suggestion I have in mind, I suggest that the qualifying clause should be inserted earlier in the amendment than it now appears, in the form suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. It should read that—

strikes in industries that affect the national-defense efforts and ignore the advantages of arbitration and mediation and the decisions reached thereby are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to accept the suggestion and the change. I do not think it necessarily makes a very great difference. I do not think the effect would be much different, but because the question arises I wish to satisfy any Senator who is in sympathy with what I am trying to do. I am quite willing to accept the change.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. The parliamentary situation has been stated by the Senator from Connecticut. Unless the Senator from Virginia should temporarily withdraw his amendment in order to permit action upon the Connally amendment, and then reoffer his amendment, the Members of the Senate would be denied the opportunity to offer amendments to the so-called Byrd amendment.

I do not think that a matter of this importance should be disposed of in that way. I think it is the sense of the Senate that any Member of the Senate who has an amendment to offer to perfect the Byrd amendment should be given the opportunity to do so. Without the withdrawal of the amendment, the only other alternative is by unanimous consent. Therefore, if the Senator from Connecticut will withdraw his request for a moment, I ask unanimous consent that the Byrd amendment be subject to amendment. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] informs me that he has an amendment to offer to the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and perhaps other Senators have amendments to offer. I think if we are to obtain the sentiment of the Senate on this matter, the Members of the Senate should have the opportunity to offer amendments to the Byrd amendment and should not be required to vote "yes" or "no" on the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I appeal to the Senator from Virginia temporarily to withdraw his amendment and let the Senate vote on the Connally amendment. Then the Senator from Virginia may reoffer his amendment to the bill. His amendment does not relate to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, except in a most general way. He may reoffer his amendment as an amendment to the bill, and it will be before the Senate for all proper purposes. It can be amended, modified, and voted upon. I urge the Senator to let us proceed now to vote on the Connally amendment. Immediately thereafter he may reoffer his amendment in such form as he may desire as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have been in the Senate for some years; and I have not seen the rules of the Senate voluntarily surrendered by Senators who happen to offer amendments. I have seen the same situation occur in connection with appropriation bills, when efforts were made to amend or to insert new matter. If my amendment is not subject to amendment under the rules of the Senate, and it was introduced in that form, I feel that I have the privilege of asking the Senate to pass upon it under the rules of the Senate. I am very sorry that I cannot accede to the request of my friends the Senator from Texas and the Senator from South Carolina.

While I am on my feet, Mr. President, permit me to say that I am in accord with the purpose of the Senator from Connecticut. I have no desire to condemn strikes in which both parties have agreed to arbitrate and to abide by the results of the arbitration. Of course, when they agree to arbitrate and abide by the result of the arbitration, no strike occurs.

I am not satisfied with the language of the Senator from Connecticut, that strikes which ignore the advantages of arbitration and mediation, and so forth, are condemned. I think some other phraseology could be drafted which would carry out the purpose of the Senator from Connecticut, in which the Senator from Virginia is willing to concur. I do not see how a strike could occur if the dispute were left to arbitration and the parties agreed to abide by the result of the arbitration. There would be no strike under such circumstances.

Mr. MALONEY. I am aiming at the avoidance of strikes.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the theory of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, it is compulsory arbitration. That seems to be the final answer to what the Senator proposes to do, because he condemns any strike which is not arbitrated.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, the Senator from Virginia, who drafted the amendment, realizes as well as does any other Senator that the only effect of his amendment is psychological. It would not have the force and effect of law. In keeping with the spirit of his amendment, I am bearing in mind the psychological effect. I realize, as he does, that there is no chance of a greater accomplishment than that. I am very pleased that he is in sympathy with what I am trying to do, and that he has not yet said—and I hope he will not—that he will not join in the unanimous-consent request to act on my amendment. Of course, he is entirely within his rights, as he has stated, in insisting upon the Senate abiding by its rules. In my judgment, to protect his amendment he may very properly object to some amendments; but if he is in sympathy with my amendment, if he is in accord with what I am trying to do, I hope he will not go beyond that point and deny the Senate the opportunity to vote on my amendment simply because some other amendment may be distasteful to him, or because he may feel that some other amendment may have an ill effect on what he is trying to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am really going along with the thought of the Senator. The Senator from Virginia is bound to realize that many Members of the Senate are in favor of the Connally amendment and want to vote for it, and yet are opposed to some features of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. If my suggestion were followed, the Senator from Virginia would not lose any of his rights, and the Senate would thereby be given an opportunity to express itself on the Connally amendment as such. The Byrd amendment could then be immediately offered and discussed, amended if necessary, and agreed to by the Senate.

The Byrd amendment does not change a line, a word, a clause, a phrase, or a sentence in the Connally amendment. I do not think it is quite in keeping with parliamentary procedure——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think my amendment is absolutely pertinent to the Connally amendment, because the objective of both amendments is to stop strikes in defense industries.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, every line in the Connally amendment, when considered in connection with the amendment as a whole, is a condemnation of illegal strikes, and no additional language is needed for that purpose.

I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Virginia is trying to do; but I do not think he is helping the adoption of the Connally amendment by insisting that the Senate must take his amendment just as he has written it and swal-

low it or reject it. I might want to vote for some little change in the Byrd amendment, but the attitude of the Senator from Virginia is, "No; here it is. Take it or leave it." I ask him once more, in the most fervent manner I know how, and as one soldier in a common cause to another, to let the Senate vote on the Connally amendment. He may then immediately reoffer his amendment. He cannot complain about what the Senate does with it. Let the Senate do what it pleases with his amendment. The Senate may change it, adopt it, or reject it, but let us not scramble it up with the Connally amendment, and thereby impede the orderly procedure. If it had not been for the Byrd amendment, I think we should have very promptly adopted the Connally amendment last night.

I appeal to the Senator from Virginia from this aspect: The unanimity with which the Connally amendment will be adopted—I hope—will have a tremendous psychological effect upon the country, upon the morale of the citizenship generally, and upon the attitude of capital and labor, if it is known that the Congress is practically united. But if the Senator from Virginia ties on his amendment, and thereby gives many Senators cause to vote against the whole thing, it will create a bad impression, because the strikers will say, "Well, we have a little group up there. They carried it, all right; but we have a little group that is against this thing." And they will buck up and will say, "We will go back on the picket line and we will create some more disturbance."

So I appeal to the Senate, let us adopt the Connally amendment by an overwhelming majority. Then we can argue and fuss around the rest of the time if we desire.

Mr. BYRD. I see clearly that the Senator from Texas has much more regard for his amendment than he has for mine.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have. I would not be advocating it if I had not.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment as revised on the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I will yield in a moment. I suggest that the language of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia be changed at the place which has been designated.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have the privilege of conferring with the Senator from Connecticut with respect to his amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Virginia. I did not hear what he said.

Mr. BYRD. I said I should like the privilege of conferring with the Senator from Connecticut with respect to his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Utah would like to be advised what is now before the Senate. Is it a unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Connecticut that his amendment be amended as proposed by the Senator from Louisiana? Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. MALONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Connecticut has not offered an amendment, because he is not permitted to offer an amendment. A little later I shall make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was a private conversation between the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Virginia which took place a few moments ago, which none of the Senators in this part of the Chamber were able to overhear. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he will request the Senator from Virginia to state what was his reply?

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to state it myself, if I may, because that will give me a further chance to applaud my proposal.

The Senator from Virginia suggested—which indicates to me that he is extremely sympathetic with my amendment, and is likely to agree to it—that he would like to confer with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia, as modified in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States, which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies, the Congress hereby declares that strikes in industry that affect the national-defense effort and ignore the advantages of arbitration and negotiation and the decisions reached thereby, are contrary to sound public policy, and such strikes are hereby condemned.

Mr. MALONEY. Now, Mr. President, I should like to say that when I submit my unanimous-consent request—and I do not know just when it will be submitted, because of the invitation to confer with the Senator from Virginia—it will be on the basis of the language just read.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess for 5 minutes in order that the Senator from Connecticut and I may confer.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not yield as yet, Mr. President.

As I have said, when I submit my unanimous-consent request it will be on the basis of the language just read, unless in the meantime the Senator from Virginia persuades me to change the language and then accepts my proposal, I assume that ordinarily I should make the request now; but on the basis of the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia I shall defer my request.

I should like, in closing, to plead with the Members of the Senate, and particularly with those who are sympathetic toward the Byrd amendment, to give very serious thought to the great step they will take as they vote on this amendment, particularly as to the action they will take on the language which I have submitted.

Yesterday in the Senate, much to my amazement—and I say this in relation to my earlier reference to hysteria—one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, without question one of the very able Members of this body, in discussing the subject which we discuss now, said that he would abandon the Bill of Rights to save America. I do not think he meant that. I think that that statement by him is an example of how far hysteria goes, when a Senator, who is easily recognized as one of the outstanding Members of this body and as one of its outstanding lawyers, goes so far in a speech as to say that he would under certain circumstances, in order to save America, abandon the Bill of Rights. The abandonment of the Bill of Rights, Mr. President, in my judgment, would be the abandonment of America. If the Bill of Rights is not the keystone of the United States, I do not know what the keystone is. I hope that Members of the Senate will have in mind that statement and other like statements when they are afforded the chance, which I hope they will have, to vote on the perfecting suggestion which I have offered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in the unfortunate atmosphere which envelops not only the Congress of the United States but the country as well, I do not know whether it is possible to secure the calm and considered deliberation which should be brought to bear upon the vital and important questions which are involved in the subject matter of the pending amendments and in the action of the House of Representatives in connection with the military appropriation bill. I say that the atmosphere is unfortunate, Mr. President, because I realize that men for whose judgment, patriotism, and sincerity I have the most profound respect, find themselves in a position diametrically opposed to that which I occupy upon this important question.

It was suggested yesterday afternoon by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that he viewed this as a question of courage, insofar as Members of the Senate are concerned. I do not pretend to quote his words, but the clear implication of his statement was that any who disagrees with the proposition that labor's right to strike should be interfered with lacks courage, if not patriotism.

Mr. President, I do not doubt the plenary power of the Government in a grave national emergency or in a state of total

war to conscript labor; to put it to work on the production line, if need be, with a soldier with a fixed bayonet behind every worker. But, in view of the situation confronting the Senate and the country, I believe—contrary to the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina—that the evidence of courage upon the part of men who must accept responsibility for shaping policies of Government in this crisis is to exercise their plenary power with statesmanship and with courage.

What all of us seek, I assume, Mr. President, is increased production for the purposes of national defense. I question whether we shall increase production if, in this all-out effort of national defense we proceed, either by legislative fiat or by legislation itself, to curtail, curb, or to take away from labor its chief effective weapon and its most prized right, namely the right to cease work. In this situation, I realize that it is very easy for some to fall into the frame of mind that a little show of force, a little exercise of congressional and Executive power, will so affect labor that it will increase production.

I expressed on yesterday, and I repeat today, that I doubt very seriously whether the seizure of industrial plants by the Government, by the armed forces of the United States, is a solution to the complex and delicate problem of human relationships that are involved in the adjudication and the adjustment of differences between employer and employee. Other Senators on yesterday pointed out some of the pitfalls which may lie before the country if we continue to resort to the methods employed in the case of the North American Co. strike at Inglewood, Calif.

In making that statement, Mr. President, I would not wish to be placed in a position of justifying the strike at Inglewood when the matters which were in disagreement were pending before the National Defense Mediation Board. Nevertheless, as was pointed out by the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], all the blame in the North American Co. strike is not to be placed at the door of labor, misguided, misdirected, though their action may have been.

I am informed that common labor, Mr. President, in the North American plant in Inglewood, Calif., has been getting 50 cents an hour. Sixty percent of the employees of the North American Co. at Inglewood are college men. The negotiations proceeded for 7 weeks, and yet, even at the time when the matter came before the National Defense Mediation Board, the management representing the company did not show any inclination to alter its intransigent position against increases in the wage scales in that plant.

I repeat, Mr. President, I hold no brief for "wildcat" strikes; I hold no brief for strikes led by Communists and Nazis or any other individuals who are not in sympathy with the principles of our Government, but no one can convince me that a handful of Communists, if there be such, at the North American plant at Inglewood, Calif., could have taken all those thousands of men out on strike and kept them there.

Let it also be said for the record, Mr. President, that it was not only the armed forces of the United States with fixed bayonets that caused the men at the Inglewood plant to go back to work; I do not doubt that armed force was a very important factor; but, nevertheless, let the record show that the national and regional officers of the Congress of Industrial Organizations pled with the men at the Inglewood plant, if they did not order them, to go back to work.

In connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I wish to say, at the outset, that I recognize that it has no force of law; it is simply a legislative declaration. Nevertheless, any person conversant with the situation confronting us, so far as labor relations are concerned in connection with our national-defense effort, who does not realize that psychology plays an important part in determining whether or not those relations are satisfactory in the sense of enabling us to obtain the production which all of us seek, regardless of how we may feel upon the question of our foreign policy, is one, I venture to suggest, who is not cognizant of the delicacy of these relationships in human contacts and human affairs.

Let it be said, at the outset, that trade-unionism, democracy, and freedom from dictatorships are synonymous. Political proletarian dictatorship cannot exist alongside free trade-unions. If we can learn anything from the history of the post-World War period of totalitarian dictatorship, the first step of dictators is to strike down trade-unionism, to take away from labor its right to the use of civil liberties in conjunction with the improvement and betterment of its condition. The first aggressive step of political totalitarian dictatorship in the destruction of democratic institutions is to strike down free trade-unionism, and, with it, the right of labor to speak its protest against economic underprivilege, to assemble together for joint action and to bargain collectively with the management of industries, be they private or public. The right to strike and the right to peaceful picketing, which constitute insofar as bargaining is concerned the chief weapon labor possesses, are outlawed; the leaders of trade-unionism are marked for political persecution of a thousand varieties, and then some fake form of labor front, controlled by the State, is set up as a substitute for free trade-unions. That has been the pattern in Germany, in Russia, and in Italy. God forbid that the United States of America at this time, when we are seeking to prepare our beloved country for the purpose of defending our way of life, should, in an hour of hysteria, take a fatal step down the course which has been followed in the countries abroad where democracy and human freedom have been trampled under the hobnailed boots of marching men.

In my view, the essential rights of labor, which are predicated upon the rights contained in the Constitution, are inseparably linked with national defense. As I view the matter, they are mutually self-supporting. Damage to either in a true democracy may be fatal to both. The furtherance of each strengthens both. We cannot save democracy in the world by first destroying it here at home.

I, for one, refuse to concede that democracy cannot survive in a crisis; that free men cannot and will not outproduce slaves.

Let not any of my colleagues or any people in this country who are not sympathetic with or who do not see the vital importance of labor's rights entertain the delusion that they can be wantonly sacrificed upon the altar of national defense without that sacrifice ultimately bringing in its train the sacrifice of the rights and liberties and freedom of other groups in our population; for once we take the position that in a time of national crisis we will abrogate the fundamental constitutional rights of millions of working men and women in this country, we cannot stop with them. We cannot confine our temporary or permanent tyranny to a particular segment of the population. The civil liberties of other groups will be abrogated. Property rights will be trampled underfoot. I fear if we start down this road there will be no turning back.

Mr. President, I measure my words when I say that any program of labor policy in relation to national defense which does not give to the great masses of the citizens of America who must perform the labor—who must, if need be, shoulder the guns, shed their blood, and pay out their treasure in the form of excessive taxation—a conviction and a faith for which they are willing to lay down their lives, if necessary, will at the perilous hour, if it comes, prove a sham and a delusion.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the words spoken by Ernest Bevin. Speaking of the heroic workers of Britain who each day are giving the lie to those who say that the liberties of labor must be sacrificed on the altar of national defense, he said, not many weeks ago, amid the crash of bombs and the killing of people in Britain:

> Let bitterness and discontent get into the hearts of my army: Then, by God, we have lost the war!

Labor has been subjected to a publicity blitzkrieg in the past few months. Forgotten are the facts in relation to the labor-relations policies of many, if not all, of the so-called national-defense industries. The National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing to labor the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing, was passed in 1935; and yet, so far as the national-defense industries are concerned, only about 40 percent of them, by a conservative estimate, have, at this good hour, collective bargaining. Many of them since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act have been notorious in their violent resistance to collective bargaining and the national labor policy as defined by law.

Many of our defense plants at this very hour are lacking in employer-employee machinery conducive to an avoidance of work stoppages and a settlement of disputes that may occur. I think it is recognized by all students of employer-

employee relations that voluntary collective-bargaining agreements between employer and employee, containing provisions for voluntary mediation and arbitration before strikes or lock-outs occur, are the best possible insurance against work stoppages. The converse, therefore, is true: Every absence of a collective-bargaining agreement, every refusal to bargain collectively, constitutes a threat to the production of national-defense material.

In the defense industries, as I indicated a moment ago, the situation is particularly serious. Powerful groups having dominant positions in defense industries have for years devoted their time, their energy, and their money, and utilized their great influence, to prevent the exercise of labor's rights, to avoid collective bargaining, and to violate the law of the land which has been on the statute books since 1935. This is not a loose statement. The 70 volumes of testimony and exhibits, the numerous reports made to the Senate by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor under Senate Resolution 266, conclusively prove that statement.

The records of that committee show conclusively that a large percentage of the companies involved in strikes listed officially as affecting national defense have been guilty of violations of the civil rights of their employees, and recalcitrant in their attitude toward the national labor policy.

Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee I have witnessed, I have heard, the bitterness which such labor policies bring in their trail. A refusal to bargain collectively in good faith is in and of itself an insult to the dignity of labor, and it almost never stands alone, as our records show, because in almost every case such a policy, in order to prevail against the national labor policy, must be implemented by devices of repression, espionage, company unions, discrimination, and ultimately the purchase and, too often, the use of arms. Such devices, unfortunate as we all know them to be, produce a poisoned employer-employee atmosphere and relationship which is not ended when the unfortunate incidents have come to a close. This poisoned, embittered atmosphere exists in important sectors of our national-defense production, and unless we take those facts into consideration we are very likely to let the hysteria of the moment lead us into unfortunate legislative declarations and policies.

I repeat, Mr. President, I assume that what we are all seeking to achieve is increased production, and I doubt very much whether the abrogation of labor's essential constitutional rights by a legislative fiat, or by legislation itself, or by Executive action, will increase production. On the contrary, I fear that it will have just the opposite effect.

I also desire to point out that, unfortunate though we all acknowledge any stoppage of production for defense to be, regardless of its cause, in my opinion there has been such an overemphasis upon the work stoppages in defense industries that we have perhaps lost our perspective in some degree. Strikes in 1940 caused a loss of about six and a half million man-days of work, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For 14 years the Bureau has kept comparable statistics, and in only 2 of those years has the time lost been less. Compared with the last World War period, less than one-half as many workers were involved in strikes in 1940 as in any of the years, 1916, 1917, or 1918, 2 of those years being, as all remember, years when we were actually engaged in war.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that in none of the 11 industries which are closely related to national defense—aircraft, shipbuilding, steel works, foundries and machine shops, aluminum, explosives, sawmills, machine tools, automobiles, electrical machinery, and engine manufacturing—in none of these 11 industries did the time lost because of strikes exceed seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total time worked, and in 8 of the 11 industries the time lost was less than three-tenths of 1 percent. Strikes during the last half of 1940, when the defense program was expanding rapidly, involved 40 percent less man-days of idleness than the last half of 1939.

I also should like to direct attention to the fact that not all the production loss in this country is due to strikes. More than six times as much time was lost last year because of illness, much of it preventable, than was lost due to strikes. More than four times as much time was lost because of industrial accidents, many of them preventable. There was a man-power loss equivalent to the time lost on account of strikes during the entire year 1939, lost every 14 hours in that year because of unemployment and part-time employment.

A special report was issued by the Secretary of Labor on May 1, 1941, with regard to strikes in the United States, and this is the latest date for which comparable figures are available. It shows that at that time strikes had declined to the point where only one-tenth of 1 percent of the workers were affected.

Mr. President, I do not think the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia should come up in this way. However, in making that statement I want the Senator to know that I do not criticize him in the slightest degree for taking advantage of the rules of the Senate and the parliamentary situation. He is well within his rights, and I am merely expressing it as my opinion that the amendment should more appropriately have come up in such a way that it would be subject to amendment.

I had hoped to offer an amendment, which I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my amendment would be suggested only against the eventuality that the Senate would adopt the declaration of policy proposed. Since the right of labor to strike, its most precious right, was to be officially condemned, I sought only to reaffirm the faith of the Senate in democratic procedure in labor relations. I sought to balance the proposal, for I say, in passing, that I think that in any action we take now we should bear in mind the difficult problems confronting the national labor leaders who, I believe, are cooperating 100 percent with the Government of the United States in seeking to increase national-defense production. I say I think we should take into consideration the problems which confront these men, and unless we feel compelled to do so on account of some drastic situation, we should not take action which, instead of strengthening their hands in seeking to secure voluntary cooperation of labor in an all-out defense effort, would strike down their efforts or would weaken them, and at the same time play into the hands of whatever subversive leadership—Communist, Nazi, or otherwise—may be in some of the labor organizations.

Therefore I plead with the Senate first of all to reject the pending amendment. If that shall not be done, then I hope in some way it will be possible for the Senate to balance its declaration so that it will not seem to be solely aimed at striking down in this hour the precious rights which organized labor have zealously guarded for so many years.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I think it would be a tragic mistake, from the standpoint of securing all-out defense production, to strike down, to abolish, to impair, or to declare against labor's right at a time when labor is being asked to make additional and effective efforts in order to prepare its Nation to defend the very rights which the Senate seems now to be in the mood to condemn.

I do not share the feeling of some that because a man has not had the benefits and privileges of higher education he is unable to reason. I am persuaded that those who have secured their education as the result of experience in life can sometimes think more clearly than those who are overburdened with philosophical theory. So I say in all sincerity that you will not fool labor, you will not fool the millions of men and women whom you are asking to produce the implements of national defense by the sweat of their brows. If you adopt a one-sided policy, if you strike down or condemn their hard-won rights, and at the same time ignore the proved and public record of flouting the national labor policy upon the part of many of their employers you will not fool labor. Will not then your plea that the national-defense effort is an effort to extend the "four freedoms everywhere in the world," fall upon deaf ears? Will not your plea that we must prepare to meet a national emergency and perhaps aggression seem hollow and false, if by your legislative fiat or action you have sought solely to strike down the rights of the very people upon whom we must depend if we are to be adequately prepared?

Mr. President, if, however, a majority of this body is determined to take legislative action or to make a solemn legislative declaration to condemn and ultimately to prohibit by law the rights of labor, it should be done, in my opinion, only after the most careful legislative consideration, only after the most painstaking effort at draftsmanship, so that

the enactment of such legislation would be balanced, and would put an end, while striking down labor's rights, to the unfair, oppressive, and many times brutal labor policies by employers. If we are to take this momentous step, which I hope we will not take, but if a majority is determined to take it, then I say we should take it only after the most careful consideration.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

EXHIBIT A

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LA FOLLETTE to the Byrd amendment:

"In the last line of the Byrd amendment, after the word 'condemned', insert 'And that complete cooperation between government, management, and labor can best be achieved by the wholehearted acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining and the recognition of the right of employees to designate representatives of their own choosing for purposes of collective bargaining, without interference through unfair or oppressive labor practices.'"

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 774. An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes;

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; and

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States.

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE-SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would not feel that I had been just to the cause of labor if I did not express very briefly my views upon the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Virginia showed me the amendment yesterday. I read it over rather hastily and concluded that there might be some merit in a properly worded declaration from the Congress upon this subject, but I cannot agree to this measure. I think there is no question in the mind of any one of us but that strikes in defense industries or strikes in any industry are deplorable, but I do not think we can prejudge a strike without a consideration of the cause which brings it about.

My mind goes back to the great industrial conflict which took place in the city of Detroit about 2½ months ago, and I can imagine what would have happened if hasty action had taken place then. It will be recalled that little was known about what the provision in the Selective Service Act was in respect to industrial conflicts. The amendment known as the Russell-Overton amendment, contained in the Selective Service Act, was considered by a great many as a means by which strikes in defense industries could be solved. I happened to be in the city of Detroit during what I think were the darkest hours of that great industrial conflict.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise because of the remark the Senator has just now made with respect to the reason for the Russell-Overton amendment. I think the Senate did not have strikes so much in mind at that time as it did the fact that there was real reason for believing that in some industries and in some corporations an effort was being made, or there was danger of an effort on the part of capital to take advantage of the national emergency in order to exact agreement.

Mr. BROWN. And refuse to produce defense articles.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. BROWN. There is no question but that the Senator from Wyoming and myself and other Senators who were here and heard the debate knew what it was about, but there was a general feeling throughout the country that we had legislated in some manner to prevent strikes and permit the Government to take over plants in the event of industrial disputes, which we did not do at all.

In that Detroit case the suggestion was made by some who were consulting with the Governor of Michigan that we ought to know the powers contained in that measure. We sent for the assistant United States district attorney, and the statute. He came over to the conference and pointed out, that the law did not apply to a situation like the one before us.

The point I wish to make is this. Suppose it had been possible to use that provision of law. Suppose the power of the United States Government had been exercised, and that great industrial plant, with 100,000 employees, had been taken over by the Government of the United States. You and I know that that would have resulted in an industrial dislocation and conflict which it would have taken weeks and months to disentangle and settle. By applying the principles of mediation, under the very able leadership of Governor Van Wagoner, of Michigan, the parties were brought together, and in peace and harmony they sat down, and 3 days after that conference the strike was settled. I think it has been settled for a long time.

Mr. President, I bring out that thought to point out that, after all, the way to settle disputes in ordinary cases—and even in some extraordinary cases—is to use the organization which the President has set up, use the efforts of the able labor leaders in both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., use the mediation service of the States and all the powers of government to persuade men to agree. I grant that sometimes it is necessary to take other courses; and I approve the course which the President took in the California situation. However, I think the powers under the Connally amendment, which I favor, should be exercised only in the most extraordinary situations.

Mr. President, my purpose in rising today is to do my part in trying to point out to the people of the country that the newspapers, in their desire to give spectacular news, and the columnists, in discussing the issues of the day, have laid so much emphasis upon strikes that throughout the country there is a feeling that the defense program has broken down because of labor's effort to bring about better conditions for workers. The idea has been spread abroad that there are a great number of strikes, and that great numbers of men are out on strike and not at work because of industrial disputes.

I think the truth is quite to the contrary, and that the number of persons on strike is very small. I believe that so far as labor and capital can carry it forward, the defense program is progressing splendidly at the present time. Therefore I inquired as to what the figures showed.

I am advised by the Office of Production Management that they estimate that there are 4,000,000 men at work in defense industries. The total number of men out of work from January to April of 1941 by reason of strikes in defense industries—that is, the industries in which the 4,000,000 workers are employed—was 62,400.

In the next period, which is a little closer to the present, and brings us down to May 1, 1941, exclusive of the Appalachian coal strike, which did not become serious until about the time it was settled, we find that there was a total idleness of 2,302,966 man-days. I think it is significant that 75 percent of this idleness was due to strikes in four plants—the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Ford Motor Co., and the International Harvester Corporation.

Sixty percent of this idleness was the result of strikes against companies with a National Labor Relations Board order outstanding against them. In other words, they had refused to comply with or were contesting the orders of the National Labor Relations Board. Sixty-three percent of the idleness was the result of strikes in companies which had not signed a collective-bargaining agreement.

There has been much talk about jurisdictional strikes. Only 1 percent of the total strike idleness was due to jurisdictional strikes.

Yesterday I heard Senators on the floor say that at the present time more

men are out of employment than at any time in our recent history. That statement is not in accord with the facts. At the present time—that is to say, as of yesterday, before the settlement of the aluminum strike in Cleveland and before the settlement of the North American Aviation strike—out of 4,000,000 employees, 31,249 men of significance to the defense program were out of employment on account of strikes. It seems to me, Mr. President, that that is a pretty good record. Less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of the men are out on strike.

A few days ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appeared some statistics which are quite illuminating. In 1940 the total number of man-days lost on account of strikes was 6,500,000. At the same time, because of accidents in industry, 46,000,000 man-days were lost, as against 6,500,000 on account of strikes. Fifty-nine million man-days were lost on account of simple colds. It seems to me that statistics like that demonstrate pretty clearly that the newspapers, the movies, and others, because they desire to give the spectacular in news, have unwittingly greatly exaggerated the strike situation.

I should like to repeat the figures. Six million man-days were lost in all of 1940 due to strikes, 46,000,000 were lost due to accidents, and 59,000,000 were lost due to simple illness, such as colds.

Mr. President, it seems to me that those figures can lead to only one conclusion, and that is that while we do have difficulties here and there, while we have had a few strikes—the most spectacular one, of course, being the strike in my own city of Detroit—nevertheless, we have a situation in which labor and private management on the whole, are doing a pretty good job.

What is the reason why labor is somewhat distressed at the present time? It is because of the rising cost of living. Because of increasing activity and consequent higher prices. We see evidences of it every day in our own offices. Businessmen are flocking to Washington. Every day representatives of corporations come into our offices and plead with us to intervene in their behalf to obtain jobs for them under the defense program. We know that during the past year they have made large profits, and will continue to do so.

Let me give a short résumé of what business did in the year 1940 as compared with 1939. Let us take, first, the aviation industry, of which the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] spoke earlier in the day. For the year 1940 the net return on the invested capital—that is, the profit—of all companies engaged in the manufacture of aircraft and parts for aircraft was 33.2 percent. The net return in the iron and steel business was close to 9 percent. The increase in the iron and steel business over the year 1939 was 98 percent. The total over-all additional increase in profits over 1939 to some 900 leading corporations in the United States, as shown by the income-tax returns, was 20 percent. These figures are taken from the April issue of the National City Bank's Review of Economic Conditions and Governmental Finance in the United States.

I think that those figures conclusively demonstrate the fact that we have had a vast increase in industrial profits; and what has thus far occurred, in view of the great increase in business due to the defense preparations of the United States, we know that in 1941 we shall again have a great increase.

What will be the result? All of us know that so far as the cost of living is concerned, this great increase in business can have but one result; that is an increase.

I have before me the statistics for recent months. On the principal items of food, rent, and clothing we find the following figures:

As of April 15, 1941, in 20 large cities rent costs were 5.4 percent above the 1935–39 normal. The rent increase in Buffalo, Cleveland, and Seattle was almost 10 percent; in Birmingham, 18 percent.

With respect to increases in food prices I state a few leading figures: On dairy products, an increase of 7.6 percent; apples, 22 percent; wheat flour, 18 percent; navy beans, 14 percent.

Retail food prices—

Says the United States Department of Labor—

have shown a moderate but steady advance since last November.

I think that I need not spend any time demonstrating the fact that not only has there been a considerable increase in costs of rent, food, and clothing, but that that increase is accelerating. It has been much more rapid in the past 2 or 3 months; and as the defense program gets under way, as products for which usually there is great demand are available in smaller quantities as a result of the use of such products in connection with the defense program, we shall have an increasing cost.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. A few moments ago the Senator read some very interesting tables and comparative figures with respect to the loss of man-days in defense industries, and comparing such losses due to strikes with those due to accident, sickness, and other causes. In making that comparison, was the distinguished Senator limiting to the defense industries the figures for man-days lost because of sickness and accidents, or was he speaking of industries in general?

Mr. BROWN. The figures covered industries in general—all industries.

Mr. GILLETTE. And the figures for man-days lost because of strikes were limited simply to defense industries?

Mr. BROWN. No; the figures for man-days lost because of strikes covered all labor.

Mr. GILLETTE. All labor?

Mr. BROWN. The figures were comparable.

Mr. GILLETTE. For all labor?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; for all labor.

In that connection I may say that, as I recall, I did not finish my statement along that line in respect to the present situation.

Eliminating the Aluminum Co. strike and the North American Aviation Co. strike, at the present hour there are about 15,000 workers out on strike in what the O. P. M. calls significant strikes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator must be mistaken about the figure he states, because the report of the War Department shows that in only those plants which have War Department contracts more than 41,000 men are idle. That figure does not include the number of men idle in plants having contracts with the Navy Department or with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BROWN. I will read to the Senator the statistics given me today.

Mr. BYRD. The report I have was received from the War Department today.

Mr. BROWN. I have the statistics which were given to me by the Office of Production Management, which lists the following strikes:

The Aluminum Co. of America, 5,000 men out on strike. That strike has been settled, as the Senator knows.

The American Potash & Chemical Co., 1,000 men.

The Detroit Steel Products Co., 1,000 men.

Freight Hauling Co. of Pittsburgh, 1,000 men.

North American Aviation Co., 11,000 men. That strike has been settled.

The San Francisco Shipyards, 2,000 men.

Sivyer Steel Casting Co., 240 men.

Twin District Council, of Seattle, Wash., 10,000 men.

Four of those cases are now before the Mediation Board.

This tabulation indicates that approximately 31,246 employees are now idle because of strikes. This figure is approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent of the estimated 4,000,000 employees engaged in national-defense work.

Mr. BYRD. There is some conflict somewhere.

Mr. BROWN. I deduct from those figures the 16,000 who are in the North American Aviation Co. plant and in the Cleveland Aluminum Co., who are not now on strike.

Mr. BYRD. I refer to statements from the War Department. I was reading the one as of June 6. According to the statement of June 10 there are 36 strikes in firms having War Department contracts; and on such contracts 46,800 employees are involved. That statement does not include firms engaged on Navy Department contracts; neither does it include firms engaged on Maritime Commission contracts. If the Senator wishes to examine the statement, I will be glad to submit it to him. It came from the labor section of the War Department.

Let me say further that I have before me a report from the Department of Labor stating that in the month of April there were 400 strikes, and that the number of employees involved in those strikes was 500,000.

Mr. BROWN. That doubtless includes the coal strike.

Mr. BYRD. It includes the coal strike.

Mr. BROWN. Four hundred thousand in the Appalachian area. The Senator knows that that strike did not become serious in effect until just before it was settled.

Mr. BYRD. Five hundred thousand were involved. In the month of March, when we did not have the coal strike, there were 113,000 involved in strikes. In the month of April 7,800,000 man-days were lost because of strikes.

Mr. BROWN. I think that figure is greatly exaggerated.

Suppose we accept the Senator's statement that there are 43,000 at present idle because of strikes.

Mr. BYRD. It is not the statement of the Senator from Virginia. It is the statement of the War Department; and it is only with respect to the War Department.

Mr. BROWN. Suppose we accept it for the sake of argument. That is about as many persons as the number living in the city of Alexandria, in the State of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. That statement does not include the Navy Department contracts, with respect to which there is an equal number of strikes, or those of the Maritime Commission; the statement relates to the War Department alone. There are about 69 strikes in existence today in national-defense industries.

Mr. BROWN. I think it is fair to stand on the figures given by the Office of Production Management.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot understand why the figures from the Office of Production Management would be more accurate than those from the War Department, which directly makes the contracts.

Mr. BROWN. I take it that the Office of Production Management is endeavoring to cover all strikes that occur in plants where 4,000,000 defense workers are employed. I think it makes little difference whether the number is 16,000, as the O. P. M. says, or 45,000, as the Senator from Vriginia asserts.

Mr. BYRD. Let me correct the Senator from Michigan again. Those figures are only with respect to strikes in plants having War Department contracts, and not plants having Navy Department contracts or plant having Maritime Commission contracts.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator have any over-all figure? How many men does the Senator estimate are out on strikes?

Mr. BYRD. The total number of strikes, with respect to which I inserted a statement in the RECORD a few days ago, is about 69. I do not know the figures for the number of men who are out on strike at plants having contracts with departments other than the War Department, but I assume that the proportion would be about the same; so I assume that there are from 80,000 to 100,000 employees out on strike. Incidentally, that was the number for the month of March, before the coal strike began.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that the O. P. M. advises me that the total number of employees on strike has steadily diminished from that time down to the present time; and certainly there was a great change yesterday when, out of their estimate of 31,000 employees, 16,000 employees went back to work in two plants.

I do not want the Senator from Virginia to think that I do not deplore this situation, which is most unfortunate; but I say that it has been greatly exaggerated when we recall that 4,000,000 men are at work on defense industries. The number referred to is a very small percentage of the total.

Mr. BYRD. That depends on what the industry supplies. Suppose it is making dive bombers, which are so vitally necessary; suppose it is building merchant ships, which are so vitally necessary; or suppose it is making tanks or antiaircraft guns or things of that kind.

Mr. BROWN. I am assuming that one item in the defense program is about as important as another; they have all got to be produced, and the workers have to be kept at work. That is all we are trying to bring about.

I think the Senator from Virginia would be doing the country and the Senate a real service if he would permit the Senate to vote upon the Connally amendment, which I think would be adopted with very few dissenting votes, and would not complicate the situation by bringing in his highly controversial amendment, which many of us oppose.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to the Connally amendment, as I understand, some who have spoken in the Senate simply say that it would only do what the President did in the case of the North American Co. strike at Inglewood, Calif. Is that the Senator's understanding about it?

Mr. BROWN. I would not be sure about that. I think, personally, that the Connally amendment, as I understand it now, with some slight amendments which have been made to it, would permit the President to take over plants which are engaged in the production of defense articles and in which, by reason of a strike or other cause, production has broken down. It seems to me that is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. WHEELER. As I think the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] brought out, there are individuals in this country who would like to see the Government take over the various industries, and among them are some—a small minority—of the workers. I remember in the last war when there was some difficulty in my State some of the workers were agitating that the Government take over the mines. The Government of the United States cannot take over and operate the mines in Butte, nor can it take over and operate successfully industrial plants. The impression seems to have gone out over the country, which I think is erroneous, that what the Army did was to take over the North American Co. plant. The Army is not running the North American plant. As a matter of fact, the only thing the Army did was to break up the picket line; that is all they did.

Mr. BROWN. They policed the job so that the men could go back to work.

Mr. WHEELER. What they did was to break up the picket line and say that anybody who wanted to go back to work could go back to work. They are not attempting to operate the factory or anything of that kind. So that situation is quite a different thing from what is contemplated by the Connally amendment.

I know the Connally amendment will be adopted, but I will venture the assertion that when it is adopted, and when we give the President the power to take over factories and mines, then we will see an agitation on the part of some of the workers of the country who will urge that the administration take over the mines and take over the factories. I am not at all sure that by the adoption of the Connally amendment we are rendering a service at all to the national defense.

There is much hysteria in the country with reference to what is necessary and what is not necessary; and I think the figures the Senator from Michigan has just furnished are certainly very enlightening, if they are true; but propaganda has been going on to frighten the people from one end of the country to the other with reference to present strikes. We had strikes in the last war, we had strikes in the mining industry in Michigan and all over the West; but at no time did President Wilson advocate taking over the mines; at no time did he advocate taking over the factories and industries.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me suggest that President Wilson advocated blacklisting the strikers so that they could not get a job in any other defense plant if they struck. There were, in defense projects, only two strikes of any importance during the Wilson administration during the World War.

Mr. WHEELER. I have to disagree with the Senator with reference to that. I do not care what his figures show, because I happen to know myself that there were strikes in industries in Arizona, in Montana, and in Michigan.

Mr. BYRD. They might not have been strikes in defense industries.

Mr. WHEELER. If copper mining was not a defense industry, there was not anything that was.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say there were no strikes; I said there were only two strikes as to which there was difficulty in settling; one at the Smith & Wesson Co. plant and another in Massachusetts, both of which were settled.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I am saying; they were settled without taking over the mines and without any legislation giving authority to take over the mines and without the necessity of sending in the United States Army to assure production.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I did not rise for the purpose of supporting the Connally amendment. I rose for the purpose of opposing the Byrd amendment, though I incidentally made the remark that I am for the Connally amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that.

Mr. BROWN. I think it would be a desirable piece of legislation. What I am objecting to at the present time is bringing in this highly controversial amendment which has not been referred to any committee, which has caused Senator after Senator to go to the junior Senator from Virginia and suggest that he amend it in this way and in that way, which is a pretty good indication of the necessity for sending it to a committee rather than to attempt to act upon his amendment without consideration by experts on the committee, who know something about the general situation.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator that I am in thorough accord with his views. I am opposed to the Byrd amendment—I thoroughly agree with him—I was very glad he gave the figures which he did this afternoon, and I think his argument is a sound one.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I want to be sure of one matter to which the Senator referred. Is it the view of the Senator from Michigan that there are now about 16,000 men out on strike as of today?

Mr. BROWN. The letter from the O. P. M. to me shows 31,000 out on strike in defense industries, which they classify as employing approximately 4,000,000 employees. I deduct from the 31,000 the 11,000 who, I understand, are back at work in the California plant, and the 5,000 or thereabouts who are back at work in the Cleveland plant.

Mr. BONE. I asked the question because I have in my hand a paper from my own State which indicates that 12,000 woodworkers in the lumber industry, which, I think, has been classified as a defense industry, are still out. If there be now only 16,000 men on strike, then 12,000 of them are in that 1 industry in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. BROWN. I doubt that that particular industry is considered by the O. P. M. as being within the defense classifications employing 4,000,000 men. I take it the figures relate to employment in factories, in the industrial production of munitions such as tanks and commodities of that general character.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Connally amendment, as I understand, provides for the taking over of plants. In practice how would that be done, according to the Senator's view? Would the Army take them over?

Mr. BROWN. I think that question had better be addressed to the Senator from Texas who submitted the amendment. I believe the President acted very effectively, however, in the North American situation; but I recognize that there is no procedure set forth in the proposal; there is no method suggested as to how it shall be done. I understand that an amendment, suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, has been accepted by which the plants are to be turned back; but I take it as is common in so many other pieces of legislation, that there must be an implied authority in the President to establish regulations by which it may be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. What prompted my question was that in the press and on the floor of the Senate it is assumed that the action of the Army in California was the taking over of the plant by the Government. I think the Senator from Montana has explained that completely.

The same persons are operating the plant who operated it before the strike started, and the same persons are working in the plant who worked in it before the strike started. All the Army did was to break up the picket line, and permit those who wanted to go to work to do so without molestation on the outside.

Mr. BROWN. That statement has been made in the Senate several times, but I think the action of the President went beyond that. It pretty plainly indicated to the strikers and their wild-cat leadership—because it is quite commonly conceded that it was wild-cat leadership—that they were not going to succeed.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. BROWN. And that, of course, is what broke up the strike.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not for the moment criticizing the action or approving it. I am merely using it as a yardstick, so to speak, to measure the action that would be taken under this amendment.

I do not think it would be fair to assume that what took place in California would be a taking-over of the plant by the Government as contemplated in the language of the Connally amendment. In my humble judgment, that would mean that the Government would, in all effect, really control the whole operation of the plant. It might again employ the same persons, but it would be the fountainhead directing the operation.

I think we are making a grave error in assuming that the mechanics employed in pursuance of the language in this bill is the mechanics employed in the Army's operation of the plant in California; for, stripped of its taking-over verbiage, and so on, it really means simply this: That the Army went there and dispersed those who were congregated, particularly in the picket line and elsewhere, in front of the plant, and served notice that the plant was open, and that anybody who wanted to work could go to work, and that the Army would protect them in their right to go to work if they wanted to go to work. To consider that a taking-over of the plant within the meaning of the language of the Connally amendment, in my judgment, is to assume something that is foreign to the purpose of this bill.

I have listened to the debate, and I have not heard anyone on the floor of the Senate state what the mechanics of taking over a plant by the Government would be. Would the Army do it? Would the Attorney General do it? Would we send the United States marshal to do it? How would it be done? In my judgment it would be done temporarily by the Army, and then the Government would designate a head for the plant, and that head would act under the President's orders to make the things that the plant was supposed to make if the workmen could be obtained to do it. Is that correct, in the Senator's judgment?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator's statement is substantially the way I understand the matter. I see that the Senator from Texas is here.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Michigan allow me to ask the Senator from Texas about that matter? I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. BROWN. I should be glad to do so, though I can complete my remarks in a very short time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. BROWN. I agree quite generally with what the Senator says, that the taking over of the North American plant in California was not the process by which plants would be taken over under the Connally amendment; but I had assumed, as I said before, that regulations of some kind would be established by which the plant would be temporarily taken over, and by reason of the Maloney amendment—which, I understand, the Senator from Texas accepted—there would likewise be a return of the plant to the private operators as soon as it was possible to do so.

Mr. President, I rose merely for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that we should not condemn those who strike in defense industry without a consideration—and no such consideration can be made before the fact—of the justice of the controversy. I think the Senator from Virginia, in his great desire to see the defense program carried forward, does the obvious and apparent thing by condemning all those who strike; but there are many times when a strike is justifiable.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is not, throughout, a condemnation of illegal and unlawful strikes.

Mr. BROWN. It certainly is.

Mr. CONNALLY. And would not the adoption of that amendment have that effect?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Texas was not in the Chamber at the moment, but I implored the Senator from Virginia to withdraw his amendment so that we could proceed to vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, which I believe solves the problem for the present at least; and I urged that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia should be referred to a committee for full consideration. My own views are pretty well expressed, I think, by an amendment which I proposed to the Senator from Virginia, but which he refuses to accept, as he has refused, as I understand, to accept any of the numerous amendments offered by Senators here in which I added certain language. I proposed that we should condemn strikes caused by excessive or unjust demands on the part of labor, and condemn jurisdictional disputes, and that we should

also add to his amendment a condemnation about as follows:

And the selfish refusal of employers to grant reasonable wage increases to compensate for the increased cost of living—

And condemn refusal to agree to collective bargaining.

It seems to me that those two propositions would take the Senator's amendment out of the class of a one-sided proposal and make it one in which we could condemn the guilty parties, whoever they might be, on either side of these industrial disputes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Michigan, let me say that we now have a Mediation Board which can settle the very questions he has brought up. I communicated this morning with the Secretary of the Mediation Board, and in no single instance has an employer refused to mediate in the present crisis. Not a single plant management, industry, or employer has refused to mediate the questions that have brought about the strikes. The question of a fair wage is a question of mediation. We cannot handle that question by legislation.

Mr. BROWN. I wonder if the Senator knows anything about the biggest strike of all—the strike of 100,000 men in the Ford Motor Co. in Detroit. Did not the company in the first instance refuse to mediate? Did they not fight against the determination of the National Labor Relations Board; and was not the strike finally settled by the company agreeing to mediate, though in the first instance they refused to do so?

As the Senator may know, the attitude of the Ford management through all the years has been that they would refuse to bargain collectively with their employees.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator questions my statement, he may call up the Secretary of the Mediation Board. I called him up this morning. He said that in no single instance had any employer or management refused to mediate disputes.

Mr. BROWN. The Ford Co. refused to mediate until the Governor intervened. That was the reason for the strike.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps the strike was not certified to the Board by Miss Perkins; but, so far as the records of the Mediation Board are concerned, not a single strike was certified to that Board wherein the employer refused to mediate the differences.

Mr. BROWN. When the Senator confines his statement to strikes certified to the Board, I think it should be said that the Mediation Board came into existence just a short time ago.

Mr. BYRD. But the Mediation Board has been in existence for nearly 90 days, during the period of this strike epidemic.

Mr. BROWN. I desire now to conclude, because I know other Senators desire to speak, and I know the Senate desires to vote upon this question, but I wish to call attention to the underlying conditions:

First. That there has been a substantial increase in industrial activity, as I have demonstrated by the figures I have given.

Second. That there has been a substantial increase in the cost of living, and that that increase has been accelerating in late months and in late weeks. With that fundamental condition confronting labor it is not at all astonishing—in fact, it is to be expected—that they should endeavor to readjust their wage scales to meet the increased cost of living.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Ample machinery is now provided to secure any just and proper increase in wages by the course of mediation, and there is no reason to have strikes. I am not condemning those who ask for increased wages.

Mr. BROWN. Has the Senator agreed to accept the Maloney amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Virginia have worked out a satisfactory solution of that matter.

Mr. BROWN. I am very glad to hear it. I do not necessarily mean by that statement that I will support the amendment until I have seen it; but I think the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut showed to me would substantially improve the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

I desire to get back to the fundamental conditions—the great increase in industrial profits, the great increase in employment, the great decrease which will take place in the production of many of the necessities of life by reason of the devotion of industry to the defense program. Take the automobile, which is a necessity in a good many instances. The Senator knows we are going to have a great decrease in the number of automobiles and a consequent increase in the price, because the supply will not be equal to the demand. The same can be applied to other industries. So we have underlying conditions under which, as I have said, it is not at all surprising that labor would be seeking a higher wage. I do not desire to condemn every attempt to bring that about. I myself hope and am confident that labor will meet this problem themselves to a very large extent.

I happen to be fairly well acquainted with the labor leader in my State, Richard T. Frankensteen, who was sent by the United Automobile Workers to California and made what I considered a very courageous speech, in which he sought to convince the laborers in the California aviation plant that they should not strike, that they should go back to work. He did not succeed, but I think he laid the groundwork for subsequent success.

Mr. Frankensteen was appointed by the present Justice Murphy, who was then Governor of Michigan, to a very high position heading welfare in the State of Michigan. Just as many other labor leaders have been attacked, he was attacked as being in league with Communists. Read the speech Mr. Frankensteen made before the labor union in California. It is as strong a condemnation of communism as could be penned or spoken by any man. He is not a Communist, but he has been accused of being one because he is in the labor movement. I say that many of the accusations which are made against many other labor people are just as groundless as were the accusations that were made against Dick Frankensteen in Michigan some 4 years ago. He is a fine upstanding, sincere American labor leader. I know that Philip Murray and R. J. Thomas were squarely supporting Frankensteen. It was not easy to face and oppose the locals, but they did. Give labor a chance and they will do more good in settling the situation than reams of statutes and resolutions.

I feel, at the present time, that we need a little more sanity and poise in our consideration of this question. Of course, we are all opposed to strikes, we do not want strikes in defense industry, we do not want strikes in any industry, but I, for one, refuse to condemn one side in an industrial dispute in advance of knowing the facts. I want to condemn the man who is wrong, I want to condemn the man who is the cause of the strike, I want to condemn labor when they are to blame, and I want to condemn capital and management when they are to blame. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia does not do that. It is a one-sided amendment, unfair to organized labor, in my judgment, and a distinct injury to the defense program.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that to some extent the disturbed feeling of the Senator from Michigan may be eased. I have been in conference with the Senator from Virginia concerning the amendment which I earlier discussed, and while I am not completely satisfied, and while the Senator has yielded to a greater extent than he seemed in the beginning to be willing to yield, we have language which I think is suitable, which I understand the Senator is to ask to have made a part of his amendment, and which I should like to read.

I should like to say, in connection with the amendment, that in my talk with the Senator from Virginia he advised me that on line 9 of his amendment, after the word "strikes", he was writing in the words "or lock-outs", so that my proposal at this point would do this, on line 11, strike out the word "such" and substitute the word "that", and after the word "strikes" insert "or lock-outs in which either side refuses to recognize arbitration or mediation and to abide by the decisions thereof." That is the end of the amendment, and the words following would be "are hereby condemned."

I should like to say again that that is not all I wanted included or all I think should be included. I should like to see the provision at another place in the Senator's amendment. But, as every Senator knows, all legislation is the result of compromise, and I think this improves the amendment to a very great extent. I should like to ask the very able Senator from Virginia if my statement is correct, and if he is to ask that my suggestion be included in his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendment in accordance with the language the Senator from Con-

necticut suggests. So that the Senate may know what the modifications are—I have two others which I desire to offer—on line 9, after the word "strikes", I propose to add the words "or lock-outs", and at the end of line 9 I propose to strike out the word "affect" and to insert the words "impede or delay." Adding the words "or lock-outs" makes the amendment conform to the Connally amendment, and likewise in striking out the word "affect" and inserting "impede or delay" the amendment conforms with the Connally amendment. It is my desire to conform, so far as possible, with the language of the Connally amendment.

Of course, the Senator from Virginia at no time had any desire to condemn strikes when one side agreed to arbitration; in other words, the side which agreed to arbitration should not be condemned, and if the issue is arbitrated, there will be no strike. So I very cheerfully agree to the modification offered by the Senator from Connecticut, which I adopt as my own.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as I understand the Senate rules, an amendment in the third degree is out of order, is subject to a point of order. Is it possible for the author of an amendment to modify his amendment at this time as he sees fit, as I understand the Senator from Virginia is now at least attempting to do?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will discover by reference to section 2 of rule 21 that in a case like this the Senator from Virginia has the right to modify his amendment as he sees fit.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the amendment as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the Connally amendment, it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 3. It is the sense of the Congress that the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor; and in view of the fact that numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States, which are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies, the Congress hereby declares that strikes or lock-outs in industries that impede or delay the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and that strikes or lock-outs in which either side refuses to recognize arbitration or mediation and to abide by the decisions thereof are hereby condemned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday we debated nearly all day the so-called Connally amendment. The Connally amendment itself could not by any stretch of the imagination be considered germane to the text of the bill which was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. Nevertheless, it was considered under the rules of the Senate, very properly, and the whole day, until late in the afternoon, was devoted to the consideration of a very essential subject. That debate through the course of the day produced almost unanimity in the Senate as to the desirability and the necessity of enactment of legislation on that subject.

Let me say that, in my opinion, the amendment of the Senator from Texas would do little more than give legal effect to the order theretofore issued by the President of the United States in the case of the aircraft strike on the Pacific coast, and that the action of the Congress would add little to the action of the soldier with the bayonet who first had occasion physically to enforce the President's order.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, the Senate debated all day yesterday one great substantive proposition. Now with the injection of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia we have debated a whole day an entirely different proposition. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is simply designed to implement and give effect to the policy already announced by the President of the United States, and apparently the whole Senate, with very little opposition, is in agreement with that proposition.

The proposal of the Senator from Virginia, as I see it, has nothing whatever to do with the amendment of the Senator from Texas. It is an announcement of general policy which was originally so generally phrased that I think nearly everyone in the Senate disagreed with parts of it, as is admitted by the Senator from Virginia himself by his very helpful acceptance of amendments to it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that since the amendment of the Senator from Virginia admittedly has nothing to do with the substantive proposition of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, the two amendments ought to be voted on separately. I think that since the amendment of the Senator from Texas has been offered, the cumulative effect of a large vote for it in the United States Senate will have a great influence on the country; that the greater the vote the amendment of the Senator from Texas receives the greater will be its effect.

Many of us who are anxious to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Texas might not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia in its present form. It seems to me what should be done is to adopt the Connally amendment with substantial unanimity, then take the time tomorrow to give full consideration to the various propositions which have been advanced for re-forming the verbiage of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, and then pass on that question separately. It does not seem to me to be fair to the Senate or fair to the people to attach the Byrd amendment to the Connally amendment, because it is not possible in that condition to get a fair vote of the sentiment of the Senate on a very great and essential proposition.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, as I recollect the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], it was to the effect that in the airplane strike in California mediation had been resorted to, and that there had been a very great and what appeared to many to be a very vexatious delay. I have heard no discussion about fixing some sort of a time limit in mediation and arbitration matters, so that the patience of everyone involved will not be worn out. I do not know that any such proposition has been suggested. I have heard no such legislative proposition suggested in this debate. I wondered how long those mediation proceedings were carried on, and what part the delay played in the strike. Does the Senator from Texas know?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I really do not have the information he desires.

Mr. BONE. I think every rational and reasonable human being can understand that a great deal of vexation may grow out of an interminable delay. Every lawyer here is familiar with the old adage in law that "justice deferred is justice denied." The time element has some very important moral aspects. I think we should put some sort of limitation on the time in which a mediation board may make a decision, so its proceedings will not wear out the patience of everyone. I do not know that that can be worked out.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing in this measure which would prohibit the continuation of production while mediation was proceeding. The parties could go ahead producing and mediating all the time. There is nothing to stop that.

Mr. BONE. I was tempted to ask the question because the Senator from Wisconsin had said there was some jockeying. Perhaps I misstate what he said.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I did not state that there had been protracted proceedings before the Defense Mediation Board. What I did say was that information which I believed to be reliable was to the effect that for 7 weeks, as I recall, negotiations proceeded between representatives of the union and the management of the North American plant at Inglewood over an effort to increase the wage scale of common labor, which was at that time, and still is, 50 cents an hour, the lowest wage, I am informed, in the industry. I further stated that when the proceedings were certified to the Mediation Board it was my information that the management still showed the same attitude against concessions during the time the matter was before the Mediation Board that it showed during the 7 weeks of negotiations preceding certification to the Board. I do not believe the matter was before the Board any such length of time as to justify criticism. I stated in my remarks that I was not defending the action of what I believed to be the misguided employees who struck while the matter was still before the Mediation Board. All I was trying to point out was that I did not believe the entire blame for the situation should be laid exclusively at the door of labor.

Mr. BONE. Of course, if any ultimate decision affecting wages and hours, and the other conditions which are involved in the dispute, is made retroactive to the time the demand was made, then a delay probably would work no great harm, because, after all, if the tribunal is a fair one, that is all anyone could expect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement concerning the amendment as it has now

been modified, as I understand, by the Senator from Virginia. I do not have the advantage of having the modification before me, but as I understand, the net effect of the amendment as now modified is twofold. First, to make a blanket declaration by the Congress that strikes or lock-outs in industries which impede or delay national-defense production are contrary to sound public policy. That is the first declaration, which, if adopted, would put the Congress on record as condemning any strikes in industries connected with national defense, regardless of how just the demands of the employees might be.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The amendment then proceeds to declare that strikes or lock-outs in which either side refuses to recognize arbitration or mediation and to abide by the decisions thereof are hereby condemned.

The second legislative declaration is a declaration in favor of establishing the principle of compulsory arbitration, a policy which this country has never adopted, even in time of war. I know that the Senator from Connecticut offered the amendment in an effort to balance, so to speak, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. I think that instead of accomplishing that purpose it would result in making a legislative declaration that the Congress favors compulsory arbitration as a national policy. I do not believe that the Congress should take any such step, even by way of legislative declaration, until after it has thoroughly considered whether it wants to adopt the legislative policy of compulsory arbitration in time of national-defense crisis. If so, it should adopt legislation which would assure to all parties in a controversy the rights to which they are entitled, rather than make a legislative declaration and then not implement the policy.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wanted to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the greatest point of difference between myself and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was on the first point raised by the Senator. I did not and do not want to declare against strikes in defense industries as a matter of national policy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have just yielded to the Senator from Connecticut. Has the Senator from Connecticut concluded his statement?

Mr. MALONEY. No.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After the Senator from Connecticut shall have concluded his statement, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I know the Senator would permit me to say that I accepted the amendment and inserted it in my amendment at the exact point he first proposed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not criticizing the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Connecticut; but, in view of the fact that I felt certain the statement of the Senator from Connecticut and his past record would lead Members of the Senate to believe that his trends were in the direction of trying to balance and ameliorate the legislative declaration, I wanted the RECORD to show, before the vote came, that, in my humble opinion, instead of accomplishing that purpose, what we now have is a double-barreled legislative declaration—first, denouncing all strikes in national-defense industries, regardless of the issues involved, as being contrary to public policy; and, second, a legislative declaration in favor of compulsory arbitration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I dispute the basic idea of the Senator from Wisconsin. It seems to me that all we are saying is, "We think that in this crisis you ought to be willing to submit your disputes to arbitration and accept the awards of the arbitrators." I say that is very different from passing a law saying, "If you do not do so, you will go to jail or suffer some other penalty." If the Senator asks me, I will say that I think that both sides to a dispute in a defense industry ought to be willing to submit the dispute to arbitration. I am opposed to a compulsory arbitration law; but I am perfectly willing to say to labor and to capital that, "In the present crisis you ought to be willing to submit your disputes to arbitration and accept the awards of the arbitrators." I say that that is not equivalent to being in favor of compulsory arbitration.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The question is as to the net effect of the interpretation of the language upon the person who reads it. It is my contention that any person reading this language is bound to come to the conclusion that it is a legislative declaration by Congress in favor of compulsory arbitration. I have already conceded in any part which I may have had in this debate that such a declaration would have no legal force or effect; but if Congress should adopt such a policy, I am convinced that the language would convey to any person who reads it the idea of a legislative declaration that so far as Congress is concerned it condemns any action which is not in conformity with the principle of compulsory arbitration. What other effect could the language have? It is proposed to say:

> And that strikes or lock-outs in which either side refuses to recognize arbitration or mediation and to abide by the decisions thereof are hereby condemned.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I merely wished to conclude what I started to say.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am sorry. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] interrupted me to say that he accepted the language in the place where I originally offered it. That is entirely true. However, after giving it further thought I attempted, as best I could, to presuade the Senator from Virginia to change the place of the language, for the reason given by the Senator from Wisconsin. I tried to make that clear in my earlier statement. I seem not to have made it clear. For the record I will say that I was disturbed by the point which is raised by the Senator from Wisconsin.

I was about to add a word or two concerning the effect of arbitration and mediation. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said about what I would say, and I join with him in his statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to conclude because the hour is growing late and I do not wish further to delay the matter. However, I wish to plead with the Senate again not to rush into any statement which, in my opinion, instead of helping to improve the situation so far as labor relations in national-defense industries are concerned, would tend to have exactly the opposite effect. Of course, all have conceded that the amendment is merely a legislative declaration. It could be adopted only in the hope that it would have a psychological effect in increasing production.

I grant that every Senator is entitled to his own conclusions as to what the effect of such a legislative declaration would be; but having devoted a good many years to the study of this question, I want the RECORD to show that it is my deliberate and considered judgment that instead of achieving the objective, which I am sure we all have, of increasing national-defense production, the amendment would have the diametrically opposite effect. Instead of strengthening the hands of the leaders of organized labor who are wholeheartedly cooperating in the efforts to speed defense production, the proposed action would weaken them, and would be seized upon by those in labor organizations who may have subversive tendencies—if there be such—to break down the constructive efforts made by the national labor leaders who are endeavoring to speed national-defense production.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am satisfied that many Members of the Senate share the view expressed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] a few minutes ago. Because of that desire I ask unanimous consent that the Byrd amendment be temporarily withdrawn, that a vote be had upon the Connally amendment, and that immediately upon the disposition of the Connally amendment the Senate proceed to the consideration and final disposition of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that request.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Virginia, except to plead with him. As I see it, he would not lose a single right he possesses if he should accede to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina. I think he would please all his colleagues if he would let them

have an opportunity to do what was so well suggested by the Senator from Missouri and, I think, also by the Senator from Texas, to let us have a vote first on the Connally amendment. Such a vote probably would show a unanimity of opinion which would not be shown if the Byrd amendment were added to the Connally amendment. To vote first on the Connally amendment would not at all hinder the Senator from Virginia from immediately offering to the bill his amendment in the modified form in which he has it, after the Connally amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I join our distinguished friend from Nebraska in that plea? I feel a great deal of sympathy for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia; but it seems to me that at this particular time the Connally amendment is of such vast importance that it ought to be voted upon just as it is. Therefore I should like to join most earnestly in the plea of the Senator from Nebraska to the Senator from Virginia to let us vote on the two amendments separately.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia was not pertinent to the Connally amendment. Let me say that it is much more pertinent to the Connally amendment than the Connally amendment is pertinent to the Selective Service Act, which it proposes to amend.

Mr. President, I have no desire to be obstinate. I believe that during the 8 years I have served here no Member of the Senate has been more cooperative with his fellow Senators than has the Senator from Virginia. But I feel very keenly about this matter. I realize that these suggestions are coming from Senators who intend to oppose my amendment, regardless of how it is offered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator from Virginia has just said does not apply to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say that the remark just made by the Senator from Virgina does not apply to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. In its modified form, I expect to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. I would not have voted for it in its original form; but as it has been modified, I think it has been very much improved.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say for myself that I am in entire sympathy with the purposes of the original amendment of the Senator from Virginia; and, with proper modifications, many of which the Senator from Virginia has accepted today, I certainly should be prepared to vote for it as a separate amendment to the bill. I do not intend to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, because I think it would weaken the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Texas; and I think the Senator from Virginia, by insisting on a vote on his own amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas, would weaken not only the probable vote for the Connally amendment but also the original vote for the Byrd amendment.

I have talked to many Senators on the floor today who are very much inclined to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia as a separate proposition, but who are not willing to have it tied onto the Connally amendment, because it would weaken the effect of the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be complete, I desire to add my name to the names of the Senators who have spoken declaring their intentions regarding the Byrd amendment. It is my intention to vote for the Byrd amendment as modified.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say that the intention stated by the Senator from Missouri is also my intention. I may have said it a moment ago; but, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear, I desire to say at this time that it is certainly my intention to vote for the Byrd amendment as modified.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I think we are furnishing a very fine example of not doing the very thing we have come here to settle. What do we suppose the employees and the employers are thinking? They are thinking, "There is that august body, and they are spending 2 days over a matter of policy." We are giving aid and comfort to the very thing against which we are supposed to be trying to legislate.

I started to offer a resolution appointing a board of mediation between the conflicting groups here, composed of certain Senators, so as to let them settle their difficulties, and let the other Senators go [laughter]; but we are not disposed to agree to mediation. I myself think the Byrd amendment should stand on its own feet, and the Connally amendment should stand on its own feet, if they have any. [Laughter.]

I have sat here in utter disgust over the fact that we cannot possibly get together on what is evident to every Member of this body—that we are in a crisis and are trying to meet it. We know what has created the crisis, but we have not the grit to face it. That is the truth. We are thinking about the election which is coming on, and it gives us pause.

I hear Senators talking about what we are going to do about setting up arbitration boards and about making arbitration compulsory. What do we call the use of soldiers out yonder in California? That looks like compulsion, right and proper: "You will either get out and go to work, or I will stick a bayonet in you." That is in accordance with the American spirit. I think it is right.

Yesterday the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said he was willing to abolish the Bill of Rights. We give up everything when the country is threatened. Of course we do. What Senator would put his interest in the balance when his country is in danger?

I had made up my mind that during all this tomfoolery and rot I would not say anything; but each man has his own idea, and I could not let this occasion pass without calling attention to the effect our action is having on the very condition we are hoping to remedy. If we cannot agree about what to do, what do we expect the men in the plants to do?

Mr. President, we are in a critical condition; and any measure which will help should be adopted. Even though we make a mistake, let us make it in the right direction [laughter], and get our country in the proper condition. There is but one direction, and that is to do what every Senator knows it is his duty to do; that is, to provide the defense articles which are necessary to make the country safe.

We go out into the country and say to the boys, "Come into the military service." As the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said yesterday, a certain man received a salary of $50,000. He laid his job aside—I do not know what strings he had attached to it—and took $21 a month as a draftee. Some of us may take less than that before the condition which now confronts the world has ended, and we are writing all sorts of little amendments, and quibbling.

There is not a Member of this body who has a better record than I have in favor of labor; but there is a limit. There is a difference between what labor may do in peacetimes and what all of us are required to do when it comes to the question of defending the country. All of us know that we have 130,000,000 patriots—p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s, all of us, every one of us—and the underlying principle of all this is shorter hours and increased pay.

I was just reading an account of those who fought for the freedom of this country from Great Britain. They lived on parched corn and sweetpotatoes. One Senator very facetiously remarked this evening that that was a good diet. I hope he will try it.

According to the figures which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] read this evening, the strikes of which so much is being made, are nothing more than a pin-prick in comparison with the labor of the vast army of those who are producing. That is like the case of the man who said the average wealth in his town was $25 a head, but one man owned it all. He averaged it out among them so far as the figures were concerned.

We are face to face, however, with a condition which strikes me as being sufficiently serious for us to lay aside our pet projects and stop this strike business, and stop the profiteering if there is such a thing. I think Burns, in his advice to

his young friend, gave the reason that is affecting us all:

I'll no say, men are villains a';
The real, harden'd wicked,
Wha hae nae check but human law,
Are to a few restricked;
But, och! Mankind are unco weak,
An' little to be trusted;
If self the wavering balance shake
It's rarely right adjusted!

I have seen that here in this debate: "What possible advantage can I get out of this debate for myself—not for my country but what political advantage can I get in this emergency?"

Let us vote on the Connally amendment, and then let us vote on the Byrd amendment, and stop splitting hairs and trying to decide how many angels can stand on the point of a needle. What in the devil do we care about any of that kind of thing in this emergency? Statesmen!—high-school boys, with all apology to the high-school boys.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether my unanimous-consent request was objected to; or has the Senator from Virginia been moved by any of the pleas that have been made to him?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is very much embarrassed. This is the first time he has thought himself to be an important Member of the Senate of the United States.

I did not make the rules of the United States Senate. I think my amendment is pertinent to the Connally amendment; I believe it will strengthen the Connally amendment; and I cannot see any reason whatever why the amendment proposed by me cannot be voted on first. If it is the judgment of the Senate that my amendment should be defeated, each Senator will do as I shall do, and vote in accordance with his conscientious convictions. If it is adopted, I make the prediction that its adoption will lose practically no votes for the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have one more request to make, and I hope the Senator from Virginia can agree to it.

I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the Byrd amendment, and, if it is agreed to, that such action be considered a final disposition of the Byrd amendment, and thereafter that a separate vote be taken on the Connally amendment without the inclusion of the Byrd amendment.

If the Senator's amendment is adopted by the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement a separate vote will then be had on the Connally amendment without the inclusion of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has the floor.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent request, if the Byrd amendment should be agreed to, under the rules of the Senate any amendment could be offered. Of course, there is no way in which the Senator from Wisconsin, for instance, could be prevented from offering his amendment; but whenever the Byrd amendment is agreed to or rejected, my request is that a separate vote be had on the Connally amendment, so that the Members of the Senate who are in the position of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will have an opportunity to vote on the Connally amendment without the inclusion of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the request is very unusual. I do not recall a precedent for the request in many years of membership in this body. If I understand the nature of the request of the able Senator from South Carolina, it is that the status of the Byrd amendment shall be fixed after one vote.

Mr. BYRNES. Oh, no; Mr. President, that is not the case. The request is that when there is a final disposition of the Byrd amendment, if it is agreed to, there shall then be a separate vote on the Connally amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may entertain a different view than that held by the Senator from South Carolina; but I shall end the controversy by objecting to the unanimous-consent request, because I think we should proceed in the ordinary, normal way.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are the yeas and nays demanded?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and other Senators called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this action rather embarrasses me, so that I do not know whether I can say what I wanted to say.

We have been debating for more than a day the so-called Byrd amendment. Even if it should be agreed to, it would have no legal effect. It expresses only the sentiment of the Senate.

We have been apt, during the past 2 or 3 years, to do things of this kind on various occasions. It has become almost a common practice to express the sense of the Senate or the sense of Congress on this or that subject. I called attention to the fact shortly after the practice first started, though not the very first time, when the Senator from Mississippi offered a Senate resolution with regard to some action which was pending before some board or court. I do not remember what the action was, but it seemed to me it was clearly apparent that the resolution really expressed the opinion of the Senate as to what kind of a decision should be made, and it was admitted that it was something over which we had no jurisdiction whatever.

That practice has been followed since then, and there are numerous precedents along that line. We get in the habit of expressing our opinion or judgment. When the Census was being taken, my good friend from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] submitted a resolution expressing it as the sense of the Senate that certain questions that the Census taker was asking should not be asked or included in the Census. We ought not to forget, in the first place, that the Senate is only part of the legislative machinery of the Government, and in the second place that the Senate and the House together are not all of the legislative machinery; that the Executive has a right to express his opinion, and if we want to express the opinion of the entire Government of the United States it ought to be not only that of Congress but that of the President as well.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator, of course, recalls that a precedent for this action was established when a resolution was passed condemning sit-down strikes.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I remember that, and I voted for it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was among those who voted for it, and it was adopted by a vote of 75 to 3.

Mr. NORRIS. I was one of them.

Mr. BYRD. That was exactly the same situation as this.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not trying to shield my own sins. I know that I shall probably introduce tomorrow a resolution declaring the sense of the Senate on something that I think ought to be changed in the rules and regulations and orders of the Federal Government. I am not claiming to be any purer or better than anybody else; but this sort of thing is a habit that we have grown into, and it is a nullity. For nearly 2 days we have been discussing a proposition which, whether we vote it up or down, will have no legal effect whatever.

I admit that it is important. It is embarrassing, perhaps, for Senators to vote either way on this proposition, but, as the Senator has modified his amendment, I am going to vote for it. I am still going to be inconsistent, as the Senate has been all the time. The amendment has no place, it should have no place, on the bill before us, when we are trying to unite the country. Yet, as it is modified, I do not see anything wrong with it.

We are elected to legislate, not to express opinions, or to condemn laws or condemn actions. If there is something wrong let us legislate and make it right if we can. If there is something which should be repealed, let us not do it indirectly by saying it is the sense of the Senate that this or that law should not be obeyed. We have not any constitutional jurisdiction to make anything of this kind effective, and we are not making it effective.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, usually the Senate expresses its views in a resolution which stands on its own legs. It is a very unusual procedure to undertake to amend a legislative act by engrafting on it a resolution which has no legal effect.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the point made by the Senator from Texas is very well taken.

Mr. CONNALLY. We do not need to condemn the habit of expressing our views when we do it by resolution, subject to amendment and debate and consideration, but when it is done in this unusual way, it presents a different situation.

Mr. NORRIS. After all, what does our judgment amount to, anyway? If one listened to the debate which has been

proceeding for 2 days, I think he would go away feeling that it would not make any difference which way we acted; and it would not.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does it change the Senator's opinion in any particular when it is called to his attention that in line 1 the pending Byrd amendment says, "it is the sense of the Congress" rather than of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. I knew that was in the amendment. I did not say so directly, but I said in this case we were expressing the sense of the Congress, and that if we wanted to express the sense of the Government of the United States we should include the President. The President is to sign the bill or veto it, one or the other.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator understand that a vote for the Byrd amendment or similar language means that the Senate is purporting to express the sentiment of the Congress?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senate is a part of the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. But a vote for it obviously means that we are voting that thus and so is the sense of the Congress. Is not that the fact?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; we are contributing our part to it. It has to go to the House to get their approval, just as any other proposed legislation must.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me see if I can refresh the Senator's recollection on a point. We had before us a few months ago a resolution offered by the chairman of the Committee on Finance calling upon the Senate to express its sense that the Securities and Exchange Commission should advance—that is to say, expedite—a hearing on any application made by the Republic of Finland for a loan.

Mr. NORRIS. I have already referred to that.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; but the Senator said he did not remember what it was.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not, but I do now, since the Senator reminds me of it. It was the case to which I referred.

Mr. DANAHER. There was not any application pending, and there has not been since, and that shows of how much value it was for the Senate to express its opinion.

Mr. NORRIS. If our action has no effect, what is the use of taking it?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the Senator's attention was called to the fact that a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the sit-down strike was agreed to by 75 to 3. The Senator will recall that the first vote on the subject of the sit-down strike was on an amendment sought to be attached to the Guffey coal bill, which amendment was defeated. Then public opinion was so aroused because of that that it was submitted as a resolution, and it was adopted, I think, by about 75 to 3.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I realize that perhaps what we do is immaterial. When we take a vote one way or the other on a matter of this kind—and I am applying this to myself—I would prefer that it did not come on such a proposal as that before us. The amendment makes a statement which is fair with regard to labor, as I see it, and I intend to vote for it, realizing, as I do, that it will have no legal effect.

Mr. President, I am one who believes that labor in this country as a rule is just as patriotic as any other class of our citizens. I think it is unfortunate, as has been stated several times in the debate, that Communists, who believe in the destruction of our Government by force and violence, if necessary, have worked themselves into key positions in various organizations, not alone in labor. I think the local labor organization in California, the one which has been considered more by the country than any other recently, the case in which the strike was broken by the President, is an instance of that. The men in the labor world higher up condemn that strike in the most severe terms. The leaders of labor, as they are outstanding in this Nation, I believe are patriotic men, just as patriotic as we are. They do not want strikes. After all, if one could conceive of a case where there was a strike without anyone being to blame, he would have to agree that its effect would retard production of armaments at a time when the country is sorely in need of them. So that I think the principle of governmental action in this emergency is justified, because we must have production or meet failure. Everyone knows that, regardless of the cause of a strike, it does impede production, and when the welfare of the country at large is at stake, it seems to me we are justified as a government in taking plenary action, even though temporarily it may do an injustice, either to labor or capital, or even to both. We must have production or we will have failure.

These times are different from ordinary times. We are justified in taking the course that was taken by the President when he stopped the strike in Los Angeles with the use of the Army. I think he was justified in doing what he did. We have authorized him to do it. It may be that some injustice may result here or there in the application of the principle which I have tried to lay down, but a different rule should prevail in time of emergency from what would prevail in time of peace.

Mr. President, the damage which has come from this one strike, in a plant which, I understand, was producing 30 airplanes a day, might mean the difference between success and failure in the efforts of our country. Yet, if we stand on a technical point, and the Government refuses to act, the failure continues, and it is conceivable that defeat may result from such a condition.

It seems to me that in a dispute arising as a result of a local condition both the laboring man and the capitalists may forget in time of emergency to be patriotic to their country. To be patriotic means that under certain conditions one must be willing to sacrifice even his rights in order to win success for his country. It seems to me that is not exemplified in many of these strikes. The man who is patriotic should be willing to sacrifice. If he is an employer, he should be willing to pay more than he believes he ought to pay. If he is a laborer, he should be willing temporarily to take less than he feels he ought to have.

We have our Mediation Board. Under it we ought to settle these difficulties, but while they are being settled let the work go on. Everyone, no matter which side of this question he may be on, should realize that that should always be done. Production ought to go right on and let the settlement come later, but let the settlement date from the time of the beginning of the difficulty.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I am interested in the Senator's point of view. I should like to know if he feels that he would, as a matter of legislative consideration, condemn a strike which may be justified.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I would not condemn a strike I thought was justified.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that that is precisely the effect of the amendment before us.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think so.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator will read the last line in it he will find that we will, as a matter of legislative expression, say that such strikes are hereby condemned.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, "such strikes" are the kind of strikes described in the modification which has been made to the Byrd amendment. It seems to me that makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; surely.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Mediation Board, or the arbitration group, makes a decision, which decision, let us assume for present purposes, is erroneous——

Mr. NORRIS. Let us not assume that. Let us make the assumption we make in all our actions in life, in all our court proceedings. We must assume that the tribunal which has jurisdiction does not decide wrongly. If we think it decides wrongly in a particular case, an appeal can be taken. The case can, perhaps, be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. The final decision may be against us. We may feel that it is wrong, but it is the decision of the last tribunal, and it is the law that every loyal citizen must obey. To disobey it means revolution. There might be cases when revolution would be justified. Even if I could, I would not destroy the right of revolution, which, in some cases, may be similar to a strike. It is, after all, a sacred right which the people of any government may exercise, as we have exercised it in the past.

Mr. DANAHER. Then the effect of the Senator's position, as I understand it, Mr. President, is that, if the Mediation Board once decides a strike shall not take place, and makes a decision contrary to the conditions and terms upon which the workers have predicated their entire action, and finds against their claim, the workers must work.

Mr. NORRIS. No; not must work. We could not compel them to work. They could quit, anyway, of course. If they were compelled to work, I admit that would be slavery; it would be involuntary servitude. But I say that when the Mediation Board, or any other tribunal which has been agreed upon to settle a dispute, shall settle it under the law we have passed and reach a conclusion, then it is the patriotic duty of every man involved in the controversy on either side to accept that judgment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator then, what possible effect can be given to this amendment if we shall adopt it?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think it will have any effect. I have heretofore said so. It will not have any legal effect anywhere. There may be some psychological effect by its acceptance. People may argue the question pro and con if they want to, as we have been doing for a day and a half, but legally it will have no effect whatever. It is not worth the paper on which it is written as a matter of law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In lines 3 and 4 of the amendment we find the language—

> The uncertainties of the future necessitate complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor.

What does the Senator from Nebraska understand is meant by the expression "complete cooperation between Government, management, and labor"?

Mr. NORRIS. I think I understand it. Perhaps I do not. Whether I understand it or whether the Senator understands it makes no difference. We are not passing a law. But I think there ought to be complete understanding between Government, labor, and capital, especially in times of emergency such as we are now passing through.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Should the Byrd amendment be adopted, would it be in order for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to offer his amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; as an amendment to the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Would it be in order for the Senator to offer his amendment as an amendment to the bill, following the Byrd amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would have to be offered, as the Chair understands, as an amendment to the Connally amendment. Should the Byrd amendment be adopted, it would then be in order to offer it as an amendment to the Connally amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he intends to offer his amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do, in the event the Byrd amendment is agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Then I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our ever blessed God, for all the light which Thou hast shed abroad, we give Thee thanks. Though we see through a glass darkly, we look forward with ardent expectation to the disclosures of a better world. How infinite in compassion and sympathy Thou art, long-suffering and kind and waiting to be gracious and merciful. Borne down by temptation and care, so often we stumble and falter; we would know Thee as the light, the bread and the way of the wisest service. Fill us with Thy spirit that we may achieve the blessed things of life, in courage, in patience, in bountifulness, in perseverance and in every gocd word and work. We pray for all who labor, who teach, who have compassion upon the poor, who seek the waste places in human experience and are helping by the rule of Christian devotion, those who need succor and encouragement. Richly bless all churches and their ministers and leaders; grant that they may be strengthened by Thee to sow and reap and that there may be gathered abundantly of their labors into the garden of our living Lord. Now Heavenly Father, draw very near the sick and the distressed; enter their hearts that they may know Thy presence and feel the breath of Thy holy benediction and Thine shall be the praise through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1941.

The Honorable the Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The certificate of election, in due form of law, of Hon. KATHARINE EDGAR BYRON, as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. William D. Byron, is on file in this office.

Yours very truly,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BYRON appeared in the Well of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized.

THE LATE ROBERT S. HALL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty this morning to announce to the House the death of a former very valuable Member of this House, the Honorable Robert Samuel Hall, who so ably and effectively represented the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi in the House for two terms. Judge Hall, who was a valuable officer of the Federal Trade Commission at the time of his death, passed away last night in his home in nearby Arlington, Va. Judge Hall receives practically every honor that could be accorded him by the electorate of that congressional district. He ably served his country as county prosecuting attorney, as district attorney, as circuit judge, and as a Member of the Congress. Judge Hall, as his long and able public service would indicate, was highly respected, loved, and honored.

Robert Samuel Hall, affectionately known as "Judge," was born in Covington County, Miss., on March 10, 1879, the son of Evans and Effie Hall. Like so many other outstanding Mississippians he was educated in the common schools of Mississippi and finished his education by being graduated from Millsaps College—one of the foremost institutions of learning in Mississippi—with a degree of bachelor of laws in 1900. Shortly thereafter he entered the practice of law in his new home at Hattiesburg, Miss. In 1906 he was elected to the State senate where he first entered public service. In 1910 he was elected county prosecuting attorney of Forrest County, Miss., which office he voluntarily gave up to assume the duties of district attorney in 1912, to which office he was elected as a result of the ability and the fidelity with which he discharged and duties of that office. The people of the twelfth judicial district of Mississippi, recognizing the unusual ability displayed by the young district attorney, further honored Mr. Hall by elevating him to the bench as judge of that district. Judge Hall served in this capacity until March 1, 1929, when he voluntarily retired to accept the office of Representative in the American Congress, having been elected by the electorate of the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi on November 6, 1928. Judge Hall served his district, his State, and his country for two terms in the Congress of the United States. His service was marked with industry and distinction. In that brief time he became chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Many of you here this morning remember with satisfaction his genial disposition and his uniform courtesy to all with whom he came in contact.

Judge Hall was a lovable man. He was a good husband, a devoted parent, and a devoted member of the Presbyterian Church. Judge Hall, in addition to his thousands of friends, leaves his widow—the former Miss Lenore Robinson, of Hattiesburg, Miss.—four stalwart sons, and two lovely daughters to mourn his untimely passing. Now that the battle of life, the vicissitudes of politics, the honors acquired, and the few disappointments in

life are no more and the splendid heritage is left to his family and posterity, may God—the greatest judge of them all—receive and keep him for the final reunion which we are all taught to believe is the just reward of God's own.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I and every other true Mississippian join our distinguished colleague ir his expressions of regret over the passing of our distinguished former colleague, Robert S. Hall, one of Mississippi's distinguished sons. To me his passing is a keen, personal loss. We were long personal friends, and during his services in the House we were thrown together almost every day. I can say of him as was said by another that he was a foe without hate and a friend without treachery.

He manifested a spirit that I sometimes wish was more prevalent in this House and in other walks of life. He reminded me of that expression of our old friend, Walter Malone, the distinguished Tennessee poet, in a little verse called Opportunity, in which he said:

Wail not for precious chances passed away,
Weep not for golden ages on the wane;
Each night I burn the records of the day,
At sunrise every soul is born again.

This verse to me expresses the daily life of Robert S. Hall.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND REPORTS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after the word "amended", insert "or otherwise as he may elect."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia tell us the meaning of this amendment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. When the bill passed the House, section 4 provided that a civilian assistant to the Director of Budgets and Reports be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Senate added "or otherwise as he may elect." In other words, this means that this civilian can either come from the civil-service rolls or outside of the civil-service rolls if the Secretary of the Navy shall so elect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all it does?

Mr VINSON of Georgia. That is all it does; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE 18 MONTHS' LAY-OFF, W. P. A.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will again take up for consideration House Joint Resolution 193, carrying the appropriation for the W. P. A. On January 29 of this year I introduced what is known as H. R. 2789, which strikes out the 18 months' mandatory clause of the W. P. A. law. Tomorrow I expect to attempt by an amendment to include this bill, H. R. 2789, in the provisions of House Joint Resolution 193, striking out, on page 16, lines 4 to 13, inclusive, which is the mandatory clause of the 18 months' lay-off of the W. P. A. This amendment is now on the Clerk's desk. I ask all Members of Congress to give thought to this amendment and assist me in bringing aid to these unfortunate individuals. I apologize to the House for bringing this bill in in this particular manner, but owing to some reason which I am unable to determine, H. R. 2789 has never had a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, and I am therefore forced to ask that it be accepted in the form of an amendment to House Joint Resolution 193.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCREASING AMOUNT FOR W. P. A.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when the W. P. A. bill will be read for amendment, I am going to offer an amendment increasing the amount in the bill to the sum of $1,250,000,000. That amount will enable us to give employment to about half of those who are unemployed, and able to work, but who cannot find work in private industry. Many people think that because of defense activities all of the unemployed who want to work are taken care of. Members from the Middle West and from other sections of the country know that defense activities are confined to a very small area of this country. Also I want Members to know that the men on the W. P. A. are for the most part men over 40 years of age and that over 60 percent are over 45, who cannot get work in private industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter from Major General Rivers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORK ON THE FARMS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] spoke about unemployment in the cities. That is not bothering us any out in the country. Our farmers are unable to get help to cultivate their crops, to harvest some of their crops, and farm work will increase from now on. We cannot get men because the factories in the cities are taking them away from us with a higher wage than the farmers can pay.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. How much do we pay them?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. In my district I am taking care of the farmers by having men on the W. P. A. leave the W. P. A. under the condition that if they do not they will not be continued on the W. P. A. rolls; also, by having the commissioner of education defer entrance to college in the fall.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If those on W. P. A. in the gentleman's district are being given employment by the farmers, there is no need for an increase. There should be a reduction in the W. P. A. appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an article showing changes made by Reorganization Plans I to V.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanmous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of inserting in the RECORD excerpts of an article by a member of the technical staff of the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, which shows the changes made by Reorganization Plans I to V, promulgated under authority of the act of 1939.

Included in the article are two tables which present a consolidated compilation of all basic changes made. One is an alphabetical listing of agencies and functions as they previously existed, a description of the nature of the change, and the disposition after reorganization. The other table shows the post-reorganization structure of the executive departments and independent agencies insofar as they were affected by the plans.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws has incorporated all of the changes in the text of the new edition of the United States Code, which will be available in the near future.

I hope these tables may be of some use to the Members.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars: First, by the inclusion of a letter from John Cashmore, president of Brooklyn College; and second, by the inclusion of a letter from William M. McCarthy, endorsing S. 220 and S. 24.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address made by me on June 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on Automobiles a Necessity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial from a newspaper in my district on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech delivered by Hon. Elbern Parsons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. P. J. Anderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Governor of the State of Louisiana in reference to the W. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks and include a communication from the Polish National Alliance pledging their support to President Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial dated June 5 on the subject of give us an air force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an article by William Randolph Hearst.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES AGAINST NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

HARRY BRIDGES AND OTHER ALIENS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House read the papers and really find out that Harry Bridges is supporting these outlaw strikes. He is an alien. I hope the Members will consider the fact that this man Alex Balint is also an alien and still he has been here for 20 years.

This country has come to a terrible pass when these outside aliens, who are not even citizens, can come in and destroy our defense program.

I have a bill before a committee of this House which provides that no alien shall represent organized labor in any bargaining with any business or industry in the United States. I would like to see that bill passed. I ask the support of every Member of this House to help me pass that bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address delivered by our minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., at Glens Falls, N. Y., on June 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PLAN DE RANCHO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me you probably can understand this:

8 Estrellas que podemos ganar este ano llevando a cabo un buen Plan de Rancho y Casa.

That is the title of a booklet gotten out by the Farm Security Administration. What it means is that you can win 8 stars each year by carrying out a good plan of county farm and home management. Then it provides the conditions under which each star can be obtained. It contains pictures. It has cartoons; little zinc etchings of one kind or another. It will make swell writing material for some of the children. It will lend itself beautifully to other uses that I can name.

I have not complained a great deal about some of the literature that has been gotten out by Government departments, but when you get to printing things in Spanish and circulating these around, I think we are just about ready to call it quits.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an item from the United States News, indicating that the American farmer is not for sale.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech made by the president of the VI Form, Mr. Douglas W. Franchot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] call your attention to printing that does not seem necessary. Well, there is much of it being done, it is waste, it is extravagant. But they continue to do it. I just want to call your attention to the Treasury statement of June 7 showing that we are now close to the five-billion mark in the red for this year which closes June 30. The actual figure is $4,990,000,000. We are over and above the $5,000,000,000 today. Extravagant, wasteful methods of this administration is the fault of these annual deficits.

We are printing more worthless material that is being sent out by the various departments than ever in the history of the world. This administration is responsible for that. It seems strange that we should continue to do it. You are not cutting down the regular appropriations as the President and Mr. Morgenthau said they should be cut. He does not mean it or he would insist that it be done. You are not going to cut them down. I am now working on the Interior Department appropriation bill in conference. It is going to be a great deal larger than it was when it passed the House. So you will find that all appropriation bills are going to be increased rather than decreased. Why? Why? Why do you permit it? Have you no sense of responsibility?

How are you going to meet the situation when we bankrupt the country, when you have a million and a half men under arms and a great Navy? If you are not able to handle it financially, we will all go bust. You will bankrupt the Nation. You have it about bankrupt now. In the name of our liberties and of our country, do not bankrupt it by doing many of the useless and unnecessary things that are being done by the administration. Stop waste. Stop extravagances. Stop unnecessary functions of government. Stop. Stop. Stop before we go broke.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short statement issued by 24 national organizations, including the Boy Scouts, the Elks, the

Roosevelt Memorial Association, and certain other organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FIRST REPORT UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 11, 1941 (LEND LEASE ACT) (S. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 5 (b) of Public Law No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by me on March 11, 1941, provides in part as follows:

> The President from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act except such information as he deems incompatible with the public interest to disclose.

In compliance with this provision, I am submitting this report.

We have supplied, and we will supply, planes, guns, ammunition, and other defense articles in ever-increasing quantities to Britain, China, and other democracies resisting aggression.

Wars are not won by guns alone, but wars are not won without guns. We all know this full well now. Beginning with the outbreak of the war, the American public began to realize that it was in our own national interest and security to help Britain, China, and the other democratic nations.

Beginning with the outbreak of the war, British and French orders began to be placed. But dollars could not be immediately turned into airplanes and ships and guns and ammunition.

In those dark days when France was falling, it was clear that this Government, to carry out the will of the people, had to render aid over and above the matériel coming off the assembly line. This Government therefore made available all that it possibly could out of its surplus stocks of munitions. In June of 1940, the British Government received from our surplus stocks rifles, machine guns, field artillery, ammunition, and aircraft in a value of more than $43,000,000. This was equipment that would have taken months and months to produce and which, with the exception of the aircraft, cost about $300,000,000 to produce during the World War period. Most of this matériel would not have been usable if we had kept it much longer. This equipment arrived in Britain after the retreat from Dunkirk, where the British had lost great quantities of guns and other military supplies. No one can appraise what effect the delivery of these supplies had upon the successful British resistance in the summer and fall of 1940 when they were fighting against such terrific odds.

Since June 1940, this Government has continued to supply war matériel from its surplus stocks in addition to the matériel produced by private manufacturers. The 50 over-age destroyers which Britain received in exchange for the defense bases were a part of the aid supplied by the Government.

By the turn of the year 1941, the British commitments in this country for defense articles had reached the limit of their future dollar resources. Their striking power required the assurance that their munitions and equipment would steadily and certainly be augmented, not curtailed.

The will of our people, as expressed through the Congress, was to meet this problem, not only by the passage of the Lend Lease Act but by the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 made on March 27 of this year to carry out this task.

In the 90 days since the Lend Lease Act was passed, and in the 74 days since the funds were appropriated, we have started in motion the vast supply program which is essential to the defeat of the Axis Powers.

In these 74 days more than four and one-fourth billion dollars out of the seven billion dollars have been allocated to the War, Navy, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments and to the Maritime Commission to procure the aid authorized. Contracts have been let for long-range bombers, ships, tanks, and the other sinews of war that will be needed for the defense of the democracies. The balance of less than two and three-fourths billions is being rapidly allocated.

To be effective, the aid rendered by us must be many-sided. Ships are necessary to carry the munitions and the food. We are immediately making available to Britain 2,000,000 gross tons of cargo ships and oil tankers.

But this is not enough. Adequate shipping for every day to come must be reasonably assured. Since the appropriation act was passed, $550,000,000 has been allocated for the construction of new ships under the Lend Lease Act. Contracts have been let, and the new ways required to build these ships are now nearing completion. Allied ships are being repaired by us. Allied ships are being equipped by us to protect them from mines, and are being armed by us to protect them as much as possible against raiders. Naval vessels of Britain are being repaired by us so that they can return quickly to their naval tasks.

The training program of 7,000 British pilots in our schools in this country is under way. Valuable information is being communicated, and other material assistance is being rendered in a mounting benefit to the democracies.

Millions of pounds of food are being and will be sent. Iron and steel, machine tools, and the other essentials to maintain and increase the production of war materials in Britain are being sent and received in larger quantities day by day.

Since September 1939 the war goods sent to Britain have risen steadily. The over-all total exports to the British Empire have greatly increased in 1941 over 1940. What is more important, the exports of those things which are necessary for fighting have increased far beyond our other exports. In the first 5 months of this year we have sent more than 12 times as many airplanes to Britain as we did in the first 5 months of 1940, and as the rate of aircraft production increases relatively more and more heavy bombers and medium bombers are being sent. At the same time we have sent more than 10 times as many aircraft engines in the first 5 months of 1941 as we did in the first 5 months of 1940. For the first 4 months of this year the dollar value of explosives sent to the British Empire was about 17 times as much as for the first 4 months of 1940. Ninety times as much in dollar value of firearms and ammunition was sent to Britain during the first 4 months of this year as for the first 4 months of 1940.

With our natural resources, our productive capacity, and the genius of our people for mass production, we will help Britain to outstrip the Axis Powers in munitions of war, and we will see to it that these munitions get to the places where they can be effectively used to weaken and defeat the aggressors.

In the report that follows facts and figures are given to the extent advisable without disclosing military secrets to benefit the Axis Powers. These facts describe the past and portray the present status of our aid to those nations so gallantly fighting the aggressors. They do not present the most important fact of all—the strong will of our people to see to it that these forces of aggression shall not rule the world.

We have before us a constant purpose, not of present safety alone but equally of future survival.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1941.*

CONSIDERATION OF VINSON BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader a question if I may. I observe in the newspapers that the so-called Vinson bill will be called up next Monday. I wonder if that is accurate or not?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. At the time the statement was made it was accurate. I make that statement so the newspapers will not think they made statements which were not justified.

The bill will not be called up before the 23d and probably on that day. That is the best information I can give. I have been informed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that he will probably call it up on that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Members can plan to have that bill before them on June 23?

Mr. McCORMACK. The best answer I can give to the gentleman from Massachusetts at the present time is what I have given. I will keep the House advised constantly so that they may have as much notice as possible as to when the bill will come up. I will inform them of anything more definite if the occasion arises. The best information I have now

is that it will probably be called up on the 23d.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. It will not be called up before that time, will it?

Mr. McCORMACK. A "gentlemen's agreement" has been made. I believe I can speak for the three gentlemen involved. I know neither of them would violate a "gentlemen's agreement."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. FULMER (when the Committee on Agriculture was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I call up the bill S. 158, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 158, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for years and years farmers have been losing millions and millions of dollars because of crop failures. Because of this, the Government has been losing millions and millions of dollars in having to make emergency loans, grants, relief, and W. P. A. employment payments to thousands of these farmers.

Let me give you a little history in connection with the crop-insurance program.

For quite some time many Members have been interested in having the Federal Government insure farm crops. I believe I introduced the first bill proposing insurance on cotton.

In 1938 the conferees on the agriculture bill agreed to include a provision setting up the Crop Insurance Corporation. At that time it was definitely understood between Senator Pope, of Idaho, and myself that wheat and cotton would be placed under the insurance program. However, cotton was left out at the time of the passage of this act only for the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture stated that he did not have sufficient information and data on cotton that would warrant the inclusion of cotton. The Secretary was authorized to secure complete and definite information on cotton and submit his findings to Congress. Under a resolution, No. 176, submitted by me, the information submitted by the Secretary was placed in House Document No. 277 in the Seventy-sixth Congress. Bills were then introduced in the Senate and in the House by Senator BANKHEAD and myself, proposing the placing of cotton under the insurance program. This legislation was passed by both Houses but was vetoed by the President.

During this session of Congress I introduced H. R. 4595, covering cotton and authorizing the Secretary to gather information on corn and submit same to the Congress, having in mind introducing legislation later on placing corn in the program. My bill was reported to the House. In the meanwhile the Senate passed the Bankhead bill, S. 158, and this bill was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, and this is the bill that we are now considering. The bill has a favorable report from the Department and the Budget Director. At this point I want to read you a letter addressed to me by the President, dated April 5, 1941:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 5, 1941.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FULMER: In view of the interest which you demonstrated in S. 2635 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), a bill which would have extended to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat, and your disappointment that I found it necessary to return this bill to Congress without my approval, I am now enclosing a copy of a letter which I have today sent to the Secretary of Agriculture outlining my present views on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I am also including at this point the letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, signed by the President, referred to in the letter written to me by the President:

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 4, 1940, I returned to Congress without my approval S. 2635 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), a bill which would have extended to cotton the system of Federal crop insurance now applied to wheat. My action was based on (a) the substantial losses incurred by Federal insurance of wheat, (b) the lack of a sound actuarial basis for a self-supporting crop insurance, and (c) the belief that when such basis was established, the producers of all major crops should share in its benefits.

I am now informed that the losses incurred by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation have been considerably less than previously estimated and that your Department feels the actuarial basis of the Corporation has proved to be sound, provided administrative expenses continue to be paid by the Government.

While I have felt that any crop-insurance plan should be self-supporting with premiums sufficient to pay administrative costs as well as indemnities, I recognize that where the Government has entered insurance fields to meet needs which commercial insurance organizations have been reluctant to provide, it has heretofore seemed proper to share or provide the necessary administrative expenses. The Department has successfully reduced the ratio of administrative expenses and has recently submitted legislation to Congress which would permit premiums to be paid in notes of the commodity, which, if enacted, will result in further substantial savings by largely eliminating storage costs.

In view of the proven benefits of crop insurance and the reduction in administrative expenses accomplished and in prospect, it now seems to me that, as reliable actuarial bases are developed, consideration might be given to the extension of Federal insurance to other crops.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Let me give you some information about the insurance operations for 1939 and 1940:

	Fiscal year	
	1939	1940
Administration: Total expenditures	$4,484,772	$5,585,134
	Crop year	
	1939	1940
Number of contracts	$165,775	$379,420
Premium collections, bushels	6,676,536	13,801,957
Indemnity claims:		
Number	55,929	112,645
Bushels	10,163,081	22,889,533
Excess of indemnities over premiums:		
Bushels	3,486,545	9,087,576
Cash equivalent	$2,229,134	$4,739,572

In 1941 the Crop Insurance Corporation wrote 420,906 contracts. The Corporation received 14,358,000 bushels of wheat for premium payments. You will note in the figures that the number of applications received in 1940 were over twice as many as in 1939, and in 1941 there was also a substantial increase in the number of applications over 1940. According to the figures and the prospective profits for this year because of the good wheat crop, you will note that the total losses for the 3 years of operation of the wheat insurance will amount to less than $5,000,000. In the meantime, the Insurance Corporation collected around 35,000,000 bushels of wheat as insurance premiums from 966,101 farmers, giving same to about 175,000 farmers who had crop losses during these 3 years. If you will count this wheat at $1 per bushel, you will find that the Insurance Corporation during the past 3 years has given to these 175,000 farmers who had crop losses $35,000,000, and at a loss to the Government of less than $5,000,000.

Naturally, if we had not been in the insurance business, we would have saved the actual losses of around $5,000,000, but what would have become of thousands of these farmers who had crop failures? Why, many of them would have been forced into tenant farming. In the meantime the Government would have had considerably greater losses than the actual losses referred to under the insurance program. I mean losses from having to give to these farmers emergency loans, grants, relief, and W. P. A. employment payments. Naturally, in working out this insurance program—that is, a fair basis for premium rates—it cannot be done in 3 years; perhaps not in 5 years. It is apparent to me, and should be apparent to you, that this is a mutual affair between farmers. I am hoping, and I believe the time will come when all crop failures will be taken care of from the premiums secured from farmers, and you will find that it can be done at a very reasonable cost to farmers.

Crop insurance, while not offering a total solution for the farm problem of

more than 2,000,000 cotton farmers, should provide an effective means by which the financial difficulties brought about by unavoidable production hazards may be overcome. In view of the many hazards that affect the production of cotton and the large number of farmers who must face these hazards, it is believed that a program of cotton-crop insurance will meet a real need.

Let me give you some real, definite advantages and benefits to farmers under an insurance program: First, farmers are able to develop better farm management; second, insurance is a wonderful assistance in securing crop loans; third, in many instances, because of this type of security, farmers are able to secure lower rates of interest; fourth, indemnity payments have definitely prevented farm foreclosures; fifth, this insurance will eliminate emergency loans, grants, and relief benefits; sixth, will make possible construction, educational, and health programs; and seventh, the operation of the wheat-insurance program has enabled the Farm Credit Administration to sell farms to tenants on a more favorable payment basis when the tenant agrees to secure his payments by carrying crop insurance.

Section 7 of the bill proposes premium payments to be made in three ways: First, in wheat; second, in cash equivalent to the wheat; and third, notes secured by soil-conservation payments.

During the past 3 years, under the operation of the crop insurance, the insurance agency has been accepting payment of premiums in wheat. It is estimated by the Department that by being permitted to take notes the agency will be able to make a saving of from one to one and a half million dollars annually in cost of wheat storage.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I take it that it is contemplated that the program will ultimately be self-sustaining?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. With the experience and background already had with reference to what has been done, the gentleman has the assurance that we will finally work to that end?

Mr. FULMER. May I state in answer to the gentleman's question that it is definitely understood that eventually it will be a self-sustaining proposition. Based on the experience of numerous private companies, the corporation up to this date has made a wonderful showing over and above the showing of those private companies. If in 5 years or 7 years we can work this out and gradually take in the various crops one after the other, in an orderly way, so as to have this program become self-sustaining and save millions annually for that class of people that follow the most hazardous business in the world, I believe it will be an excellent undertaking.

Mr. COX. The statement of the gentleman, especially worthy of note, as I see it, is that the taking of notes instead of the delivery of wheat is expected to reduce the cost of administration to an extent considerably above $1,000,000.

Mr. FULMER. At least one million, and perhaps one and one-half million.

Mr. Chairman, may I state that this is not a partisan or a political matter. To me it is a common-sense, sound business proposition. Three years operation of the insurance program on wheat has proven the soundness of the program. No doubt some few Members will refer to the few million losses in 1939 and 1940. Let me state that the benefits received by farmers, including these few millions of losses at the expense of the Government, really meant the saving of many more millions to the Government in replacing emergency loans, grants, W. P. A. employment, and relief.

Crop insurance, where farmers have crop losses, will enable farmers to pay their obligations, interest on their mortgages, and taxes. It will enable thousands of farmers to continue to be landowners, thereby saving the Government millions of dollars that would have to be spent in trying to make landowners out of tenant farmers, many of whom have lost their lands because of crop failures.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether this bill is substantially the same bill that the House passed overwhelmingly last year.

Mr. FULMER. It is identically the same bill, proposing to include cotton at this time; and may I state that it is the purpose of the Committee on Agriculture from time to time, when we have definite information, to put in other crops in an orderly manner, one after the other, so we will not break down the program and in order that the program may be successful, without cost to the Government, and at the same time mean millions of dollars to the farmers.

Let me give you a concrete example as to just how crop insurance may prove to be a life saver to a farmer. Here we have two farmers, each of whom produces normally 10 bales of cotton. We would say that this cotton and cottonseed is worth $600. One of these farmers is insured for three-fourths of the value of his normal crop, or in the amount of $400. Both of these farmers have a total crop failure. You can readily see that the farmer with the $400 insurance would be able to pay practically all of his obligations, taxes, and interest on his land mortgage. It should also be very apparent to you that the only way out for the other farmer would be to call on the Government for an emergency loan, the securing of a grant, W. P. A. employment, and perhaps a certain amount of relief. In the meantime, the farmer with the insurance will enter into the next year's farming program with his obligations paid, or practically so, while the farmer without the insurance will wind up at the end of the next year with 2 years' obligations, all of which will mean that eventually this farmer will pass on into the tenant class.

In that private insurance companies, who operate purely for profit, have not been able to be helpful in solving this serious problem, naturally out of our experience during the past 3 years it should appear to every Member of Congress that the Government has entered into one of the most worth while, businesslike, helpful activities of any activity that it has ever engaged in. Ask yourself this question: Just how long would other groups, business and industry, last without proper protection, insurance, and so forth? Farmers are subject to more hazards in the producing of their crops than any other line of business in this country, and yet they have been operating all of these years without any insurance or protection whatsoever.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

WHEAT AND COTTON INSURANCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, the broad question involved in the consideration of this legislation is how far you wish to put the Government into the insurance business and thereby set the Government up in the insurance business in opposition to private insurance agents and agencies.

If the Government is going to insure wheat and cotton, why not the other farm crops of the country, as these two crops represent a small percentage of the national farm income? Otherwise the procedure is a continuation of the New Deal to legislate for the few at the expense of the many. If the Federal Government is to insure all the crops, why should they not insure the barn to hold the crops? If the barn is insured, why not insure the house? If the buildings are to be insured, why not insure a family, which is dearer than all the crops and buildings?

The second question involved is whether we should at this time increase Federal expenditures for nondefense items.

The Ways and Means Committee is searching eagerly to find every possible avenue to raise revenues. The "widow's mite" is in jeopardy. The public debt, now headed for $90,000,000,000, is twice the combined value of all the farms and farm buildings in the United States, which in 1940 had a value of only $33,000,000,000. Daily my constituents write and ask me to work to reduce the nondefense expenditures of this Government. Undoubtedly yours are doing likewise, or, if not, they most assuredly will be doing so.

The third question involved in the consideration of this legislation is whether it is a good governmental policy to pass additional legislation that has a tendency to increase the production of wheat and cotton. These two crops are soil-depleting crops and crops that now have most embarrassing surpluses.

Do you realize all the legislation that has been passed for the benefit of a few crops?

Do you realize that the cotton crop alone in 1 year, already has $125,000,000 in soil-conservation payments, $96,000,000 parity, $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 storage, $40,000,000 export bounty, and, in addition, numerous other so-called subsidies? In fact, the fiber crop was worth only $595,000,000 last year, so the

so-called subsidy is now annually over half the value of the crop.

Do you realize that wheat has huge parity payments? Do you think a wheat producer should get 15 to 17 cents per bushel premium for growing, or not growing, wheat when we already have a surplus of wheat? Or why should this wheat producer get 17 cents per bushel bounty when the barley and other grain growers do not have a bounty on their product?

The flax grower does not have a bounty, when we are on an import basis as far as flax is concerned.

The following table shows the United States wheat production from 1920 to 1940:

Wheat production—United States

	Bushels
1920	843,277,000
1921	818,964,000
1922	846,469,000
1923	759,482,000
1924	841,617,000
1925	668,700,000
1926	832,213,000
1927	875,059,000
1928	914,373,000
1929	823,217,000
1930	886,470,000
1931	941,674,000
1932	756,927,000
1933	551,683,000
1934	526,393,000
1935	626,344,000
1936	626,766,000
1937	875,676,000
1938	931,702,000
1939	751,435,000
1940	816,698,000

Note that the average production is over 100,000,000 bushels more the last 4 years than it was the 4 years before. Where is the crop control?

The following table shows the exports of wheat:

Wheat: United States exports, by 5-year averages, 1900–1938, and for calendar years, 1939 and 1940

Period [1]	Quantity	Value
5-year average:	Bushels	
1900 to 1904	109,466,000	$81,306,000
1905 to 1909	56,646,000	52,142,000
1910 to 1914	56,913,000	55,063,000
1915 to 1918 [1]	173,481,000	276,970,000
1919 to 1923	181,931,000	341,951,000
1924 to 1928	131,140,000	189,392,000
1929 to 1933	64,219,000	57,363,000
1934 to 1938	28,182,000	25,833,000
Annual:		
1939	63,214,000	36,815,000
1940 (11 months)	14,078,000	10,972,000

[1] Fiscal years 1900 to 1918, inclusive; 1915–18 is a 4-year average; calendar years 1939–40.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Note from the above table we have gradually lost our export wheat market. Also remember, for the last couple of years we have had to pay an export bounty of 25 to 27 cents a bushel to get rid of it.

Did you know that 1 congressional district received more money from A. A. A. in 1 year than 32 different States received?

Did you know that three congressional districts received over $43,000,000 or more money than all but two of the States in 1939?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Were any of those districts in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MURRAY. I will say to my distinguished colleague that they were not, but I do not want to get into any argument with any congressional district or any State and therefore I do not use either the number of the district or the State.

Did you know that five congressional districts got 23 percent of the money in 1939?

Did you know that of the four States with a total value of over $2,000,000,000 in 1935, the first State received $87,000,000 in 1 year, 1939; the second State over $59,000,000; the third State over $41,000,000; and the fourth only $13,000,000? Since 1933 to 1941, one of these States received $451,000,000; one, $288,000,000; one, $180,000,000; and the last, $62,000,000.

Did you know the fourth mentioned State was one that did not happen to grow the right crops to get the large payments?

Do you know any reason to continually have legislation for two or three crops that represent only a small part of the national farm income? Or should we have a constructive program for all the farmers of the country?

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

The other side of this picture is: First, if Federal crop insurance is developed, the proponents say that there would not be the demand for emergency legislation, for droughts, floods, grants, and the other projects so that in fact the United States Treasury is really being insured instead of the crops.

Second, the production of crops can be much more readily financed by the insurance program. This is evident. The farmer gets his policy; he can go to the bank and borrow for his operations as the banker knows just how many bushels of wheat the farmer will have and soon he will no doubt know about how much the farmer will receive a bushel for it, so he can, with complete safety, make the loan.

Third. The Republican platform includes crop insurance. I have not read the Democratic platform since 1932, but I hear the insurance provisions are in that too. Unless one repudiated that part of his party's platform during the campaign, he is honor bound to support the platform according to my way of thinking. Unless of course, if one does think he is bigger than his party, it is usually an erronecus opinion.

Fourth. Many students of this problem believe that this program can be self-sustaining, and that a general benefit will be obtained. This depends wholly on the administration, of course. I personally feel I should vote to go along with the legislation for the above reasons, but I do so with deep misgivings as to how the New Deal will conduct it.

In conclusion I wish to say that the wheat-insurance program has been carried on with a much greater overhead than would obtain if more crops were included and if this Federal insurance is to continue all farm crops should be included so we could discontinue legislation for the few at the expense of the many.

Do you not really think that anyone that can raise from five to nine thousand acres of wheat a year should be able to attend to his own insurance?

Do you think the public should be asked to carry on this kind of an insurance program?

The present farm program needs plenty of fixing and here is an opportunity to begin if you wish to legislate for the greatest good for the greatest number instead of continuing for the few at the expense of the many. We should include all crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as the rank and file of the farmers throughout the country are concerned, the gentleman's last proposal, in my opinion, is very sound. In diversified farming areas, which represent most of agriculture in this country, they should be entitled to insure their crops just the same as a few of the basic farm commodities are insured, and I am therefore glad the gentleman has mentioned that proposition.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am sure that anyone who has spent any time studying agricultural legislation will agree that all crops should be considered. I do not mean in the last few years, but for the last 20 years we have been legislating for the few.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot but come to the conclusion that we must include all types of farmers, regardless of the type of the farming that he is engaged in. We cannot continue to do it simply because he happens to raise this or that crop. I think we must insure the whole farm crop.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we are going to have an insurance program for agriculture which is to be sound and permanent, such a program must be self-sustaining and established on a business basis. At the present time wheat was used as an experiment. We tried wheat out for 2 years. It is impossible to establish tables of experience over a 2-year period. I opposed this cotton program insurance bill last year, as the gentleman knows. The President vetoed the bill. Now he recommends that we insure cotton. I am not sure but what we are making a mistake in taking in other commodities than wheat before we complete the experiment with wheat to see whether it will work out on a sound basis and give us a permanent and a sound insurance program.

Mr. MURRAY. If the gentleman were to make an investigation of the wheat policies, he would find that in many cases only about two men are insured in a county. One can readily see that entails a much greater overhead than if we had the whole farm being in-

sured. It just convinces me that much more that we should either quit going into the insurance business any further or should include all crops on the farm, because the overhead could be cut down then, and in fairness to the wheat program I think it should be brought out that the first year these policies cost the taxpayers $29 apiece, and that was given to the man that got out the insurance, and that has been reduced this year to $10 per policy. This is just another thing that confirms me in the conclusion that we should include all farm crops or get out of the insurance business altogether.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the gentleman, I am sure, agrees that we should not include a crop until we do have the necessary statistical information to make it self-sustaining, as near as we can.

Mr. MURRAY. And I say to my distinguished friend that this New Deal can be so lacking in knowledge when they want to be lacking, and can give so many answers when they want to give them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. MURRAY. And I will answer the question in this way. All these stories that they have to have, history behind it all, are not to me as laudable, because I think it is not very difficult to get a case history of a whole farm practically as quickly as you can get it of one crop. Therefore, I say, instead of going into this the way we are now—and next year we will have corn—we should, I think, take in the whole farm crop.

Mr. PACE. But the gentleman would not advocate an all-comprehensive, all-crop program?

Mr. MURRAY. I would; yes.

Mr. PACE. At this hour?

Mr. MURRAY. At this hour or at the next hour. That is the basis on which I would operate—for all of the people, and not for just a few.

Mr. PACE. Although the Corporation has not the information as to the average loss and the yields?

Mr. MURRAY. The trouble is that these New Dealers seem to think that we never knew anything about agriculture or soil fertility until about 5 or 6 years ago, when the fact is that we had considerable knowledge of agriculture wrapped up in our agricultural colleges throughout the country for many years, although that information does not seem to have gotten as far as Washington. They would not go through the performances they are at the present time if they had as many answers as they think they have.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The distinguished gentleman must know that if we authorize full coverage for all commodities the administration would not go ahead until they made an investigation, because they must establish it on a sound basis.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I may be the only Member of this House who is opposed to this bill, but if so that will be quite all right, and I think I can make the case.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a little while ago privately asked me as to whether I would be for this bill if corn were included. The answer is, "No." I am opposed to the Federal Government going into the field of crop insurance, because it is going to be suicidal. It will develop a colossal headache, and we will have proved exactly nothing, except to carry a huge burden upon the Federal Treasury. Let us see what the score is. I have gone into this. We had the Secretary of Agriculture before the subcommittee in connection with the appropriation bill for 1942 for the Department of Agriculture. The figures I am going to give you are documented, and I can give you the pages, if you like, from the record of the printed hearings.

In 1939 the wheat premiums were about 6.7 million bushels and the losses were 10,000,000 bushels. You compute that at 60 cents a bushel and we lost $2,216,000 on our wheat experiment in insurance in 1939.

They said at that time, "As we find a sounder basis everything will be hunky-dory." In the following year, 1940, they took in over 13,000,000 bushels in premiums on wheat. They paid out 22,000,000 bushels in payments. Expressed in terms of 60 cents a bushel their loss was $4,431,000. I have reason to believe that the score is going to be no different in the crop year 1941 because they are already anticipating that there will be a loss.

Here are succeeding losses each year. But that is not the whole story. You will find additional losses in the fact that the administrative expense comes out of the Federal Treasury. I will take for my authority the great gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who is a member of the subcommittee. He asked Mr. Smith, head of the Crop Insurance Corporation, what the cost of administration was. You will find this on page 938 of the hearings if you are interested in looking. Mr. Smith said $5,434,488. It has run over $5,000,000 a year. Add $5,000,000 to $2,000,000 and the loss was $7,000,000 in 1939. Add $5,000,000 to four and four-tenths million, and the loss was nine and four-tenths million in 1940. We are going to have that continuing administrative cost as we go along. We are going to carry a big load of red ink in this venture year after year.

I am satisfied in my own mind that we are not going to work out a sound actuarial basis unless the premium is so high that farmers will back off, and then we can cross off these insurance contracts and put it in red ink on the books of the Treasury. We should look ahead a little. This thing is tied to something else. When you insure a crop do not forget you are developing a vested interest in that crop, and if for some reason we have to change our agricultural economy because of world conditions, then what we have done will stalemate any chance to get out of that situation.

Sixty countries are raising cotton. China produces 3,000,000 bales; India. 5,000,000; Russia, two and three-tenths millions; Egypt, three and twenty-five one-hundredths millions; and Brazil, 3,000,000. They have three and one-fourth million square miles of territory in Brazil. They have millions of acres of new cotton land in Brazil. They have 42,000,000 people. They are going to get ready to whack off some of their coffee trees and go into the cotton business. Once we secure an insured interest in the cotton production of this country and it becomes necessary to change the economy, frankly, I do not know how we will do it. I am alarmed about extending this, and we have not seen the limit. To aggravate the situation and provoke even greater losses insurance will be gradually extended to other basic crops. Let me read from page 948 of the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. This is our friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] speaking. He asked this question:

> Now, Mr. Smith, are you working, for instance, on the rice crop?

Here is Mr. Smith's answer, the head of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:

> Yes, sir. At the present time we are working on cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and citrus fruits, and studies are being made on each one of those commodities.

So after a while we are going to insure oranges on the trees. We are going to insure lemons, I suppose, and make sure there will be a rice harvest. Some of these may prove sour crops for the Federal Treasury.

I do not know how they are going to arrive at an actuarial basis, based upon accounting mortalities, as the gentleman from Minnesota says, and make this thing work out without a staggering loss. I am alarmed about it and that is why I am opposed to it. I do not know of any other country that does it. As we go along, having no regard particularly for the future, we are going to wind up with a tremendous headache. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. If you are going in for insurance, let us go whole hog.

I am disposed to offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, after the colon, which would read as follows:

> With the cotton crop planted for harvest in 1942, the field-corn crop, and the oats crop, flax crop, rye crop, sorghum crop, sugarcane crop, peanut crop, potato crop, sweetpotato crop, barley crop, buckwheat crop, alfalfa crop, artichoke crop, celery crop, rutabaga crop, pear crop, plum crop, almond crop, apricot crop, avocado crop, orange crop, lemon crop, broom-corn crop, cherry crop, soybean crop, hop crop, hay crop, clover crop, onion crop, prune crop, tomato crop, and spinach crop whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a satisfactory actuarial basis has been established for such commodities.

The accent might be on the spinach.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman left out chickory.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman also left out cashews.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman have peanuts in there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have peanuts in there.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable there are not more Members on the floor today to envision how we are going to project this Government into a crop-insurance policy that will continue in proportion as those boys down in the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation continue to push insurance for other crops. Each year we are going to wind up with a headache and a deficit. If there is to be any withdrawing from this program that time is now.

We are not satisfied with the result obtained in the field of wheat. We have had losses in the years in which wheat has been insured. There will be a loss this year, in my judgment, as indicated by the testimony. Why should we add another crop now?

If you are bound and determined to extend crop insurance, why not defer it for a year or two until sounder actuarial data and information is available to the Congress and to the Department of Agriculture. I wish there were more interest, I wish there were more opposition to the pending bill at this particular time. It is a very unfortunate thing that on a matter of policy so grave and with so many implications there is such a great lack of interest at the present time. We are going to move on if we take this step today and indulge in other fields of insurance. After a while, we will simply have to tax it against the Federal Treasury and then wonder where the fund will come from. I do not know whether anyone else in this Congress will vote against the pending bill today, but I shall raise my voice as best I can and vote against it.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The policy is to afford some sense of security to most all other American citizens. For old age there is some assurance of a return on their efforts. Now, what does the gentleman propose to offer in the way of security to that branch of the citizenry that provides all of the food and fiber for the Nation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not propose anything as a substitute. If you are going to carry out logically that theory of assurance, insurance, and guaranty, then why not insure the plumber his job, why not insure the grocer a return on the canned goods he pushes across the counter, why not insure every segment of public life in this country? Let us find them all and somehow or other put them on the insurance rolls and be done with it. I am not yet persuaded that we are going to depart from what they call a sound American viewpoint. If we can get prices up—and I am willing that the farmer have adequate prices from one year to another—then when he does have adversity he can balance the good years against the bad.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if we follow that proposal through, what about industry that will go on for a year, or 2 or 3 years having a loss, then pick up the stitch and have a good year or two so that one cancels the other. Obviously if you are going to go the whole hog on this insurance principle, then look out.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman, of course, understands the farmer has no protection under the Social Security Act. He has no benefit from a guaranteed wage under the Wage Act. He has no way to set aside a retirement fund like the millions of Government employees. He has to plant his crop, produce his crop, and when the evening comes and it is destroyed by the elements, he is left destitute and alone.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a far better answer to that. Instead of having him go through all the rigmarole of planting wheat, hoping for rain, plowing, and cultivating the land, and so forth, let us make direct provision out of the Treasury and be done with it. That would be the answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, it is always very interesting to listen to our very industrious, loquacious, and learned friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This is nothing new. The gentleman has opposed this legislation heretofore. In spite of that fact the House has passed this legislation on two previous occasions by very large votes, although later it was vetoed by the President. I understand on reliable authority that the President will sign the pending legislation at this time and I hope, in spite of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, that this House will see fit to repeat what it did on a former occasion and pass this legislation, affording some sense of security and protection to that large class of our citizenship of the Southland who are engaged in the production of cotton.

As has been pointed out on the floor of this House repeatedly, we believe in insurance in this country. Insurance is a fundamental, recognized principle of our economic life. We insure our automobiles, we insure our homes, we insure our lives for the benefit of our loved ones, we even insure in this modern age under this Democratic administration against old age and the evils thereof.

In spite of the attempt that was made to ridicule this legislation, and ridicule, I admit, is always a very dangerous weapon when effectively used by a skilled foeman, the legislation is desirable and it is fundamental. I hope that this House, notwithstanding the facetiousness that has been shown and the ridicule that has been leveled at it, will go ahead and repeat what it did on a former occasion and pass the legislation, giving the President of the United States an opportunity to sign it in the light of the further study that he has seen fit to make.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say to the gentleman, as he has stated, that last session, the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, on two roll calls, this identical bill passed by a vote of more than 2 to 1. This year the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States recommend favorable consideration of it, and the Secretary states that as to other commodities he is not prepared to recommend an insurance program, until further investigation. I gladly support the pending bill as I supported the prior bill, and I repeat the arguments I then made.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for his very able contribution to this discussion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Mississippi says that this identical bill once passed the House. There is not a man in this House who can read this identical bill and have any idea what it means—I say this advisedly—unless he gets the law and superimposes upon the law these amendments. He is a very quiet, analytical man if he can do that satisfactorily inside of 1 or 2 hours.

When the chairman of this committee appeared before the Committee on Rules he was unable to do it. It cannot be done. I have been attempting for better than an hour here to write an amendment to a provision in the bill, and with this "strike out and insert," "the comma," and "the colon," and the language being amended by this bill not being before the Congress, it is a technical physical impossibility. I hope the committee will not bring another bill like this in here.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my distinguished friend and colleague on the Committee on Rules that he does himself a grave injustice. I personally resent the aspersions he has cast upon his ability as an able Member of this House, as a lawyer, and as a man for whom I have a very high regard. The matter is not so difficult as all that. My friend is very astute, and I am sure he can analyze the situation as he sees fit.

Mr. Chairman, now to get away from personalities for the few remaining moments which I have, let us analyze the situation briefly. What is the purpose of this legislation? The bill is simply an amendment to the crop-insurance bill which was passed by the Congress some 2 years ago. That bill provided for crop insurance on wheat alone. For 2 years that law has been in effect, and the wheat farmers of the country have found it satisfactory. Last year the Congress passed this identical bill, extending the benefits of the Crop Insurance Act so as to include cotton. The bill, had it become law, would have given the farmer insurance on his crop against failure from drought, floods, and the pestilence of the boll weevil. When he planted his crop he could realize that by good husbandry his crop would not be a total loss because

of the visitation of any of these evils which have heretofore beset him.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege at that time, as a member of the Rules Committee, to report House Resolution 271 of the Seventy-sixth Congress which made in order the consideration of this measure. At that time and in behalf of that legislation I addressed the House at some length upon the benefits which it was hoped the bill would extend to the cotton farmers of the Nation. The President saw fit, as has already been pointed out, much to the astonishment of those of us who were friendly to that legislation, to veto that bill, and so it is back today for your reconsideration. And as I have already stated, the President, in the light of the opportunity for further study that he has had to make of the legislation, has signified his intention to approve the bill if the Congress sees fit to pass it again.

It is argued here today that in view of the fact that this legislation is more or less experimental further time should elapse before the benefits of the Crop Insurance Act should be extended to cotton. The Department of Agriculture differs sharply with that position. This legislation for 2 years has been tried out in the wheat-growing areas in 32 States of the Nation. And now the President of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and the friends of the farmer generally favor the enactment of this bill. Frankly, I confess that no one can say definitely just how this matter will work out in its application to the cotton crop. But in the light of the success which it has met with in the wheat area, and in my zealousness to see the cotton farmer improve his lot, I am asking the House today to pass this legislation and at least give us an opportunity to try it out. If it proves unsatisfactory, of course, we who are most interested in cotton will be the first to ask for its repeal. Personally, I am very much in the same attitude about this that the President himself was in the early days of 1933 when he took over as the head of this Government. He said that we were going to try; that we were going to make mistakes; that we would profit by those mistakes; but that we were going to try to do something. Because of the lot of the southern cotton farmer with the loss of his foreign markets, with the continuous innovations of new substitutes for cotton, and with the growing tendency of other parts of the world to become as independent for their raw materials of this country as possible, I am in favor of trying out this experiment for the cotton farmer. Frankly, my friends, if this bill becomes a law and the farmer can have the sense of security that will come therefrom, together with the parity payments and the soil conservation payments which have already been provided by the Congress, I personally feel and rejoice in the fact that the farmers in my section can at least feel that they have not been neglected in these stirring and chaotic times by the American Congress. At least those of us who have the interest of the farmer at heart can get some satisfaction out of knowing that we have done the best that we could under the complicated and complex conditions that exist in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will not be 50 votes cast against this bill here today in spite of the derision that has been pointed at it by some of our Republican friends on the left-hand side of the Chamber. The bill should pass, the President should sign it; and the farmer should have an additional sense of security from the floods, the droughts, and the pestilence with which he is harassed. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to approach the consideration of this bill with the thought in mind that crop insurance is definitely an experiment. I do not believe anyone can say it is anything more than that. I have never heard anyone urge the enactment of this type of legislation on any other theory. It most certainly is an experiment that is worth making, however. There is no business in the world which has as many hazards confronting it as farming, and there is no business in the world which has as little insurance against its natural and normal hazards as agriculture.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not true that the hazards he has mentioned have made it impossible for the farmers to get insurance and protection that will protect him against disaster and loss, like other forms of business, and if this is not an effort to put him on an equal footing with the businessman, who is able to get insurance so that if disaster, fire, flood, or otherwise, comes along, he can protect himself and get back in business?

Mr. HOPE. I believe the gentleman has stated the proposition very well indeed. I agree with him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the gentleman from Kansas said that this is experimental, is there anybody on this floor who will deny that we lost over $2,000,000 in 1939 on wheat, that we lost over $4,000,000 in 1940, and that in addition we spent over $5,000,000 in administrative expenses in each of those 2 years, over and above the losses? Is there anybody who will deny these figures?

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman's figures are correct as far as I know, yet it seems to me that they fail as an argument against crop insurance. We all know that as long as insurance is on one crop only there will be greater hazards some years than others. If the premiums were figured absolutely correct from an actuarial standpoint there would probably never be a year when they would be exactly the same as the losses. Sometimes they will be over, sometimes under.

I believe the fact that we have had losses in the 2 particular years this plan has been in operation, coupled with the fact that these 2 years were years of severe drought in a large part of the Wheat Belt, is simply another proof of the fact that we ought to have crop insurance if it is practical. I do not believe this experiment as to whether or not crop insurance is practical will be decided or can be decided in 1 year or 2 years or 3 years. I believe in any line of insurance you have to go over a period of several years in order to get the basic figures upon which to determine the risk and the amount of premium to be charged.

When the present crop-insurance system was set up it was applied on wheat originally because there were more basic data on wheat than on any other crop, yet there were not such data as any of us would have liked to have had on wheat. During the last 2 years, however, much more data have been accumulated through the experience of the Crop Insurance Corporation. They know a great deal more about it now, and about the proper rate to charge for premiums, than they could possibly have known at the time this plan was put into operation. They will know more at the end of this year and more at the end of next year than they know now. It is frankly an experiment.

We have had two disastrous years as far as wheat is concerned. I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois that we are bound to have a loss this year. On the basis of present wheat prospects, the Corporation will likely not have a loss this year, but if it should have a loss that still does not prove anything as far as the soundness of the program is concerned. I believe that is the answer to what the gentleman from Illinois says, that you cannot say that because of your losses in 1 year or 2 years the proposition is a failure. It may be that the rates are too low, but the fact that there were losses for 2 successive years, which were particularly bad years as far as wheat production is concerned, does not even prove that. If the Corporation makes a profit this year and makes a profit next year, that will entirely alter the picture the gentleman from Illinois paints.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman makes an argument against the bill because, as the gentleman has stated, Hartford and Travelers and other private companies which had a great mass of actuarial data never could make it pay, and now the Government has the advantage of that data and still we have to recast the actuarial approach from time to time. So why not limit this experiment at least to one crop instead of moving into other crop fields and into other losses?

Mr. HOPE. I think there is something to what the gentleman has said about not expanding it to too great a degree, although I understood him to say in the course of his remarks that if we are going to have this he wanted it expanded to all crops and all commodities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is definitely correct.

Mr. HOPE. I think what we should do is to approach this matter carefully and cautiously as data are accumulated on other crops than wheat. There is

only one other crop upon which sufficient data have been accumulated to justify us in going into it now, and that is cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman was speaking about the hazards that the farmer is required to meet. May I suggest that not all of the hazards come from nature; and, as an illustration, let me cite this: In the spring those of us who grow apples are required to spray. Everyone knows if you are going to get fruit you must keep bees, and just as soon as the spring opens up and spraying begins around comes a Government inspector and says, "You are putting on too much spray; you are going to kill all the bees." Pretty soon along comes the fellow who inspects as to scale and he says, "You have not put on enough spray; you have got to put on some more." This puts the farmer in an awful hole and he does not know what to do. Is there some solution for that problem? I am interested personally.

Mr. HOPE. I know the gentleman is, and I sympathize with him, but I think his complaint is a little beyond the scope of this bill. I agree with him that what he has related describes another hazard which the farmer is up against.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; one that the Government puts on.

Mr. HOPE. There is no argument about that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not a fact that the losses that have been pointed out represent the cost which the Congress contemplated and for which Congress anticipated money would have to be spent in order to set up the organization and start crop insurance and give it a trial. That was contemplated at the time we passed the original act, was it not?

Mr. HOPE. We all know that when you set up any business organization the overhead is considerably higher in the first year or two, and that, of course, has been the case here. I hope the time will come when crop insurance will be a self-sustaining business proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I do not know whether it will be or not, but I believe we are not justified in saying that it is not sound until we give it a fair trial, and I do not believe we can give it a fair trial by limiting it to one crop, and now that we have sufficient data on cotton, I think we should extend it to the cotton crop and see how it will work out upon the two crops. If we have other crops that may be included later, such as corn, I think it is a fair proposition to include those crops also.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If the gentleman will permit one further question, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think we can justify the money we have spent and will spend when we take into consideration the amount of money this Government has spent for relief in certain sections where they have had floods and other disasters, such as hailstorms that wiped out entire crops, and would we not be the beneficiaries in the long run from that standpoint alone?

Mr. HOPE. I think, undoubtedly, had crop insurance been in effect during the past few years, the relief burden of the Government in many areas which have suffered drought and other disasters would have been very much less. I do not think there is a bit of doubt about that.

I now want to call attention to one other feature of this bill and that is the one which provides that the Crop Insurance Corporation may take notes rather than wheat or cash in payment of the premium. This will save at least $1,000,000 a year in storage charges. As you perhaps know, under the plan that has been in operation, premiums were paid in wheat, or if paid in cash, the Government bought wheat and held that wheat in reserve so it could be paid out as indemnities during the following year. This was unnecessary and it has been expensive. More than 2 years ago I urged that that plan be abandoned. In the last Congress I introduced a bill to provide for taking notes instead of collecting the premium in wheat at the time the insurance was written. I am glad to see that this bill contains that provision.

I hope this House will do what it did previously, pass this bill. Certainly if we were justified in passing the bill a year ago, with the data we had then, we are justified to a much greater extent in passing it this year.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. DOWNS. I happen to represent a State where they grow considerable tobacco. Can the gentleman give me any good reason why we should have crop insurance for wheat and cotton and not tobacco?

Mr. HOPE. For one reason, there is not sufficient data.

Mr. DOWNS. I understand that they are going to experiment with cotton. Why not experiment with tobacco?

Mr. HOPE. We have actuarial data on both cotton and wheat to a greater extent than we have on tobacco. As soon as we accumulate enough data to justify it, I think we should consider including tobacco.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the present system of crop insurance where payment of benefits and premiums are both made in kind, as the gentleman has pointed out, we were faced with the storage problem, and tobacco is a perishable commodity that has to be processed before it can be stored. Now, with this new bill, there is a provision for the payment of premiums in notes rather than in kind, and as soon as the Department can get the data upon which to justify the program for tobacco, I for one will be very much interested in seeing the Department adopt a program for tobacco.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am considerably distressed by the figures stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He indicated that in 1939 our premiums were something like $6,000,000 and the losses were around $10,000,000, and in 1940 the premiums were $13,000,000 and the losses $22,000,000. Then he indicated that the administrative cost was something like $5,430,000. Will the gentleman explain those losses to us and state whether those figures are correct?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe those are quite the figures which the gentleman from Illinois gave, but even if they were as bad as that, I do not feel that the fact that the losses were greater than the premiums for a 2-year period is necessarily any argument against the continuance of crop insurance. They merely show that the hazard in some years is greater than in other years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman form Kansas has again expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that the present system of Federal crop insurance, now limited to wheat, be extended to cotton. In our cities and towns today there are millions of persons who have social security through unemployment insurance because of our great President and the Congress of the United States. The butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker throughout the land have this income safeguard against periods of unemployment. Yet there are other millions of our people who, because of their occupation—and it is the greatest occupation of all—have been unable to avail themselves of the benefit of this unemployment safeguard. I refer to the bulk of our farm population, the cotton farmers, particularly.

At this time it seems to me not only desirable and expedient but also necessary and imperative that some form of protection, which would serve a comparable purpose to a great extent, should be available to cotton growers. Such a safeguard would be cotton-crop insurance. It would, in effect, be the unemployment insurance of the cotton grower of the South. Already it has served well the wheat growers of our country, benefiting not only them but also their communities, their merchants, their governmental subdivisions, and city labor. It can do the same for the cotton grower, for the southern merchant, for southern communities, their governmental subdivisions, and for city labor.

Everyone is familiar with the principles of unemployment insurance. During periods of employment the city worker contributes a small percentage of his annual earnings to the unemployment compensation fund. Then, when he is no longer employed, he is paid a stated sum for a minimum number of weeks. Thus he has an income when his source of income is shut off. Cotton-crop insurance will do the same thing for the cotton grower. The cotton crop is the cotton farmer's annual income. Without a crop he has no source of in-

come, just as the city worker without employment has no source of income. With cotton-crop insurance, however, the cotton farmer would pay a small percentage of his crop in good years to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Then, in years of cotton-crop failure—when he has no income—he would collect an indemnity. In this respect, his indemnity could be likened to unemployment compensation paid the city worker when he is unemployed and without a source of income.

Thus, what unemployment insurance has done for the city laborer and what wheat-crop insurance has done for the wheat grower, cotton-crop insurance can and will do for the cotton grower. For 3 years crop insurance has been in effect for wheat growers of the country. In good years they contributed a small amount of their crop to the Corporation to protect themselves against crop loss from all unavoidable hazards. So, too, would the cotton farmer under a cotton-crop insurance plan. In good crop years he would pay to the Corporation a small amount of his crop to protect himself against loss from all unavoidable hazards. In crop-failure years, just as the wheat grower has done, the cotton farmer would be paid an indemnity from the premiums he and his fellow cotton growers paid for their crop insurance. This is the way cotton-crop insurance—his unemployment insurance—would work.

The insurance would cover all cotton grown on the farm and would be an "all-risk," which means that if the grower suffers a loss from any unavoidable hazard, such as drought, flood, hail, frost, tornado, storm, excessive or deficient moisture, insect damage, or plant disease, the insurance covers it. The amount of premiums and the amount of indemnities for crop losses can be determined in pounds of lint cotton and payment could be made in either cotton notes or its cash equivalent, at the option of the grower.

Its effect would be more far-reaching than would seem possible at first glance. Complete crop loss, remember, takes from the cotton grower his sole means of income. Lack of money means going into debt—if he can get credit—or going without vital and essential food and tools. The result is that not only does the farmer and his family suffer, but also his community, the merchants, and city labor, because the farmer is unable to purchase what labor manufactures. I know that the record of cotton-crop loss years is studded with unpaid taxes, mounting foreclosures, unpaid interest, and mortgages, increasing relief expenditures. Thus governmental subdivisions are saddled with increasing relief costs, dwindling tax income, and a growing sociological problem.

Experience with crop insurance on wheat has demonstrated that this protection against crop loss will help stabilize farm income and local business, contribute to the health of the individual and the welfare of the community, and help maintain the cotton grower as a necessary part of the Nation's economy. Cotton-crop insurance will go far toward leveling the ups and downs of good years and poor years in agriculture and strengthening morale in these days of national defense.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I admit at the outset that I do not know very much about the workings of this crop insurance as it applied to wheat last year, and as it is intended to extend it to cotton, but in the main I say I am in favor of anything that will assist the farmer in any way to eliminate this great risk that he is subject to. I hope that eventually we will be able to extend insurance benefit to all of the major crops. I am sure that under the risk to which he is subjected it is impossible for the farmer individually to carry insurance. I tried that some years ago. Before I moved out to my present home I had a large farm and raised a lot of corn and wheat and other grains. I carried insurance for several years, and even during the good times, shortly before the war, in 1914 and 1915, it was impossible for me to carry the premiums. Therefore, after 2 or 3 years I dropped the premiums, and the next year we had the worst hail storm we ever had in that territory. It destroyed the entire crop, excepting a little hay. Of course, we will always find those who constantly say that the farmer is being subsidized to a large extent. I admit that, but on the other hand I do not believe that his subsidy compares with the subsidies that are provided in an indirect or in a different way for industry. This is only a protection to the farmer comparable to the protection that industry has by way of tariffs. Usually, and certainly if we ever resume our friendly trade relations with South America, the farmer will be used for trading stock, because South America does not have anything else to ship to this country except agricultural products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that this insurance proposition will compensate the farmers of this country for what they will lose in the trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay?

Mr. GEHRMANN. No, I do not believe we can ever have protection enough to compensate the farmer for the loss he is going to be subjected to with competition from foreign nations. That is why I say that anything that goes to the farmer, even though it does not affect my district at all, I am for it. I have supported all of these measures, including parity payments, although they have not helped us at all. I have supported them for 7 years with a lot of patience, believing that eventually we will have recognition for the largest single industry, namely, the dairy industry. I am very happy to know that we have a chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and a number of other Members from the cotton and Southern States who have absolutely pledged their support, and I am sure they mean to go along and do something for the dairy industry this session.

When we got to the point where perhaps the dairy farmer could enjoy some fair prices, along comes our Secretary of Agriculture and pegs the butter price at 31 cents. Then he said we must produce more cheese and butter, and the farmers in my State—which produces more than half the cheese in the United States—converted many creameries and put in extra cheese vats to make cheese. Our universities and the State department of agriculture spent millions of dollars to improve the quality of cheese, and to educate the people all over the country to eat more cheese. In other words, to become cheese-minded. Now, along comes the Department of Agriculture, and says we have to curtail the consumption of cheese so we can ship more of it to Britain and other places. I think we can produce enough cheese to supply Britain as well as other countries, if Britain would draw on her own colonies and South American countries, and use what they produce over there. I am sure it is not fair to ask our people to curtail the consumption of cheese when we have worked for years and years to build up and acquire the habit of eating cheese.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has spoken about curtailing the consumption of cheese. I just noticed a week or so ago that the administration announced there were 45,000,000 American citizens who were undernourished because they were not eating enough cheese.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what I said. We have been educating them; telling them that they need dairy products, but now they say we must not eat so much of it. Of course, we go along with one experiment after another, and I am in favor of this, but until we adopt the principle of setting a floor under farm prices, based on cost of production, we will not put the farmer on a self-supporting basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the House to understand that after 8 years of the New Deal and the more abundant life there are 45,000,000 Americans who are still undernourished?

Mr. GEHRMANN. According to the press, evidently there are; but at the same time they do not want them to eat cheese because some other country probably needs it more than our own people.

Mr. KNUTSON. I can appreciate it happening under the New Deal. We never had 45,000,000 undernourished when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I think it is absolutely not the business of the Department of Agriculture to tell our farmers that they should write us who were opposed to getting into this war by convoy or other means, that we should support convoying, because they claim that if we could convoy and safely deliver agricultural products, our farmers would get a better price for them. I thought they were only rumors, but I sent out

45,000 questionnaires, and I asked everybody that I had on the mailing list if they were in favor of convoys. I had opposed the passage of all measures that might lead us into war, but since they passed, I wanted to know if they wanted me to vote for convoys. I received something over 7,000 answers, and I will say that the percentage in favor of convoying was a little over 2 percent. It was 2.06 percent, but in those replies a great number of farmers, several hundred, asked me who instigated or who caused this rumor. They thought it was a rumor. No one could put his finger on who actually ordered this. I do not know if they meant county agents or the different Farm Security administrators, or whoever they were that evidently spread this idea that they should write to us about being in favor of convoys.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I received at least 15 letters written on the same type of paper, with the same typewriter, coming from my district but mailed from Minneapolis, in which these farmers, who I think were mostly on the A. A. A. committee, urged me to vote for a bill that would use the American Navy for convoy purposes. I wrote to all of those men—in fact, I answered the letters and I asked the question, "Who told you to write this letter to me?" because there is no legislation pending in Congress, as far as I know, urging the use of the Navy for convoy purposes. A great many of my letters that went out to those people have come back, which demonstrates that somebody in high circles is sending out fictitious letters, forged letters, you might say, urging us to vote for some type of bill that is not in existence.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that owing to the many discussions over the radio by different people about convoys it has inspired many people to write to their Congressmen as to how they feel upon the question of convoys?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that I have been receiving a lot of letters not only from Montana but from all over the country, and they run at least 85 percent against convoys and about 95 percent against participation in this war.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mine run more than that. Out of 7,000, the actual percentage figures, computed this morning by my secretary, are 2.06 percent in favor of convoys and about 98 percent against convoys. After I received a number of these letters I called up the Department of Agriculture, but I was not able to get anyone at any time at either the Farm Security or in another regular department of the Department of Agriculture who would assume responsibility or who knew anything about it. I do not know where it came from, but anyway it was quite prevalent and is being used all over the country to urge the farmers to write to their Congressmen to get them to support convoying or other means in order to deliver the goods to Britain.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All of the letters I received were to enact legislation to provide convoys so that we can sell our farm products or send our farm products over to Great Britain.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what they meant. I think it is absolutely unfair, in the first place, for the Department of Agriculture to curb farm prices in order to protect the consumer. It seems to me they ought to look in between somewhere. Maybe it might be some unnecessary middleman who is making an unreasonable profit. Both the consumer and the producer should be treated more fairly by eliminating profiteers usually found among unnecessary middlemen. One thing is certain, and that is while the farmers have been producing at a loss for many years, and it appears now because of this preparedness program they might recoup some losses, they are not willing to enter this war for that purpose. Would that some other groups could feel the same way about this war.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] 10 minutes.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, this debate has certainly taken a wide range; however, it is known to most of us that whenever we discuss a problem here relating to agriculture it is permissive for the debate to take a wide range because agriculture is a Nation-wide subject and vitally affects many different districts in these United States. There have been a lot of things developed in this debate that have been exceedingly gratifying to me. One is the fact that there is so little opposition to the pending measure, and I refer particularly to organized opposition. The only opposition was expressed by our delightful, charming friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who bases his opposition on the thought that he is against all kinds of crop insurance. He did not say, "If you give it to wheat you should give it to cotton." He is just against all kinds of crop insurance. Yet, from the standpoint of economy, he then announces he is going to offer an amendment that will include every kind of a commodity in this bill. This strikes me as too ludicrous to even reply to. In making the closing speech in this debate, with time limited, I necessarily will have to just touch the high points.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I only rise at this time because I do not see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the floor. I had a different understanding of his statement. I may be in error, but my understanding was that the gentleman thought that if we were going to have crop insurance on any crop, we should have it on all crops.

Mr. DOXEY. I think the gentleman is right about that; but until we know what the history of a commodity is and whether or not the background of it makes the commodity capable of being an insurable proposition along the lines of crop insurance already established, I say it is unreasonable to try to extend it to that commodity, or to think about extending it to all agricultural commodities until the Government has sufficient data and a satisfactory actuarial basis for dealing with such commodities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not arguing about it. I am trying to make that correction.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate that, and I want to be fair as well as clear.

Let me give some background with reference to crop-insurance legislation, and also talk about the merits of this bill. The bill has been discussed so ably by those who preceded me that it is unnecessary for me to go into details.

There is this one additional feature in this bill which is an amendment to the crop-insurance bill, and that is it makes cotton eligible for the insurance program, just as wheat is now eligible for the insurance program. The bill further provides as an amendment to the Federal Crop Insurance Act that the Department of Agriculture, for which appropriation has been made, shall get up actuarial data regarding corn, as corn is the next commodity in line as a reasonable, practical proposition for the extension of the insurance program if and when the facts justify it and Congress passes a law to include corn just as we have extended or are endeavoring to extend it today to cotton. There is this additional feature, as has been explained here today: The farmer can pay his premiums in three ways. He pays them in two ways now—with the commodity in kind or with cash. This bill provides the additional feature, which I think is quite a helpful addition, to wit: He can pay his premium with a commodity note. That note, of course, is payable when due. In that way it cuts down the expenses of the Department in not having to carry the commodity and pay a storage on it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say there is some background behind this legislation. Those of you who have been here as long as I have been know that we have talked crop insurance for many years. It was talked about under the proposed program of the old Farm Board, and, in my opinion, if they had had a little more crop insurance at that time and a little less purchasing program, the program might have turned out better. Nothing was done except talk so far as the crop-insurance program was concerned until in 1937. You know the President at that time called the Congress back in November for a special session of Congress, and the Committees on Agriculture in the House and in the Senate went to work on a general agricultural bill. There was no general agricultural program, because the United States Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I am not trying to throw any bouquets, but our committee worked incessantly on that proposition. The House passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act in December 1937. The Senate passed it a few days later. On about December 15, 1937, the Agricultural Adjustment Act went to conference. On the House side every

Member that was in the committee of conference on that bill is in Congress except our distinguished friend, Marvin Jones, who was then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The rest of us, our distinguished chairman today, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and I, are all here. We were the conferees appointed by this House in 1937.

We went into conference with the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees were composed of some of the gentlemen who are in the Senate today and some who are gone. I do not have time to give you the details, but we worked in that conference day and night, even during the Christmas holiday.

We knew that crop insurance was a good thing. The House passed the bill without crop insurance, but the Senate put an amendment in the bill including insurance for wheat, as an experiment. At that time the Department of Agriculture had more actuarial data regarding wheat than any other commodity. Crop insurance is pioneering. This is all ground work. I wish I had time to tell you of the manner in which the Department of Agriculture has handled this crop-insurance program and to compliment them, for I think they richly deserve it. This proposition has cost the Government some money, but it is money well spent, and how infinitesimal it is compared to the good it has done.

Right here, not by way of digression, but by way of emphasis, let me say that this program will work better or as well on cotton as it has on wheat. The Department not only has factual data and historical data on cotton, but it has plans to put this cotton-crop program into operation. They have studied cotton, and I feel sure they will make a good job of administering it. I believe the benefits will greatly outweigh any liabilities or expenses that may be incurred. When we oppose this bill on the ground of economy, I tell you it is false economy because the agricultural program does not have the benefits and protections thrown around it that other programs have. I do not believe you begrudge this program we are endeavoring to put forward for the benefit of the cotton farmer.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Referring to the losses incurred during these 2 or 3 years, may I say that they are nothing to compare with the millions that were lost in the way of emergency loans, grants, and relief, because of crop failures, that the Government never did get back.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman is eminently correct, and I appreciate his observation. Crop insurance has lightened the relief rolls. You men who know cotton know that it is a credit crop proposition; it is run on credit. If a farmer fails, he cannot pay his bills in the fall of the year, and naturally he goes on relief. It has been proven in the wheat section that if the farmer has a loss the Government, having insured his wheat crop up to 75 percent—and it insures not as to price but as to yield, and they pay either in cash or in kind—he will have something not only to pay his debts with but to live on. In that way it will reduce, or should reduce, some of the expenses our distinguished chairman has mentioned.

To go back to the conferees, we said, "All right; we will put the wheat-insurance program in the bill." Some of us insisted at that time on putting cotton in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, but more data were available as regards wheat. Those of us who have agriculture really at heart know that we have to give and take in order to get anything. It is my privilege always to do anything I can for wheat or any other commodity, dairying or anything else. But each has to take its turn. So we agreed that wheat would go in as an experiment and that then cotton would follow if and when the department that administered the program said that they had the necessary facts regarding cotton and Congress authorized cotton to be included.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the interest he has always shown in matters pertaining to agriculture. My wheat growers have been unfortunate because they have no storage facilities and cannot take out this insurance by reason of that fact. I wonder if the gentleman will tell me, although perhaps it has been explained in the Committee during my absence, what percentage of the wheat farmers of the country took advantage of this insurance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOXEY. I can give the gentleman the figures. The number of wheat contracts in the year 1939 was 165,775, and the number of contracts in the year 1940 was 379,420. Just what percentage that is of the entire wheat production I cannot begin to say, but I know there are about 2,000,000 farmers engaged in the production of cotton and more than that engaged in the production of wheat, so the gentleman can see what the percentage is. Necessarily, any program of this nature has to have a beginning and it has to grow.

Mr. HAINES. I want the gentleman to understand that I am very much in sympathy with it.

Mr. DOXEY. I understand, and I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. I hope the gentleman's wheat farmers will take advantage of this program and that they will have facilities for storage, but if we pass this bill and our amendment goes in, the storage item will not be so important, because they can give commodity notes.

Mr. HAINES. If the gentleman will permit an observation, may I say I believe this will be of more benefit to the cotton growers than it is to the wheat growers.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman has always been magnanimous, and we appreciate it. I certainly hope this program will be a success. Cotton needs all the help it can get.

I challenge any man to show that this program is not fundamentally sound, although you may raise some objection on the ground that it may not be economically sound for the first 2 years, when it is necessarily in an experimental stage.

I want you to realize that you cannot solve this agricultural problem with one piece of legislation. It is going to take a number of pieces of legislation, and this is fundamental, but it is just one proposition and, naturally, when our friends from the Corn Belt have the actual data that will justify the Congress in enacting such a law, speaking only for myself, I may say that you will find me just as enthusiastic to include corn in the crop-insurance program as I have been to include wheat, and as I believe you will be to include cotton.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield to the gentleman, and I want to say to my friend from Washington that he has been of invaluable help in this matter, and I am delighted to yield to him. He is a real friend to the farmer.

Mr. LEAVY. I happen to be on the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations with my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and he and I draw different inferences from the same set of facts. He contends that wheat insurance has been a failure, while I take the position it has been a success. And if you will turn to page 931 of the hearings on agricultural appropriations for 1942, you will find that we have collected in 3 years $23,960.000 and have paid out $19,240,000, and there is now a reserve of $4.720,000. These figures are the wheat collections in terms of dollar value. Of course, that includes premiums collected for fall-wheat crop that will be harvested this year, against which there are indemnity possibilities for the current crop year. We have collected wheat in the amount of 33,473,000 bushels, and we have paid out in wheat value 32,969,000 bushels, and we show a profit of 504,000 bushels, or that much more wheat on hand to meet losses than has been paid out. Natural conditions indicate there will be a very small loss and the surplus will likely exceed the total losses to date.

We have done this in the face of two of the most adverse years. Now, if we have made this fine showing with wheat, and we have had but 3 years of experience, and this year promises to be a year showing a surplus, certainly we can do the same thing with cotton.

Mr. DOXEY. I want to say to my distinguished friend from the State of Washington that I was not exactly as familiar with those facts as is my friend, because he is on the Appropriations Subcommittee with our distinguished friend from Illinois, and if I had had the facts and the time I would have answered the gentleman from Illinois in that regard, but I had neither the time nor the facts, and I thank my friend from Washington for his contribution. But whether this cotton-crop insurance is a paying proposition in the beginning or not, I say to you it is a righteous cause, and I believe the House will vote almost unanimously

in favor of the pending measure and help us help the cotton farmer. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is hereby amended by substituting the word "crop" for the word "wheat crop" and by substituting the words "agricultural commodities" for the word "wheat."

SEC. 2. That section 506 (h) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "for wheat and other agricultural commodities."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all of section 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. That section 506 (h) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'for wheat and other agricultural commodities' and by inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following words: 'and preparatory to the application of the act to other basic commodities when so provided by law, shall assemble data relative to field corn, for the purpose of establishing a satisfactory actuarial basis for such commodity.'"

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the comma, at the end of line 4, insert "and dairy products."

And in line 6, change "commodity" to "commodities."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose I have in offering this amendment to the committee amendment is this. The committee amendment permits the gathering of further data in regard to several agricultural products. All I ask is to add to those agricultural products dairy products.

The amendment does not insert dairy products as one of the insured products in the bill. It merely gives an opportunity so that in the future, data shall be gathered in regard to dairy products as well as other agricultural products. It strikes me it is a fair proposal that dairy farmers be granted the same opportunity to have the Government gather the data for them and arrive at certain conclusions as for producers of other farm products to have that opportunity, and therefore I trust the members of the committee will accept the amendment in good faith, as affording merely a fair and equitable opportunity for the dairy farmers.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that the only other commodity at this time carried in the bill is corn.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I realize that and I have added dairy products to corn.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I deeply appreciate the great interest that the gentleman has in the dairying industry and I assure him that I am just as much interested in that industry as I am in every other agricultural commodity in this country. Recently we have had hearings on a bill in the committee, that the dairy folks were interested in, and we are working out legislation which we hope to present to the House later on that will give consideration to the dairying industry. Several amendments like this will be offered, and I know that these gentlemen are conscientious, and that they want to make a showing for the record for their people, but we ought to thoroughly understand that we could not insure the dairying interests because we could not store a great many of their products. May I say that in this bill we had several other commodities but the committee finally agreed that we ought to go along in an orderly manner, taking these crops up from time to time and we cut out all crops at this time except corn. Later on we will follow with other crops and eventually, as previously stated, we hope to include all the crops that would be workable and that could be insured on a sound basis. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is deeply interested in hay. That is a very important crop and I am hoping that we will be able sometime to take care of hay. I hope we will not load down this bill with amendments and let us go along on a sound program so as to make this program a success. When the Department has proper information and data, we can bring other crops in in an orderly way.

As the gentleman stated a moment ago we do not have the information on other crops and until we have definite information I hope that we will not load this bill with amendments, so that we may have another bill vetoed. Let us take these products up in an orderly manner. I assure the gentleman that I am deeply interested in agriculture in every section of the country and in the people who produce these crops. I hope that the House will pass this constructive legislation in the interest of two-million-odd cotton farmers in the South. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to the committee amendment: Page 2, at the end of line 4, after the word "corn", insert the words "and hay."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the subject of crop insurance is one which is going to require a great deal of study over the next few years. It is not my purpose to rise here today to ask whether that subject is a proper one or not. My object in submitting this amendment is to draw to the attention of the membership of the House, and I dare say over half of these gentlemen come from dairying districts, the necessity of further studying and gathering of data on hay and fodders. I am saying to you that every time there is a drought in one section or another of the country, it becomes necessary for dairy farmers all over to provide some sort of subsistence feeding and to obtain hay from other parts of the country.

It is the tendency of exploiters to come from outside into these localities that have this hay shortage and raise the price of subsistence of dairy herds. I offer this amendment for the purpose of asking the Congress to include hay as a subject for study and research because it is absolutely necessary and is a basic commodity in every dairying section of the country.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. When the question of tobacco was before the Committee, which is a much more insurable crop so far as the figures are concerned, the gentleman speaking voted against that amendment, did he not, in Committee?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot recall just what my vote was on that because it was sometime ago and it was not on a record vote.

Mr. CREAL. I recall it very vividly.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In dairy sections of the country hay is a basic commodity, because upon hay and fodders the dairy cattle must subsist and I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that if he had had the experience I have had in living in a dairy section at a time of serious drought, he would realize that more dairymen go out of business than tobacco farmers or anyone else in the country could possibly begin to, because during a drought they sacrifice permanently their sole capital stock, namely, their dairy herds. It is not a question of building up their commodity or their stock in trade in 1 year as the tobacco farmers can. The situation they are faced with is the necessity of building up their dairy herds for a number of years.

I submit for the consideration of this committee that if crop insurance is going to be indulged in and studied and adopted, it is sensible and logical to pick out a number of basic crops. There is no more basic crop in the world than hay from the standpoint of the dairyman. The rural constituents of at least half the Members of the House are absolutely dependent upon hay in their sections, in order to sustain livestock and dairy animals of their country.

Let me make one more point: I hope that the study will proceed from a consideration not of the commodity itself, but of the feasibility of insuring that commodity and the method by which it will be insured. For instance, a surplus commodity brought in from a section where a shortage occurs, such as hay, should have a reasonable price. Otherwise the dairymen of that district cannot survive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Hay at $25 a ton brought in from the outside is exploitation of the dairy farmer. Hay at $10 a ton, however, is reasonable.

Therefore, I feel that the recommendation should be along the line of providing a guaranty for the dairy farmers in one section where a drought occurs, perhaps to have that hay shipped in at Government expense from areas nearest to it, that possess a surplus. It is my hope that in the study provided by the Hall amendment—and I ask the committee to approve of this now—it will give consideration to the feasibility of some kind of insurance for this vital necessity to the dairy farmer.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. If the premium is paid in kind and the loss is paid in kind, that would automatically take care of that situation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; if a reasonable price can be agreed upon.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. How are you going to take care of restrictions in shipping hay across State borders?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I submit that is a question for the committee and the Department of Agriculture to think about, and I am sure they can reach a definite decision on it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is a State matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe the authorities will work that out, nevertheless.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am thoroughly in accord with the general provisions of our policy of crop insurance. However, we cannot take the whole step at one time. It is logical and necessary to begin the system with one crop, which we have already done, that is, wheat. It seems to me the next major crop to consider is cotton, which is a part of the plan in the bill at the present moment.

We cannot go too fast in this matter, because insurance of all kinds is based upon scientific, mathematical, statistical data and facts. We must have complete and extensive study of those facts before we can go too far in including crops. I think cotton should follow wheat. I understand the intention is to follow with a study of corn in the next logical order. That I heartily approve of. I think any amendment which would include too much would defeat the whole purpose of our program. For that reason I oppose such a proposal, although the proposal suggested may ultimately be desirable. Let us take one step at a time.

It might seem to some that I would not be interested much in cotton-crop insurance. If any explanation is needed, I want to correct any notion Members may have in that regard. Of course, you have not heard me, as the Representative of a cotton-producing State, say very much about crop insurance. One reason is this: It may seem to some that we do not grow much cotton in Arizona, but I assure you that we do grow a great quantity of cotton. Part of it is the long-staple variety, but long or short, crop failure is unknown. We grow cotton in an irrigated country. Whenever we have water—and now we have an assured supply for a given acreage—we have no such thing as a crop failure. For that reason we are less anxious about insurance for cotton than are some of the other portions of the country where there is not only possibility but probability of partial or complete crop failure. However, there are hazards for the cotton farmers and for that reason I think even my cotton farmers ought to have the protection which this great social institution of insurance will afford them on a voluntary basis. For that reason I am firmly in support of this measure without amendment.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I will ask my colleague if he does not think it is better to approach this subject step by step? We first took on wheat. We are now preparing to take on cotton. We are making a study of corn. It is better to take up those commodities one at a time rather than to try to scatter out over the whole field and not make a good job of any investigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly it. The history of all types of insurance verifies the statement the gentleman has made. In matters of life and accident insurance and all that sort of thing, mistakes have been made by incorporating too much; going on rumor and hearsay and supposition instead of statistical data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As my good friend is interested in statistics, it may be interesting for him to know that his State has had over 11 percent of the value of its farms in subsidies in the last 8 years. Our colleague from New York only had a little over 1 percent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I am not asking for discrimination in any way. I want to assure my colleague from New York that I am not asking for discrimination. I am merely asking for businesslike procedure in the adoption of this new legislation. I am a firm believer in the institution of insurance, that is, I recognize insurance as a desirable economic institution to spread risk. Through it, the burden of loss is scattered over many who are subjected to the same hazard and is thus lighter upon each individual. This is one way to "bear ye one another's burdens."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If there were available a sufficient amount of data, and I am sure there is, on this particular commodity, would the gentleman not feel that it merited study since so many dairy farmers throughout the country are affected?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in sympathy with any study and any movement based on sound data—provided not too much is attempted at once. I think we will have to take the Agricultural Department studies and statistics first, of course, and I understand they are recommending this one step before we take the next step.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure will pass without the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWNS to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the word "corn" insert "and tobacco."

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to give the impression to those sponsoring this bill today that I am opposed to crop insurance for cotton farmers, but, despite the action taken on the previous amendments, I am a bit concerned about the tobacco growers in my State.

I am not entirely sold on the idea that crop insurance is good for all crops in this country; however, I do feel that if we are going to have insurance for wheat, if we are going to have insurance for cotton, we should give some thought to the other farmers in this country. In all fairness to the tobacco growers of my State, we should make arrangements for a survey of the tobacco crops of this country to see if it is advisable to extend crop insurance to tobacco.

From my own experience, the raising of tobacco is perhaps more risky than the raising of wheat, corn, or cotton. I know that in my State entire crops of tobacco have been wiped out by a storm. I am not going to take up any more of your time because I believe a sufficient amount of time has already been taken on this bill. I urge that my amendment for a survey of the tobacco crop be given your due and earnest consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the first comma in subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and with the cotton crop planted for harvest in 1942."

SEC. 4. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "producers of wheat against loss in yields of wheat" in the first sentence, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "producers of the agricultural commodity against loss in yields of the agricultural commodity."

SEC. 5. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" in the third sentence of subsection (a).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 2, line 20, insert "that section 508 of the said act, as amended, is further amended by

striking out the period at the end of the third sentence of subsection (a), inserting a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That the insurance herein provided shall be limited to 2,000 bushels of wheat and/or 20 bales of cotton to any one producer beginning January 1, 1942.'"

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I do so because it is in keeping with, not only the political platforms, but also in keeping with the agricultural objective of fair-sized farms. Here is a legislative opportunity to begin this procedure. If we are to give a so-called subsidy to anyone, it should be to the family-sized farm and to the men who would be inspired to own and operate their own farms.

Do you realize that from the last available figures we find:

Size of payment	Total number, United States	Percentage of total	Cumulative percentage of total
$0 to $20	1,251,687	23.850	23.850
$20.01 to $40	1,185,833	22.590	46.440
$40.01 to $60	842,500	16.050	62.490
$60.01 to $100	890,956	16.980	79.470
$100.01 to $150	458,752	8.740	88.210
$150.01 to $200	254,034	4.840	93.050
$200.01 to $300	183,905	3.500	96.550
$300.01 to $400	79,006	1.510	98.060
$400.01 to $500	38,269	.730	98.790
$500.01 to $1,000	48,968	.930	99.720
$1,000.01 to $2,000	11,170	.210	99.930
$2,000.01 to $3,000	2,131	.040	99.970
$3,000.01 to $4,000	708	.013	99.983
$4,000.01 to $5,000	353	.007	99.990
$5,000.01 to $10,000	411	.008	99.998
Over $10,000	113	.002	100.000
Total	5,248,796	100.000	

Do not 10 percent get 40 percent of this money?

After the Ways and Means Committee brings in the new tax bill we are going to do a lot of thinking and maybe some explaining as well. Should we jeopardize the "widow's mite" and reach all around for every conceivable dollar and still promote a Federal insurance program of insuring 5,000 to 9,000-acre wheat farms?

The present agricultural program needs plenty of constructive legislation. Here is your opportunity to legislate for the greatest good for the greatest number, instead of for the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care personally to criticize the present agricultural program. There are enough other people to do that. I will just say that the greatest criticism that can be leveled against the program is the fact that the farm people of this country have not been getting the money. The last available information, which I am sure each and every one here this afternoon will be glad to hear, shows that 23 percent of the farmers get $20 or less total A. A. A. funds per year; 46 percent of the farmers get $40 or less per year; 62 percent get $60 or less per year; 79 percent of the farmers get $100 or less per year; 88 percent of the farmers get $150 or less per year; and 93 percent of the farmers get $200 or less per year.

The reason I introduced this amendment is because of the fact we have heard so much about family-sized farms in the last 10 years in this country. We keep on appropriating money that does not go to the family-sized farmer. It goes to lots of places it should not go. Do you realize that 10 percent of the people who get the checks—and I will not call them farmers—receive 40 percent of this money?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Suppose that in the case of cotton, a farmer produces 30 bales of cotton, and that 30 bales come from a sharecropper. In my State the title to the crop is in the landlord; therefore that fellow who needs insurance under this amendment would not receive any benefit.

Mr. MURRAY. That depends on what our agricultural objective is. If our only objective is to find out how much money we can get out of the United States Treasury to distribute around, that is one objective. If we are going to try to do something for the farm people of the country, that is another objective. If we want this money to go to the farm people, there is no use blaming the Secretary of Agriculture. It is right here in our lap today. We are the people who are passing on this legislation. If we want to keep our insurance in line and help the class of people who own and operate their own farms, and give them some incentive to do so, we will have to direct our legislation toward that end.

Let us consider for a moment the man who has from 3,000 to 9,000 acres of wheat. If you think that after this new tax bill is passed you want to go home and tell them we have done something for the farmers by passing an insurance bill for these 9,000-acre wheat fellows, you might regret that you entered into that kind of a program.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman did not tell us who the 10 percent was that got 40 percent of the money.

Mr. MURRAY. May I say to my distinguished colleague that I try to keep out of as much trouble as I can. I do not want to get into that. Every one of you should study where this money has gone. The facts are available. The average State of the Union has had 10 percent of its assessed valuation. There are two States that have had over 40 percent of the valuation of their farms and buildings. There are other States that have not had 1 percent. There is not any common sense in the method used in distributing this money. That is not the fault of the Department of Agriculture; it is our own fault.

I cannot see how any fair-minded man can oppose this amendment. If anyone opposes this amendment, he has a right to do it, legally, morally, or in any other way, but I just feel that he is not interested in the farmer who lives on the farm and that he is pretty apt to shed crocodile tears as far as the farmer is concerned. I cannot see why anyone could have any objection to this amendment. Two thousand bushels of wheat is surely a large enough crop to make the farm that produced it a family-sized farm, and 20 bales of cotton is enough to be raised on a family-sized farm.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the payments that go to some farms are away beyond the value of 90 percent of the small farms of this country?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

If anybody can tell me why a cotton farmer who can raise 50 or 100 bales of cotton or a wheat farmer who can raise 9,000 acres of wheat should have the public carry his insurance, I wish they would state it. I personally do not see why he should expect us to give him that kind of protection when he is already getting $10,000 in soil-conservation checks. Remember he is already getting that now, and you want to give him another protection by insuring him against loss.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to talk of the merits of the amendment, but I do wish to call attention again to the matter of draftsmanship.

They say that patience is a virtue if the fish do not bite. For the last few years we have adopted this awful, ridiculous, nonsensical method of draftsmanship, which is a disgrace to any legislative body. I am sure that no Member of this body will justify this method. It came in as a custom 8 or 10 years ago at a time when everything enacted was an emergency measure, and the purpose was, and so stated, to pass legislation hurriedly without considering what the legislation already was, because it took too much time. As a result, when it was desired to amend a section of an existing law, the committee would get a drafted bill from down the street which stated, for instance, that section 2 would be amended by striking out the comma in the second line after the third sentence of the law as recorded in the statutes, and inserting a semicolon and 4 or 5 lines. Of course, the Members of the House knew nothing about it unless they took the time individually to get the statute and superimpose the proposed amendment on the statute.

In some committees the custom has grown. It did grow for awhile, then it stopped. Few committees of the House will any longer report a bill in this manner.

The bill we have before us today is drawn in that way, and there is not a Member of the House, including a single member of the committee reporting the bill, who can explain the bill so you can understand it without having the statute before him. Take a look at the bill in your hands.

We have a rule, the Ramseyer rule, which requires that in the report there be a statement of the law as it now is, with the additions and subtractions brought about by the amendment, so that after all is said and done the Ramseyer-rule-reported amendment is what should be and I believe will be in the bill.

Take this section 508. If the bill simply stated that section 508 was "amended to read as follows," just as you

will find section 508 in the report, then you know what it is all about.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has offered an amendment to the bill. We all know that under the rules of the House you cannot offer an amendment to anything excepting that which is in the bill the House is considering. You cannot offer an amendment to a statute, as on page 6 of the Revised Statutes, or something else. You can amend in the Committee of the Whole only the language that is in the bill before the House. If we can only do that, it would be impossible to amend this bill. The gentleman, however, after consulting the Parliamentarian, I am sure, has drafted an amendment which will accomplish what the gentleman suggested. I believe there is no question that if a point of order had been made against the amendment, the point of order would have been sustained.

For instance, section 5 of the bill as reported states:

That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" in the third sentence of subsection (a).

Tell me what that means. To prepare his amendment the gentleman had to get subsection (a) of the law—the law book—and then he had to figure out the third sentence. The third sentence is nowhere repeated in the bill which is before the House. The third sentence ends with the word "just." There is no such word in the bill before the House. The amendment strikes out the period, and after the word "just", insert a colon and "Provided." Then the amendment follows.

I am calling attention to this practice.

I know my protests are distasteful to some people, but I hope this great Committee on Agriculture will not bring to the House a bill drawn in this form again.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to express agreement with the view of the gentleman from Michigan that this is a very lax and improper way to draft legislation in that we never know just what it is we are doing without reference to a great many statutes. I have thought so for a long time, but I have gone a little further than the gentleman from Michigan in that I have offered a resolution to change the rules of the House to require that when an amendment to a statute is offered, the amendment shall be set forth in extenso.

I simply want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, who is also a member of the Rules Committee, I hope he will cooperate with me in bringing that resolution out of committee.

Mr. MICHENER. I surely will.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that we have under consideration now a Senate bill, drawn in the Senate and passed by that body and sent over here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know we have a lot of them drawn like this in the House, too.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers have dealt primarily with the rules relating to the drafting of legislation and amendments. I want to get back to the measure we have under discussion, and particularly to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

It seems to me that if crop insurance is a good thing for one, it is a good thing for all, regardless of whether it is the small farmer or the large farmer. Furthermore, we ought to take into consideration the fact that a great part of our production—and particularly is this true of cotton, and I am sure it is of wheat, although I am not so familiar with the growing of wheat—but a great part of our cotton is grown by the little fellow who does not have title to the land, who does not have absolute title to the cotton that is grown, but has an interest in it by reason of having contributed his labor. Suppose that man is working as a sharecropper on a large farm. Perhaps there are 10 or 15 or 20 of these sharecroppers, and each one of them makes 15 bales. It is not the 15 bales that would be taken as a standard, but it is the amount grown on that entire farm, which would mean that not a single one of those sharecroppers would be able to get this insurance.

There has been a great deal of talk about getting up data and information relating to this program before we proceed upon it. I certainly think it would be very interesting to see what the data would reveal as to the application of this particular amendment. Personally, I believe that crop insurance is a good thing for all of our crops. This Congress has spoken upon that subject and has said that such should be our policy, and it has been the policy of this Congress to extend crop insurance just as fast as it could reasonably be done—wheat first, now in its third year, and then cotton, with a study of corn, and following that tobacco, and so on, until the basic crops are all included under a crop-insurance program. I think this is simply good business. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] a few minutes ago, in questioning the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], brought out some of the facts relating to the conduct of the wheat-insurance program during the last 2 years or the last 3 years, including the present year. We cannot tell yet just what the result of this year's activities will be, because we do not know finally what the crop production will be, but I saw in the paper just a few days ago an announcement that we had an unusually large and good wheat crop this year.

I talked with one of the officials down in the Crop Insurance Division of the Department of Agriculture, and while he could not tell me definitely, of course, what the results would be, it was stated that it was believed the gains of this year would go a very long way toward wiping out the losses of the 2 past years. But even if we lost every single dollar that we have paid out on this program, I still say it would be good business and good economy. I just happened to look over the figures of two counties down in my district where there was a rather heavy drought in 1939. If this program had been in effect at that time, there would have been terrific losses in those two counties. In Lauderdale County, Ala., there would have been payment of 1,377 bales over the amount of premiums that would have been paid, and in Colbert County, immediately across the river, there would have been payment of 1,434 bales over and above the premiums, making a total of 2,811 bales in those two counties.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: If it had been limited to only small farmers and not the big farmers, the big farmers would pay the premium that would help the small farmer all over the country?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DOXEY. And, therefore, when you help the big farmer, as they are trying to talk about here, you help the little farmer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it must be spread out to be made effective, but I want to go further and say that at the time I referred to above cotton was selling for approximately 8 cents a pound, and the number of bales of cotton I have just referred to would have amounted to $112,440, a terrible loss when you consider that factor alone, but I call your attention to the fact that within 3 months' time in those same two counties there was spent in emergency relief funds to take care of those farmers who had sustained losses as a result of that drought $93,685. A large additional amount was spent in the following months to rehabilitate those farmers. The total far exceeded what the losses would have been under a cotton-insurance program. The history of our emergency farm relief cost throughout the country over the period of 1926 to 1936 is that we spent more than $600,000,000. This bill would go a long way toward relieving us from a great deal of that expenditure. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY) there were—ayes 35, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That sections 508 (b), (c), and (d) and 516 (a) of said Act, as amended, are further amended by substituting the words "the agricultural commodity" for the word "wheat" wherever it appears.

SEC. 7. That section 508 of said act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In connection with insurance upon yields of cotton, to include provision for additional premium and indemnity in terms of lint cotton to cover loss of cottonseed, such additional premium and indemnity to be determined on the basis of the average relationship between returns from cottonseed and re-

turns from lint cotton for the same period of years as that used for computing yields and premium rates."

SEC. 8. That section 516 (a) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the figures "$6,000,000" and substituting in lieu thereof the figures "$12,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see by the bill that you are striking out the figures "$6,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$12,000,000." We have been in the habit of doing that in practically every appropriation bill that has come along. I have been working on the Interior subcommittee for the last few days, and we strike out $1,000,000 and put in $2,000,000, we strike out $500,000 and put in $2,500,000 and we strike out $50,000 and put in $500,000, we strike out a million and a half and put in five million. That seems to be the history of this administration ever since I have known it for 8 long years. The President of the United States criticized the Hoover administration for going into the red in the 4 years of the Hoover administration, but after getting the receipts from the things that were retrievable by this administration, in the 4 years of Hoover's administration he went in the red probably a billion and a half dollars in 4 years. This administration will go in the red over $5,000,000,000 this year. It has been in the red an average of three and a half billion dollars for each year since it started in March 1933—8 long, red years. We are now considering the relief bill, and in that relief bill, right in the face of appropriating for war for 1941 and 1942 to the tune of $37,200,000,000, you are asking for a big sum of money for relief. You have not put the people of this country to work and at the rate you are going you will not put them to work. You want to keep them on relief.

Now you want to do the same thing in this agricultural bill. You are heading this Nation for bankruptcy. You are heading this Nation for one of the greatest wrecks that it has ever encountered. I asked one of the high Members of this Congress this morning in committee, "Where are you going to get the money?" and he replied, "We are going to print it, like Hitler does." Think of that from a high official of this Congress. On a conference report last week, when we had other high Government officials present, I asked them the same question, "Where are you going to get the money?" and one of the greatest financiers in Congress said, "We are going to print the money."

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; if the gentleman can tell us where we are going to get the money.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Do not you print all your money now?

Mr. RICH. Yes; but we have always tried to back it up with something; we have always tried to make it sound, but now it is becoming just like the money that old Kaiser Wilhelm printed years ago, after we had gone through the World War, after we had tried to make the world safe for democracy, and you could buy a bushel of that German money for a nickel.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the Member of Congress you referred to was laughing when he answered the question, "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. RICH. The gentleman was present when the statement was made that we would print this money like Hitler is printing it. Oh, this is no laughing matter. These are facts that we want to know. You have been laughing at the Nation, and you have been fooling this country, you have been humbugging them for 8 years—for 8 long years—and yet you say it is a laughing matter. To me it is one of the most serious, one of the most solemn, one of the most important things that we can give our time to; and yet you say it is a laughing matter. I do not term it that, and I think we are long past the time when this Nation and the Members of this Congress should consider this a laughing matter. You come in and want to change this from $6,000,000 to $12,000,000 in this bill. Is it a laughing matter? It is not going to be when your children and your grandchildren and your great-grandchildren are compelled to pay for the folly of this administration. It is high time that you did something about it.

A wreck is ahead unless you get serious, stop laughing, do things that are sound, spend sparingly, economize, be prudent in your appropriations. The taxpayers will soon revolt; but I am afraid it will be too late, we will be bankrupt. And who is responsible? The answer is one and only one, and it is Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Congress. They are responsible. I am not. Why? Because I have opposed your extravagances. I want sound business judgment in the administration of affairs. No more reckless and unaccountable administration. Will you help give it to us? I hope you stop laughing and get serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. It seems to me that some of the members of this Committee are failing to distinguish between providing the means whereby the farmers of this country can be self-supporting and may stay off the relief rolls and the simple expenditure of money that will never be returned. I think that failure to distinguish between making an investment in the ability of our people to earn a living and simply contributing money is a rather common thing in this country. When we considered a bill recently to loan money to farmers with which to buy farms, we found many Members speaking of what the Government was giving to the farmers. Yet we have actually had the experience throughout the years proving that more than 100 percent of the maturities were paid up to date. In spite of this, many Members, who did not know any better, got up and talked about what we were giving the farmers. We were not giving the farmer a thin dime when we loaned him money with which to buy a farm when experience shows that we get back every dollar, plus interest. We are not giving the farmer something when we provide a means whereby he may insure his crops by paying a number of bushels of wheat or a number of pounds of cotton sufficient to provide the reserve necessary to pay the losses all over the country the next year. All we are doing is saying that the United States Government, being the only agency in the United States that can spread these losses widely enough, will make available to the farmers of this country the ability to spread their losses; that is, to actually share their losses with each other. The Government is not paying those losses. The farmers of the United States are paying those losses in premiums of wheat or cotton that they pay in in order to get this insurance.

The additional $6,000,000 about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is so exercised is money to carry on the administrative expenses of this program. If you carry on the administration of the program and let the farmer himself carry the losses, if you will put up $6,000,000 for administrative expenses, you will save 60 times this amount in the relief bill, about which the gentleman is so worried. I know from personal experience living among these people. I have seen their crops wiped out. I have seen the grasshoppers come. I have seen the floods and the droughts come. I have seen these farmers make not one thing, and at the end of the year what happens to them? You know and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] knows what happens to them. They then become an expense to the United States Government far over and above the little administrative expense that is involved in this bill. It then becomes a real and substantial burden to this Government. Then the Government must pay for the relief itself in addition to the administration.

I think we all want to save money for this Government. If you want to save money for the Government, give these farmers an opportunity to contribute their own cotton—not Government cotton but their own cotton—to a collective pool, whereby each one may be assured at the end of the year that he will have some income with which to feed and clothe his family, with which to avoid the necessity of going on relief or hunting a W. P. A. job. With a very small expenditure for the administration of this kind of program you will save many multiplied millions of dollars on that very relief bill that stares you in the face today. Give these farmers a chance to help themselves. We are not coming in here asking you to pay these losses. The farmers of the United States are not seeking relief. The farmers of the United States are seeking justice, seeking a parity livelihood, seeking an opportunity to make with their toil the same kind of a living that the other people of the United States are making; seeking in this instance an opportunity to know that when they contribute in advance from their own property a fair and equitable premium, that at the end of the year they will be able to remain off the relief rolls and to save the Government expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

I always delight in hearing my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] talk, because he is good at figures. He is a good, sound, businessman. He offers constructive criticism and sticks very close to facts, sometimes. I believe in life insurance. I carry life insurance. I believe it does a great deal of good in addition to the good it does those who carry it. Other people make a good living out of it, big dividends, and big salaries. I believe in fire insurance. I carry it all the time on everything. Yet other people applying that fire insurance, to merely administer it, receive big dividends and high salaries. Crop insurance, when rightly administered, is just as practical, is just as sound, as either fire insurance or life insurance. There is no more reason for saying that all are sound or all are unsound.

Now, the gentleman seems to think that this money is to be appropriated for the man who has a failure of crop, to give him a direct appropriation. The object is to make it absolutely self-sustaining, but, of course, when you begin a program there is no money in the Treasury with which to make administration. This is the administrative end, and we should wait and see, before hurling arguments against this, whether or not there is any loss or whether or not we will also be able to take care of the administrative end.

I am going along with the Committee. I voted to put tobacco in. Tobacco is one of the most practical crops of all to be insured. I have seen tobacco crops that on Saturday could be sold for $100 an acre, which on the following Monday morning could not be sold for $5 an acre by reason of winds or hail or other things. All other crops when damaged can be salvaged in part, and a part of the loss saved. I thought tobacco ought to be in. I hope some day it will be. Since the Committee has acted, I will go along with it, and will vote against every other amendment that is offered until that other day comes. I see nothing whatsoever wrong with this. The farmers of 48 States cannot organize an insurance company, but there are failures of crops. Sometimes there is a failure in one part of a State and a good crop in the other part, just as the man who has a fire loss has paid insurance a long time. He suffers a loss and others who do not have any loss take care of his loss. The crop people will do the same thing. It is on a perfectly sound, economical basis. As sound a thinker and as good a businessman as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is, I am a bit surprised that he would criticize this program as being unsound and tell us, "Why, these men cannot pay a premium," when they have good years in one part and a loss somewhere else. What they pay in one section of the country will make up for the other section, just the same as a big fire is a loss on the spot, but there are other areas that pay in that do not have fires.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. You are asking for administrative money double what it was. The payments to be made to farmers will not be double what they were, will they?

Mr. CREAL. We are including another crop in this bill and, of course, it requires more for administration.

Mr. RICH. Therefore you will not need that amount to be doubled for overhead expenses. That is what I believe is wrong.

Mr. CREAL. When you include other crops the administrative expenses will be greater.

Mr. RICH. In that case you do not require double the amount for the administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been the hardest man, and he is a Republican, on Herbert Hoover of any man in the House of Representatives. He is always talking about what it will take to pull people out of the hole, according to figures. It reminds me of the fellow who had a mule and no need for it for awhile because he had an extra one and another man said he would take it for that time and feed it for its work. That fall the man brought him back and the mule was skin and bone and dragged along with his head down. The fellow had to pay out a great deal more to bring the mule back than if he had kept him home doing nothing. It was almost an entire loss instead of the mule earning his feeding.

We should sometimes remember it is your debt. When you voted for Herbert Hoover and tried to perpetuate him 4 more years, then condemned others for pulling the people out after they sunk, you are not accomplishing anything constructive, nor getting very far by criticism of those who have had to restore the badly kept house the President found.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I should apologize perhaps for further trespassing upon the patience and indulgence of the House, but you know there are certain plausibilities which one cannot permit to go by without some protest.

Can you imagine, for instance, a life-insurance company which gets all of its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury? The Crop Insurance Corporation does, because we sat over here last year and gave it over $5,000,000, and a year before over $5,000,000 for administrative expenses. In proportion as this insurance field is extended, the administrative expenses will grow.

With further reference to the observations of my good friend from Kentucky, have you ever seen a fire-insurance company which can come down to the Federal Treasury with its hat in hand and seek to repair its losses or get its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury? There has been no hint or intimation at any time that the set-up is going to change, and whether the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation makes money or loses money it is going to continue to get its administrative expenses out of the Federal Treasury. That matter ought to be emphasized.

The second thing to emphasize is that if there were any fire-insurance company or any life-insurance company that operated on the basis that they have operated the Crop Insurance Corporation in the field a week the insurance commissioner of every State of the United States would lock its doors in a hurry as it would wind up in a state of insolvency.

I gave you the figures this afternoon and nobody has arisen on this floor and controverted these figures. We took in 6,700,000 bushels in premiums in wheat in 1933 and paid out 10,000,000. Just translate that into terms of 60 cents a bushel. They lost a little over $2,000,000 and, if we should translate those losses into terms of parity prices the loss is going to be larger. And do not forget, somebody will be back here some time in the future and insist that whenever we get to the point where there is no profit in paying premiums and getting indemnities in kind they will want to put it on a parity basis and take it out in the form of cash.

That is the first year of crop insurance, in which we lost over $2,000,000. The documented information that was given to us is here. Here is the account of Mr. Smith, president of the Corporation, as he gave it for the next year. They took in about 14,000,000 bushels of premiums and they paid out 23,000,000 bushels of premiums, in round figures. So we lost 9,000,000 bushels of wheat. Translate it at any figure you please and you will get a loss of somewhere between four and six million dollars. So we lost over two million in 1939, we lost over four and a half million dollars by the least calculation in 1940, and it is indicated on the basis of crop conditions we will lose money in 1941.

Why in the name of all that is sacred should the Congress of the United States project the Government into the field of cotton insurance until a sound actuarial basis has been worked out? Having failed to place wheat insurance on a sound basis why should we now undertake cotton insurance? On the basis of the above, I propose to vote against this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That said act, as amended, is further amended by redesignating section 518 as section 519, and by addition thereto of the following new section:

"SEC. 518. 'Agricultural commodity,' as used in this act, means wheat or cotton, or both, as the context may indicate."

SEC. 10. That section 508 (d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sentences immediately after the first sentence thereof: "Nothing in this section shall prevent the Corporation from accepting, for the payment of premiums, notes payable in the commodity insured, or the cash equivalent, upon such security as may be determined pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and from purchasing the quantity of the commodity represented by any of such notes not paid at maturity."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 4, line 1, after the word "purchasing", insert "at the prevailing market price of."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is that when the farmer makes a settlement, if he does, and is foreclosed, he will get the market price for the commodity which is the security for the note given. I believe everybody wants that to be done, and I can see no reason why the Committee should not agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 36, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 95, noes 42.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—256

Allen, Ill.	Boggs	Burgin
Allen, La.	Boland	Byron
Arnold	Bonner	Cannon, Fla.
Barden	Boren	Capozzoli
Barnes	Bradley, Pa.	Carlson
Barry	Brooks	Cartwright
Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.	Casey, Mass.
Beam	Bryson	Chapman
Beckworth	Buck	Clark
Beiter	Buckler, Minn.	Claypool
Bell	Bulwinkle	Cochran
Bennett	Burch	Coffee, Nebr.
Bloom	Burdick	Coffee, Wash.
Cole, Md.	Hill, Wash.	Peterson, Fla.
Colmer	Hope	Peterson, Ga.
Connery	Hull	Pfeifer,
Cooley	Hunter	Joseph L.
Cooper	Imhoff	Pittenger
Copeland	Izac	Plauché
Courtney	Jackson	Poage
Cox	Jacobsen	Priest
Cravens	Jarman	Ramspeck
Creal	Jensen	Rankin, Miss.
Crosser	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin, Mont.
Crowther	Johnson,	Reece, Tenn.
Cullen	Luther A.	Richards
Cunningham	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Curtis	Johnson, W. Va.	Rizley
D'Alesandro	Kee	Robertson,
Davis, Ohio	Keefe	N. Dak.
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Robertson, Va.
Day	Kennedy,	Robinson, Utah
Dickstein	Martin J.	Rogers, Okla.
Dingell	Kennedy,	Russell
Domengeaux	Michael J.	Sabath
Doughton	Keogh	Sanders
Downs	Kerr	Sasscer
Doxey	Kilday	Satterfield
Drewry	Kinzer	Scanlon
Duncan	Kirwan	Schuetz
Durham	Kleberg	Schulte
Dworshak	Knutson	Secrest
Eberharter	Kocialkowski	Shanley
Edmiston	Kramer	Sheppard
Eliot, Mass.	Landis	Sikes
Elliott, Calif.	Lanham	Smith, Conn.
Ellis	Larrabee	Smith, Pa.
Englebright	Lea	Smith, Va.
Faddis	Leavy	Smith, Wash.
Fenton	LeCompte	Smith, W. Va.
Fitzpatrick	Ludlow	Snyder
Flaherty	Lynch	South
Flannagan	McCormack	Sparkman
Flannery	McGehee	Spence
Fogarty	McKeough	Steagall
Forand	McLaughlin	Stefan
Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Sullivan
Ford, Thomas F.	Maas	Sumners, Tex.
Fulmer	Maciora	Sutphin
Gale	Mahon	Sweeney
Gathings	Marcantonio	Talle
Gavagan	Martin, Iowa	Taylor
Gearhart	May	Tenerowicz
Gehrmann	Merritt	Terry
Geyer, Calif.	Meyer, Md.	Thom
Gibson	Mills, Ark.	Thomas, Tex.
Gilchrist	Mills, La.	Thomason
Gillie	Monroney	Tolan
Gore	Moser	Traynor
Gossett	Mundt	Vincent, Ky.
Granger	Murdock	Vinson, Ga.
Grant, Ala.	Murray	Walter
Green	Myers, Pa.	Ward
Gregory	Nelson	Weaver
Gwynne	Nichols	Weiss
Haines	Norrell	Welch
Halleck	Norton	West
Hare	O'Brien, Mich.	Wheat
Harrington	O'Connor	Whelchel
Harris, Ark.	O'Hara	Whittington
Harris, Va.	O'Leary	Wickersham
Hart	O'Neal	Williams
Healey	O'Toole	Wilson
Hébert	Pace	Worley
Heffernan	Patman	Wright
Hendricks	Patrick	Young
Hill, Colo.	Patton	Zimmerman

NAYS—100

Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Martin, Mass.
Andrews	Gerlach	Michener
Angell	Graham	Mott
Arends	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin	Guyer, Kans.	Oliver
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Osmers
Baumhart	Edwin Arthur	Paddock
Bender	Hall,	Pheiffer,
Bishop	Leonard W.	William T.
Blackney	Hancock	Plumley
Boehne	Harness	Powers
Bolton	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hoffman	Rich
Canfield	Holbrock	Robsion, Ky.
Carter	Holmes	Rockefeller
Chiperfield	Howell	Rodgers, Pa.
Clevenger	Jarrett	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rolph
Crawford	Johns	Rutherford
Dewey	Johnson, Calif.	Sauthoff
Dirksen	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Ditter	Jones	Short
Dondero	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Kunkel	Springer
Elston	Lambertson	Stearns, N. H.
Engel	Lewis	Stevenson
Fellows	McGregor	Taber
Thomas, N. J.	Vreeland	Wolfenden, Pa.
Tibbott	Wasielewski	Wolverton, N. J.
Tinkham	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl
Van Zandt	Winter	
Vorys, Ohio	Wolcott	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ford, Leland M.

NOT VOTING—74

Andersen,	Gifford	Pierce
H. Carl	Harter	Ploeser
Anderson,	Hinshaw	Rabaut
N. Mex.	Hobbs	Ramsay
Andresen,	Hook	Randolph
August H.	Houston	Romjue
Bland	Jenks, N. H.	Sacks
Bolles	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.
Boykin	Johnson,	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Shafer, Mich.
Byrne	Kefauver	Shannon
Camp	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Cannon, Mo.	Kilburn	Simpson
Case, S. Dak.	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
Chenoweth	McArdle	Stratton
Clason	McGranery	Sumner, Ill.
Cluett	McIntyre	Tarver
Collins	McLean	Thill
Costello	Maciejewski	Treadway
Culkin	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Delaney	Mansfield	Wadsworth
Dies	Mason	Wene
Disney	Mitchell	White
Fish	O'Day	Woodruff, Mich.
Fitzgerald	Pearson	Woodrum, Va.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Jennings against.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama for, with Mr. Leland M. Ford against.

Mr. Pearson for, with Mr. Cluett against.

Mr. Fitzgerald for, with Mr. McLean against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Pierce for, with Mr. Simpson against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Clason against.

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Bolles.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Thill.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Mason.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Harter with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Costello with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Wene with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Hook.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. White.

Mr. Houston with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. McArdle.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Sacks.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STARNES. I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4595) was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

WILDLIFE RESTORATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 587) to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii to explain the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the Pittman-Robertson Act, approved by Congress in 1937 to the Territories and possessions, in part, at least, with a limitation as to the amount that may be spent. That is the act that provides the Federal Government's program of wildlife restoration and protection. It has applied to the States, but because the phraseology of the law is limited to the States, the Territories and possessions have not shared in the program.

This bill has the approval of the Department of the Interior. It provides that not over $25,000 shall be used in Alaska, nor more than $10,000 in Hawaii and the possessions. The money, of course, comes from the excise tax on arms and ammunition and, therefore, the program is self-supporting and would not require an appropriation out of the General Treasury.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The citizens of the Territories pay that tax along with the other citizens?

Mr. KING. Yes; indeed. The excise tax on arms and ammunition is collected on the munitions sold in the Territories as well as on the continent. We have been helping to support the program throughout the country without sharing in it to any extent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman has explained the bill very well, and I, therefore, withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937, be amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under this act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $25,000 for Alaska, and $10,000 each for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by this act; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the Territories, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina have further business for today?

Mr. FULMER. I have no further business for today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has had the call today. There are other bills on the calendar that the committee has reported out and that are very important, but which have not been called up. For instance, there is the Coffee sugar bill, in which a great many people are interested and upon which the beet-sugar industry is looking for aid during the coming year. This is the Agriculture Committee's day. The rules intend that the committee shall call up all its bills on the calendar. There is not a rule of the House, and the Committee on Rules cannot even bring in a resolution, taking away from a legislative committee the right to call up its bills on the calendar on its Calendar Wednesday. The Agriculture Committee calendar has not been completed today, and the committee has the remainder of the day. Is it in order for any member of the committee to call up a bill reported by the committee in order that the democratic processes of the House shall obtain? That is, can a chairman of a committee thwart the will of a committee and refuse to exhaust the calendar of eligible bills?

The SPEAKER. That matter is not in the hands of the Chair. However, the Chair may state that no member of a committee may call up a bill on Calendar Wednesday unless he has been specifically authorized by the committee to do so. The Chair would not know whether or not the committee has instructed another member of the committee to call up any other bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The one sacred day of all calendar days is Calendar Wednesday. The rights of people of the country repose in these committees. Calendar Wednesday is known as the people's day because no arbitrary power can deprive a committee from the privilege of calling up its bills on this day. It can only be dispensed with by unanimous consent. Even the leadership of the House cannot take away from a committee the right of the people to have their legislation considered on this day. Now, a majority of the Committee on Agriculture have reported out that sugar bill favorably, and they are asking for its consideration. Is it possible that somebody within that committee which has reported the bill favorably can deny the people their right to have their legislation considered? A rule is not necessary today. If that Coffee sugar bill is not brought up today when there is plenty of time, the fault certainly rests, not with the Speaker, not with the majority leadership, not with the Rules Committee, but with a recalcitrant Committee on Agriculture or the controlling members thereof. Why should the sugar-beet interests be discriminated against in this arbitrary way?

The SPEAKER. The Chair answered the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry some time ago.

The Clerk will call the next committee.

Mr. BLOOM (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of my committee whether or not an amendment to this bill on page 1, line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out the word "deem" and insert the word "find", is to be accepted.

Mr. BLOOM. That amendment would not be acceptable to the committee because it was voted down in committee.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to object, and I do object.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman objects to the consideration of the bill in the House as in committee?

Mr. JONKMAN. Until I get a chance to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that if objection is heard the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONKMAN. I want to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is now on the statute books a law that prevents aliens and citizens from departing or entering this country during the time this country is at war. This became the law in 1918, and at the suggestion of several departments of the Government, including the State Department, the Army, the Navy, and the Intelligence Bureau, we have been considering an amendment to the effect that the present law shall become operative whenever the President shall find it necessary and shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

I think I can best explain the measure, Mr. Chairman, by reading a letter or a statement made by Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, who has been in charge of the Passport Division of the State Department for 25 years. This will give the Committee a very clear idea of what this amendment really seeks to do. The statement is as follows:

Since the outbreak of the present war in Europe the Department of State has from time to time given consideration to the desirability of the modification of the act of May 22, 1918, entitled "An act to prevent in time of war departure from or entry into the United States, contrary to the public safety" in such a manner as to permit the President, at a time such as the present, to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons, if he deems that the interests of the United States so require. While the entry of aliens into the United States may now be regulated to some extent under the authority of statutes already enacted, there is no provision of law under which citizens of the United States may be required to bear valid passports in order to depart from or enter the United States or under which the departure from the United States of aliens may be controlled. Since the outbreak of the present war it has come to the attention of the Department of State and of other executive departments that there are many persons in and outside of the United States who are directly engaged in espionage and subversive activities in the interests of foreign governments, and others who are engaged in activities inimical to the best interests of the United States who desire to travel from time to time between the United States and foreign countries in connection with their activities, as well as others who desire to leave the United States for the purpose of evading justice.

During the last war, when it is believed a lesser number of persons were engaged in espionage and subversive activities in the United States than is now the case, notwithstanding the fact that the United States is not at war, it was found desirable to enact legislation to provide for the regulation of travel to and from the United States on the part of all persons, citizens as well as aliens. The situation existing throughout the world and the necessity of promoting as far as possible the national defense justify, it is believed, the enactment of legislation providing for the centralization of control over the entry into and departure from the United States of persons of all classes. It is believed that this could be accomplished by the modification of the first paragraph of the act of May 22, 1918, so that the President could issue rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons. Since the act of May 22, 1918, was the subject of considerable litigation and consequently has been construed in a number of respects by the courts of the United States, it seems particularly desirable that that act be amended rather than that new legislation be enacted. The subject has been discussed with the Attorney General and he has expressed an opinion favorable to the reenactment of the act of May 22, 1918, or legislation along the lines of that act.

Section 1 of H. R. 4973 modifies the opening paragraph of section 1 of the act of May 22, 1918, so as to permit the President, under conditions as now exist throughout the world, to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry into and departure from the United States of all persons, if he deems that the interests of the United States so require.

Section 2 of H. R. 4973 amends section 3 of the act of May 22, 1918, by changing the penalties for violation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder from $10,000 or 20 years imprisonment, or both, to $5,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both. It has not been deemed desirable to retain the severe penalties prescribed by the act of May 22, 1918, since the experience has shown that severe penalties too frequently influence both courts and juries in favor of defendants and result in the miscarriage of justice. Section 2 also amends section 3 of the same act by including aircraft among other vehicles of transportation which may be forfeited to the United States if concerned in any violation of the provisions of the act.

Section 3 of H. R. 4973 amends the act of May 22, 1918, by adding two new sections, Nos. 5 and 6. Section 5 has been added in order to remove any possibility of doubt that even though a permit may be issued abroad to an alien under authority of the proposed legislation he may nevertheless be prevented from entering the United States if upon his arrival in this country he is found to be inadmissible to the United States under any law relating to the entry of aliens into this country. Section 6 has been added in order to make it clear that the revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of the bill shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committed or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred prior to such revocation.

It is not contemplated, should the proposed legislation be enacted into law, to restrict or to prohibit or in any way to impede the legitimate travel of citizens of the United States or the legitimate and necessary entry into or departure from the United States of aliens. The Department of State in nowise discourages travel of American citizens to countries of the Western Hemisphere or the travel of the inhabitants of such countries to the United States. Such travel is considered advantageous not only to the United States but also to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere in drawing them together more closely in sympathy and understanding, and it is encouraged rather than discouraged. It can therefore be anticipated that any rules or regulations issued under the proposed legislation would be drawn up in such a manner as to avoid undue inconveniences and difficulties in the matter of the departure from and entry into the United States of citizens of the United States and aliens, and that particular regard would be given to the matter of affording every convenience to American citizens who desire to enter Canada or Mexico from the United States and to the citizens of Canada and Mexico who desire to travel in the United States.

I may say that the bill that was enacted in 1918 is exactly the same law. The only difference, in effect, is that we make it operative on the issuance of a proclamation by the President and change the penalty and add the word "aircraft" with respect to the vehicles involved.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman, of course, has been in my district on a great many occasions and I am sure is familiar with the wonderful seashore and summer resort located on Lake Erie, on the Canadian shore, known as Crystal Beach. A number of residents of the city of Buffalo own property at Crystal Beach. Will it be necessary for them to obtain a permit or something of that kind to go over there to visit?

Mr. BLOOM. No; nothing of that kind will be involved. That will be taken care of in the rules and regulations and instead of impeding such travel in any way, it will be facilitated with respect to travel between Canada and the United States.

Mr. BEITER. They will not be held up or have to have a lot of papers, and so forth?

Mr. BLOOM. No; it will be exactly as it is today. This is exactly the same as the law is now. The President may find it necessary to issue a proclamation so as to prevent abuses that are coming up every day. The law will only be effective when such a proclamation is issued and then only under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed. This is all the bill calls for, and it is exactly the same law that we previously had.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Do not all foreign countries have restrictions similar to this in this bill, in time of peace?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I feel that this is needed legislation. It is constructive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will this in any way suspend or avoid the present immigration laws?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; it has nothing to do with the immigration laws.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. But the language here reads more like an immigration bill than a foreign-department bill.

This bill distinctly speaks of a person entering and going. I can understand a person in the United States who wants to go out, and we have reason to keep him here, but how about an alien who has a proper visa from a proper consul, during the time this was enacted into law?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman wants to know how this will affect the alien who has received a proper visa? Mr. Chairman, that is just what we are trying to do. This is what they do. They get a passport or a document of travel, and they come to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes more. They come to the United States. At the same time they get a visa to Mexico. Then on this passport they also have a visa to Cuba or some other country. They have that visa to the United States and the visa to Mexico and the visa to Cuba, then these friendly enemies, or whatever you

may want to call them, come over here, and they have their conference, and they say, "We are going to Mexico, and we are going to hold a conference there," and that is where they make the ball, and they will come back here to shoot it. So they are admitted into Mexico under the visa they have, and also they have a right to go to Cuba and come back to the United States, and they go and arrange all of their work, and they come back from Cuba or Mexico to the United States. Under this proposed bill they cannot do that. That is what we are trying to prevent, and we are trying to prevent our own citizens who are doing the same kind of work. This would prevent a person who is a citizen of the United States, like Fritz Kuhn, or anybody else, from leaving the country if we wanted to keep him here. There are many cases like that. As I say, this is the present law. The only difference is that we are making it operative now, so as to prevent the things from happening that we are trying to prevent from happening. If we can prevent them at this time, whenever the President finds it necessary to issue that proclamation in the interest of the United States, then this law becomes operative today, instead of waiting until we get into war.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Of course, we are not in war at the present time.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. And that law was enacted in time of war?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Does the gentleman realize that we have permitted hundreds and hundreds of our people to go out to other possessions to work, to help to build up defense in those countries, even to England? What protection would they have returning?

Mr. BLOOM. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. They would be stranded in those countries, would they not?

Mr. BLOOM. No; they would not, because the present rules and regulations would cover that. If they are entitled to come into this country, they can come here, and if they are entitled to leave this country they can do it. It is only when the department that has that under control says so that they cannot leave.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. What does the gentleman mean by "entitled to come"?

Mr. BLOOM. Under the rules of travel, under their passport.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. These men go there, and they are in Trinidad, or Bermuda, or Newfoundland, and we will say the President should issue a proclamation of this nature. What would happen to them? They would be stranded.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, I know; but the gentleman is figuring on something that the President would not do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The act would only operate against those persons who were committing acts of sabotage or doing something inimical to the best interests of the United States, under the act as it was in operation during the World War, and would be in operation today, if this bill were passed.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I am mindful of that law. We do not want to strand these people in those other possessions.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The very purpose of the changes in this bill are stated by the gentlemen to be in times of the present emergency, restrictions on passports which have previously applied in wartime. On that point all members of the committee are agreed, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] has said, that it is highly commendable legislation. However, I think the attention of the committee should be called to the undeclared changes which have crept into the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain, if he will, for the benefit of the Members, why the language was changed from the wording, which was that the President shall find certain facts, to the present wording, which says that the President shall deem certain facts. I think it would be illuminating to have that explained for the membership of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be glad to explain it, but as my colleague from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] has the dictionary before him and this matter was taken up before the committee, we find there is no difference between the word "deem" and the word "find." There is absolutely no difference between the word "deem" and the word "find." It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. The bill calls for "deem," and one or two Members thought it should be "find." But there is absolutely no difference between "deem" and "find." I will leave it to the members of the Committee to decide.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say the necessity for this legislation, I think, is so convincing that no one who knows the facts back of it would oppose the bill, because all the various agencies of the Government, the F. B. I., the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, the State Department, and all of them, realize that with the present situation existing there must be some clearing house or central place where people coming and going at this time can be checked upon, so as to prevent sabotage and "fifth column" activities. Instances were cited before our committee which showed the necessity for this legislation and the necessity for it now. It should not be postponed.

With reference to the word that my friend is talking about, there was considerable discussion before the committee of the substitution of the word "find" for the word "deem." When that comes up under the 5-minute rule I will take a little time to discuss it more at length. However, I do not care to consume any more time upon that at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, as soon as opportunity offers, I am going to ask for 1 hour of debate on this question in order to give an opportunity to certain Members here who wish to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. EATON. For 1 hour?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is entitled to 1 hour and the ranking minority member is entitled to 1 hour, if he desires to use it.

Mr. EATON. I am asking to be recognized for an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized, and he may yield such time as he likes up to 1 hour.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I do not expect we will have protracted debate, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is seized and possessed with certain ideas which he wishes to pass along.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hold in my hand a copy of the Code of Laws of the United States of America. Title 22, section 223, the one which this bill purports to amend, reads in the first sentence:

> When the United States is at war, if the President shall find that the public safety requires—

Will the gentleman tell us why the word "find" and the word "if" were stricken out of the bill?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question, and, because I am unable to answer it, I want to play safe and keep that word "find" in there. I do not think, if we were to want the person produced who changed the word, that we would find him very quickly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understood the gentleman to read that, the law provided that it did not apply unless we were at war?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But this new bill does not say that. This bill says that the President may, if some other countries are at war.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman propose to amend this by putting back all the language of the old statute?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; I do not.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, why not?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will explain that in my statement.

Mr. Chairman, ostensibly the purpose of this amendment is as was stated by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee; in short, to give the President wartime powers that were enjoyed by the wartime administration in 1918 during the war, in the present situation in the present emergency. You might put it that it is desired to give the President wartime powers in peacetime. I do not wish to so put it.

I shall not attempt to answer the question whether we are in war or whether we are not in war. I shall not attempt to answer the question whether we are at peace with the other nations of the world or whether we are not at peace with the other nations of the world. I personally have no objection and I have no quarrel with that change, namely, to change the words "when the United States is at war" to "whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states." That is ostensibly the purpose of this amendment—to give the President the same powers in this situation, this emergency, that President Wilson had in the wartimes of 1918, to prevent persons from entering into or departing from the United States except under regulations imposed by the President and under penalties imposed by this amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was after war had been declared and we had entered into the war?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes, indeed. That was a wartime power.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that we have already given the President wartime powers?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will come to that in my statement, if I get that far.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I have no quarrel with that; and, if I understood the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee correctly, he stated that is the only change that has been made. In other words, he said the act of 1918 is dormant until we have another war, and that the purpose of this bill is to put it into effect at the present time, although presumably we are not at war. I have no quarrel with that.

However, I want to call your attention to the fact that there have been some further changes made which I deem are very vital changes, because in the same paragraph the present law provides—

> That if the President shall find that the public safety requires—

This amendment changes those words to read:

> If the President shall deem that the interests of the United States require.

The point I am making here is that we are constantly drifting away from constitutional methods of procedure in government and proceeding to a government by Executive decree. We have done it, and we are doing it consciously, we are doing it unconsciously, and unless you had your attention called to this I am firm in my belief that you would be doing it unconsciously to an extreme degree if you passed this bill.

There is a lot of difference in whether or not an act is passed in behalf of the public safety or it is passed in behalf of the public interest. I think most of you are aware of the fact that laws passed in the interest of public safety have a paramount sanctity to other laws which are passed merely in the public interest. The public safety is paramount to everything else; and acts of that kind, acts done thereunder, will be sanctioned by the courts because they are done in the name of public safety and in behalf of public safety, which override individual prerogatives and rights, and must, of necessity. But that is not true of the public interest.

In wartime President Wilson had this prerogative only for the purposes of public safety. Here in peacetime we propose to say "whenever it is in the public interest." Every law which is passed, with the exception of private bills, perhaps, is assumed to be in the public interest; but it is not presumed they are passed for, nor necessarily have any connection with, the public safety. It is because this act as it stands now was passed for the public safety that we can give subscription to these powers. But even that I am not going to quarrel with. I am willing to go along with that. I realize that we are in a situation, where we are involved in a program of defense that requires every effort, and that the administration should have the power to keep persons out of the United States who will hurt the public safety and prevent those from departing who might injure public safety. So, as I say, I am willing to go along on that proposition of changing "public safety" to "public interest," although I do not think it is necessary. It is certainly giving the administration far more power in peacetime than the war administration was granted in wartime.

Assuming that we are going to accept "public interest" instead of "public safety," then I go one step further and ask, Why was this word "deem" placed in there instead of "find"?

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I think it is true that the connotation of the word "deem" is different from the word "find." I would prefer the word "find" now. But does the gentleman think, as a practical matter, that there is any real difference in those two words in this particular statute?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; I think there is a very vital difference. I would like to put it this way, if the gentleman will permit me: If the substance of constitutional processes is constantly slipping away from us, I am going to do what I can to conserve the form thereof.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. May I ask the gentleman if he would be in favor of the bill provided we put in "find" instead of "deem" and "safety" instead of "interest"? Would he be in favor of the bill then?

Mr. JONKMAN. I certainly would if both were changed, but as a matter of compromise I am willing to let "interest" go. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is necessary, I do not think we should do it, but I consider that word "deem" of far greater importance, if I may answer it that way.

It has been said here that the word "deem" and the word "find" mean the same thing. Mr. Chairman, if they were substantially the same, I would not object. I am not here splitting hairs. However, there is a vital difference between the word "deem" and the word "find."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I was interested in what the Chairman had to say with reference to the fact that this bill did not apply to immigration or to the admission of individuals generally. I call the gentleman's attention to this sentence in the report:

> So as to permit the President in time of national emergency to prescribe rules and regulations governing the entry and departure from the United States of all persons if he shall deem that the interests of the United States so require.

If you leave out the word "emergency" or the word "necessity" or the word that you used awhile ago instead of the word "interest"—what was the word?

Mr. JONKMAN. "Safety."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If you leave out those words and leave in "interest," can you not step over and give this sentence its full interpretation and give the President the full authority to say who may come in and who shall go out without regard to any immigration law?

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question but what this amendment, if passed, will override the immigration laws. There is no question but what under this amendment the President will have the power to say whether or not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] goes to South America or does not go.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would there not be plenty of time after we get into war to give the President the right to set aside all immigration laws?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do feel that the present situation is such as to call for extraordinary powers in the matter of keeping people from coming into or going out of the United States. I do believe that is the situation, whether we are at peace or not. I want to go a long way, but I do not want to go as far as this amendment goes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman distinguish between these two phrases in the original act and in the so-called amendment here? The first is—

when the United States is at war, if the President shall find—

The second is—

whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, the President shall deem—

In what capacity does the President act in the first instance, and in what capacity does he act in the second instance?

Mr. JONKMAN. The word "find" has in modern usage a legal meaning as well as a common usage meaning. I do not know what dictionary the gentleman who referred to the dictionary consulted, but the one at the stand at the Speaker's desk shows a vital distinction between the two words. The word "find" in law means—

to determine and declare an issue of fact by its verdict or decision, as a jury or court.

If the President must find, he can find it on facts. I do not care whether it is an established fact or not, but he must find it on some fact, he must base his finding on some fact. That is the legal and special meaning of the word today.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Passing from that to the word "deem," that is where the President gets his right to use discretion. He does not have to find on facts, he just uses his own judgment. If you use the word "find," however, he has to find some fact, and until he does find some fact he does not find, he just guesses, and that is what "deem" means.

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is this not the distinguishing criterion between the two, that in the first place, under the original act, the President finds with reference to the public safety of the United States, and in the second instance he sits as arbiter between two or more warring states, of whom the United States may not be one?

Mr. JONKMAN. Almost the gentleman persuades me not to give in to that word "interest." I am willing to go a long way, let me repeat. The public interest is so broad that it beggars description or definition. The President could always say he did it in the public interest and find something, but when he must find it based on the public safety, and that is all we considered it could be based on under constitutional principles in 1918, that is a different question.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. As I understand, the word "deem" means to decide or conclude. The word "find" means to decide or conclude, after having made a study or investigation. It is true there is that difference between the two words. However, you cannot go back of the finding, and you cannot challenge it by saying that sufficient consideration has not been given. Therefore, I maintain there is no difference in this particular statute between the words.

Mr. JONKMAN. The finding is based on facts, there is no question about it, in law.

Mr. GWYNNE. But you cannot challenge it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute in order to ask him a question.

Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that if the committee accepts the suggestion of the gentleman and makes the change from "deem" to "find" the gentleman will be through with all his talk and will vote for this bill as is?

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman is afraid I am being persuaded. I will say, "Yes," I will vote for the bill if that is changed.

Mr. BLOOM. That is just what I wanted to do a long time ago, and the gentleman knows it. All right, I will agree to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York says he will accept this amendment. May I ask the gentleman, when the bill goes to conference will the gentleman insist on keeping the amendment in the bill or will he accept the amendment here for the purpose of getting the bill through the House and then throwing the amendment away as soon as he gets into conference?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I think that is very unfair.

Mr. MICHENER. Why?

Mr. BLOOM. I made a statement, and this is not the first time the statement was made, but I am not in the habit of resorting to tricks to get the gentleman to vote to my way of thinking. I can assure the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to do anything of the kind. I will say, however, that if in conference all the members of the committee of conference feel that we should have the word "deem" instead of "find," I shall naturally have to go along with them, and we can come back to the House again.

I do not know where the gentleman gets his bag of tricks from, but I never thought of such a thing. I think it is very unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New York——

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is going to talk to him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am talking here. I was just asking the gentleman's attention. Of course, if the gentleman does not care what is going on in the House, all right.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then for the consideration of the other Members of the House, if not for that of the gentleman from New York, nobody was accusing anyone, as I understand, of resorting to any trick. We all know that when we put provisions in bills they have frequently been stricken in conference. There is no trick about it. It was due, undoubtedly, to force of argument of the other side and that is all we were trying to safeguard. There is no occasion for anyone to be offended. It is a nice day and what is the use of getting mad about anything?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I want to say to the chairman that I appreciate the fact that he has gone along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and myself in respect of this change, and I have every confidence he will stand pat on his statement and with this language the entire membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee is unanimously in favor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JONKMAN. I have answered the gentleman's question affirmatively, but may I say in addition on this word "deem" just to finish my definition of what it means that according to the dictionary at the Speaker's desk it means "to be of opinion, to think, to esteem, to opine, to suppose."

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Since the gentleman has agreed to accept the gentleman's proposed amendment, let me ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman from Michigan think that with this change the President still can modify all the immigration laws if he wants to do so?

Mr. JONKMAN. I will give the gentleman a candid answer to that. I know something about the processes of the executive part of the Government and, especially, the Department of Justice; and, as I said, he needs only a shred of evidence to support his findings. It can be upon a very meager finding, but what I obtain by this is that we are conserving constitutional processes of government instead of going further toward processes of government by Executive decree. It is now up to the executive departments whether they want to use high-handed methods, but the Congress has not authorized them to do so.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Did the gentleman get before the committee any assurance from the State Department as to how they expected to enforce this law?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not believe I can answer that. I will leave that to the chairman.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want to be for this bill, but I should hate to vote for the bill this afternoon, when the gentleman tells me that the President, by reason of what we do here this afternoon, is to have authority to change every immigration law.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is without the amendment, I may say to the gentleman—if he merely had to "deem"; but not, in my judgment, when he has to "find."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the House will probably be better satisfied with reference to the necessity of this legislation if they had heard the testimony that was presented before the Foreign Affairs Committee with reference to existing conditions that have brought to the attention of our Government the necessity for this legislation.

I have a statement which was presented to our committee, signed by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Gen. Sherman Miles, of the Intelligence Division of the War Department, and Capt. H. E. Kirke, of the Office of Naval Intelligence. These three gentlemen represent the intelligence divisions of the Department of Justice, the War Department, and the Navy Department that have had to do with the curbing of subversive activities on the part of our own citizens as well as aliens. It has been brought forcefully to their attention by incidents that have happened and are happening daily, that we must have this legislation, and their statement revealed the necessity for this bill.

The public generally is of the opinion that no one can leave this country without obtaining a passport. This is not correct. There is no law requiring anyone leaving this country to secure a passport. The only reason passports have been obtained has been because most countries to which citizens are going require passports before they can be admitted to such countries, and it is because of the laws of the countries which they are visiting that require passports that passports are secured by our citizens. Under existing law, and without this law, we have no right to prevent anyone from leaving this country at any time he desires to do so.

The evidence before our committee showed two instances, which were cited at that time, that have happened recently, of aliens leaving this country whose departure to foreign countries adversely affected the defense of the United States, but without this bill the Government was powerless to prevent their leaving. It was stated there were a number of incidents occurring in the enforcement of espionage laws which revealed the necessity for this law so they could effectively keep check on parties under suspicion and whose activities stamped them as enemies of our Government.

The sole purpose of this legislation is to give that same power that this Government had during the World War, and have a sort of clearing house where people entering or leaving this country would have to give their reasons why they were going or coming, and where it would be determined whether they were engaged in espionage, and whether their coming in or going out would be inimical to the interests of the United States. It does not affect any other law on the statute books. It is simply in addition to existing law by which anyone at this time, in addition to any other right they may have under any other law, would have to go to the State Department and state why they were coming in or going out and secure an entrance or exit permit.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am interested in what the gentleman said about what Mr. Hoover said and what others said, but at the same time they are enforcing officers. What does the Secretary of State's office say?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, represented the State Department, and he said that the legislation was needed, and badly needed. The Department of Justice was likewise represented.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I shall not press my inquiry further.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is approved 100 percent, and the only controversy in the committee was whether it should contain the word "deem" or "find." I think it is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. That difference has been adjusted, and the committee is now unanimous.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am somewhat worried about this bill, as to how far it goes. If it goes far enough to suspend our immigration laws, I am against it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It does not.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If it corrects the specific difficulty, I would be in favor of it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It does not touch the immigration laws any more than an appropriation bill does. It says, in addition to all laws, when a person comes in or goes out, he has to clear himself through the State Department. The bill authorizes the President to require restrictions and prohibitions in addition to the immigration and other laws. It does not repeal or weaken these other laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that it is more important than ever before to keep people out of the country who are undesirable, and to keep people in when it is in the interest of the United States Government?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thoroughly agree with that statement, and our entire committee now recommends the passage of this bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS OF OHIO. I understand the gentleman to say that the whole thing is a matter of the difference between tweedledum and tweedle-deem?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think that is right.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BLOOM. Nor have I, and I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 1 of the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), is amended to read as follows:

"That whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall deem that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or Congress, be unlawful—."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 6, after the word "shall", strike out the word "deem" and insert the word "find."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Clerk had started to read the second section. I make the point of order that the amendment comes too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet, and the amendment was on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the circumstances, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 1, line 5, after the word "whenever", insert the words "the Congress shall have declared that."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] destroys the whole purpose of the bill. This does not say anything about "whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states." They may be foreign states. The Congress should not, by resolution, say that a state of war exists between Germany and some other country, or whatever two countries it may be. If it were to apply only to the United States, that would be a different thing, but this bill provides in case of a war between any two countries, whatever the countries may be. So it does not belong in this bill in any way, and would destroy the purpose of the bill completely.

I therefore hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The purpose of the amendment is to say that whenever Congress shall say that a state of war exists.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Everybody knows that a state of war exists between certain countries now, but Congress would be powerless by a joint resolution to do anything about it. This is a very foolish amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 3 of such act of May 22, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

"That any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this act, or of any order or proclamation of the President promulgated, or of any permit, rule, or regulation issued thereunder, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by like fine or imprisonment, or both; and any vehicle, vessel, or aircraft, together with its or her appurtenances, equipment, tackle, apparel, and furniture, oncerned in any such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following section 2, insert section 2a, as follows:

"SEC. 2a. That section 4 of such act of May 22, 1918, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. That the term "United States" as used in this act includes the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

" 'The word "person" as used herein shall be deemed to mean any individual, partnership, association, company, or other unincorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That such act of May 22, 1918, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to entitle an alien to whom a permit to enter the United States has been issued to enter the United States, if, upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible to the United States under this act or any law relating to the entry of aliens into the United States.

"SEC. 6. The revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued in pursuance of this act, shall not prevent prosecution for any offense committed or the imposition of any penalties or forfeitures, liability for which was incurred under this act prior to the revocation of such proclamation, rule, regulation, or order."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 3, following line 17, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall authorize the President by rules and regulations or other methods to permit the entry into the United States of any alien whose entry is prohibited by law."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. It merely says that by rules, regulations, or other methods the President cannot lift our immigration ban. In other words, the power that this bill gives to the President is to further restrict immigration, and my amendment takes away from him any power to lift our immigration ban.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. Chairman, we have the present act that is now on the statute books and it becomes operative in time of war. It would become operative under this bill at any time that the President shall issue a proclamation. The rules and regulations are to be laid down by him. The present law has been construed by various courts.

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to do something to preserve the interests of the United States. An amendment such as this will destroy the whole purpose of the proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman contend this bill should carry authority for the President to lift our immigration restrictions by rule or regulation?

Mr. BLOOM. He has the power to do that now. The act remains exactly as it is now. When he issues a proclamation, he makes certain rules and regulations. He says that the good fellow has a right to come here, the man who has a right to leave may do so and the man who has a right to come back may do so. He makes rules and regulations to preserve our safety and our security.

If you do something else that is going to tie his hands, you do away with the effectiveness of the whole act. The law remains exactly as it is now and there is no change in the present law proposed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the Members to these words on the first page, line 7:

the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise.

That means when the interests of the United States require additional restrictions and prohibitions.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should not be opposed to my amendment, then.

Mr. EBERHARTER. By no stretch of the imagination could there be anything in this act that would give the President the power to lift any restrictions or prohibitions.

Mr. CURTIS. If that be true, the gentleman should not oppose my amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, again I wish to emphasize that that is the law now, and there is no question about that. The gentleman's amendment is absolutely superfluous, and would, if adopted, destroy what we are trying to do. We are trying to make this law operative at the present time.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 31, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from a New York paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein brief excerpts from letters I have received in connection with the plight of the small manufacturers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. George Meaney, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in the Hotel Astor in New York City last Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER and Mr. PATMAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I find on looking over my manuscript that I cannot complete it in 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—A NONDEFENSIBLE NATIONAL-DEFENSE, PET PROJECT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is, in this emergency and under the Constitution, my Commander in Chief. As such, though criticized by some for so doing, I have supported him and his foreign policy. I pledge him my loyalty, reserving my rights guaranteed to me by the Constitution.

I am for unity. The country should be united in this crisis.

I agree with the President that the United States will actively resist whereever necessary and with all our resources every attempt by Hitler to extend the Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere, or to threaten it.

I agree with him that in order to save ourselves and to remain the United States of America we must and should and will resist every Nazi attempt to gain control of the seas.

I am sure I do not know where this may lead us. It is the only position which, as self-respecting, liberty-loving citizens, any of us can take. The question is whether we can maintain it as against those events outside our hemisphere which have written America's destiny for and in spite of us, whatever it may be. We accept our full responsibility for our own salvation. Let the world take notice and govern itself accordingly.

But, when it comes to playing politics with our internal economy with the obvious intent to take advantage of a situation in order to put across, under duress of the emergency, a pet project under the guise of national defense, loyalty to country comes first, and I will not be a party to such a scheme. I will not help to perpetrate what I consider to be a fraud on the body politic of the United States, one that leads but to disunity in itself and affords an offered opportunity for anyone to challenge the motives, and properly to question the capacities, of our Commander in Chief who, under existing circumstances, seeks to serve a selfish end at his country's expense.

It is unfortunate—and worse than that—that the President should have at this time submitted the St. Lawrence waterway project for the consideration of Congress, for it is obviously unnecessary, inexpedient, and is just what it looks to be, despite the camouflage, a pet project.

From the standpoint of national defense, if not from the standpoint of the need for more power, it is absolutely unjustified.

That is a pet project, the President admits. This is no time for pet projects at the expense of the taxpayer. Our lives are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the President's message. I am sorry he delivered it. I do not and cannot agree with him in the premises. I regret that he was constrained to send it to Congress at this time. This is no time, nor is it the place, for the Commander in Chief to lay himself open to charges that can be substantiated by his own admissions that this is a pet project he is advocating. His plea in confession and avoidance gets him nowhere. That is paternalism gone mad.

I am opposed to it and to the general proposition. I believe, and always have believed, and always shall believe, that, as Calvin Coolidge said:

> A President should not only not be selfish but he ought to avoid the appearance of selfishness.

People are human. They size a man up correctly, and his idiosyncrasies are their measure of the greatness of the man.

Mr. Speaker, on June 2 last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested, I am against the proposition because I do not like the subterfuge employed.

In these days when we and the country need every dollar it is almost a crime, under the guise of national defense for the President to urge in support of his pet project, that the farmers and realestate owners and common citizens of Vermont, and elsewhere, give up their lives, liberty, and property to help put across and over this project which he did not dare submit as a treaty, as it should be, but has finagled into an agreement.

Abraham Lincoln asked his Secretary of State or War: "If you call the tail of a four-legged sheep a leg, how many legs would the sheep have?"

"Five," said the Secretary.

"Four," said Lincoln, "for calling a tail a leg doesn't make it so."

Calling this St. Lawrence waterway affair an agreement when it is in fact a treaty does not change it at all. It is a treaty. It should have been submitted to the Senate as treaties are required to be submitted by the Constitution.

It is not the question of whether one favors the St. Lawrence waterway or is opposed to it that should give one especial pause at this moment in considering the matter.

Without regard to the merits and demerits of the project I disapprove most heartily, as I have said, this latest attempt of the President, with deliberate purpose and intent to sabotage, evade, and to avoid the mandatory provisions of the Constitution by offering a joint resolution for the consideration of Congress instead of submitting the text of a treaty when, as I have said, as in the present case, an international agreement is involved which, according to my first impression, and as confirmed by what heretofore has happened, in my opinion, should and does require ratification by the Senate.

It smells too much like the attempts to torpedo the Supreme Court, and resembles his "to hell with the Constitution," or words to that effect in re the Guffey coal bill. Every American knows that.

Section 2 of article II of the Constitution prescribes that the President "shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators concur." The decisions of the Supreme Court with respect to what constitutes treaties make interesting reading in view of the submission of this joint resolution, which is clearly and obviously an attempt to avoid the Constitution and the decisions of the Court. The precedents for the joint resolution also are enlightening.

What some people are speaks so loud I cannot hear what they say. The President, apparently realizing that the Senate would not ratify such a treaty as he might selfishly submit, has procured an opinion to the effect that the method he seeks to employ is legal.

As a lawyer, I am not so sure. Because the Attorney General writes that what the President says is the law, does not, under existing circumstances, make it so. I reserve the right after study of it, to agree, or to continue to disagree, as I do now, on first impression, with respect to its legality. Just because the present Attorney General and the Supreme Court, as now constituted, might be expected to find it so to be, it does not follow necessarily that the method is justified. Consequently, it does not convince me. Nor does the fact that Canada is alleged to have acquiesced in the plan. Why not? They would have seven-eighths of the cake. They are going to

eat it. But in fact Canada has not acquiesced, except under duress, if at all.

I live near the border and my Canadian friends tell me that Canada has gone along at the insistence of, and under pressure by and from the President of the United States, with his "or else," or veiled threats as to what might and may happen if they did not and do not acquiesce. Ask somebody from Canada if this is not the fact. It is.

The President was right in his statement. There are those of us who know that the St. Lawrence waterway is a pet project of his, and we realize that rule or ruin he proposes to put it across under the absolutely untenable theory that it would contribute to national defense. That is pure unadulterated bunk. It is a fraud on the public. He might as well have used the general-welfare clause to substantiate his position. It would have been just as nonsensical.

Frozen solidly into the ice for from 4 to 6 months, the ships would be useless, except as targets. The shipyards would have to be closed from 4 to 6 months in 20 to 30 degrees below zero weather. It does not make sense from a national-defense angle.

One who studies the situation cannot fail to appreciate the absolute fallacy of placing the St. Lawrence seaway project under the cloak of national defense. Just where does a navigable channel for open vessels, closed by ice for 6 or 7 months each year fit in with our national-defense scheme? Nowhere. How is the urgent need of more power for the defense and other industries to be served by a project that will not furnish power for 6 or 7 years? Not at all. If the need of power is so urgent, why cannot it be supplied by Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, or Bonneville? It could be. The emergency exists at this moment; it is pressing and is daily becoming more pressing. We are not preparing against an embryonic emergency due several years from now. It is actual and active, and time is of the essence. As a national-defense project this is a perfect fraud on the people.

Then again, and lastly looking at the problem from the long-range point of view, would this undertaking prove to be of substantial benefit as a defense measure? No.

The argument advanced is that shipyards should be constructed on the Great Lakes as "a secure haven." It is suggested that such shipyards would not be so exposed to attack as those located on or near the seaboard.

In this era of improvement in air navigation, when the range of aerial fighters and bombers is constantly increasing, who can say that a shipyard located at Cleveland is any more immune from attack than one located at Chester, Pa.? It must be remembered, too, that the 27-foot channel could not be used by battleships or cruisers or by any other war vessels of capital proportions.

Consider with what ease, given an invasion from the air, this channel could be put out of commission through the action of bombing planes; or how vulnerable it would be at the hands of the saboteur. The distance from Chicago to Montreal, for example, is 1,247 miles, and for a considerable part of this distance vessels built in the Great Lakes area would be required to move through narrow, winding channels, flanked with locks, dams, spillways, and sluice gates, all essential to the canal's operation. One bomb from the air, one exploded charge of dynamite, and the canal would be out of business indefinitely, with the vessels of a beleaguered nation lying helplessly and uselessly at anchor a thousand miles or more up a blockaded river. It is scarcely conceivable that reliance would be placed upon so frail a line of defense. It does not make sense.

A NIGHTMARE

From the standpoint of national defense against international aggression the proposition to establish ocean shipbuilding on an inland waterway is too preposterous to require discussion. It centralizes such industry on bodies of water that for 200 years have been free from everything suggesting such a thing.

Then again the expense involved in the original proposition is but a drop in the bucket compared with what it would cost to construct docks, drydocks, shipyards, and necessary auxiliaries to all these.

Once constructed, the everlasting bill for maintenance of these necessary complements to equipment would be a terrible drain on the taxpayers. That is not all. They must be defended. We will have to have forts, fortifications, and aircraft batteries; sailors, soldiers, marines, establish new air bases, and so on ad nauseam.

It is a fantastic dream. It will be a nightmare if the people do not wake up.

Much more might be said against the project and the insidious method employed in attempting to take advantage of the people and to put it over as a national-defense measure; which it absolutely is not.

I say to you that the pet project of the President is unsound financially. From an economic standpoint it is ruinous. From the standpoint of national defense it is not defensible, as such, at any time, but particularly at this time for that it submits us to so many hazards inside and outside, economic, power, and financial fields to which I have heretofore alluded, as to make the indefensible project, as it has been properly characterized, a national menace.

FARMERS LOSERS

It is claimed by the proponents that the St. Lawrence waterway would benefit the farmer by saving him money, by saving him several cents a bushel on the cost of shipment of grain from the "upper lake ports to Montreal and beyond."

It is claimed water transportation would save from 6 to 12 cents a bushel. That is ridiculous, in view of the fact that during the past 10 years the average total charge for moving wheat from the head of the Lakes to Montreal has been only 5½ cents, and the cost of handling grain at Montreal is only three-fourths of a cent a bushel, or a total of a little more than 6 cents for the entire movement from the head of the Lakes to the hold of a ship at Montreal.

SAVINGS ARGUMENT IS FUNNY

The savings suggested would wipe out the present total charge. The savings argument would be funny, if it were not a serious matter for one to use figures so carelessly.

But, conceding that there might be some saving, what would it be and what would it do to the American farmer? We do not have to speculate. We know that in 1929 the railroads reduced the export rates on grain in order to comply with the suggestion of President Hoover, and on the representation that such reduction would stimulate exports of wheat and increase the price received by the American farmer. What happened is a matter of official record. It is a long sad story from the standpoint of the American farmer. Instead of helping to uplift the grain prices, cuts in railroad rates on export shipments did precisely the opposite thing.

The cuts in railroad rates resulted in lower quotations on wheat at Liverpool, and the wheat market at Chicago plunged downward to below the bottommost level ever previously reached. This was in May 1929. Check it in the newspaper stories of early May of that year and in Government statistics covering transportation costs and wheat, if you wish to verify it.

You will find it true. You will also find that from May through to fall during the remainder of the period of reduced rates, as a result of a well-intentioned effort to help maintain wheat prices for the farmers of the United States, it came about that the railroads got less money for hauling the wheat; the farmers got less money not only for the small fraction of the United States crop which was exported, but also for the whole crop, domestic as well as export, since the break in export prices in Liverpool reacted on the Chicago and other United States markets; the Canadian farmers who supply most of the export market got less for their wheat; and the foreign traders and consumers were able to buy wheat at lower prices.

In short, the savings from that experimental reduction in export rates on grain turned out to be losses for everybody on this side of the Atlantic—farmers and railroads alike. Whatever the savings were, they went to the foreign grain traders or the foreign consumers.

And yet, in the face of experience, it is now proposed to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of United States tax money, and some Canadian tax money besides, to force a permanent repetition of the experience.

That is not the only bad effect of the proposal.

The proposed St. Lawrence plan, while intended to reduce the carrying charges for moving grain out, would at the same time and in the same degree reduce charges for moving grain into the United States.

Even with the present 14-foot channel in the St. Lawrence, the movement of grain into the United States is apparent and is a matter of concern.

Now, if, through the bounty of the American taxpayers in building a 27-foot channel, this low-wage, low-cost foreign grain is enabled to come all the way in

low-wage, low-cost foreign shipping, how much higher would we have to put our tariffs to protect the American grain grower?

Why should the American taxpayers be called upon to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, collected from American farmers among others, to make it easier for foreign grain to be brought into the markets of the United States?

SAVINGS FOR WHOM?

Propcnents of the project say that the money should be spent in the name of savings in transportation charges. But who would get the savings?

Certainly not the people of the United States.

All they would get would be the privilege of paying the bill.

Certainly not the farmers of the United States who produce the grain. All they would get would be more foreign competition and less money for their grain.

The truth is, that this St. Lawrence waterway is a nonliquidating, debt-increasing, nonprofit proposition that will hang like a lodestone or an indeterminate mortgage on the farms of the nontributary States and others for years and years to come.

THE FARMERS SHOULD HAVE POWER AND LIGHT AND HEAT

Power and light and heat the farmers should have at a reasonable price. All the advantages which go to make life better and happier and more livable they are entitled to, but this plan does not furnish these things at a price commensurate with the cost. It does just the opposite. It sinks the taxpayers in the mire of more money to pay for nothing for them.

The facts are incontrovertible.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COPELAND] in an able speech on the floor the other day made the following comprehensive and elucidating statement as to alleged agricultural benefits. He said:

WHAT BENEFIT TO AGRICULTURE?

Proponents of the proposed treaty argue that a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway would be a great advantage to agriculture in the Midwest. Let us compare the grain rates by rail of the farmers in the United States with those of Canada in order to get their grain to points on the Great Lakes where they could use the proposed waterway. The following data will serve to illustrate the lower rail cost of transporting the grain of the Canadian farmer to the Lakes.

Let us consider the rate on wheat only for comparable distances. The Canadian farmer, from Winnipeg, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 424 miles, pays a ton rate of $2.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Yankton, S. Dak., to Duluth, a distance of 424 miles, a ton rate of $5.30. The Canadian farmer, from Virden, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 604 miles, will pay a ton rate of $3.66, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Ark., to Chicago, a distance of 607 miles, a ton rate of $7.30. The Canadian farmer, from Grenfell, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 704 miles, a ton rate of $3.80, while the American farmer will pay, from Okahoma City to Chicago, a distance of 775 miles, a ton rate of $7.80. The Canadian farmer, from Rush Lake, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 912 miles, a ton rate of $4.40, while the American farmer will pay, from Salina, Kans., to Chicago, a distance of 641 miles, a ton rate of $6.20. The Canadian farmer, from Maple Creek, Canada, to Port Arthur, a distance of 1,017 miles, a ton rate of $4.60, while the American farmer will pay, from Helena, Mont., to Duluth, a total of 1,138 miles, a ton rate of $8.90, or from Twin Falls, Idaho, to Duluth, a total of 1,630 miles, a ton rate of $12.20. These rates were collected approximately 5 years ago, but we are advised that they are yet relatively and comparatively and substantially the same.

CANADIAN SUBSIDIES

When we take into account the many governmental aids and subsidies given to the Canadian railroads to aid them in the transportation of Canadian grain, the lower wages paid to Canadian railway labor, and the much lower taxes upon the railroads in Canada than on the railroads in this country, it is clearly impossible for American railways to meet Canadian rail rates on grain.

How can a Nebraska farmer pay twice as much per mile as the Canadian farmer to get his wheat to the lake port and then pay an extra 10 cents per hundred pounds tariff at Liverpool, compete with the Canadian farmer? How can a farmer in Nebraska, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, the Dakotas, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Tennessee, Missouri, Oklahoma, or Arkansas, carry all of these handicaps and use the St. Lawrence seaway in competition with the farmers of Canada; especially so, when the land in this country is more expensive and the cost of farm labor is higher? How can they compete?

MISSISSIPPI SYSTEM

The hope of the farmer of the Middle West to reach world markets lies not in a seaway through Canada but in low barge service to the Gulf and out to the sea upon the Illinois, Mississippi, Missouri, and the Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. These rivers penetrate the wheat fields of the United States and reach the sea through our own country. This is a navigation system that has been developed through projects upon which we have already spent millions of dollars, and which is, in a large measure, completed. We certainly cannot solve the problem by spending hundreds of millions of dollars to bring cheap foreign-flag ships to the wheat fields of our strongest competitor, for in many instances they will bring in import loads that will compete directly with our American farm products, and they naturally will reload with products such as Canadian wheat, which can be bought at a delivered price with which the American farmer cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer in the Middle West producing corn, wheat, oats, rye, or livestock, and every producer of coal, steel, or ore, every railroad, every truck, would be financially hurt by this seaway project. American laborers would be hurt, and we want nothing to do with any project that would make them compete with slave labor or the underprivileged, underpaid laborer of Europe.

POWER—VERMONT NOT A BENEFICIARY

Then, the people, especially those of Vermont, should not be fooled by all the talk about cheap power and light.

The power that is proposed to be generated admittedly will not be available for Vermont farmers. It will be distributed to other areas than Vermont. The map shows that. The statement of the proponents of the project proves it.

More power for upper New York State and Canada at the expense of Vermont farmers and those of other nontributary and nonbeneficiary States—that is the story.

VERMONT IS NOT ON THE POWER OR LIGHT MAP

Vermont is shown to be not on the proposed distribution map for either power or light. Do not take my word for it. Take a look at the map. Read what the most ardent proponents have to say. They say Vermont is a nontributary State and therefore will not benefit. The map shows it.

It all analyzes down to this, and sugars off in the pan of fact, that Vermont farmers would be paying for a "pig in a poke," or for something that never can or will be delivered to or be of benefit to them.

VERMONT FARMERS ARE LOSERS

The farmers of Vermont and the country will be the losers, measured in dollars and cents and taxes. They will not be beneficiaries.

They will have to pay the bills. They own real estate. It sticks its neck out always. There is the farmer's property always visible when more revenue must be raised. When farmers know and can see what it is all about they are the most reasonable and substantial people in the world. Now is the time when they should open their eyes and should buy no gold brick. They should make it their business not only not to be made suckers, but to obstreperously and orally voice their opposition to any suggestion that somebody can make a Roman holiday at their expense.

The tremendous expense involved in this project will put an invisible, though nonetheless actual, taxable mortgage on them. Real estate always has borne, and always will bear, more than its fair share of taxes for the reason that it is visible and actual. Taxes! taxes! taxes! is the answer to a proposition that by the benefits accorded does not justify even its demonstration.

The benefits are not compensatory; they do not justify or offset the suggested burden to be imposed. To ruin the farmers in order for the Federal Government to subsidize the building of this waterway is impractical nonsense from a national-defense standpoint.

It is worse than a fraud on the American public. It is an economic monstrosity, and has no business to be before Congress or the people at this time of all times.

IS IT ECONOMICAL? NO; IT IS AN UNSOUND PROJECT ECONOMICALLY

The report of the joint board of engineers on the St. Lawrence waterway based on a study concerned mainly with the bulk transmission of the St. Lawrence energy available to the United States to either of two load centers, the metropolitan district around New York, and the New England district, in its conclusion finds that—

The project is therefore economically unsound.

You do not believe it? Then look at page 672 of the St. Lawrence Navigation and Power Project, published by the Institute of Economics, the Brookings Institution. See for yourself.

Then again, talking about power, the fact is the records show that there is already adequate potential power in our own rivers and streams—which we, and not the Government, own, if we do not control them—for the development at a reasonable cost, to produce such electrical energy as would be sufficient to supply at a fair figure the demands and the needs of every farm in Vermont and New England.

WASTEFUL EXTRAVAGANCE

The tremendous cost of the St. Lawrence waterway involved in the power development is all out of place. It is a wasteful extravagance, because we do not need more facilities for power development. There are equipped and ready to go unused power plants at Niagara Falls today that can and would furnish such, and all additional electrical power as might be necessary to supply agricultural needs. The fact that these unused plants are idle is the complete and perfect answer to the propaganda involved in the "need for more power" premise. The answer is we do not need the waterway for power purposes, or for national defense involved in the alleged necessity-for-more-power angle, as stated. Aside from all our United States undeveloped power resources, Canada has the undeveloped Gatineau and the equipped, but idle, power plants at Niagara Falls. There is potentially no power shortage in Canada, nor is there actually any shortage now.

NO SHORTAGE THAT CANNOT BE MET

There are no grounds whatsoever on which to base a claim of shortage of power in New York State either, as of now or as of 1942. The present reserve and unused capacity of the existing utility companies of New York State is more than 30 percent above the demand.

There is no power shortage existing here or in Canada in fact, and none that can be contemplated, that could not and cannot be met quickly and at comparatively moderate cost by the erection or installation of steam plants should the occasion arise therefor.

In short, the power-shortage argument is defeated by facts proving "there ain't no such animal."

There are a lot of other things I would like to talk about, but I have talked longer now than I intended to do. However, I do not propose to quit until I say something else that is on my mind concerning the camouflage of necessity for this pet project of the Roosevelt dynasty when it is claimed it will contribute to national defense. That is an erroneous claim, born of a desire to take advantage of a situation and of the people.

MANPOWER SHORTAGE

I am opposed to the project at this time, particularly because there is presently a shortage of manpower, of engineers, of mechanics, and skilled labor. The shortage of equipment, particularly machines and tooling equipment, is pronounced at this moment. There is a shortage of certain materials, and skilled labor will be required to provide synthetic substitutes. You know, as I do, that the raising of money is becoming a serious question, and, with present obligations running into billions, the expenditures of public funds and the consumption of manpower, machines, and material and the use of machinery should at this time be restricted to bona fide national-defense projects.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE NEEDS USED AS A SUBTERFUGE

We should not lose sight of the fact that with the gigantic task of rearming for national defense actually under way for eventualities that may happen today, tomorrow, next week, or next month, and with a definite indication that if they happen at all they must happen soon, and with the further indication that when they happen it will be in great force, swift and sudden like a bolt of thunder from a clear sky, national-defense projects should be meticulously determined and not confused with projects that could not be completed or in operation for 6 or 7 years—long after national defense and rearmament have ceased to be an emergency. The term "national defense" should not at any time be used as a subterfuge to mislead the public and attain results under the cloak of national defense that are obviously not connected with the present emergency.

Just think of it! The St. Lawrence-Great Lakes navigation and power project contemplates a system of canals, dams, locks, and sluiceways to increase to 27 feet the depth of the St. Lawrence River in Canada and along the border of the United States, deepening the canals and channels connecting the Great Lakes, and installing waterpower plants on the St. Lawrence River which will require not less than 7 years for completion.

Bear in mind also that, aside from the requirements of the democracies, which are intensely urgent and over a wide scope, the United States also urgently requires all types of naval vessels, additional merchant vessels, guns, tanks, planes, munitions, machinery, and machines, as well as raw materials.

Do not overlook the fact that the task of helping the democracies to which this Nation is definitely obligated and the rearming for national defense will absorb all of the men, equipment, material, and money the United States can devote to it.

It is as true as that the sun rises and sets that any effort resulting in the diversion of men, equipment, material, and money from the task of rearming for national defense and for aiding the democracies to a half-baked "brainstorm" such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, would be a serious interference with the task of rearming and assisting the democracies that will undoubtedly result in serious embarrassment, and costly as well as futile sacrifice.

CHEAP TRANSPORTATION TALK A MIASMA

Its proponents say that the St. Lawrence seaway will furnish cheap transportation. For whom? From where? To where? I ask. We may as well ask those questions. We will not get the true answer from the proponents of the seaway. There are now a number of small foreign-flag ships operating on the Great Lakes today via the St. Lawrence River. They are bringing the products of Europe's mines, forests, factories, and agriculture—all produced by cheap labor, which convincingly reminds us that the standard of living of European labor is far below that of American labor.

FOREIGN FLAGS AND FOREIGN LABOR

If the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed with the proposed deeper draft, foreign-flag ocean vessels would, of course, quickly take advantage of this deeper draft and these ships would bring to America foreign agricultural products to compete with the American farmer and millions of tons of foreign coal to compete with the American miners. Do you want to pay for this? They would bring foreign ore, foreign steel, foreign mill and factory products—all produced by foreign labor at starvation wages—to compete with like American products. American ships will be eliminated from this trade. Is that what you want? They cannot operate in competition with foreign-flag ships which, due to their low scale of wages and other low operating costs, are able to operate under freight rates prohibitive to American operators. That is the picture.

THE VERMONT ANGLE

Mr. Speaker, in common with many others, I labored for a long time under the mistaken notion that the St. Lawrence Waterway might furnish the necessary basis for a valuable connection by way of St. Francis and Lake Champlain that would be of benefit to Vermont. I am now satisfied I was wrong.

I have spent many hours in conferences with those who are both for and against the project. I have studied the arguments and the entire proposition, both old and new. I have consulted officially and unofficially those who are in a position to know the facts with reference to the probability or even possibility of either profit to the people of Vermont generally, or the farmers in particular, or/and to the country at large.

The truth is the burden of expense and cost imposed will be so great and so irreducible as to make any alleged benefits insignificant.

There is no evidence that the project could be made self-sustaining and self-liquidating, and there is every indication that its cost and expense would be a continuing charge against the taxpayers.

MISTAKEN NOTIONS

The people of Vermont should no longer labor under the mistaken notion or misapprehension that the proposed St. Francis-Lake Champlain cut-off that might involve and include Lake Champlain and thereby benefit Vermont municipalities and areas surrounding is even a probability. It is not even a possibility.

The people of the State of Vermont ought also to be advised that the War Department district engineers and the Secretary of War declined to authorize the making of even a superficial survey of the proposed Champlain cut-off to connect with the St. Lawrence waterway, because their preliminary investigations showed that the costs would so greatly exceed any possible benefits to be derived from the project that the expenditure would not and could not be justified. So they did not make the survey.

VERMONT'S CONTRIBUTION NEVER JUSTIFIED

No possible situation can be conceived as ever developing, I am told, that would justify Vermont's contribution to the expense involved. The burden the taxpayers would have to bear would be so tremendously out of proportion as to more than offset for many years to come all the prophesied possible benefits that the proponents suggest might accrue.

Its cost is staggering—a billion to two billion dollars, possibly. The cost will have to be borne proportionately by the farmers and real-estate owners of Vermont and the other nontributary and nonbeneficiary States that now pay 36 percent of the Federal income. From 64 to 85 percent of the expense incident to the construction of this nonliquidating project will have to be paid proportionately by the farmers of Vermont and others who will derive no benefit whatever therefrom.

It follows, therefore, that Vermonters are not particularly interested in the St. Lawrence waterway because of any alleged benefit to accrue to them from the St. Francis proposed cut-off.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board opposes the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as indicated by the following major findings of its staff, which made an economic survey:

General conclusion: This economic survey of the St. Lawrence seaway and New York State-Ontario power project[1] conclusively demonstrates the proposed development, considered in its entirety as an undertaking which includes navigation as well as power works, to be unsound. The seaway would be so generally ruinous to American commerce and industry, labor, and capital, that its Nationwide deleterious effects would far exceed whatever claimed advantages might redound to certain special interests from the waterway or to New York State and the Province of Ontario from the power plan. The following findings tell why:

The minimum total cost of the whole St. Lawrence project for both the United States and Canada would be $1,120,588,000. This figure is founded on Government estimates. It is about three times the cost of the Panama Canal.

The St. Lawrence project, on the basis of experience with similar works, probably would cost more than the $1,120,588,000. A total of $375,000,000 was spent on the Panama Canal, although it had been estimated to cost only $160,000,000; the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal cost $53,000,000 instead of $16,000,000, and the Suez Canal cost $80,000,000 instead of $30,000,000.

At least 85 percent of the United States share of the project's cost would be borne by American taxpayers who would be the victims of unfair discrimination. These taxpayers live in the region which could not be benefited by the St. Lawrence seaway even if claims of proponents were valid.

American labor, transportation, and industry, on the Government's estimates of probable seaway traffic, would lose $109,647,000 a year. Diversion of business from American transportation systems to foreign carriers, diversion of Canadian export grain movement from the United States and loss to American coal producers account for this figure.

The net loss to the United States would be $76,595,000 each year on the basis of the Government's estimates of seaway traffic. This sum represents the difference between two factors: One is the loss to established American commerce and industry plus the expense to American taxpayers; the other is the possible rate saving by shipping via the St. Lawrence.

During 42 percent of the year the St. Lawrence seaway could not be fully utilized. The route would be closed because of ice conditions.

The American farmer would not gain from the St. Lawrence seaway. Export grain would be the chief American agricultural product to be shipped through the waterway. Even if a possible maximum saving of 3 cents a bushel were realized, this would be absorbed by the foreign purchaser and vessel owner.

American manufacturers who have cultivated this country's great inland market would be seriously damaged by foreign competition resulting from the St. Lawrence seaway. Alien tramp steamers would dump cheaply produced commodities on this currently protected Great Lakes market.

Foreign tramp ships would have almost exclusive use of the St. Lawrence seaway. American-owned vessels of sufficiently shallow draft to ply the proposed waterway comprise only 5 percent of the world's merchantship tonnage.

No route for more profitable trade between American ports would be offered by the St. Lawrence seaway. The location of the St. Lawrence is such that no appreciable coastal or intercoastal commerce would occur.

The St. Lawrence seaway would not carry the volume of traffic nor bring the savings in shipping rates to the exaggerated degree cited by many proponents. They have set the probable tonnage at 11,496,000 and the probable savings at $45,516,000 annually. The more accurate estimate is 3,873,000 for tonnage and $8,822,000 for savings.

The net loss each year to American commerce and industry and to the American taxpayer, on the basis of more accurate figures for estimated tonnages and savings, would be $42,233,000. The United States investment in the St. Lawrence waterway would result in lower earnings and higher taxes.

Maintenance of wholly cordial relations between the United States and Canada might be endangered by the St. Lawrence seaway. Serious questions could arise as to responsibility for defense of the waterway in times of war and as to preservation of water levels in Canadian harbors on the lower St. Lawrence River.

Surrender of United States sovereignty over Lake Michigan would result from any treaty which, like the proposed treaty of 1938, limited the withdrawal of water from the lake at Chicago. It would prevent further development of the Great Lakes-Gulf of Mexico waterway by the United States.

The proposal for restoration of Niagara Falls' beauty and for further power generation there has been inexcusably made contingent on the whole St. Lawrence project: There is no engineering demand for tying up the needed Niagara Falls project with the St. Lawrence development.

The United States would subsidize Canadian power to the extent of $48,860,000: This figure is reached by taking the minimum cost ($90,000,000) for the Canadian share of the power, under the least expensive plan yet advanced, and deducting costs strictly chargeable to power ($41,140,000), under the present plan.

It is perfectly practical to divorce the seaway and power portions of the general St. Lawrence plan: There is no justification for burdening the proposed power development with the unsound seaway proposal.

The amount of power which would be created on the United States side of the river for $206,065,000 under the present St. Lawrence scheme could be produced for only $90,000,000 without the navigation project: The St. Lawrence Power Development Commission set $90,000,000 as a reasonable cost of power works on the American side of the International Rapids section.

Whatever power benefits might result from the St. Lawrence project would affect only the State of New York and eastern Canada: The St. Lawrence plan does not envision sale of United States power beyond the confines of New York State.

Neither New York City nor western New York is a practical market for St. Lawrence power: Under existing delivery conditions, power from nearer sources is more practical and economical for these areas.

Previous estimates of increased power demand in New York State are too optimistic: The Niagara Frontier Planning Board finds that the demand in 1952 probably will not exceed 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Overdevelopment of hydroelectric power is a dangerous policy to pursue. When generating plants are built without an adequate market for the power, the capital charges accumulate to such an extent that the project never pays.

Adequate and economical power potentialities, apart from the St. Lawrence River, exist today in New York State and eastern Canada: Two outstanding examples are the Ottawa River in Canada and Niagara Falls.

Progressive development of Niagara Falls power potentialities independent of the seaway and in step with power needs is the most practical plan: This would eliminate economic hazards to the new developments and to existing plants.

[1] The project is popularly known simply as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. A more appropriate title, however, is the one used here: The St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State-Ontario power project. The latter is more explanatory because, while the seaway would affect large regions throughout the United States and Canada, the St. Lawrence power development, as planned in the international scheme, would supply hydroelectric energy only to the State of New York and the Province of Ontario.

THE VERMONT ATTITUDE

The Senate and House of Representatives of Vermont in legislature assembled adopted the following joint resolution in concurrence:

No. 2929. Joint resolution opposing St. Lawrence waterway project

Whereas the President of the United States has announced that he will propose to the Congress of the United States that it take the necessary action to authorize completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

Whereas the claim that the United States needs the St. Lawrence seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the seaway project are out of all proportion to any industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue from the project; and

Whereas competent authorities have pointed out that the waterway would be icebound 5 months of the year; that no provision for tolls is contemplated; that free use of the waterway for foreign shipping would injure New York State and New England economy, ruin our railroads and our seaports on the Atlantic coast; and that the Great Lakes area would be deluged with cheap products of foreign countries to the injury of American industry, labor, and agriculture; and

Whereas during the navigation season the comparatively narrow ship channel of the St. Lawrence would make vessels easy targets of bombers and afford abundant opportunity through sabotage or bombing to destroy the locks and dams in the St. Lawrence, thus gravely interrupting traffic; and

Whereas in view of the existing urgent national-defense production needs it would appear most unwise to divert men, money, materials, and machinery to construct a waterway which would be in disastrous competition with New York State's canal system and New England railroads; and

Whereas the United States should concentrate now upon the construction of airplanes, ships, guns, tanks, and other munitions, and not waste public funds, material resources, and effort on a waterway project against which so many seriously important and valid economic objections have been raised; and

Whereas the President's assertion that the United States "needs this great landlocked sea as a haven in which it will always be to build ships and more ships in order to protect our trade and our shores" has been sharply challenged; and

Whereas it would seem an act of national folly to dissipate labor and resources on a project not vitally necessary and which could not be placed in operation before 1948: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, That the people of the State of Vermont, represented in the General Assembly, therefore affirm their opposition to use of the St. Lawrence River for establishment of a deeper seaway, and hereby record their opposition to the construction of a St. Lawrence River seaway as highly unwarranted in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.
LEE E. EMERSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved April 9, 1941.

WILLIAM H. WILLIS,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, the project is economically unsound. From the standpoint of national defense it is indefensible. The methods employed in an undertaking to force the Congress to ratify an agreement made under duress of war reflect no credit on anybody.

THE SPILLWAY FOR TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

And I want to say another thing, Mr. Speaker, and get it out of my system. This St. Lawrence waterway pet project is nothing more or less than a spillway for the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

It is almost impossible for me to believe that a President would go so far to advance the interests of his pet project in times of an emergency such as now confronts us. As an adjunct to national defense, the project is so far separated from the body politic as to have died of its own inanimateness had it not been revived by Presidential inoculation.

President Roosevelt—and nobody in his right mind should envy him his job in this difficult time—has trouble enough. More power to him and more strength to him as he undertakes to remedy a situation which, if not restricted, has potentialities to make national defense impossible. He has problems on his hands which will take all his time and exhaust all his ingenuity and strength without mixing in this issue, which involves one of his pet projects.

The people are fed up with incompetency and with a lot of words. What they want is action. Let the President forget his egocentric monomania. Let him delegate his granted power to men equally if not more competent than he. Let him get it into his head that God never made one man competent to handle alone a situation such as confronts the President.

He has been afraid to delegate power and authority, or, if not afraid, at any rate he has not done so, and that is the clearest demonstration to me that he seems to lack the essential qualities of such an administrator as this country needs in this emergency. It is time to call a spade a spade.

The present national state of affairs is directly traceable to the failure of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to let go of anything. "L'etat c'est moi" is the Louis XIV curse of this administration. Nobody is to blame but the President. He has assumed and reserved and retained to himself all the power, while he has asked for more all the time, only to demonstrate either his incompetence or indisposition to deal with a situation which he could have avoided but which now confronts us.

I am for unity. I am for the President as Commander in Chief, and so are you. But I know God never made any man big enough to do what Franklin D. Roosevelt attempts to do all alone. I am opposed to his attempts to concentrate all power in himself. I do not believe he has any Messianic ability.

God save the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE YOUNGER, PRETTIER NURSE ISSUE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report to the House a matter which has caused me great humiliation and embarrassment. I do not wish to make a point of personal privilege, because this would involve a controversy with newspaper reporters, fellow Members, and the fair sex, but I deem it my duty to report the facts to the House.

Last week I took the floor to speak in favor of the amendment of my colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, providing for the training of student nurses as well as the refresher courses and postgraduate courses for former nurses. Due I hope in some small part to my efforts, this meritorious amendment was adopted by the House. In that speech, I pointed out that statistics showed that we did not have a sufficient number of nurses already trained to take care of the present emergency. To my amazement and horror, this was garbled and distorted as follows in the public press:

Representative VORYS (Republican) of Ohio, today advocated more "younger and prettier nurses" for the national-defense program.

A naval air pilot in the last war, VORYS said that World War nurses were not easy on the eye and insisted that the 1941 soldiers are entitled to a bit of glamor when they are sick.

"Do you want 'em younger?" a colleague shouted.

"Yes," answered VORYS.

The reporters' notes and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I made no such statement. I may have mumbled something about the unavailability for this emergency of nurses who were fair, fat, and 40, but I made no cry for younger, prettier nurses nor for glamorous nurses, nor did I slur the beauty of the nurses we had in the World War. The cry for younger, prettier nurses for this emergency came, not from me, but from colleagues on this floor who shouted out interruptions during my speech, confusing the reporters on the floor and in the press gallery—Members who now, when under fire, have developed a passion for anonymity.

Nevertheless, this newspaper report which went all over the country has caused me to receive many letters, of which the following is a sample:

Mr.: I bet you look like an old goat yourself. I served in the World War, and I still keep my girlish figure and still serving good old Uncle Sam. What do you look like?

This garbled news story was also the occasion for an editorial in the Ohio State Journal, from which I quote:

From several points of view, Congressman JOHN VORYS is absolutely right in urging that an effort be made to select Army nurses with oodles of oomph and great gobs of glamor. * * * with wisps of hair (blond or brunet, whichever you prefer) straying from beneath the cap, and fluttering a saucy challenge in the breeze.

However, the thermometer reading might not be very reliable.

And there might conceivably be a concerted effort on the part of the entire Army to get hospitalized. Also, there might be a tendency to make convalescence last as long as possible.

There are attractive Army nurses in service, and of course there are some who are just average. This is as it should be. Sweethearts and wives back home don't want too much competition.

These misrepresentations of my remarks have done me a double-barreled injustice. First, I am in wrong with the, not older, but shall we say unyounger nurses and ex-nurses of the land; second, I am in wrong with the sweethearts and wives of our trainees, who do not want their loved ones in camp to enjoy poor health.

I am particularly shocked that I should be falsely quoted as saying that World War nurses were not easy on the eyes. The truth is that my memories are the exact opposite of this statement. The beauty and fame of World War nurses were made immortal in songs of '17 and '18 which you all remember:

I don't want to get well;
I don't want to get well;
I'm in love with a beautiful nurse.

Every World War veteran here will remember the other song:

Good night, nurse; tell the doctor I'm no better.

The World War nurse was further made immortal in a whole stanza from the song Mademoiselle from Armentieres, beginning—

The Army nurse is a wonderful nurse,
Parlez-vous?—

And so on. Now, the truth is that the best nurse I ever had was gray-haired and fiftyish, and we all loved her. The truth is that whatever her individual age, shape, looks, or weight, a real nurse, efficient, tireless, thoughtful, and courageous, enduring privation and danger, long hours without rest, under constant pressure from overworked doctors, under the everlasting wheedling, whining, crabbing, kidding, demanding, pleading, coaxing, complaining of the boys under her care—such a nurse, in her trim white uniform against the drab background of a service hospital filled with ornery hepatients, looks like an angel of mercy, a vision of loveliness to every one of them,

for she is the eternal feminine, the sister-sweetheart-mother of us all, looking after her menfolks when they need her.

So I say to the nurses, God bless 'em, for they are women; God bless 'em.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; and

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 774. An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will continue public hearings on the subject of royalty payments and the freezing of funds, covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 12, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, June 13, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. (Postponement of meeting of Thursday, June 12, 1941.)

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Builidng, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873, a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

632. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed language for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1942, to permit the Secretary to make and sell microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

633. A letter from the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting suggestions for legislation clarifying the relationship between the office of the Comptroller General and the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

634. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Licking River at Salyersville, Magoffin County, Ky., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

635. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Cold Spring Inlet, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 29, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 262); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

636. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 25, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tiffin River and tributaries, Ohio and Michigan, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

637. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of the Intracoastal Waterway between Charleston, S. C., and the St. Johns River, Fla., with a view to determining whether it is advisable to construct an anchorage basin at Buckingham Landing, Mackay Creek, Beaufort County, S. C., at this time, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted October 24, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

638. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted July 11, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

639. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 1, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Meredosia Bay, Ill., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 1, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

640. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Port Watsonville Harbor, Calif., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 11, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

641. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Crystal River, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 28, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

642. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Dugdemona Bayou, La., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5027. A bill to codify title 3 of the United tSates Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5028. A bill to provide for fire escapes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 5029. A bill to encourage the consumption of agricultural commodities, promote the general welfare, facilitate the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

My Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5030. A bill to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 5031. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Pulajane and Moro campaigns, and other uprisings in the Philippine Islands from July 16, 1903, to December 31, 1913, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 5032. A bill to permit the importation of defense articles by or on behalf of the United States free of import duty or import tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5033. A bill providing that any person holding any civil, elective, or appointive office shall not forfeit the same by reason of military service in the armed forces of the United States in time of national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5034. A bill to suspend the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a period of 1 year commencing July 1, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5035. A bill to amend title 29, section 157 of the Code of Laws of the United States, by the addition thereto of section 157 (A) prohibiting those opposed to the Government of the United States from becoming members of any labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 5036. A bill providing for the acquisition of additional lands for the Nansemond Ordnance Depot, Nansemond County, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis L. Jacobs and Dr. Louis Sachs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Albert Spillman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 5040. A bill for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1366. By Mr. CARTER: Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, memorializing the Congress to take such steps as are necessary to provide that the brush, debris, and other materials in the area to be covered by water from Shasta Dam be removed prior to the time the area is flooded; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1367. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 47, memorializing the Congress to aid in furthering the development of Highway 20; to the Committee on Roads.

1368. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., approving a national-defense program for the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1369. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, favoring the preservation of the cane-sugar refinery industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1370. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Olga Cochran and other residents of Mount Vernon, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2475, to protect the health and morale of men called for service under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1371. Also, petition of Rev. H. C. Mayhew and other residents of Mount Vernon, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2475, to protect the health and morale of men called for service under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1372. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing the cane-sugar refining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1373. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by G. M. MacLafferty and 50 other citizens of Coos County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1374. Also, petition signed by Walter Haffner and 76 other citizens of Columbia County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1375. Also, petition signed by Theresia Robinson and 24 other citizens of Columbia County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1376. Also, petition signed by J. P. Simpson and 40 other citizens of Polk County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1377. Also, petition signed by Peter J. Rennings and 40 other citizens, of Marion County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1378. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of Mrs. Lafern Trainer, of Volborg, Mont., and 17 others, of Custer County, Mont., opposing enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, particularly because those measures would enable a majority of the barbers of the District of Columbia to effect a compulsory observance of a religious day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1379. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the State of California, asking consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relative to the proposed Loma Prieta State Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1380. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1381. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of M. E. DeMoss and 55 other citizens, of northern Iowa, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our Refuge and our Strength: We thank Thee for the gifts of life, of love, and beauty, betokening the perpetual springtime with which Thou visitest the human soul. And as we lift our eyes and hands to greet Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, bestow on us with balm of light and heavenly dew the grace that comes from Thine own self, with healing in its wings, that we may be drawn from joy to each new opening joy into the realm of full forgetfulness of pain.

So let Thy love for us prevail that even when our vision fails and darkness falls we may find the darkness to be but Thine own enfolding garment. And when our day of life is o'er may the wings of night be unto us as the wings of God, under whose shadow we shall find eternal rest and peace, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, June 11, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of Harlan F. Stone, of New York, to be Chief Justice of the United States in place of Charles Evans Hughes, retired as of July 1, 1941; of James Francis Byrnes, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in place of James Clark McReynolds, retired; and of Robert H. Jackson, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in place of Harlan F. Stone, nominated to be Chief Justice of the United States; and also submitting several other nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 587. An act to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937; and

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burton	Ellender
Aiken	Butler	George
Andrews	Byrd	Gerry
Bailey	Byrnes	Gillette
Ball	Capper	Glass
Bankhead	Caraway	Green
Bone	Chandler	Guffey
Brewster	Chavez	Gurney
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Brooks	Clark, Mo.	Herring
Brown	Connally	Hill
Bulow	Danaher	Holman
Bunker	Downey	Houston

Johnson, Calif.	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	Norris	Tobey
Kilgore	Overton	Tunnell
La Follette	Pepper	Tydings
Lodge	Rosier	Vandenberg
Lucas	Shipstead	Van Nuys
McCarran	Smathers	Wallgren
McFarland	Smith	Walsh
McKellar	Spencer	Wheeler
McNary	Stewart	White
Maloney	Taft	
Mead	Thomas, Idaho	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of the serious illness of a close associate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOMINATION OF SENATOR BYRNES TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a nomination which has been sent to the Senate by the President.

The VICE PRFSIDENT. Without objection, and as in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a nomination, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of JAMES FRANCIS BYRNES, of South Carolina, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice James Clark McReynolds, retired.

Mr. GLASS. I move that the nomination of our colleague the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, be now considered without reference to a committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, out of respect and even devotion to the Members of this body, it has been the unbroken custom to adopt such a proposal as that made by the eminent Senator from Virginia, and I join him in his motion.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee it is with great pleasure that I second the motion of the senior Senator from Virginia.

I have been a Member of this body for 8 years. One of the first friendships that I made as a new Member was that of the nominee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I know I voice the sentiment of all Members on both sides of the Chamber in saying that we look upon the departure of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] as a Member of this body as a severe loss to the Senate and to the country.

As an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court he will render distinguished service, as he has done as a Member of the Senate. He has been fundamentally sound in his statesmanship. He will be fundamentally sound as a jurist in all his activities on our highest Court of Appeals.

It is, therefore, Mr. President, with much pleasure that I second the motion of the senior Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the jurisdiction over District of Columbia credit unions from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Comptroller of the Currency to the Farm Credit Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAND ACQUISITIONS, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Executive Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, together with the cost of each tract and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, favoring the allocation of funds for and the prompt construction of the Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs in connection with the flow of the Mahoning River furnishing water to industrial and steel plants in the Mahoning Valley from Newton Falls, Ohio, to New Castle, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 68

"Whereas the history of Texas bears witness that the people of this State oppose to the last drop of blood, and the last breath in their bodies, tyranny and aggression; and that they love liberty even more than life itself; and Texas and Texans have never hesitated to enter the fray when this two-headed monster, tyranny and aggression, has threatened their homes and their ideals.

"The bloody fields of San Jacinto, Goliad, and the Alamo give mute testimony to these facts; Shiloh and the Wilderness in the Civil War, and the impetuous charge at San Juan Hill were altars upon which they made their sacrifices; and Chateau Thierry and the Meuse-Argonne confirm the willingness of Texans to make the ultimate sacrifice to preserve freedom, liberty, justice, and peace in all the world; and

"Whereas two divergent philosophies of government are now embraced in a deadly struggle that has drawn into its flaming vortex most of the countries of Europe; and the totalitarian states have sworn to extirpate democracies and democratic people from the face of the earth, and are now at war with our ideals and our way of life that we cherish as a heritage; and Great Britain is the last remaining barricade sheltering our Nation from the forces of tyranny and aggression: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Texas, speaking for the people of Texas, inform the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States:

"That the people of Texas, in these days of peril to ourselves and all democracies throughout the world, are unified behind the foreign policies of President Roosevelt, and desire that a firm policy toward the aggressor nation be maintained without thought of appeasement, and that Great Britain be given all possible aid until victory is won, so that the epitaph of Christian civilization may not be 'too little and too late,' and that steps be taken to impress upon both capital and labor the full realization of their responsibilities for national defense, so that strikes and lock-outs may not occur and imperil the safety of this Nation and our civilization over a few pieces of silver; and

"That Texans are and will remain true to their historic heritage, and are willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary that our Nation and our posterity may live in peace, freedom, and liberty; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States, so that the President and the Congress and all the world may know that Texans still honor the principles of their fathers."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Allen County, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of Topeka and Dodge City, Kans., praying for the

enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying that the United States keep out of foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Somerville, Mass., praying that the United States use convoys to assure the safe delivery of goods to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the Pilgrim Association of Congregational Churches, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to provide for feeding the starving peoples of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the table:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in opposition to proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry

"Whereas it is the established policy of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to preserve the domestic sugar-refining industry in Massachusetts, as evidenced by Massachusetts House Document No. 1296 of 1934, favoring Federal legislation for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry, which legislation the Congress subsequently enacted in 1934, thereby protecting consumers in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the United States on the supply and price of sugar; and

"Whereas existing Federal law provides a readily accessible supply of raw cane sugar from Central and South American countries, which, as our Government experts on defense and consumers' needs have stated, is ample for United States consumption; and

"Whereas legislation by the Congress is being considered and which, if enacted, would deprive this sound Massachusetts industry of much of its raw material, would deprive our good neighbors of Latin-American countries of the market for their product, and would add millions of dollars to the huge subsidy now given to the beet-sugar industry, thereby increasing the burden upon the American consumer: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges upon the Congress of the United States to oppose any change in existing Federal law that would create unemployment in this Commonwealth, further overburden the consumer, and detract from existing good will between the United States and the Latin-American countries, so necessary in this time of national emergency; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, June 5, 1941."

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND PREVENTION OF VICE CONDITIONS IN VICINITY OF MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. TUNNELL presented 16 identical petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., which were ordered to lie on the table; and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the names attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas certain bills (notably S. 860 and H. R. 4000) have been introduced into Congress, "To provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments"; and

Whereas military authorities now possess all necessary power to control the sale of alcoholic beverages to members of the land and naval forces; and

Whereas certain sections of these bills are, we believe, unconstitutional; and

Whereas the control of alcoholic beverages and the control of prostitution are unrelated, and therefore ought not to be combined in one piece of legislation; and

Whereas we believe the enactment of these bills into law would establish an unwise and dangerous precedent, and would be opposed to the general welfare of citizens of the several States and obstructive to the common defense of the United States:

We, the undersigned, citizens of Delaware, respectfully request that these bills be reported unfavorably.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COURT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present for printing in the body of the RECORD and appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Court of New Hampshire opposing the authorization of a flood-control project in the so-called Sugar Hill location, New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution to oppose the authorization of a flood-control project at Sugar Hill

Whereas a new flood-control bill is being considered in the United States Congress which would substitute authorization of a dam at Sugar Hill, in the town of Lisbon, N. H., for one previously authorized at Bethlehem Junction; and

Whereas this general court gave its consent to the Bethlehem Junction project by an act adopted May 31, 1939, known as chapter 149, Laws of 1939, and

Whereas citizens of Lisbon, Littleton, and other Ammonoosuc Valley towns have voted unanimously at a mass protest meeting their opposition to the Sugar Hill dam project and have requested that this general court go on record in opposition to any Federal authorization for building a flood-control dam at said Sugar Hill, but reaffirming approval of the Bethlehem Junction dam site as already authorized; and

Whereas the new proposed project would entail considerable loss to the towns of Lisbon and Littleton and disrupt the economic relations between the towns in said area; and

Whereas no protest has been voiced by the citizens of Bethlehem to the Bethlehem Junction project already approved by Federal authorities and consented to by this State: Now, therefore

The house of representatives in general court convened (the senate concurring), hereby resolves, That this general court records its opposition to Federal authorization for building a flood-control dam at Sugar Hill, in the town of Lisbon, and directs the Governor of the State to forward forthwith copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, the President of the Senate of said body, the chairman of the congressional Flood Control Committee, and to each of the Representatives and Senators of this State in the United States Congress.

RESOLUTIONS OF YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BRIDGES presented a resolution adopted by the twenty-second annual convention of the Yankee Division Veterans Association, at Manchester, N. H., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the twenty-second annual convention, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Saturday, June 7, 1941

We of the Yankee Division Veterans Association hereby go on record at our twenty-second national convention being held in Manchester, N. H., as favoring the passing of necessary laws, rules, and regulations governing the transportation of all supplies for Great Britain and all the democracies with the necessary assurance that these supplies will reach their point of destination; be it further

Resolved, That we heartily approve and endorse the return to the age-old policy of the United States to the freedom of the seas.

Mr. BRIDGES also presented resolutions adopted by the twenty-second annual convention of the Yankee Division Veterans Association at Manchester, N. H., which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the twenty-second annual convention, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Saturday, June 7, 1941

We hereby resolve that the Yankee Division Veterans Association go on record with the suggestion that Congress posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell for his patriotic service and foresight in recommending an adequate air force to function as a separate unit of the armed force of the United States.

Resolution adopted at the twenty-second annual convention, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Saturday, June 7, 1941

Be it hereby resolved, That we, the Yankee Division Veterans Association, in meeting at twenty-second national convention, in Manchester, N. H., do hereby favor the passage of bill known as H. R. 4523.

This bill recognizes the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces.

Resolution adopted at the twenty-second annual convention, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Saturday, June 7, 1941

Be it hereby resolved, That we of the the Yankee Division Veterans Association hereby go on record as approving of delegating the necessary powers to the President of the United States in this period of national emergency for any and all programs of national defense which will safeguard the lives, the property, and the security of the citizens of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we of the Yankee Division Veterans Association, assembled in Manchester, N. H., for our twenty-second annual convention, do hereby pledge ourselves to aid, assist, and support the President of the United States of America in fulfilling the necessary requirements in this program of national defense during the present period of national emergency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1557. A bill to provide for reimbursement to the holders of cotton pool participation trust certificates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 437).

S. Res. 117. Resolution relating to a formula for determining parity prices for basic farm commodities (submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma May 15, 1941); with amendments (Rept. No. 439).

By Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 293. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an assay office at Helena, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 438).

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; with amendments (Rept. No. 440).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 11, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 774) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1630. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the line of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HERRING:

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an academy for training persons for civilian positions in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1632. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 587. An act to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. BROWN, the Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 899) for the relief of Ernest A. McNabb, and it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, which was on page 1, to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 2. That section 506 (h) of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "for wheat and other agricultural commodities" and by inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following words: "and preparatory to the application of the act to other basic commodities when so provided by law, shall assemble data relative to field corn, for the purpose of establishing a satisfactory actuarial basis for such commodity."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

FUNDS EXPENDED BY PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of the Interior and the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, following my remarks, a break-down showing how the money from the Puerto Rican relief was spent, what remains, what was in the revolving fund, and what was expended permanently.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 11, 1941.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Territories and Insular Affairs Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Pursuant to your request in connection with your consideration of S. 1358 for a statement of the purposes for which funds made available to the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration have been expended I submit the following summary:

Funds made available by allocations from appropriations under the Emergency Relief Appropriations Acts of 1935 to 1937, and by direct appropriations under succeeding relief acts, including fiscal year 1941	$69,904,000
Projects and programs for which above funds will have been obligated by June 1941 (round figures):	
General rural rehabilitation	12,229,700
Rural and urban housing	9,081,700
Hydroelectric projects	9,269,400
Forest and reforestation	3,434,000
University building (including School of Tropical Medicine)	2,875,000
Cattle-tick eradication	1,765,000
Soil conservation	1,668,900
Administrative expenses, including construction of administration buildings and official censes of Puerto Rico	5,136,700
Cement plant	1,455,000
Projects and programs for which above funds will have been obligated by June 1941 (round figures)—Continued.	
Various Army and Navy projects	$1,152,700
Construction and repairs of schools	1,950,800
Swamp drainage for malaria control and land reclamation	1,743,500
Roads and streets	2,355,800
Water and sewer systems not included under other headings	780,000
Loans to cooperatives and individual farmers	7,900,900
Land purchased for rural rehabilitation	3,600,900
Construction and repair of public buildings, parks, and recreational facilities	1,798,200
Miscellaneous activities not classified above	1,615,000
Total	69,814,000
Estimated obligations for fiscal year 1941 for projects authorized by President for financing out of revolving fund created by act of Feb. 11, 1936:	
Operation, disposition and sale of sugar lands	180,000
Rentals and taxes on leased lands, repaid in turn by sublessees	78,794
Operation and maintenance of housing projects, including $40,000 reserves for future replacements and repairs	180,000
Total	438,794
Total estimated obligations	70,252,794

No appropriation has been sought for the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration for the fiscal year 1942. But consideration must be given to the fact that as a result of previous Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration activities the Government has acquired properties valued at approximately $18,000,000, most of which, including secured loans and some 8,000 dwelling units, are income-producing. To safeguard these assets and to conserve social and economic benefits which might be completely lost if the entire Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration program were suddenly terminated, it would seem essential to continue certain limited activities. This can be done through the medium of projects to be approved by the President out of the revolving fund created by the act of February 11, 1936. There is approximately $3,000,000 in that fund, resulting exclusively from Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration operations.

To maintain the fund as a truly revolving fund, amendment of the act of February 11, 1936, by the provisions of S. 1358 is desirable. Thereby income derived and proceeds of the disposition of property produced by the revolving fund itself will go back into the revolving fund. The limited Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration projects which await Presidential approval for financing out of the revolving fund during the coming fiscal year, have been so planned that I believe they will result in no eventual depletion of the revolving fund if S. 1358 is approved. I enclose a detailed break-down of expenditures in connection with the projects listed above.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. BURLEW,
First Assistant Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration—Approximate amounts of expenses incurred for certain general and specific programs, to June 30, 1941

General or specific program	Approximate expenses incurred under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of—						Grand total
	1935 (fiscal year 1936)	1936 (fiscal year 1937)	1937 (fiscal year 1938)	1938 (fiscal year 1939)	1939 (fiscal year 1940)	1940 (fiscal year 1941)	
Urban housing developments	$2,426,400	$298,900					$2,725,300
Hydroelectric projects	2,727,000	754,000	$1,830,700	$972,700	$1,018,100	$1,966,900	9,269,400
Forestation	1,242,000	1,205,600	249,200	336,800	193,400	207,000	3,434,000
University buildings	1,395,600	397,500	270,800	8,000			2,071,900
School of Tropical Medicine	51,100	119,500	134,100	294,900	199,500	4,800	803,900
Cattle-tick eradication	295,300		364,900	436,500	428,800	239,500	1,765,000
Coconut bud-rot eradication	117,300		8,200				125,500
Loans: Lafayette, including land sold to land cooperative which has been reconveyed to the Government; includes also $550,000 for the butyl alcohol plant, and $545,000 operating expenses (latter partly repaid)	5,127,500					150,000	5,277,500
Los Caños	954,000					150,000	1,104,000
Other cooperatives, and individual farmers, and overhead expenses	717,800			256,900	254,700	290,000	1,519,400
Land purchase, rural rehabilitation including surveying, legal expenses, etc.:							
Lafayette—other than land sold to land cooperatives, included under "Loans to Lafayette"	829,010						
All other rural rehabilitation lands, such as coffee, tobacco, fruit, and central resettlement areas	2,771,890						
	3,600,900						3,600,900
Construction of central service farms	306,400			57,200	40,300	900	404,800
Land utilization and operation of central service farms	1,239,900		159,300	904,200	923,200	46,600	3,273,200
Workers reconstruction camps and educational units	1,562,500	217,700	72,000				1,852,200
Construction of animal sheds and purchase of animals	182,600	9,600	100	119,400	86,900	3,900	402,500
Construction of farmers' houses	3,450,900			754,200	1,709,100	442,200	6,356,400
Coffee, tobacco, and fruit (wages for workers)	3,468,100	200,000	340,500				4,008,600
Agricultural extension, canning and home demonstration	149,800		21,900	26,700	189,300		387,700
Highways, roads, and streets	183,200	792,600	647,700	523,200	202,500	6,600	2,355,800
Waterworks and sewers	104,800	222,100	189,700	54,900	162,000	46,500	780,000
Cement plant	1,163,500		280,900	10,600			1,455,000
Administrative expenses (including aerial map and administration buildings, $256,000)	3,178,500	174,900	403,300	564,500	371,800	229,200	4,922,200
Census (1935)	214,500						214,500
Sanitation and health works and social service	104,400	388,500	560,700	281,300	4,900	16,600	1,356,400
Construction and equipment of health units		349,500	80,400	7,300			437,200
Construction and repair of public buildings		99,400	225,500	328,800	101,900	1,900	757,500
Construction and repairs of parks and recreational facilities		82,800	4,100	11,600	22,500		121,000
Soil conservation			298,100	488,100	477,100	405,600	1,668,900
Vanilla projects		33,100	2,400				35,500
War Department projects		351,100	132,600	523,300			1,006,400
Navy Department projects			21,700	84,900	39,700		146,300
Schools (construction and repairs)			1,207,600	687,500	55,700		1,950,800
Boys' Orphan Asylum			399,900				399,900
Malaria control and swamp drainage				1,224,300	518,300	900	1,743,500
Commodities distribution project				164,000			164,000
Agronomy and marketing section					26,400		26,400
Irrigation canal and power plant (Isabela)					67,000	15,600	82,600
Agricultural liquidation						356,900	356,900
Miscellaneous	778,300	140,400	148,000	73,600	168,500	142,200	1,451,000
Total	34,742,300	5,837,200	8,053,700	9,195,400	7,261,600	4,723,800	69,814,000

SAFETY ON HIGHWAYS—SUGGESTIONS BY THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in his recent proclamation declaring an unlimited emergency, the President of the United States called upon the American people to eliminate "waste and needless friction." It is an appeal to all citizens to give individual cooperation in eliminating those things which serve to delay and retard the national-defense program. Of particular importance in this connection are traffic accidents and traffic confusion resulting from unprecedented highway movements in many sections of the country. It is estimated that some 500 men, women, and children were killed in traffic mishaps over the recent Memorial Day week end. Every precaution is being taken to see that the forthcoming Fourth of July week end does not bring a repetition of this tragic situation.

Cooperating with Federal and State agencies is the American Automobile Association, with its 725 affiliated clubs and branches, including my own State organization, the Automobile Club of Rhode Island. The A. A. A. has prepared and is widely distributing some very timely advice to motorists in the way of suggestions when encountering military convoys, rules for safe driving and safe walking, and what visitors to military camps and training centers should know to prevent delay and loss of time when visiting these centers. With the thought that this information is important to all citizens, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR MOTORISTS ENCOUNTERING MILITARY CONVOYS

(Prepared by American Automobile Association and approved by War Department)

Frequently military convoys moving on the open highway will have sufficient space between vehicles to permit civilian motorists to pass the column provided all safety precautions, such as not passing on hills, curves, and the like, are observed. As in any other case, the passing driver is responsible for safe clearance.

When traveling through cities the column may be closed up, and, if adequately escorted by police, will move at a normal speed and may go through stop lights and stop signs. Under such circumstances motorists should not attempt to break through the column or to drive alongside.

If overtaken by a convoy in the city, pull over to one side of the street in the same manner as when an ambulance or a fire engine is approaching.

On the open highway, even though the vehicles are somewhat spread out, the convoy, when escorted by State police, may go through a stop light. When approaching an intersection through which an Army vehicle is moving, slow down and make sure that no additional vehicles are coming before driving through, even though the light is green. This precaution should be followed both in the city and on the open highway.

The complete cooperation of the walking and driving public is essential to efficient military and civil traffic. The observation of good driving practices will facilitate military movements and at the same time result in a minimum of inconvenience to civilian traffic.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SAFE DRIVING AND SAFE WALKING

Keep your place in the line of traffic and avoid weaving. Keep a steady driving pace and avoid spurts of high speed.

Take plenty of time for your trip. Get an early start.

Avoid passing on hills, curves, and at street intersections.

Take a restful position at the wheel. Grasp the wheel lightly to avoid tenseness. Avoid eye strain caused by staring ahead.

Adjust the driver's seat so there will be no strain in reaching the accelerator and brakes.

Drive within your headlights at night. Check brakes so they will stop within the distance revealed clearly ahead.

Keep on right side of the road.

Be sure the car is in good mechanical condition—brakes, tires, and steering wheel in particular.

PEDESTRIANS

Obey traffic signals and officers at controlled intersections.

Look carefully in both directions before crossing streets.

Never cross street on highways from between parked cars.

Walk facing oncoming traffic when on rural highways.

Wear or carry something white when walking on highways after dark.

WHAT VISITORS TO MILITARY CAMPS SHOULD KNOW

During the travel season of 1941 thousands of relatives and friends will be planning visits to men in khaki now under arms. The United States War Department suggests the following steps to assure quick contact by relatives or friends of soldiers:

1. Know the exact location of camp, number of division, number of regiment, battalion or squadron, letter designating company, battery, or troop, and also branch of service, such as Infantry, Cavalry, Quartermaster Corps, Ordnance, etc., of person to be visited. The full name and initials of the man in the service should be given. In many instances men with identical names are in the same outfit so delays are avoided by exactness.

2. Check on visiting hours: Usually Wednesday and Saturday afternoons are "free time" for the men in camps unless they happen to be on duty. To avoid disappointment, a telegram or letter in advance of the visit is desirable. Give the man in camp time to reply.

3. The season of maneuvers is ahead. Thus it is desirable to find out definitely whether the person to be visited is in camp or in the field. Here again a telegram in advance of a visit is advised.

Military police at the entrance to posts will answer questions, but they cannot be expected to know the names and locations of all men at the post. However, they will direct visitors to the divisional or regimental headquarters.

A WORD ABOUT PICTURES

Spy hysteria has gripped a great many sections of our country, and vacationists should be very careful when taking pictures, especially of strategic military objectives, such as industrial plants, docks, Army and Navy camps or bases, flying fields, etc. One A. A. A. member has written us regarding a very unpleasant experience that occurred on a recent trip through Texas. Because they were found taking pictures in the vicinity of an oil refinery, this member and his wife were arrested, their camera was taken from them, they were compelled to spend the night in jail, and finally released after F. B. I. agents assured the local authorities there was no reason for holding them. A. A. A. field reporters warn that in all sections industrial plants are very careful about photographers, and in many places people found taking pictures have had their films confiscated by local officers.

To be on the safe side, inquire before taking pictures of any place that might conceivably be of interest to "fifth columnists" or foreign agents.

REHABILITATION IN THE REPUBLICAN VALLEY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him at McCook, Nebr., on June 10, 1941, before the first annual meeting of the Republican Valley Conservation Association on the subject Rehabilitation in the Republican Valley, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION—ADDRESS BY COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, before the convention of District of Columbia bankers at Hot Springs, Va., June 5, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY C. V. WHITNEY ON UNITED STATES TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by C. V. Whitney, chairman of the Pan American Airways System, on the subject The Challenge to United States Trade in Latin America, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIORITY OF PRODUCTION FOR DEFENSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE SPRINGFIELD (MASS.) DAILY NEWS

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Priority for Defense or for New Social Order," published in the Springfield Daily News of June 4, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES A. FARLEY—ARTICLE FROM KNICKERBOCKER NEWS

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Knickerbocker News of May 23, 1941, entitled "Jim Farley Still Idol of Public," which appears in the Appendix]

ARTICLE FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS ON JUDGE BEN B. LINDSEY

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to Judge Ben B. Lindsey, published in the Rocky Mountain News of June 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER OF FRANCE FOREVER

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the San Francisco Chapter of France Forever at a meeting held at San Francisco on May 19, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM CLARENCE L. IRELAND ON THE WAR SITUATION

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Clarence L. Ireland relative to the war situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN OIL TO JAPAN

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to oil shipments to Japan, published in the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, June 12, 1941, and written by Joseph Driscoll, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as modified, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not want to delay a vote on this amendment for more than 1 minute.

I wanted to support the Byrd amendment. I cannot support the Byrd amendment as it has been modified. I shall make a brief statement to the Senate of my reasons.

As modified, the amendment provides—

That strikes or lock-outs in industries that impede or delay the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and * * * are * * * condemned.

If the amendment stopped there, I would support it with all my heart and soul; but it goes on and deals with another situation:

And that strikes or lock-outs—

Not just strikes or lock-outs in national-defense industries, or those that impede them, but that all strikes and lock-outs—

in which either side refuses to recognize arbitration or mediation * * * are * * * condemned.

Mr. President, the effect of that language, in my humble opinion, would be that if there should be a strike in a ladies' hosiery mill, and the mill owners should refuse to mediate, the innocent, those who were striking, would be brought under the condemnation. By the action of the adverse party the innocent are made to suffer; and the amendment covers every type of strike or lock-out.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. Gladly.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Connally amendment, the Byrd amendment, and all amendments to those two amendments be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. BALL. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota withdraw his objection if I should propose a limitation of 15 minutes? I understand that the Senator from Minnesota has an amendment to offer.

Mr. BALL. Yes; I have an amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. Under that limitation, I think the Senator would be allowed ample time to discuss his amendment.

Mr. BALL. I probably shall not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES. Then I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the proposed unanimous-consent agreement apply to the Connally amendment or the Byrd amendment—which one?

Mr. BYRNES. It applies to both.

Mr. McNARY. Why not take up for consideration the Byrd amendment?

Mr. BYRNES. I will limit the proposed agreement to the Byrd amendment, then. I ask unanimous consent

that debate on the Byrd amendment or any amendment thereto be limited to 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, unless the Senator should include the other amendment, a Senator could speak on my amendment without any restraint. Let us have a vote.

Mr. BALL. I should like to take about 15 or 20 minutes in the discussion of my amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. I withdraw the request.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I had completed my statement. I retained the floor merely for the purpose of yielding to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I desire to say that it was simply an inadvertence that the word "such" was omitted before the word "strikes." That word should be inserted before the word "strikes."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that I think the amendment would be better if it should read as follows:

and that strikes or lock-outs in such industries—

That would confine the amendment to industries which affect the national-defense program.

Mr. BYRD. Then the words "in such industries" would come after "lock-outs"?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; "and that strikes or lock-outs in such industries that impede"—and so forth.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. That, of course, would meet my first objection, and I think is is a very proper modification. It does not meet the second objection, however, and that is that action by the adverse party operates to the detriment of the innocent party.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think so, Mr. President, if the clause is read in connection with "strikes or lock-outs." In other words, those who are guilty of lock-outs are condemned. Those who are guilty of strikes, in the event that that side refuses to mediate or arbitrate, are condemned.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment further? Under the language stated by the Senator, if either side refuses to accept mediation or to abide by the decision, the strike or lock-out, as the case may be, is condemned. In other words, if a strike exists, the employers, by their action in refusing to accept mediation, may bring it under condemnation. If a lock-out exists, the laborers by their action may bring it under condemnation.

Mr. BYRD. I think that is a very strained construction. Clearly, the intent is only to condemn the side that refuses to arbitrate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by adding, after the word "lock-outs", the words "in such industries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator indicate the line?

Mr. BYRD. In line 3, page 2, after the word "lock-outs", insert "in such industries." That confines the provision to industries engaged in defense work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated by the Senator from Virginia.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as modified, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote, but if permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is not present. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who is absent because of illness, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is in a conference at the White House and unable to be present. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, both Senators would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business. If present and voting, I am advised they would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of the serious illness of a close associate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—46

Andrews	Connally	Overton
Bailey	George	Pepper
Ball	Gerry	Smith
Bankhead	Gillette	Spencer
Brewster	Glass	Stewart
Bridges	Gurney	Taft
Brooks	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hill	Tobey
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Butler	Houston	Tydings
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Lodge	Van Nuys
Capper	Lucas	Walsh
Caraway	McKellar	White
Chandler	Maloney	
Chavez	Norris	

NAYS—25

Adams	Ellender	Murdock
Aiken	Green	Rosier
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bunker	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Wheeler
Danaher	McFarland	
Downey	Mead	

NOT VOTING—25

Austin	Langer	Russell
Barbour	Lee	Schwartz
Barkley	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	Murray	Truman
Davis	Nye	Wagner
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Harrison	Radcliffe	Willis
Hatch	Reed	
Hughes	Reynolds	

So Mr. BYRD's amendment, as modified, to the amendment of Mr. CONNALLY, was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of Mr. CONNALLY's amendment, as amended, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. The Congress hereby further declares that complete cooperation between government, management, and labor can best be achieved by the wholehearted acceptance of the principles of collective bargaining and the recognition of the rights of employees to designate representatives of their own

choosing, for the purposes of collective bargaining, without interference through unfair or oppressive labor practices.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is not my intention to delay the Senate by any protracted discussion of this amendment. The amendment is simple in form and speaks for itself. It is offered in order to reaffirm the sentiment of the Senate and of the House in favor of democratic procedures in relation to collective bargaining, to reaffirm the support of Congress of the national labor policy which has been on the statute books since 1935, and to indicate that the Senate is aware of the fact that all the difficulties in defense industries and other industries are not due solely to labor, but are due in part to the recalcitrant attitude of certain employers, especially in defense industries, against the national labor relations policy, and the indefensible methods which they have employed in defeating the effort of their employees to exercise their rights under the Constitution and under the national labor policy.

On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I only wish to say that I concur in the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am heartily in favor of his amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and withholding my vote, I desire to say that if permitted to vote on this question, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, I am advised he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of the serious illness of a close associate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—71

Adams	Danaher	Maloney
Aiken	Downey	Mead
Andrews	Ellender	Murdock
Bailey	George	Norris
Ball	Gerry	Overton
Bankhead	Gillette	Pepper
Bone	Glass	Rosier
Brewster	Green	Shipstead
Bridges	Guffey	Smathers
Brooks	Gurney	Smith
Brown	Hayden	Spencer
Bulow	Herring	Stewart
Bunker	Hill	Taft
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Houston	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Tunnell
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Capper	Kilgore	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Van Nuys
Chandler	Lodge	Wallgren
Chavez	Lucas	Wash
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	White
Connally	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—25

Austin	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	Nye	Truman
Davis	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Harrison	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hatch	Reed	Willis
Hughes	Reynolds	
Langer	Russell	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to Mr. CONNALLY's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Texas, as amended, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the modified amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the Connally amendment, on page 2, line 11, after the word "investigation", it is proposed to insert "(1)"; in line 15, after the word "cause", to strike out the word "and" and insert "(2)"; in line 16, after the word "interest", to strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and (3) if such existing or threatened failure of production is due primarily to a labor dispute, that either or both parties to such dispute have failed to utilize existing Government conciliation and mediation facilities in an effort to settle such dispute, or that despite use of such facilities the dispute has not been settled and a failure of production exists or is threatened."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if my amendment should be adopted, the sentence beginning in line 6 on page 2 of the Connally amendment would read as follows:

> Such power and authority may be exercised with respect to any such plant during the existence of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or in time of war in which the United States is engaged, whenever the President finds, after investigation, (1) that the national-defense program will be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or threatened strike, or lock-out, or other cause, (2) that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary or desirable in the public interest, and (3) if such existing or threatened failure of production is due primarily to a labor dispute, that either or both parties to such dispute have failed to utilize existing Government conciliation and mediation facilities in an effort to settle such dispute, or that despite use of such facilities the dispute has not been settled and a failure of production exists or is threatened.

Next would follow the proviso suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. President, this is the first time we have been asked to act on legislation dealing with the specific problem of stoppages of production in defense industries due to labor disputes and the only answer which the Connally amendment as it now stands gives is to send in the Army, take over the manufacturers' plants, and break the workers' strikes with bayonets. I do not think that is the only policy which this administration is following, and I do not believe it is the only answer which the Congress wants to give to the country and to employers and employees. It seems to me that our basic policy in settling disputes is to use conciliation and mediation, and only if they fail, or if the parties to a dispute fail to avail themselves of those facilities, should we resort to such a drastic remedy.

I should like to read a couple of paragraphs from the President's statement of last Monday, when he issued his order to take over the North American plant. He said:

> Conciliation was resorted to and efforts at conciliation failed. The dispute was then certified by the Secretary of Labor to the National Defense Mediation Board.
>
> The course of mediation has now been interrupted in violation of an agreement

entered into by the bargaining representatives of the workers to continue production during the course of the mediation. Full stoppage of production has resulted. This has created a situation seriously detrimental to the defense of the United States.

In his order he said:

Whereas a controversy arose at said plant over terms and conditions of employment between the company and the workers which they have been unable to adjust by collective bargaining; and whereas the controversy was duly certified to the National Defense Mediation Board, established by the Executive order of March 19, 1941, and whereas before the negotiations had been concluded before the said Board, and in violation of an agreement between the bargaining representatives of the company and the workers authorized to appear before the Board and conduct the negotiations, production at said plant of said aircraft and other articles and materials vital to the defense of the United States was interrupted by a strike which still continues.

In other words, in his order issued on Monday the President made exactly the finding which I propose by my amendment that he should make before resorting to such a drastic remedy. I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment, because I believe it strengthens his amendment and gives the country a better picture of what we are trying to do to settle disputes in defense industries.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas cannot accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. We now have mediation boards, conciliators, and all that. The President will not use the power which he used in the California case until the parties shall have mediated and conciliated until everybody is worn out.

The Senator says that his amendment would strengthen my amendment. If cutting off both arms and legs would strengthen it, his amendment would do so. I do not want my amendment diluted, denuded, dehorned, and de-everything in order to get it through. We have been generous. We have accepted amendment after amendment in order to placate somebody; but in all good conscience I cannot accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. It goes right to the heart of the bill. I cannot in good conscience accept it, and I hope the Senate will reject it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator says that before taking over a plant the President will make sure that conciliation and mediation facilities shall have been used to the fullest extent to which the parties will use them. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know to what extent the parties will use them. I say that the President will not invoke this power until the parties shall have had the opportunity to conciliate and mediate.

Mr. BALL. If that be the case, why does the Senator object to putting such a provision in the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. Simply because it gives another excuse for delay. Who set up the Mediation Board? The President of the United States, because he wanted to give the parties an opportunity to mediate. The parties to any labor dispute have free access to the mediation facilities. They have the opportunity to file their complaints and have them adjudicated. In the North American Co. case in California, after the workers had done so, they still would not work. They tied up the plant. They undertook to paralyze the arm of the Government; and the President did not intervene in the North American case until the processes of mediation had been exhausted. I know he will not do so in any other case.

I am not in favor of putting into the bill a great number of "ifs," "ands," "buts," and "wait-a-minute" clauses. The paramount duty of the Government is to secure arms, defense materials, ships, and all the equipment necessary for the national defense. I want the Government to have the power to step in whenever it is necessary, without having to wait around until three or four walking delegates and agitators decide when and if the Government may act, after delaying mediation and dillydallying.

Let us see what the Senator's amendment says:

That either or both parties to such dispute have failed to utilize existing Government conciliation and mediation facilities in an effort to settle such dispute, or that despite the use of such facilities the dispute has not been settled and a failure of production exists or is threatened.

That is just a lot of words, to create a situation in which some representative of either the employer or the employees can prolong and delay mediation and prevent the Government from stepping in until mediation shall have been exhausted.

Mr. President, there is nothing inconsistent between my amendment and the continuation of mediation while the men are still working. That is the purpose of the amendment. The purpose is to have the Government step in and say to the parties, "This plant is going to operate. You may go ahead and mediate as long as you wish. You may conciliate; but while you are mediating and conciliating this plant is going to operate."

The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota would prevent the Government from stepping in until the parties had concluded their mediation and conciliation, which might require months. What is the harm in going ahead and keeping the plant in operation, and letting the parties have all the mediation they want? I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, is the Senator from Texas contending that he wants the Government to step in and take over the plant while the workers are working and the dispute is before the Mediation Board?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say that.

Mr. BALL. That is what the Senator very plainly implied.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not imply that at all.

Mr. BALL. The Senator wants the Government to take over the plant during the process of mediation.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Under the terms of my amendment, whenever production were stopped or impeded by labor disputes, the Government could step in; but mediation would not have to stop. The parties may go on mediating. But under the Senator's amendment there might be a slow-down in a plant, and it might be said, "Well, we are mediating. You cannot step in, Mr. Government, until we get through mediating. One of our mediators is out of town and will not be back until next Monday, and we shall have to wait until we talk to him." [Laughter.]

What I propose to do is to have the Government step in and take charge of the plant and operate it, and let the mediators mediate while the men are working. I do not see why men have to stop working while mediation is going on. Mediators do not work, anyway. [Laughter.] They are salaried, high-hat, white-collar men. They will do the mediating; but why do all the men in the plant have to stop work until some professional agitators get through mediating?

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take very long, but I am very hopeful that the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be agreed to.

In connection with all the legislation we have been trying to write on the floor of the Senate without the benefit of the advice of a committee or the advantage of calm study we shall probably make some mistakes; but whatever we do now will have some chance of further consideration. This does not seem to me to be a complicated amendment. It does not seem to alter greatly the situation, as the Senator from Texas appears to see it. It seems to me there should be a full chance of mediation before the very unusual step proposed in the bill is taken.

We may live to regret the legislation we have been writing during the past few days. Because it seems to me there is a further chance for sensible protection in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I am sincerely hopeful that the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. BALL and other Senators called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How many Senators are required to order a roll call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixteen.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many Senators are present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is one-fifth of the Senators present, as shown by the last roll call.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. On that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). Again referring to my pair, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I transfer my general pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the death of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on account of the serious illness of a close associate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] as absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. HOLMAN. I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the roll call has been concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The result has not been announced. A Senator may change his vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote will be recapitulated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to recapitulate the vote.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I object. The vote has been recapitulated once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is too late in making his objection.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Can a recapitulation be ordered after the announcement of the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in the discretion of the Chair if there is a doubt about the correctness of the vote.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I beg the Chair's pardon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has stated that it rests in the discretion of the Chair if there is any question as to the correctness of the vote.

Mr. MCCARRAN. How does the Chair exercise his discretion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He asks for a recapitulation.

The Chief Clerk resumed and completed the recapitulation of the vote.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—36

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Maloney
Aiken	Danaher	Murdock
Ball	Downey	Norris
Bone	Gerry	Shipstead
Brewster	Green	Taft
Bridges	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Holman	Tobey
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Burton	La Follette	Wallgren
Butler	Lodge	Walsh
Capper	McCarran	White

NAYS—34

Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Rosier
Bulow	Hayden	Smathers
Byrd	Herring	Smith
Caraway	Hill	Spencer
Chandler	Houston	Stewart
Chavez	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Tunnell
Connally	McFarland	Van Nuys
Ellender	McKellar	
George	Mead	

NOT VOTING—26

Austin	Langer	Russell
Barbour	Lee	Schwartz
Barkley	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Nye	Wagner
Davis	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Harrison	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hatch	Reed	Willis
Hughes	Reynolds	

So Mr. BALL's amendment to the amendment of Mr. CONNALLY was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the original Connally amendment as amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am permitted to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if the Senator from Mississippi were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am free to vote, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is absent because of the death of his mother, has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on account of the serious illness of a close associate. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting these two Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are also detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—67

Andrews	George	Norris
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Pepper
Bankhead	Glass	Rosier
Bilbo	Green	Shipstead
Bone	Guffey	Smathers
Brewster	Gurney	Smith
Bridges	Hayden	Spencer
Brooks	Herring	Stewart
Brown	Hill	Taft
Bunker	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Houston	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Byrnes	Kilgore	Tydings
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Caraway	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chandler	McCarran	Wallgren
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wheeler
Connally	McNary	White
Downey	Maloney	
Ellender	Mead	

NAYS—7

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Murdock
Aiken	Danaher	
Bulow	La Follette	

NOT VOTING—22

Austin	Lee	Schwartz
Barbour	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Nye	Truman
Davis	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Harrison	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hatch	Reed	Willis
Hughes	Reynolds	
Langer	Russell	

So Mr. CONNALLY's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release I issued on April 5, 1941, in connection with the so-called Connally amendment which was adopted by the Senate today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 5, 1941.—Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, has had prepared and will introduce an amendment to the Selective Service Act, providing authority for the Government to take over and operate during the period of the emergency any industrial plant producing defense materials or convertible into a defense manufacturing plant in which the national-defense program may be impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production at such plant as a result of a strike or labor disturbance or other cause.

"The Selective Service Act," said Senator CONNALLY, "now provides that the President is authorized to take over and operate any industrial plant, the owners or operators of which refuse or decline to make implements of war or national-defense articles for the Government upon reasonable terms. These provisions apply to the failure of employers to cooperate with the Government program of national defense.

"The amendment which I have prepared and which I shall introduce adds another paragraph to section 9 of the Selective Service Act and provides that the President, through the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, may take over and operate, for the period of the emergency, any plant equipped for the manufacture of any articles or materials required for the national defense or any plant capable of being transformed into a plant for the manufacture of defense articles, and in which plant the national-defense program is impeded or delayed by an existing or threatened failure of production as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance or other cause. It provides that the Government may operate the plant purely in the public interest.

"The prime and paramount objective of the Government is to secure continuous and maximum production of war munitions and supplies. Anything which interferes with that kind of operation of all available plants, whether on the part of employers or on the part of employees, is against the public interest, and the Government ought to have the right and power under such circumstances to step into the plant and to take charge and operate the plant as a national-defense project purely in the national interest."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may we now have a vote on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1524) was passed.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4756, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 19, after the figures "$5,000", to insert "and $1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 23, after the words "principal clerk", to strike out "$3,780", and insert "$4,000"; on page 3, line 1, after the figures "$3,540", to insert "and $460 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 3, after the figures "$3,600", to strike out "assistant Journal clerk, $3,360;"; in line 5, after the word "clerks", to strike out "two at $3,180 each", and insert "one at $3,600, one at $3,360, one at $3,180"; in line 9, after the figures "$2,460" and the semicolon, to strike out "press relations officers", and insert "assistants at the press door", and at the end of line 13, to strike out "$144,540", and insert "$146,640."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee employees", on page 4, line 19, after the word "at", to strike out "$2,800" and insert "$2,880"; in line 20, after the figures "$1,800", to insert a semicolon and "additional clerical assistance at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $6,000, and Senate Resolution No. 49, agreed to February 3, 1941, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1941"; on page 6, line 25, after the figures "$2,220", to insert "assistant clerk, $2,000, and Senate Resolution No. 57, agreed to January 27, 1941, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1941"; on page 7, line 5, after the word "each" and the period, to strike out "Revision of the Laws—Clerk, $3,900; assistant clerk, $2,400; assistant clerk, $2,220; additional clerk, $1,800."; in line 12, after the word "each", to strike out "assistant clerk, $2,000" and insert "two assistant clerks at $2,000 each"; and in line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$507,260" and insert "$506,940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clerical assistants to Senators", on page 8, line 3, after the words "additional clerks at", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,800"; and in line 4, after the word "Senator", to strike out "$144,000" and insert "$172,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the end of line 8, to strike out "$1,083,000" and insert "$1,111,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper", on page 8, line 16, after the word "each", to insert "and $480 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents"; in line 19, after the figures "$4,800", to insert "and $1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 21, after the figures "$3,000", to insert "one $2,200,"; in the same line, after the figures "$2,100", to strike out "two at $2,000 each" and insert "one $2,000"; on page 9, line 17, after the word "correspondents", to strike out "four at $1,440 each" and insert "two at $1,560 each, two at $1,440 each"; and at the end of line 22, to strike out "$269,044" and insert "$271,444."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Post Office", on page 10, line 6, after the word "at", to strike out "$1,620" and insert "$1,740"; and in line 7, to strike out "$53,340" and insert "$56,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate", on page 10, at the end of line 18, to change the appropriation for reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate from $60,340 to $66,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 8, to insert:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to procure and furnish each fiscal year to each Senator and the President of the Senate, upon request by such person, United States air-mail postage stamps in an amcunt not exceeding $50 for the mailing of postal matter arising in connection with his or her official business; and to enable the Secretary of the Senate to carry into effect the provisions of this paragraph for the fiscal year 1942, there is appropriated the sum of $4,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 20, after the words "officers of the Senate", to strike out "$19,500" and insert "$26,900: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1942 the allowance for stationery for each Senator and for the President of the Senate shall be $200 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds", on page 32, line 11, after the words "in all", to strike

out "$282,745" and insert "$369,574, of which amount $27,900 shall be immediately available", and in line 15, after the name "Architect of the Capitol", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $4,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1942, for the purchase of rugs and carpets.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 10, to insert:

Building for Senate Folding Room: For the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a building to house the Senate Folding Room, $83,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the privately owned land, lots 17 and 18 in square No. 677 in the District of Columbia; and to construct thereon and equip a building for the Senate Folding Room and such approaches, connections with public utilities and with the Capitol Power Plant as may be necessary: *Provided further*, That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts; to purchase materials, supplies, equipment, and accessories in the open market; to employ professional and other services without reference to section 35 of the Public Buildings Act approved June 25, 1910, as amended, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and to make such other expenditures for travel, advertising, and other miscellaneous purposes as may be necessary: *Provided further*, That the plans for the construction and equipment of the building shall be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing and on completion the mechanical and structural care of the building shall be under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That all funds expended by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to authority contained in this paragraph shall be disbursed by the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library Buildings and Grounds—Mechanical and Structural Maintenance," on page 34, line 25, after the words "by law", to strike out "$89,520" and insert "$91,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 13, after the words "buildings and grounds", to strike out "$74,840" and insert "$77,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress", on page 37, line 12, after the name "Librarian", to strike out "$1,314,840" and insert "$1,318,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Legislative Reference Service", on page 38, line 8, after the name "Librarian", to strike out "$126,720" and insert "$135,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Increase of the Library of Congress", on page 40, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library Buildings", on page 43, line 7, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$750" and insert "$3,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 7, to insert:

Nothing in this section shall prevent the Librarian of Congress from accepting funds provided by educational foundations, or committees for the aid of exiled scholars, or other donors, which funds are specifically provided for the placement of exiled or displaced foreign scholars in the Library of Congress, and any exiled or displaced foreign scholars employed on such funds shall not be included in the limitation above fixed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, and I was instructed by the committee to offer the amendment on behalf of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the proper place in the bill:

That Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees in this act or resolution: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment proposes severely to change existing law. Under existing law, the salaries of the attachés of the various committees are statutory. Under the pending proposal, the chairman of a committee would be authorized to make the salary of any favorite he may have the total amount appropriated for the committee, which is $9,000. It would create the utmost confusion and discontent, in my judgment, and I hope the Senate will not adopt the proposed amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this matter was not considered by the subcommittee which passed upon the various items in the bill; but after the subcommittee had completed its hearings and was ready to report to the full committee the matter was brought up, and there it was put to a vote of the committee. I myself did not vote for the proposal, but a majority of the committee did vote for it; and as chairman of the subcommittee I was authorized to present it to the Senate, and I have done so.

I may say, however, in support of the proposal, that many Senators have desired to have a higher-priced attaché in their offices than the law at present would permit. Some Senators want what they call a research secretary, at $4,500 a year, and there is no way by which they can get such an employee unless they take a part of some other salary and add it to the salary of the research secretary in order to make up that amount. Some Senators feel that during the legislative sessions they should have more employees in their offices than during recesses, but because the salaries are static they have to have the same number of employees during a recess they have during a session. Senators, therefore, desire to rearrange their forces and be able to certify such rearrangement to the financial clerk of the Senate, so that during the session they may have extra clerks and reduce the number of clerks when they do not need them during the recess. As I have stated, I am not advocating the amendment; but I do not wish to be in the position of offering it, even on behalf of the committee, without having its proponents who presented it have their side stated.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I must say that I am afraid the adoption of the amendment might lead to a very reprehensible practice. I do not desire to cast a reflection on anyone, but I believe wholeheartedly with the Senator from Virginia. I agree that a Senator should have available such an assistant as we cannot hire for the salaries we are now authorized to pay. I think that would be very desirable, with the amount of work that is being done now in Senators' offices, which I believe is four or five times greater than it was 18 years ago; but the salaries remain practically the same. If Senators need further assistance, as I think they do, a salary should be provided which would be sufficient for an assistant who could take a good deal of the personal work of the Senator, which he cannot leave to the present office force, and provision should be made for that. But to authorize a switching around, raising someone's salary and lowering that of someone else, might result in having the full amount allowed paid to one person, as the Senator from Virginia has said. I am not saying that that would be done; but I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amendment was offered before the committee by me. The situation in Senators' offices is that there is a fixed, frozen schedule of compensation. A Senator cannot make adjustments for length of service or competency, nor can he take into consideration lack of adequate capacity. Every Senator must pay his clerk $3,900, one assistant clerk $2,400, assistant clerks $2,220. It does not matter whether a Senator's assistant clerk has been in his office for 10 or 15 years, he cannot raise his pay, and when he employs a new, inexperienced clerk, that clerk will get the fixed, statutory salary.

We have done for the office of the Vice President exactly what the amendment seeks to have done for Senators. We do not in the amendment increase by one cent the aggregate amount of expenditure in Senators' offices, but merely provide that a Senator may, if he sees fit to do so, readjust the salary schedule and the number of employees in his office, in order to meet the conditions in his office. I doubt whether there are any two offices

in the Senate Office Building where employment conditions are identical.

As it now stands, there are Members of the Senate who are exercising the privilege of making the changes to which I have referred. Various devices have been adopted to accomplish what I think is a necessary correction of the salary schedules in the offices. But the Senators who do that are in jeopardy of being held responsible for their action. If a clerk is, under the statutory schedule, entitled to be paid $2,400, and the Senator should see fit, in order to equalize, to reduce a clerk a hundred dollars or $200, and pay that amount to another clerk, the Senator would run the chance of the clerk whose pay had been reduced coming back and saying to the Senator, "You must repay me this amount." It is merely a question of whether the Senate is willing to leave some discretion, some leeway, to Senators in rearranging their offices.

Some Senators need more help, in number of clerks, than they have. This might enable them to spread the work among more people. They need more during certain times of the year than at other times. There are certain Senators who do not need the full amount of their allowance. This would enable them to secure more competent employees, though a less number.

The amendment provides that, if a Senator wishes to make this arrangement, he may go to the Disbursing Office and certify the changes he has made, and the Disbursing Office will then pay in accordance with his certificate. In other words, it would give to the individual Senator a chance to escape the absolutely hard and fast statutory rule. The amendment was submitted to the committee, and is now submitted to the Senate, with the idea of being of assistance to Senators in one of the most difficult problems they have, that is, their office force, and the compensation of their office force.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Very gladly.

Mr. OVERTON. There is a provision in reference to clerk hire in connection with Representatives which is somewhat similar, in fact, almost identical in principle with the amendment now being discussed There is no statutory fee fixed for each clerk in the House of Representatives. There is an allocation of a certain gross amount—I do not recall now what the amount is—with the sole limitation, according to my recollection, that no clerk shall be paid in excess of $3,900.

If the pending amendment shall be adopted, then the clerical forces of Senators will be on the same sort of schedule, practically, as that which governs the clerical force in the other House.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is correct; it would give to a Senator the same privilege which is now given to Members of the House in the matter of the adjustment of the number of employees and the relative scale of salaries.

Of course, it is possible to conjure up abuses. I happen to be one of those who have implicit confidence in the membership of the Senate, believing that Senators will so conduct their offices and that they will make such use of the discretion given them that there will be no abuse, but, on the contrary, that there will be more efficient service and a more just scale of compensation in the offices of Senators.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the plain fact is that the proposed amendment would transfer from the Senate to the chairmen of committees the right to fix the salaries of the various attachés. In other words, if a committee chairman has a favorite employed in his committee, he can give him or her the salary of some other attaché of the committee, or he can give him or her the whole $9,000 which is appropriated for the committee's activities. That would take us back to the old era of national scandal, when Members of Congress actually were charged with putting in their own pockets a part of the clerical fund which was appropriated to a committee. That is exactly what it would do and it ought not to be done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I recognize the import of what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said. I think the distinguished Senator will agree that the work of the first secretary of a Senate committee is very heavy. He has many onerous and important duties. I believe the Senator will realize that, in the case of some of us at least, it is difficult to get the right kind of secretary for $3,900. I wonder how the Senator would feel about voting down this amendment but increasing the salary of the principal secretary, the first secretary, above $3,900.

Mr. GLASS. Very well, let the Senate do that; but under this proposed amendment the least efficient attaché of the committee, if he or she is a favorite, could be given twice as much as is paid to the most efficient attaché of the committee.

Mr. HILL. The other way would be the better way and the more direct way to do it, would it not?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; I think so.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment which I think will solve the problem, and in acting upon it the Senate can squarely face the issue. Since I have been in the Senate it has become apparent to me that, because of the rapid growth of the Government, individual Members of the Senate find it impossible to obtain information about the status of the Government which they ought to have. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Virginia that the Senate ought not to hide behind any cover. The Senate ought to face the issue squarely.

I shall propose an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee, the effect of which will be to give to each Member of the Senate a research assistant, and I suggest he should be paid $5,000, because I do not think an efficient and valuable man can be obtained for less. I have no fixed idea about the matter of the salary, however.

Originally I thought I would propose that research assistants be provided for the majority and the minority leaders of the Senate, but it is apparent that every Member of the Senate needs more help. I believe in the case of two-thirds of the Senators their staffs are overworked now and are not able properly to handle the volume of business they must handle.

Something has been said about vacation. There is no prospect of vacation for the employees. There is prospect of increased duties and no vacation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated, and then I shall ask the Senate to adopt it. I propose it as a substitute for the pending amendment. But before it is read let me make a further statement. I think we had better face the issue squarely. We should see to it that each Member of the Senate is better informed through the efforts of some efficient person who has time, intelligence, and energy to search for and obtain information. I must say that frequently I am required to speak without proper information. I know the great difficulty Senators have properly to inform themselves with respect to public questions.

Mr. President, I now ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. As a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TYDINGS on behalf of the committee, it is proposed at the proper place in the bill to insert the following:

A research assistant, at $5,000 per annum, for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no doubt in the world that a very good case could be made out for more help in many Senators' offices. I think that is particularly true in the case of Senators from States such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, which have large populations. In order to try to meet that situation the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the legislative measure in the last session provided for an extra clerk for every Senator, and for still more extra clerks based on population, in cases where there were more than 3,000,000 persons in a State. So we tried to make some extra provision in that respect at the last session of Congress, and also in the present session.

What is now proposed to be done is to create an entirely new office, the incumbent of which will receive $1,100 more a year than Senators' secretaries now get. This person will be called a research assistant. In my opinion, 10 or 15 of the Senators may appoint a person who would fit within the qualifications of a research assistant, who would probably be some young college graduate who had a bent for legislative research. But I have a feeling that eventually most of the $5,000 would be paid to a political assistant rather than a research assistant, and, in my judgment, with a three and one-half billion dollar tax bill soon coming before the Senate to be voted on, and the prospect of a war, we ought not to adopt a measure of this kind without adequate

hearing before the Committee on Appropriations.

If the proposal is voted down and the Senate feels that the secretaries are not paid sufficiently, and the Senate feels that their pay should be raised, that is a different proposition. But I do not believe we should now create a new position in Senator's offices at $5,000 a year.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment provides for a salary of $5,000 per year for a research clerk in each Senator's office. There are 96 Senators. That would mean almost $500,000 a year to be added to the pay roll for the current force of the Senators. The total cost of clerical assistance to Senators, as shown in the bill, with the additions made by the committee, is $1,111,800. So if this proposal were agreed to we would be increasing the appropriation for clerical assistance to Senators by almost 50 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think when we all contemplate the full import of the amendment, which I know springs from the finest intentions on the part of the Senator from Kentucky, if the Senate is going to do anything—and I am not recommending that it should—it ought to confine its action to its present office force rather than to create a new position the pay of which is $1,100 higher in the pay scale than secretaries are now getting in each one of the Senator's offices.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has missed the point. Efficiency is not obtained in the offices of Senators by adding two or three extra clerks. I am trying to make the Senate more efficient. I have no pride of opinion in the matter of the amount of salary that should be paid. If a Senator could obtain a good research assistant for his office at $5,000 a year, he ought to be paid that amount. But it is apparent to me that on so many occasions Senators act without knowing what they are acting upon that I am persuaded they would be much better informed if each had a research assistant who knew what was going on in the world and in our own country.

The Senator from Maryland suggested that perhaps in some cases assistants with political ideas rather than research ideas would be appointed. I have a most efficient secretary, who has been with me since I have been in the Senate and was with me all through the time I was Governor of my State. I am very well satisfied with him My arrangement with him is very satisfactory. But I think every Member of the Senate should have a research assistant in order to be more efficient, in order to know what is going on in the world, and to inform himself and his people, and in order to legislate efficiently and effectively.

Mr. President, we should face the issue squarely. We should say to the people that we need such assistance. I am willing to vote for the proposal because I need such assistance. The staffs of Senators from large States such as New York and Pennsylvania—and it is true even of my staff—are overworked. If I were to add to my staff three additional members at $1,500, or $1,200. or $1,000 a year, that would not make my office more efficient. Neither would such an addition make any other Senator's office more efficient. I will not withdraw the amendment. I want it adopted. I shall ask for the yeas and nays when the time comes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Two years ago when I took over the duties of junior Senator from California, I found that the volume of business going through my office was so great that my office force was totally insufficient to carry on that work; and because of lack of office space and clerical assistance I have been unable satisfactorily to perform my duties. The work in my office, due to the defense crisis, has at least doubled, and I find that I am totally incapable of keeping in mind the various bills pending before the Senate, making proper research upon those bills, and being prepared to vote intelligently when I appear on the floor of the Senate.

Like many other Senators, I have practiced law. I should say that, comparing the work of a Senator to the practice of law, if a lawyer had as much business in his office as I have in my office, there should be three or four partners carrying on that amount of business.

Almost every Senator is on the point of breaking down endeavoring to carry on the great volume of his work. The press representatives and the public probably do not see 20 percent of the work that is being performed by Senators. A large part of our time is consumed in committee hearings, in interviewing constituents from our States, in presenting departmental matters, and in preparing for legislation in the Senate. An economic investigator and assistant for me would help me tremendously in properly functioning as a Senator from the State of California. I should be many times more valuable to the people of my State and of the United States if I had additional assistance.

Mr. President, I realize that California is not a typical State. As a result of the war we have a tremendous number of defense industries in California; but I am certain that every Senator could very well use additional assistance, to the advantage of his people and his State.

Let me conclude by saying to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that if I believed, as the Senator seems to believe, that most Senators would use the additional amount for a political fund or for some political appointment I would be against the proposal; but, with due deference to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, I do not believe such would be the case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Neither do I.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am glad to hear the Senator make that statement. I believe that most Senators need and would properly use the additional assistance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is much merit in the argument of the Senator from California. There is no doubt that this question deserves very careful consideration in the effort to see that Senators who have a great burden should have as much of that burden as possible lifted from their shoulders.

However, the place to argue that matter is not on the floor of the Senate. The place to argue that question is before the Appropriations Committee when it is considering legislation. We ought not to adopt a proposal of this kind merely because it would benefit the Senate, without weighing all the factors. As chairman of the subcommittee, the matter not having come before the subcommittee, I am forced to make the point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] that there is no provision in law for such an appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the same argument would apply to the Tydings amendment, and I make the point of order that it proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before we leave the subject, since this bill has come up Senators have frequently asked if they could not be supported by the committee on the floor of the Senate in an effort to obtain increases, particularly for their secretaries. Let me say that whenever the legislative appropriation bill comes over from the House all Senators know it because it appears on the daily calendar. Next year if any effort is made to increase the salaries of secretaries the matter ought to come before the committee.

Some of the Senators from large States are present. In the case of Senators from large States I feel that there is a real need for some additional help; but we ought not to grant such additional assistance indiscriminately. We must not lose sight of the fact that some of the States—and I do not say this to reflect upon them—have one Representative and two Senators; yet Senators from such States receive the same amount of office help as do the Senators from New York. We ought not to lose sight of the facts. Any Senator who needs help to do his work well ought to receive help, but we ought not to grant it broadside at a time such as this, with defense appropriations running into billions of dollars, and a new tax bill running to three and a half billion dollars, without giving the matter very careful consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since every Senator present seems to feel that something ought to be done about the matter of enabling each Senator to have more efficient and better help, and since there is such disagreement as to how this end should be attained, why not send the bill back to the committee and give the committee an opportunity to thresh the matter out?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I do not intend to yield further. I rose to make a motion to send the bill back to the committee, because if we do not do so, we

shall have to wait until next year. I do not want a research assistant next year. I want one now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes to accomplish the same purpose without sending the bill back to the committee, and wishes to obtain the appropriation, I can suggest how it can be done.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has made a motion that the bill be sent back to the committee to consider the proposal which he is supporting.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator could accomplish the same result merely by introducing in the Senate a measure which would likewise go to the Committee on Appropriations. As chairman of the subcommittee having to do with the matter, I can assure him that he would have an immediate hearing, and that there would be a report on the bill one way or the other.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Such a measure would have to go to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The House would have no interest in it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that. I do not intend to agree to the suggestion.

Mr. HILL. We know that the pending bill will become law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator from Kentucky that even if the bill should be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee the committee still could not include the appropriation, because we cannot authorize the expenditure of money until Congress first passes an enabling act. So, even if the bill were recommitted to the Appropriations Committee, nothing would be accomplished. The committee would simply bring the bill back without the desired provision in it. However, if the Senator will follow the procedure I have outlined, and first obtain the authorization, he will be able to obtain his appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Mr. President, we can increase the appropriation in the bill by $384,000. That would take care of the matter. I shall send to the desk an amendment providing a sufficient amount of money to accomplish the purposes we seek to accomplish.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a motion to recommit the bill would not make in order the amendment under discussion, and would not make in order the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], against which a point of order has been made by the chairman of the committee. The Appropriations Committee is prohibited by the rules of the Senate from bringing in legislation. All we can do in the committee, as we frequently do, is to say that so far as the committee in concerned we will not make the point of order. But any Senator may make the point of order. It has been made. It would not do any good to move to recommit the bill.

Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a suggestion which may clear up the matter?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will first allow me to say a word, I shall be glad to yield to him later.

I have frequently discovered that Members who wish to get things done enter into an understanding with other Senators not to make a point of order. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has made a point of order, which has put us in the position in which we now are. I insist on my motion to recommit the bill. I wish an opportunity to see if an understanding cannot be had that when the bill comes back the point of order will not be made. Then we shall get what we are trying to get.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have filed in due form a motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI. If the Senator from Kentucky will aid me in suspending the rule so that my amendment may be considered, he may offer his amendment as an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have the floor. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that is right; let us make a bargain here: "If you will do what I want done, I will do what you want done." [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. That is no new doctrine here; that has been done ever since I have been here: "If you do what I want done, somebody else will do what you want done."

I make a motion to suspend the rule so that this matter can be taken up.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum if we are to vote on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Virginia raised a point of order against an amendment of mine, so I am submitting the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Chair ruled on the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair has not done so, but the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS. Then, Mr. President, I ask that my motion be considered.

Mr. GLASS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Murdock
Aiken	Ellender	Murray
Andrews	George	Norris
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Pepper
Bankhead	Glass	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Green	Rosier
Bone	Guffey	Shipstead
Brewster	Gurney	Smathers
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Herring	Spencer
Brown	Hill	Stewart
Bulow	Holman	Taft
Bunker	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Byrd	Kilgore	Tunnell
Byrnes	La Follette	Tydings
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Caraway	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chandler	McCarran	Wallgren
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	White
Connally	Maloney	
Danaher	Mead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado, pursuant to notice heretofore given, to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, in order to propose the amendment against which the point of order has been sustained.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, what was the Chair's announcement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced the pending question. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado, pursuant to notice heretofore given, to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, in order to propose the amendment against which a point of order has been sustained.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, before taking a vote on the pending question, I should like to have the Senate give some thought and consideration to the problem of those of us who come from the larger States.

I wish to say to the Senate that I have been here for more than 2 years. I am not now considering the volume of work that reaches my office as a result of present-day conditions, but I have in mind the steady flow of work running over the past 2 years. While I should look with favor upon the proposal offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky, which would, no doubt, increase the efficiency of Senators individually and collectively and relieve them of quite a burden of which, in my judgment, they should be relieved, the immediate task of attending to the volume of present business recommends itself to me as the first matter that should receive our consideration.

Coming from a State of approximately 14,000,000 population, a State that is located within 200 or 300 miles of the Capital of the Nation, a State wherein the headquarters of every national institution and industry are probably located, where the legal departments of many of America's and of the world's great activities are found, it is a physical impossibility for a Senator from a State so large and so close to Washington even

to answer his long-distance telephone calls.

It is necessary for me to have one man delegated to the opening of my mail; it is necessary to have several assistants sorting the mail, separating the mail; it is necessary for me to have two or three people doing nothing but filing the mail.

I will say to you, Mr. President, in all sincerity, I have no other income except that which I receive as a Member of the Senate. One-half that income is spent each month in providing necessary and essential clerical force in my office. I would make a great deal more money if I were to retire—and perhaps my retirement would not be a loss either to the State or to the Nation—because of the State officers' pension or retirement system which we have in the State of New York. But, even though I am a poor man, even though I have no other income, I feel that I have a right to live and to serve the people of my State.

A research representative would be very helpful; but what I need to relieve the immediate burden, to answer the first-class mail, to attend to the numerous callers at my office, approximating a hundred a day, is additional ordinary clerical personnel. I should not like to be attacked in any newspaper or magazine for what seemingly might be an effort to add to the patronage in my office. I wish we could set up the office, say, of Senate recorder, wherein the mail would be opened and all the various items which could be collectively attended to would be attended to, such as separating and sorting the mail, the proper reference of certain correspondence to committee chairmen, or taking up matters with the departments for routine replies, leaving only that which was necessary for the Senator himself or for his immediate assistants to look after.

I wish to say, Mr. President, whether that can be done or not, that the question of population should be considered; the question of the nearness of the State to the Capital should be taken under advisement. The position of Senator and the leadership attached attract national attention and cause volumes of work. So something should be done. An expert personnel assistant, at the instance of some Senate committee, should make an investigation of my office and of the offices of all other Senators and report to the committee as to the dire necessity, for the time being at least, insofar as clerical force or personnel is concerned.

It is necessary for me to work 7 days a week; it is necessary for my office force to put in approximately from 10 to 12 hours a day; it is necessary for us to ignore a large volume of the correspondence that comes to our attention. Unfortunately, we cannot answer any of the mail which is referred to as propaganda mail. We are taking care of only that mail which is individual or important; and we are not doing a very good job at that. So it occurs to me that, some time, some place, before some committee, action should be taken that would temporarily, or for the duration of the session, take care of the individual wants of individual Senators.

I believe that some thought should be given to the possibility of pooling work that could properly be pooled. I believe that consideration should be given to a Senator who, we will say, properly to illustrate the point, is in the position of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who, no doubt, because of the international turmoil existing among the people, and because of his position of leadership, receives thousands of letters every day. He should not be overburdened; his time should not be stolen away from the tasks to which he is assigned. But if we had a committee, with an expert on personnel, during the time the international condition is emphasized, the Senator from Georgia could be given adequate clerical assistance.

Mr. President, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to tell the Senate that it ought to give some consideration to the physical and mental well-being of its Members. If, Mr. President, you would think of the casualty list of the last few years, of the endless days and months that have been lost to the Senate and to the country because of illness of Senators, if you will consider the leaders in the Senate today who are on the sick list or are working with perhaps little more than 50 percent physical efficiency, then I believe you would be willing to have this proposal well considered, thoroughly discussed, carefully analyzed, and to adopt some method which, while leaving every Member free from the possibility of attack on the ground of a desire to add to his patronage, would yet give to him proper opportunity to serve the country and be relieved of these unmanageable burdens from which I believe we are entitled to be relieved.

So, Mr. President, while the proposal which has been advanced by the junior Senator from Kentucky would not take care of my physical tasks, though it would be helpful and I know would add to the efficiency of the Senate collectively and individually, yet a proposal to be studied and considered by a committee set up for that purpose, which would take care of the present-day burdens only temporarily, rather than as a permanent proposal, would do more to benefit my particular case.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to get a better understanding of the present parliamentary situation. The Senator refers to a proposal by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], but the pending motion will not give us an opportunity to vote on that proposal; will it?

Mr. MEAD. The pending motion, as I understand, applies to the Senator's proposal. It leads to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is to suspend the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. I may be wrong, because I was out of the Chamber for a while. As I understand, the pending motion is the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. Is not that correct?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The motion before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to suspend the rule. The reason for adopting the motion to suspend the rule is so that my amendment may be submitted, which will accomplish the purpose that is desired.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator from Colorado had an amendment. It is the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky; is it?

Mr. CHANDLER. The immediate proposition is the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky in lieu of the amendment offered on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] under the authority of the committee.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, to clear the air, as it were, I should like to have the pending motion read by the clerk.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. A motion to suspend the rule, under the rules, must provide for the consideration of a particular amendment. It must be set out with the motion. In other words, a motion to suspend the rule to consider an amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado on one subject would not permit, even if the rule were suspended, the consideration of an entirely different subject in the way of an amendment from another Senator.

I have not heard the motion read; but before we vote on the motion to suspend the rule we must be confronted with the purpose for which we are asked to suspend the rule. Let us have that before us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the rules, the motion is to suspend the rule so as to make in order the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. That amendment, as I understand it, is an amendment which would permit a Senator to allocate as he may see fit the funds now allotted for his secretarial staff. If, however, the motion to suspend the rule prevails, and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado then comes before the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] may offer his amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is precisely the situation.

Mr. HILL. So by suspending the rule, as I understand, the Senate not only may vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, but it may also vote on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Kentucky having the right to offer his amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My understanding is exactly the same as that of

the Senator from Alabama, with the further requirement that, as I understand, the amendment must be germane; but the question of germaneness is to be decided by a majority vote of the Senate without debate. So, as a matter of fact, if the Senate wants to add the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, it has a right to do so under the rules, provided a two-thirds vote can be obtained in the first place to suspend the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York again yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator from Kentucky has said and what the Senator from Alabama has said and what the Senator from Missouri has said does not alter the proposition I was trying to get an understanding of, and get before the Senate. Before we can suspend the rule a reason must be given, and the amendment which is proposed to be offered if the rule is suspended must be printed with the notice; so that is the motion which will control the question whether or not we will suspend the rule. If it is suspended, and we get beyond the point of voting on the motion, then we come to the question of the amendment; but the reason for suspending the rule in this case, as I understand, is to enable the Senator from Colorado to offer a certain amendment which, I assume, is printed and on the clerk's desk. I should like to have that amendment read, so that we may know what it is all about.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me add at that point that it is my opinion that the Senator from Nebraska is exactly correct in his interpretation, with the exception that after the amendment of the Senator from Colorado becomes in order the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] as an amendment to or a substitute for that amendment will also be in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The question raised by the Senator from Missouri as to the germaneness of my amendment is answered by the fact that already there are numerous changes in the bill in the way of additional clerks, and additional salary for them; and the Senate certainly would not decide adversely on the germaneness of my amendment, inasmuch as it has already agreed to numerous changes upon which points of order might have been made, but were not made, when they were originally agreed to on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, as I have tried several times to tell my friend from Kentucky if his proposal has merit and it is fully considered by the committee, there is no disposition to withhold the remedy he suggests. However, all the things that were in the bill when it came to the floor of the Senate were the result of testimony taken before the committee. Now the Senator is attempting, without ever going before the committee, to go away over the heads of the committee, no matter what the testimony may be, and put in his proposal.

There is a great deal to be said against this amendment. I do not want to take the time to do it; but there are some small States whose Senators already have as much clerical help as the Senator from New York has, with the exception of one clerk.

Mr. MEAD. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, if this matter is to be considered, it ought to be considered on the basis of some equities. I have no disposition to oppose the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky, if it has merit, when we consider it; but it ought to go to a committee, so that it may be fully heard, just as all the other matters that we have passed on were heard.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kentucky is not trying to go over the heads of the committee. I am trying to establish a remedy for something that the committee should have settled a long time ago on its own motion, not on mine. It is not my fault that it has not been settled heretofore. I am not criticizing the committee for failure to settle it, but there has been a failure, and it ought to be settled. I prefer to have it settled now. If it is not settled now, I shall try some other way of settling it later, but I want to support the motion of the Senator from Colorado. It is in order to suspend the rules, and—

If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere done well
It were done quickly.

And we ought to have it done now.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to conclude by briefly restating my position.

Of course, because of present circumstances, I must grasp every opportunity to rectify a situation that is burdensome, and that is the situation which exists in my office, but I believe that a committee of the Senate, organized and equipped to do the task, should be empowered by legislation to investigate conditions in each Senator's office from time to time, and particularly in emergency periods such as this. Such a committee could lay down rules and regulations governing the employment of added personnel. The committee could call upon the United States Civil Service Commission for personnel experts to analyze the condition in your office and in mine, and to prescribe the number of added clerks necessary under present-day conditions. The committee could, if they desired, explore the possibility of pooling the work, so that collectively the appropriations would not be much larger than they are today.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that no matter how we determine the issue which is before us today—whether by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, which has for its objective creating a research position in each Senator's office, or whether we adopt the proposal advanced by the Senator from Colorado, which will leave the classification of the salaries at the instance of the Senator—there will still remain the difficult task that burdens the Senators from the larger States. There will still remain the burdensome task of the Senators who, for the moment or for the session, happen to be in the limelight, as it were. No alleviation of those burdens will be brought about by the amendments we are to act upon today.

Of course, to a limited extent the pooling of salaries or the creating of another position would help; but the problem would still remain. In my judgment, my problem could only be solved by the addition of a fairly sizable number of typists and of stenographers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. My situation is totally different from that of the Senator from New York. I represent a State of half a million people, while he represents a State with a population of some 14,000,000. Obviously his mail is much greater than mine. I can get along now with the force I have. I do not want to vote any additional assistants for my office. The way in which the proposal comes up I must vote "yes" or "no" on it. I cannot consistently support a proposition that is going to give a position to my office which I do not need. I think the Senator's suggestion of a committee is entirely correct. I cannot agree with the Senator from Kentucky, and I cannot agree with my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, about rearranging these matters. I think that would cause Senators much embarrassment and much difficulty. I would prefer to have the salaries in my office fixed by law. I think the problem should be carefully studied, as the Senator from New York has indicated, so as to meet the situation as it exists, and as it affects those who represent different States and have different conditions to face.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if we had certain rules and standards set up by the proper committee of the Senate, the investigation of the needs of any office would not give consideration to political activities or activities not germane to a Senator's official duty. That is all I have in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has made a very logical statement in supporting his own position, which I know to be accurate, as we all do. I have no desire at all to cut the Senator short, but desire to help him find a solution not only for his problem but for the problems of others similarly circumstanced.

I would suggest, with the permission of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who appointed me chairman of the subcommittee handling legislative matters, that the Senator from New York, together with other Senators who likewise feel that they have a particular problem to meet which is not generally applicable to the whole Senate, prepare proposed legislation calculated to solve their problem; and I promise them, as chairman of the subcommittee, that as soon as the matter is referred to the

subcommittee we will have hearings on it, and attempt to arrive at a solution which will be equitable to the persons concerned, and not generally applicable where assistance would not be needed. If that sort of proposal is introduced in the Senate, we can consider it from all its angles and make an attempt to solve the problem.

If we adopt the pending suggestion we may be solving one or two parts of our problem, but while we do that we are also creating adverse conditions in the offices of Senators who do not need extra help, as the Senator from New York does. We should not do that, particularly when we have just voted to cut down strikes brought on because workers are protesting that they want more money.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I realize that the matter will not be expedited along the lines I have outlined by any prolonged debate, but the debate has been very interesting, and it has given us all an opportunity to present the problem as we see it.

I will say to my distinguished colleague from Maryland that I have introduced just the sort of a proposal he has suggested, which would allow one of the committees of the Senate to give consideration to our temporary needs. I believe the bill has been referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

My reason for introducing a proposal of that type was that I wanted to get away from creating any additional clerical positions, and to give the committee an opportunity to set up certain standards and to authorize temporary clerical help if it was found to be necessary. I think it is merely a temporary expedient, but it may lead to a permanent corrective of the problem we are discussing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I are both members of the committee, and I know, without consulting the Senator from Arizona, that I can speak for him when I say that we shall be very glad to consider the Senator's particular situation as it applies to himself, and the situation of other Senators, and endeavor to find some remedy at the earliest possible moment.

There is a difference between appropriating for an emergency and appropriating permanently, and the purpose of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is to take care of emergency situations. Therefore, if the Senator will pursue his request, having already introduced the bill, I for one shall do my utmost to try to see that justice is done.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. MEAD. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. My recollection is that a subcommittee was appointed by the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, consisting of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], I think the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and I believe I was the minority member, to consider the question of clerical assistants in the offices of Senators, and the question of the salaries to be paid them.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have not heard of any meeting of that subcommittee since.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me say to the Senator that we have tried repeatedly to reach the Senator from Maine, as well as the Senator from Arizona, and I drew up the amendment now before us when we could not reach the Senator from Maine, and I offered it before the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I have been here all the time; but I was not so much concerned about that. I did not mean to be critical. What I did desire to ask was whether the proposal of the Senator from Colorado was the recommendation of the majority of the subcommittee.

Mr. ADAMS. It is.

Mr. WHITE. May I say a further word while I am on my feet?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to indicate generally my complete sympathy with the views expressed by the Senator from New York regarding the problem which faces Senators, the problem raised in many instances by wholly inadequate office forces, and when I say inadequate, of course I mean inadequate in numbers. I view this problem, as every other Senator must, with some personal interest, but I think I view it objectively, too.

I have in mind that I came to Washington as the secretary of a Senator of the United States when I was nothing but a boy just out of college. I recall very definitely how every morning I used to go to the hotel to take dictation from that Senator. He used to open the mail, read a letter, dictate an answer to me, and throw the original letter in the wastebasket. I have no recollection of the Senator for whom I was working keeping a single letter in the 4 years I was with him, and I know that as his stenographer and clerk I did not keep a copy of a single letter written by me at his dictation during the years in which I was associated with him. And that was only a few years ago. [Laughter.] In the intervening time a tremendous change has come about, both in the character of the work which comes to the office of a Senator and in the volume of the work. I venture to say that today I have coming into my office, even though I am from a small State, 10 times the volume of mail which the Senator to whom I have referred received when I was acting as his secretary.

This cannot be helped, because as governmental activities have expanded, and new activities have been created, the Government has touched the citizens of the Nation and has touched the business life of the Nation in a thousand ways that were undreamed of in past years. Then, there have been the tremendous campaigns of the columnists and the radio commentators, who advise people to write to their Senators about this, that, and the other thing.

I know perfectly well that Senators who come from large States are utterly unable adequately to meet the demands which are made upon their time, their thought, and their energies, and to some degree at least that is true of every Senator.

This condition has some very unfortunate consequences, it seems to me. I think it makes a direct contribution and perhaps is the greatest reason for the fact that Senators come here on the floor and are compelled to vote upon matters to which they have not been able to give an hour's study or an hour's thought. There ought to be some way devised by which Senators, or persons who ought to be Senators in the proper sense, can give thought to the problems of government, can give thought to the form and substance of legislation. The vast increase in legislative proposals and the demands of all kinds and character which come are all at the cost of the proper attention and the first responsibility of a Senator, which is to be a student of governmental problems and of legislation pending in this body. Some way ought to be found by which Senators can be relieved from this multiplicity of detail, this burden, this weight of governmental organization, and of the demands which come to them. There ought to be some way by which a Senator can be relieved from so much detail, and rise, if the capacity is in him, to the stature of a Senator of the United States. There are few men in this day and generation, and in the situation which confronts us, who can meet that obligation.

Mr. President, I think I shall vote for the motion to suspend the rule. I shall do it only because I understand that an amendment is to be offered to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. I do not approve of a lump-sum appropriation to be made available to a Senator to be distributed as he sees fit among his office force. I do not want a Senator of the United States to fix the salaries of his office; to be responsible for the salaries of his office. I do not want brought down upon a Senator an avalanche of suspicion and criticism at the way he makes distribution of $15,000 or $14,000, whatever the amount may be a year. I believe in statutory salaries. I believe in statutory salaries for the employees of the Government generally, and no less, and perhaps even more, I believe in statutory salaries for employees of the Senate itself. So, Mr. President, while I am going to vote for the motion to suspend the rule and shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, if I correctly understand it, I shall vote for the substitute proposed to be offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], which provides for a research assistant for each Senator, to be paid the salary named in the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor, but before doing so I wish to say one more word. The distinguished Senator who has just concluded his brief statement brings to mind another thought which I believe would be germane in any discussion of clerical help and any discussion of the activities of a Senator which may come up upon the floor of the Senate. That is the question of committee assignments. We have, I suppose, some 32 standing committees, and probably 10 or 15 select

committees. We may have two or three hundred subcommittees. One morning only a week or two ago four committees which I had to attend were currently meeting, and, of course, it was simply a physical impossibility for me to attend them all.

The duty of attending committee meetings came to my mind when the Senator from Maine was on his feet, because of the statement previously made by the Senator from Colorado that the Senator from Maine could not be reached to attend a certain committee meeting. The chances are that the Senator could not attend all the committee or subcommittee meetings participated in by the Senator from Colorado by reason of his burden of committee assignments. I have attended a great many committee meetings with the Senator from Maine, and I know how diligently and how conscientiously he performs his committee duties.

Mr. President, I meant to say to the Senate a long time ago that while a certain distinguished Member of the House and myself, as a Member of the Senate, were given considerable credit for the enactment of the so-called Ramspeck bill, it was the diligence of the Senator from Maine, his constant attention to committee meetings, that made it possible for us to bring out that very helpful and most meritorious measure.

When we consider the volume of work we are called upon to perform, we should also have in mind the great number of committee assignments and the importance of those assignments.

I shall be glad to yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, what the Senator from New York has been talking about would apply to few other Senators besides himself, Senators who come from States having large populations and in which much business is done. The Senator's difficulties, which arise from the fact that his State has a large population and does much business would not be alleviated, would they, if we should suspend the rule and act upon and agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, such action would not be the answer to the problem I have in mind, but it would contribute in some measure to lessen the burden. As I also said, I am embracing every opportunity adequately to staff my office, so that the wants and the demands and the privileges of the people I represent may have some consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the amendment proposed to be acted upon, if the rule shall be suspended, has not been read. I have tried to have it read for the last half hour, but have not succeeded in having it read. Sometimes it seems that perhaps the Senate would rather discuss a question of procedure than to try to know what the matter in controversy really is. As I understand, however, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would enable the Senator from New York to appoint assistants in lieu of the help he now has, and attach a salary to each one of them in whatever amount he pleases within a certain amount of money to be provided. Does the Senator from New York want that?

Mr. MEAD. No; the Senator from New York does not want that, but he has in mind that the adoption of the motion may lead to the offering of substitute amendments, and that they may be in order. Therefore I believe it would open the way for further consideration of amendments.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator think that, in line with the suggestion made by my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], which seems to me to strike at the very heart of the matter, that the question which the Senator from Colorado raises, and the Senator from Maine raises, is one which ought to have deep and very careful study by a competent committee of the Senate before we try to enact a law on the subject? Why should not the matter take that course? Why should not a committee of the Senate try to frame legislation which will meet and cover this very difficult situation? It seems to me we throw discretion to the wind when we try to formulate a law of this kind on the floor of the Senate itself.

Mr. MEAD. I have submitted a resolution dealing with the matter, and it is before a regular committee of the Senate, but I am still of the opinion that Senators are so busy that they will not be able to consider my resolution unless we take advantage of the opportunity to relieve them of some of their work and to relieve them of it now. So in order that my resolution may eventually be considered, I am ready to give some relief today.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in my judgment, if we now suspend the rule and adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, we shall have a suspension of our work from our people at home. Another set of Senators will be here to take our places, and we shall be entirely relieved from the terrible burden which is bearing us down.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] says he is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, but that he intends to vote for the motion to suspend the rule. If he wishes to defeat the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, the best way—and perhaps the only way—is to vote against suspending the rule, because a two-thirds vote is required to suspend the rule; and if the rule is once suspended, only a majority is required to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. So if we are opposed to that amendment and vote to suspend the rule, we go at least halfway toward killing our own votes when we vote against the amendment itself.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that it is a mistake to say that committee consideration was not given to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado. The matter was before the subcommittee which was handling the legislative appropriation bill, and the subcommittee in turn appointed a subcommittee of three to make a study of the question and to present an amendment which, in their judgment, would undertake to carry out the purpose which a majority of the subcommittee had in mind. So the subcommittee met and considered the matter. At least the Senator from Colorado and the senior Senator from Louisiana gave earnest consideration to it. As a result, this amendment was proposed, and was then taken up by the full committee. The full committee, after consideration, authorized the Senator from Maryland to present it upon the floor.

If the Senator from New York will indulge me, I see nothing very objectionable in the amendment. So far as I am individually concerned, I am perfectly willing to run the risk of being relegated back to my State if I should vote for the amendment and it should be agreed to. I think each Senator is in the best position to determine just what compensation his various clerks should receive. A Senator may have in his office some clerks who are entitled to $2,400 a year, some who are entitled to $3,000 a year, and some who are entitled to no more than $1,500 a year.

The purpose of the amendment is, instead of having a frozen schedule of compensation which a Senator must pay to each clerk, regardless of ability or experience, to permit the Senator to determine just what compensation each clerk shall receive. For example, the Senator from Maine may have clerks in his office who come under a scheduled salary of $2,220, although they may not be worth $2,220. I may have a clerk under that schedule who is worth no more than $1,800 or $2,000. The purpose of the amendment is simply to authorize each Senator to fix the salaries in his own office.

There could be no scandal about it. There could be no opportunity improperly to use the funds—if it can be contemplated for a moment that any Senator would do so—because each Senator would certify to the disbursing officer the compensation which each of the employees in his office should receive. Therefore, the only difference between existing law and the law contemplated by the amendment is that under the terms of the amendment each Senator would determine the value of the help in his office and fix the salaries accordingly. He would spend no more and no less than the total aggregate sum allocated for clerical help and would certify to the disbursing officer the list of his employees and the salary which each should receive.

In the case of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who requires more aid than, we will say, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York could use the same aggregate amount and have a larger number of employees. Many of them might be called upon to do mere clerical work which could be performed by a $100-a-month or $90-a-month clerk.

On the other hand, some other Senator may be so situated as to require fewer, but more experienced and better-qualified, assistants. He could arrange his office to accommodate that need.

In any event, there would be no opportunity for scandal. There would be no

opportunity for criticism, because the whole thing would be done openly and aboveboard. The schedule of salaries would be filed with the disbursing officer, and the salaries would be paid to the employees by the Treasurer of the United States and not by Senators.

Therefore, Mr. President, after mature thought—at least on the part of the Senator from Colorado and myself—we proposed this amendment. I hope the rule may be suspended.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, before yielding the floor I wish to say that the suggestion just developed by the Senator from Louisiana, whereby we could file with the proper officer of the Senate at the beginning of each session of the Congress a list of personnel and the classification of salaries, would, in my judgment, prevent any misuse or any unjustifiable apportionment of the money.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who occupied the floor a few moments ago, that I am not excited about this amendment. No matter how we might utilize the amount of money allocated, it would be inadequate so far as I am concerned, because at least $400 over and above that amount is now required for the proper manning of my office. I am hopeful that the suspension of the rule will allow us to amend the amendment so that we may obtain some relief now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there is one point about which I think we should be quite clear. I am not apprehensive of suspicion of the integrity of Senators. Each session Congress appropriates many billion dollars. This session some $19,000,000,000 have been appropriated; and now we are told that a Senator would be under suspicion if he should distribute among the employees in his office $12,000 in a year, and that our people at home would keep us there if we should see fit as a body to endeavor to work out on an intelligent basis the schedule of salaries in our own offices.

The offices of Senators and Representatives are understaffed. We are the fundamental legislative body of this great land. We pass the laws upon which the entire Government operates. In this body we have passed as many as 165 laws in one afternoon; and yet I dare say not one Senator knew the contents of 20 of them. We deal with the very future of our Republic; and yet we hesitate to provide ourselves with even a minimum amount of assistance. If the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy should appeal to Congress for $10,000,000 for additional assistants, in the form of 50 lawyers, or other help, we should not hesitate for a moment. We are appropriating money by the hundreds of millions, and by the billions, to staff the Government; but we question whether our constituents would stand for our providing additional assistance for ourselves.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I might suggest to the Senator that only recently the President by proclamation created a new department. That new department has been in existence for only a few weeks. Within the last week the head of that department came before one committee of the Senate and testified that already he had a staff of 250, including a corps of attorneys, economists, and other special and clerical assistants.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, if I may make the suggestion to the Senator, that if the departments of the Government, starting with the Cabinet officers and other department heads, are permitted to have almost an unlimited number of attorneys, economists, specialists, engineers, and other advisers of one kind and another to advise them in their duties, it is not far afield to ask that each Senator may have at least one assistant who should be a specialist, so to speak, for the benefit of the office of the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it is not just for the benefit of Senators that I am speaking. I am speaking for the benefit of the country. It will mean better legislation if we are properly equipped. On the whole, the Senators of the United States are not equipped today to pass on the great fundamental items of legislation. We are oppressed with the minutiae of our offices. We cannot attend to the matters coming before committees to which we are assigned. Bills of great complexity come in. We have seen bills of 200 and 300 pages filed on Monday and taken up on Wednesday, bills in which there were paragraphs which could well be studied a week or a month; and yet we are called upon to vote.

We hesitate to provide ourselves with anything but clerical help to answer the routine correspondence of our offices. It is not our interest which is involved; it is to the interest of the United States that we be properly advised and properly informed. We have 24 hours a day, but we have enough business requiring our time to take 100 hours a day. I know that I am reasonably diligent. I devote to my senatorial duties practically every waking hour from 9 o'clock in the morning until midnight, and yet I cannot begin to touch the problems that come to my desk. It is not fair to the country; it is not fair to me. And then for us to say, as we do, that the people of the country will not sustain us in taking steps to look after their business better.

I am perfectly willing to say to my constituents, "If you want an uninformed Senator, if you are not willing to have one who is anxious to help you, get somebody else who is interested only in getting his salary and in keeping the good opinion of those who are not interested in the public welfare."

This is not a new matter. It has been discussed on this floor, it has been discussed in the corridors for years. There is no reason why we have to refer it back. There is not a Member of the Senate whose office is not under-staffed. There is not a Member of the Senate who is able to give to his duties the time, the attention, and the study which they deserve.

Some Senators are better equipped than others. Those of us less well equipped perhaps need more help. The Senator from New York is concerned with a problem which is peculiar to two or three States. I am concerned with the problem which affects the office of practically every Member of the Senate. It is a general problem, and I think we should meet it. I think we should meet the Senator's problem in due course. I think the need is here, but I think we lack courage. We are fearful of doing the thing we know we ought to do.

I am perfectly willing to face my constituents and say to them, "Senators needed additional help, and I voted for it," and to say to them, "It takes a half million dollars—yes—to aid in administering what? A Government which is spending $20,000,000,000 a year." And yet we hesitate.

Today we are considering an appropriation bill. Outside the committee there is not a Member of the Senate who knows what is in this legislative appropriation bill. I have brought on the floor of the Senate appropriation bills appropriating as much as three and one-half billion dollars. The Members of the Senate could not understand the details of such a bill, and yet they are concerned with it.

We consider measures to be enacted into great fundamental laws. Now and then, there is a measure which we carefully discuss. Most of the time we pass bills without the opportunity fully to discuss and study them; and yet now the Senator from Kentucky is pointed out as seeking a very dangerous thing when he asks that the Senators of the United States, representing great States, be furnished with experts to aid them in performing their duties.

I venture to say that the Department of Agriculture has 500 lawyers. I venture to say that the Department of the Treasury has lawyers by the hundreds. But we have a little legislative drafting service; that is the extent to which we go in providing ourselves with expert advice. If we want information we go to the Library. There are several million books there; we can go there; it is all there. But we do not have the equipment to get the information we should have.

I do not know how to handle all the work confronting me. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I have been utterly helpless to handle the amount of work which has confronted me. We go home and we work as long as our eyes will stand, and there on our tables at home lies unfinished work. We come to our office, and the work piles up.

It is a little like getting into quicksand: One shovelful is taken out and two shovelfuls come in. I come from a State which is not populous, generally speaking; and yet I answer 50,000 letters a year. About 200 or 300 letters a day go out with my signature on them. That work takes time, and we do not have the chance to devote the proper attention to

the fundamental legislative matters which confront us.

We come into the Senate, and what do we do? We say, "What shall we take up today?" That is what we do most of the time. A Senator rises and makes a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill so-and-so or House bill so-and-so—a bill of great importance—and we have not had a chance to study it. We are compelled to rely upon the committees.

If we had the assistance of someone whom we could have make a detailed and technical study of such matters, we could render a better service to our country.

In advocating this measure we are not seeking to help ourselves. We are seeking to help the country. That is what I am concerned about. We give all that is in us; we cannot give any more. But we can give better service if we are better equipped. I trust the Senate will not hesitate to suspend the rule so that the matter can at least be discussed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I know there are a great many difficulties which confront Senators in the performance of their duties. We cannot obtain a perfect solution of the difficulty which confronts us. The Senator from New York has well pointed out that he has to meet conditions which perhaps very few other Senators have to meet; and yet I can conceive of a Senator from New York not writing a dozen letters a day.

Senators have spoken of the work falling upon various committees. How about the Committee on Foreign Relations? Its able chairman is now before me. Right now and perhaps for a considerable time to come, as well as during several years past, the work of that committee has been ponderous, almost too much for human mind to master; and yet in the history of the Senate there have been many times when the work of that committee amounted to practically nothing. If peace should come again to the world, the burdens now resting upon that chairman and that committee would to a very great extent disappear. When railroad legislation is pending, the Committee on Interstate Commerce is overburdened.

When banking legislation is pending the Committee on Banking and Currency is overburdened; but the pendulum swings up today and down next year. We cannot help that. I myself cannot see how the adoption of the motion to suspend the rule would help solve the dilemma of the Senator from New York; nor can I understand how it would help the Senator from Maine in solving his problem.

Some Senators have much work because of what they have done for their country. Able Senators who, with ability and courage, have devoted a great deal of their time to patriotic services attract to themselves a correspondence which does not come to those of us who constitue the average group of Senators, and there comes an added burden to the others which they must meet and bear. Would we arbitrarily provide that Senator Jones or Senator Smith shall have $25,000 for research work and also have 10 employees and not give the same privilege to the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from Nebraska? We cannot divide it up in that way; we cannot make the burden equal, no matter what we do. We might just as well submit to it.

The Senator from New York said, "I had four committees meeting all at once at the same hour." Well, the able Senator from New York can remedy that situation. The remedy can be put in a sentence, and the Senator from New York himself will not dispute it. He is on too many committees. A Senator who, under present conditions, handles a great committee, such as the Foreign Relations Committee, if he is on a dozen other committees, has to neglect them. He cannot look after his duties on the other committees. It is a physical impossibility for a man to serve on the Interstate Commerce Committee, on the Foreign Relations Committee, on the Banking and Currency Committee, on the Agricultural Committee, and, perhaps, on the Judiciary Committee at the same time. That is too much for any man to undertake. Yet a Senator need not do that unless he wants to. Everyone admits that Senators serve on too many committees. I suppose every Senator who has given the subject any thought—and I presume they all have—will concede that we ought not to have as many committee assignments as we have. Look over the Congressional Directory and see the committee assignments various Senators have. They will all admit the number is too great. The work of all of them cannot be done by any one man; as in the case of the Senator from New York, they might be meeting on the same day and at the same hour.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Will the Senator from Nebraska point to me one single, solitary sentence in the proposal of the Senator from Colorado that would remedy the situation? It would simply give to him and to me the right to fix the pay of attachés of our respective committees; and we might, through partiality, fix the pay of the least competent one above that of the most efficient one.

Mr. NORRIS. That is true, we might. The Senator from Maine, who says he is going to vote for the motion, is opposed to that very proposition.

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. CHANDLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from California, and then will yield to the Senator from Kentucky later.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I desire to vote to suspend the rule so as to have the opportunity to vote for a proposal which is to come up in the form of an amendment by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to furnish each Senator an economic adviser or expert at a salary of $5,000 a year?

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska—and I will take only a few seconds—that in the complicated world of legislation that lies ahead in finance, and agriculture, and industry, and war it is impossible for me to believe that there is a Senator who would not benefit tremendously by having the assistance and aid of some expert economist and some person versed in legislation to help him bear the burdens which right on the floor of the Senate, without even counting committee hearings, are beyond the strength, I believe, of any Member of the Senate of the United States. It is because I desire the opportunity to vote upon the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kentucky that I shall vote to suspend the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I disavow any personal or selfish interest in the matter at all. I will make the assertion that my office staff is as satisfactory to me as the office staff of any other Senator is satisfactory to him, and I do not care how satisfactory the other staffs may be.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think anybody has even thought that there is any personal interest in the matter on the part of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Someone suggested that there is a disposition on the part of somebody to give every Member of the Senate a higher staff official, which would result in the people becoming so outraged that they would send Senators home.

Mr. NORRIS. I think they would keep them home.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think it is very important to the people that any individual Member of the Senate remain here. I think the Republic would probably go on if all of us disappeared in time. I think the important matter is how well we serve them while we are here.

If the Senator will further yield, I want an opportunity to suspend the rule so that I may offer an amendment which, if adopted, would give to every Senator—not discriminate at all, but give to every Senator—an expert, if such a man can be obtained, or a research man who can look into the important matters coming before Congress and keep Senators informed. I assert that there is not a Senator, with the duties we all have and the responsibilities we all have, who has an opportunity fully to inform himself on important public questions that come before the Senate of the United States. I want that opportunity, and, unless the rule shall be suspended, I will not get it.

It is said that if we let the suggestion go to the committee the committee will consider it. This is no new proposition; it has been considered ever since I was a boy, and probably will still be under consideration when my boys grow up. I am anxious to help the Senator who needs help to get it now; and this is the way to get it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, still that is not the way to legislate. We all know that. We do not require a $5,000-a-year expert in our offices to tell us that that is not the way to do business in the Senate. Mr. President, probably it would be a good thing if we allowed every Senator to appoint an expert—I suppose he would not even have to be called an expert; although some of them probably would be experts and some of them would not be; I do not know, but I assume that they would all be economists and philosophers—pay them $5,000 a year, let them run the Senate, and let us go home, where the people would probably keep us. We might get an improved condition; but that is not the way to legislate. If I——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in a moment, if the Senator will let me finish this paragraph.

If I want to have the Senate legislate on an important proposition, what do I do? I introduce a bill. It goes to a committee. It has consideration. In due time it comes out of the committee with either a favorable or an unfavorable report, with or without amendment. The Senator from Kentucky wants to do away with all that.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, no.

Mr. NORRIS. He wants to legislate right here on one of the most intricate problems that confront us as Senators; and it is one of the most intricate problems. I realize that it has difficulties. I am not trying to underestimate them; but, Mr. President, on this important question it is proposed to suspend the rule, and Senators are told, "If you will suspend the rule and adopt this amendment we will give every one of you an opportunity to appoint a man to a $5,000 job." That is the way it is proposed to bribe Senators to get this amendment through; and it is in the nature of a bribe.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no wish about the salary. It does not have to be $5,000. I desire to try to make the Senate more efficient than it is.

Mr. NORRIS. All right.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has stated that a bill goes to a committee and comes out with a favorable or an unfavorable report. If he will look at the statistics of the Senate and House of Representatives, he will find that there are thousands and thousands of bills that go to committees and never come out with any report. It is impossible now even to find them. They are somewhere, but they are lost.

There are two ways to legislate. One is to legislate when you can get your bill out in the usual way. The other is, when you cannot get it out in the usual way, to suspend the rule and thereby get it out. That is the reason why the rules of the Senate provide for suspension of the rule, so that when a Member cannot get relief in any other way he can ask the Senate to set aside the rule and give him an opportunity to have his bill considered. That is the reason for the rule.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think that is the reason, but for argument's sake let us admit that it is the reason. We have the rule, and we are all trying to abide by it. Senators may take advantage of it for any legitimate purpose if they want to. I will not object to that. Nobody will object to that; but when the Senator talks about thousands of bills being introduced, let me tell him this:

Just the other day, before the Judiciary Committee, there came a report from a subcommittee of which I happen to be a member. We had three bills referred to us, and we recommended the indefinite postponement of every one of them. In the case of one of them we afterward changed the recommendation, because the chairman wanted to look further into the bill, and it came back to us. We had a bill there which embodied practically the same proposition that I have seen up in that committee for the past 15 years. We have taken volumes of evidence and hearings on it.

We inquired of the chairman of the subcommittee, "Why does not the introducer of the bill, the Senator who introduced it, appear in support of it? A United States Senator, with all the glory and glamor that comes to every United States Senator, no matter who he is, had introduced the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee said, "I talked with the Senator about the bill. I invited him to the hearings. He said he did not want to come; that he had no interest in the bill." The Senator introduced the bill because a friend of his had drawn it and given it to him and asked him to introduce it, and he put us to work on that bill without his doing a thing, without his even drawing the bill.

We spent hours and hours upon that bill, and finally voted to postpone it indefinitely, not necessarily because there was not merit in it, but because it was a question that the committee had thrashed out a dozen times before, and had not agreed on any report, or any action to be taken regarding it.

There are thousands of those bills. There are now pending before that committee bills to make a holiday in honor of somebody who invented a wheelbarrow, or something of the kind. In the case of some inventions everybody would admit that we perhaps would do well if we had a celebration every year in honor of the inventor; but when we once start that sort of thing there is not any stopping place.

When that bill was up, I wanted to add to the illustrious inventors named in it a man in my State who had invented a new endgate to a wagon that enabled the corn husker, when he filled the wagon with corn from the field, to shovel it out without having a board put in the wagon, or without picking out by hand a lot of the corn before he could get the scoop shovel down to the floor. That poor man invented an endgate of that kind. He never got a dollar out of it. He had the invention patented, and he thought—probably in an exaggerated way—that it was worth a great deal of money. A representative of a big wagon factory came down to buy his right, and the inventor asked him too much money; so the big corporation which was making wagons that we have seen all over the agricultural part of the country started to make those endgates without paying any attention to the patent, and they have been making them ever since, and the poor inventor died of a broken heart. He had not any money, and he could not get anybody to fight a big corporation of that kind in a patent case; and if you will talk with patent lawyers you will say that the course he took was wise, after all, because it would have taken a fortune to fight the matter through.

We have all kinds of bills pending before our committees, and we must pass on them and approve them or reject them. We cannot help that situation by appointing an economist at a salary of five or ten thousand dollars a year for each one of us. We ourselves must meet that situation.

The Senator from Colorado said, or at least intimated, that we ought to have enough courage to vote for this amendment. I think we ought to have enough courage to vote it down. No charge is made that any Senator is lacking in courage. I said that I thought the people at home would keep us at home if we took this step and did what the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would do. I have not any personal interest in the matter. My service here is about ended. It does not take any courage on my part, and I am not claiming any, to vote either way or any way or both ways on this proposal. I am about at the end of my string. I realize that just as well as the rest of you do; and the rest of you realize it too, without any doubt. No question of courage is involved in this matter. If courage is involved, we ought to have enough courage to stop a machine that will give every Senator the right to apportion the salaries of all his help. That meets the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. We ought to have the courage to vote against the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky, which would give an expert to every one of us. I desire to say to the Senator from New York that we shall never meet the situation by giving ourselves more employees.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. A moment ago the Senator mentioned a suggestion for a corrective; that is, my being associated with a smaller number of committees. I have before me the Congressional Directory, and I find that there are over 600 committee assignments which Members of the Senate must of necessity fill. There are only 96 Senators, and therefore it probably is incumbent upon us to take our average share of assignments. In addition to that, however, some of the committees have from 8 to 10 or a dozen subcommittees; so the point I make is that occasionally there are three or four meetings on the same morning. That may happen, and it very frequently does happen.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it does.

Mr. MEAD. I wish there were a smaller number of committees. I wish it

were possible for the organization of the Senate to reduce the number of subcommittees and full committees; but the Senator from New York is not on any too many committees when we consider the activity of the committees, there being major and minor committees, and when we consider the number of committees which the Members of the Senate must of necessity fill. With one or two exceptions, I did not ask for my present committee assignments.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have not charged the Senator with anything of that kind. It would not be a charge, even if it were true. The Senator has a right to ask for committee assignments. That is a common practice.

Mr. MEAD. Our States have a right to expect their Representatives to represent them on committees. But if we were to suggest to the leaders of the Senate that, as a corrective, we would resign our committee assignments, we would still have the burdens of our office work, and we must of necessity do that work first. I think the committee work is the important work, next to the work of the Senate, and I believe we should give that first importance in any consideration of help we need to enable us to perform our duties.

In all, the Senate has 43 committees; 32 regular committees and 11 special and select committees. There are over 600 committee assignments, without considering the subcommittee assignments, which run over a thousand. So that work must be divided up. Anyway, it must be taken into consideration in connection with the work assigned to a Senator, and that is why I mentioned it a moment ago.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator had let me have a word when he was talking so well and so eloquently, I think I could have answered him in one sentence. But he has mentioned so many things that I do not know whether I will remember all the question. I forgot the first part before the Senator got the last part out.

Briefly, the Senator would find a remedy for most all the the ills he has mentioned if Senators were not allowed to hold so many committee assignments; and there is not a Senator of experience, in my judgment, who will not say that is true, that one of the evils is that we have too many committee assignments. Several years ago there was considerable agitation on the subject, and we adopted a rule, at least we had a gentleman's agreement, that if a Senator served on two major committees, that should be the limit. There were some exceptions. One was that if a Senator was chairman of a certain committee, he should not have any other committee assignment. It was not long before we gradually disregarded that agreement, until we are back pretty nearly, though not quite, to a condition as bad as the former condition.

When the Democrats were in power or the Republicans were in power, and they had to accommodate so many Senators, they would say, "This committee has 18, and we will give it 21," or the next committee might have 16, and they would make it 18. Gradually we drifted away from what we knew was the right course to pursue.

It is in our power now to remedy the situation. No Member of the Senate should be allowed to have seven or eight major committee assignments. I do not criticize those who have. In most cases I suppose they ask for them and get them; but it is not right. It makes it impossible for such a Senator to do the best work of which he is capable for the good of his country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In any case, even admitting that there is an evil which should be corrected, the place to correct it is not on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it is not.

Mr. TYDINGS. But in the committee; and as I have said, if any Senators who have just complaints will introduce legislation to accomplish what they desire, we will give them a quick hearing, and try to meet them half way, rather than take the matter up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. That is commendable. I know there is room for improvement; I do not deny it; but the Senator from Maryland has suggested what, in my judgment, is the only right remedy to adopt. We should not try to settle this question without mature committee consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senate wants to settle it, has the Senator any objection?

Mr. NORRIS. I cannot help myself. I am not complaining about it. If the Senate wants to discharge every committee it has and settle everything right here on the floor, I cannot help it, and I will not complain about it if a majority wants to do that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am sorry the Senator stated that this was in the nature of a bribe, because I did not offer it with any such idea.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I did not think the Senator was offering it with any such thought.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator would get just as much out of it as I would get out of it, because I suppose I would get less than anyone else. The Senator has been here a long time, but there are many who do not know much about how the Government operates in these complex times, and I think we could solve our problems by getting someone to take the burdens of our work off us and furnish us needed information, and that is what I am seeking to accomplish.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no idea in my mind but that the Senator's motive is just as pure as is mine.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was sorry to hear the Senator say it was in the nature of a bribe.

Mr. NORRIS. If I thought it was, that would not necessarily mean that I thought the Senator was trying to bribe the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not deny that a good case may be made out for some of this contention. What I am complaining of is the method. I am contending that it should be brought before the committee. If Senators will bring it before the committee, we will do everything we can to give them a fair hearing.

Mr. CHANDLER. A good thing should be done by a good method. If it is not done by the Senator's method, he should let me do it by mine.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senator's method is good.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think so; and I think I should have a right to pursue my own way.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not question the Senator's motive at all; and, as I have said, if the Senate wants to do it, Senators will not find me complaining afterward. I can live under that condition just as well as can anyone else, because I have not very long to stay here anyway.

It comes down to the practical proposition, Do we want to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered, so that for my office and for other Senators' offices an appropriation will be made approximating the total amount of salaries of all our clerical help, including our secretaries, leaving it to us, so that we can say one man will have a certain salary and another another salary, and divide it up as we choose?

What would the country think about it? We should have some regard for what the country thinks. In these times, particularly we should have a solid and united country, and we should have a solid Senate. How would the country take such a proposition?

I do not wish to be thought as charging anyone with a lack of courage. One Senator has intimated that it takes some courage to do this, but that it is right. I do not think it takes any courage, and I do not think it is right. We should not do it.

We talk about relieving Senators of burdens. We would be putting one of the greatest burdens on every Senator's back if we adopted this proposal. Each Senator would have to divide up the money. Do Senators want to do that in their offices? Do they think their constituents want them to do it? For the good of the country, should we do it?

I do not know what the amount would be.

Mr. WHITE. I think at the present time the aggregate salaries are slightly under $14,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us say $14,000 or $15,000 comes to me to do what I please with, to hire for the work as many men or women as I want to hire, and to pay them anything I want to. Do Senators want to do that? Is there a Senator who thinks he can do it and not escape just criticism? It would be one of the worst burdens ever put on a Senator's back if he were called on to do that thing.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I imagine that every Senator has in his office a secretary in whom he has confidence, and whose

judgment in most things he respects, or he would not keep him as his secretary. In my years of experience as a Senator, attempting to handle the floods of mail which come along at intervals, I have been upon many occasions compelled to do what seems to be the very thing that is suggested by the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, divert my secretary from his work and put him on the job of helping me try to get at the meat of a bill, or helping draw some amendment; and my own secretary has done a pretty good job. Perhaps I am in error, but I think most Senators would agree that if it were possible to get an extra clerk, thus furnishing needed assistance, the secretary might then be diverted to research work without unduly disturbing the operations of the office.

I recall that not long ago the postmaster in the Senate Office Building stated that 125,000 letters a day were coming into the Senate Office Building.

That is more than an average of a thousand letters a day to each Senator's office; and I know that in some of the crises which have confronted us, Senators have received more than a thousand letters in a day. The mechanical work in trying to answer the correspondence is a formidable problem in itself. To be prompt, to show some decent regard for the feelings of those who write, and to give them intelligent answers calls for the cooperation and assistance of everyone on a Senator's staff.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the proposal contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would work out satisfactorily, but I think the average Senator knows in his own mind whether his secretary can do that kind of work. I know my own secretary has done that kind of work in my office. In connection with one bill, to which I have given a great deal of consideration, and on which I have worked night after night, my secretary has often stayed with me until 12 and 1 o'clock in the morning. It has been a long and difficult bill to work over.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, what the Senator has said about the work of Senators and of Senators' secretaries is probably true. I have not said anything about my own individual work. I do not intend to do so. I think the question is a greater one than that. We are not going to bring about a condition which is entirely satisfactory no matter what we do.

I understand that a few years ago the House of Representatives, in providing for the help of its Members, provided a certain lump sum to be given to each Member of the House, and each Member was permitted to divide the lump sum as he saw fit. So much fault was found with that procedure, there was so much criticism of it, it was so unsatisfactory that I understand it was changed, and now they have a rule somewhat similar to ours. I am not positive about that situation. What I have said about it is from hearsay. I have not looked into the matter. But I do not think there is any dispute about the fact.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator it is my information that the House has the lump-sum practice now.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think they have that practice now.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am advised that the lump-sum practice is still in effect there. The Senator was correct except that his sequence was wrong. It was only recently that was done.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be true.

Mr. President, I regret that anyone should say that Senators would vote against this proposal because they were afraid to vote for it, that they were not courageous enough to stand up and do what they know to be the right thing. I do not think that is true. I do not think such an intimation is justified.

Mr. President, by making such a provision as here proposed we would not get better service. A Senator may hire a dozen experts, and still the burden of legislation rests on his own shoulders. He can read and study only 24 hours a day, and even though he had 50 experts serving him, he would be obliged to study legislation in the same way he does now. This proposal would not relieve him. A Senator probably should be relieved of much of the work that falls to him to do, but the acceptance of this proposal would not relieve him. In fact, none of the proposals made here would relieve him. We can provide a remedy if we wish to take action and cut down membership on committees or even cut down the number of committees.

Mr. President, I have not heard the proposed amendment read, nor have I had an opportunity to read it myself, but from what I have heard said about it, I believe the Senate should vote down the motion to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to have the pending motion read?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

JUNE 5, 1941.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place to insert the following:

"That Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees in this act or resolution: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen may certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule."

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I want to make one brief observation. I could join in a great part of the remarks made this afternoon by the proponents of this amendment, but one thing has not been mentioned, and, because I think it possible that this debate will be studied in the future, I should like to point out that for a long time past—perhaps it is a little more quiet now because of the international situation—the charge has been made here and over the country that ours largely has been, and is becoming to a greater extent, a government of bureaucracy, and that the legislature has surrendered.

Of course, that is in part the truth. There is not a Senator who does not know that it becomes necessary for the committees of Congress to depend upon the departments for a great part of the information they obtain. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Appropriation bills are written without full knowledge, even by the committee members, and are dependent upon the confidence they have in departmental and other officials. So it is in the other committees of the Senate. It seems to me this proposal affords a chance in some degree to get away from the charge, and what I believe to be the fact, that this is becoming to a great extent a government of bureaucracy, a government by the departments, and not by the legislature.

I mention this in part because I want to satisfy myself that I express my views and do not rest upon the statements of others in connection with an issue which in some slight respects is delicate of discussion in the Senate.

Mr. President, I think the proposal is wise. Ever so many Members, during the years I have been here, have talked about this matter and have admitted their inability to be kept properly informed. I think with the kind of person the Senator from Kentucky has in mind, with one so equipped, we would not only be better legislators, we would not only have better legislation, and not pass 165 bills in an afternoon without study, but, in my judgment, we would save the Government over a period of time hundreds of millions of dollars.

I hope the motion prevails.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, so that the amendment proposed by him may be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and will vote. I vote "yea." I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON],

and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business in various Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent due to the death of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on account of the serious illness of a close associate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is unavoidably absent on public business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—50

Adams	Connally	Mead
Aiken	Danaher	Overton
Andrews	Downey	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Bulow	Houston	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	La Follette	Tobey
Caraway	Lodge	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chavez	McCarran	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	White
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	

NAYS—14

Bailey	Ellender	Hayden
Bone	George	Norris
Bunker	Gerry	Spencer
Byrd	Glass	Tydings
Byrnes	Green	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Langer	Schwartz
Barbour	Lee	Smathers
Barkley	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	McNary	Truman
Brown	Murdock	Vandenberg
Davis	Murray	Wagner
Gillette	Nye	Wallgren
Harrison	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hatch	Reed	Wiley
Hughes	Reynolds	Willis
Johnson, Calif.	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI is agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment for the consideration of which the rule has just been suspended and ask that it be stated.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

That Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees in this act or resolution: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the amendment which I offer as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

A research assistant, at $5,000 per annum, for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we have discussed this matter in the Senate for 2 or 3 hours, and I do not desire to discuss it any further. However, I request that the yeas and nays be ordered on this amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment, and yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senator from Kentucky. Did he offer his amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, or as a substitute for it?

Mr. CHANDLER. As a substitute. I prefer to have my amendment considered as a substitute.

Mr. OVERTON. The effect of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would be to displace the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct; the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would then be lost.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. I do not understand the parliamentary situation. Did the Senator from Kentucky state that he offered his amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. For the information of the Senate, or at least for the information of those of us who did not hear the amendment read, may the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky be again read before we proceed any further with the roll call? I should like to have the amendment read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will again state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed by the Senator from Colorado, it is proposed to insert the following:

A research assistant, at $5,000 per annum, for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is not offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it is offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. STEWART. Then it is not offered as a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me pursue my inquiry a little further. If the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as I understand, if the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky should be agreed to, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would be entirely wiped out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. That would not be true, however, if the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky were offered as an amendment to the Adams amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is adopted it will replace the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, suppose a Senator cannot get a research assistant for his office?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any debate during the calling of the roll is out of order. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the pending amendment should prevail, would the situation then be that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as amended, would become the pending question, and subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment were offered as an amendment and should be adopted in that form, the question then before the Senate would be on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as amended.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and let my vote stand. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business in various Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. BRIDGES. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—30

Adams	Connally	Lucas
Andrews	Danaher	McFarland
Bankhead	Downey	Maloney
Bone	Guffey	Mead
Brewster	Herring	Pepper
Bridges	Hill	Rosier
Brooks	Houston	Shipstead
Caraway	Kilgore	Stewart
Chandler	La Follette	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	White

NAYS—35

Aiken	Ellender	Overton
Bailey	George	Radcliffe
Ball	Gerry	Smith
Bulow	Glass	Spencer
Bunker	Green	Taft
Burton	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Holman	Tobey
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	Murdock	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Norris	

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Langer	Smathers
Barbour	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Bilbo	McNary	Vandenberg
Brown	Murray	Wagner
Davis	Nye	Wallgren
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Harrison	Reed	Wiley
Hatch	Reynolds	Willis
Hughes	Russell	
Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz	

So Mr. CHANDLER'S amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of Mr. ADAMS was rejected.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following:

A research assistant, at $4,500 per annum, for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is out of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course it is, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is out of order on the ground that it seeks to increase an appropriation, whereas the original amendment for which the rule was suspended would not increase the appropriation. The appropriation may not be increased.

Mr. CHANDLER. The rule has been suspended, and so it does not now apply.

Mr. TAFT. Only as to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The rule was suspended on the motion of the Senator from Colorado so as to permit him to offer a particular amendment to the bill. When the rule was suspended it was then in order for the Senator from Kentucky to offer as a substitute a proposition in the place of that submitted by the Senator from Colorado. There can be no further amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, because the rule was suspended primarily for one purpose only, and that was to consider the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. A substitute would be in order, but another amendment to the bill would require another suspension of the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think the situation is perfectly clear in this regard. The rule was suspended to permit the offering of an amendment by the Senator from Colorado. When the amendment of the Senator from Colorado was properly offered under the suspension of the rule, an amendment could be offered to that amendment subject to the point of order that it was not germane, in which case the question of germaneness should be decided by the Senate by a majority vote.

If the Senate had adopted the substitute of the Senator from Kentucky, it would then not be in order certainly to amend further what the Senate had just by a majority vote put in the bill; but, the substitute having been voted down, we are, from a parliamentary standpoint, in precisely the same situation in which we were when the Senator from Colorado offered his amendment under a suspension of the rules; and if the amendment now offered by the Senator from Kentucky should be considered and adopted by a majority vote of the Senate, it would be perfectly proper from a parliamentary standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland insist a point of order——

Mr. TYDINGS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to overrule the point of order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it in order now to offer a substitute for the so-called Adams amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A substitute amendment would be in order, but the perfecting amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Kentucky would take precedence.

Mr. DANAHER. Would a substitute for the substitute be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be in order. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is in the second degree, and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is in the first degree.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am ready for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I do not quite understand the amendment as read from the desk which the Senator from Kentucky has offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. ADAMS it is proposed to add the following:

A research assistant at $4,500 per annum for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. On the amendment to the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky, if I may have his attention, that I think his amendment should be changed. He should modify it. It says "a research assistant." What he means is that each Senator shall have a research assistant.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is in the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, but——

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the clerk read the amendment again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will again be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment of Mr. ADAMS it is proposed to insert:

A research assistant at $4,500 per annum for each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CONNOLLY. It does not say that each Senator is authorized to have such an assistant. It merely says——

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the way all appropriation items of this character read.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it does not do that, then it may be changed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Under rule XVI, paragraph 1, it is provided:

No amendments shall be received * * * the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law—

There is no law providing for research assistants—

or treaty stipulation * * * or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate—

This amendment is not so moved—

or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

There has been no such estimate.

It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would not increase the appropriation in any way, but in suspending the rule to consider that amendment we did not suspend the rule providing against amendments increasing appropriations. I should like to submit that point of order as to the amendment now being considered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One point of order has already been submitted, on which the Chair was about to rule.

Mr. LUCAS. I submit that the point of order raised by the Senator from Ohio is out of order, because the Chair has already ruled on the point of order raised by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I should like to have the Chair rule on the point of order I have made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest to the Chair that the point made by the Senator from Ohio is not tenable. We are not increasing an appropriation. We are legislating, and the suspension of the rule made it possible for us to legislate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will overrule the point of order raised by the Senator from Ohio. By a vote of two-thirds, the Senate has suspended the rule for the purpose of legislating.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], on which the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] and permit my vote to stand. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting.

Mr. BRIDGES. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business in various Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—30

Adams	Downey	McFarland
Andrews	Guffey	Maloney
Ball	Herring	Mead
Bankhead	Hill	Murdock
Bone	Holman	Overton
Bridges	Houston	Pepper
Chandler	Kilgore	Rosier
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Smith
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Van Nuys

NAYS—34

Aiken	Danaher	Shipstead
Bailey	Ellender	Spencer
Brewster	George	Taft
Bulow	Gerry	Thomas, Idaho
Bunker	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Green	Tobey
Butler	Gurney	Tunnell
Byrd	Hayden	Tydings
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh
Capper	McCarran	White
Caraway	Norris	
Chavez	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Barbour	Langer	Smathers
Barkley	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Bilbo	McKellar	Truman
Brooks	McNary	Vandenberg
Brown	Murray	Wagner
Davis	Nye	Wallgren
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Harrison	Reed	Wiley
Hatch	Reynolds	Willis
Hughes	Russell	

So Mr. CHANDLER's amendment to the amendment of Mr. ADAMS was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I voted for the first proposal of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] in the hope that it would achieve what many Senators said they desired with reference to the handling of their office desks. I voted against the second one after the Senate had shown what its attitude was. In order to reach what I think is the real desire of a very great many of the Members of this body, I am going to move that the Adams amendment be perfected in the following particulars:

In line 1, that we strike out the words "and chairmen of standing committees."

In line 3, that we strike out the words "or committees."

In line 5, that we strike out the words "or committees."

In lines 6 and 7, that we strike out the words "and committee chairmen."

As thus perfected, the Adams amendment would read:

That Senators may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices in this act or resolution: *Provided further*, That Senators shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut just what he has in mind by his amendment. As a matter of fact, he is now drawing a line between the office force of a Senator who is chairman of a committee and a Senator who is not chairman of a committee.

The ordinary situation is that the office force of a Senator becomes the committee force when the Senator becomes chairman of a committee. The Senator now is simply excluding the office forces of Senators who happen to occupy chairmanships.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Colorado, let me point out that that particular problem is a separate one. It is a special one. It ought to be dealt with in and of itself, and should not be involved in the allocation of the staff, and the allocation of salary to the staff.

As the Senator from Virginia has already pointed out, the moment we get into the field of allocating salaries among several committee chairmen and their clerks, the net result will be that one committee clerk will be getting $8,000 and another $2,000. That situation ought to be met fairly and squarely, as a problem independent from the main problem confronting us all.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Are there any committee chairmen on the other side of the aisle? [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. If there are any committee chairmen on this side of the aisle, I do not know who they are.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been trying all day to get the Senators some help, and the majority of them do not want it. I did not want it in the first place. I thought it would be a fine thing for us to have some research men to try to keep the Senate up with the current problems of the day.

The Senate voted for one of my propositions, and the other was precisely the same, and they voted against that one. I am rather fed up with the whole proposition; and I will vote against the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut, and it will go back to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut. Without objection, they will be voted en bloc. [Putting the question.] The amendments are rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, but I do not favor the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and I simply want the RECORD to show that fact. I do not think it is wise for us to undertake the responsibility of fixing the salaries of our clerks and prorating them around.

Mr. TYDINGS. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if there should not be a record vote, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to this amendment.

I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, not because I believed more assistance or help is not needed by the Senate, but because I am not convinced that it is the proper way to accomplish that end.

Some years ago I submitted a resolution providing for a research economic counsel responsible to the Congress and controlled by the two Houses of Congress. We have no independent research counsel for the Congress. We have a Congressional Library, but the staff of the Library is appointed and controlled by the President. Millions of dollars are appropriated for research work in the executive departments, but Congress does not appropriate any money for research in connection with its own work. We are, therefore, when we come to get information, the servants of the executive department, instead of being independent.

I think we should find out how much money the executive department is allowed for the purpose of examination and research in the economic field. I believe such an act is necessary in order to establish the independence of Congress in research work.

What happens when a bill is introduced in Congress? It goes to a committee. The committee sends it to the appropriate department to find out whether the department approves or disapproves it; and it has become the custom, if the department disapproves it, that as a matter of course the Congress must not consider it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that the Senator from Minnesota is making a speech in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood him to say—perhaps I did not hear him correctly—that we vote here each year millions of dollars in appropriations for sufficient clerks and research help in the departments, and that he does not think that is right unless we have some of our own here.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator was not in favor of the Chandler amendment, and I wonder why.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Chandler amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; the amendment which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] offered to provide research help.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I stated in the beginning of my remarks that I did not think that was the best way to handle the problem. Is that sufficient?

Mr. LUCAS. Not insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned. In view of the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota, although I do not intend to criticize him, I cannot understand how the Senator can make the speech he is making at this particular moment, but vote against the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. He says he does not think it is the proper time, or this may not be the proper way to do it——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator suggest as to how it should be done?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have tried already to explain that; by having a special act creating an independent research council, subject to the orders and control of the two Houses of Congress. I do not believe the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would have been adopted in the other House. We would have to have the support of the House for the amendment in conference. I think something should have been done long ago along the line of providing for an independent economic research council, responsible to the two Houses of Congress, independent of the Executive, to do research work for the Members of Congress.

On the question of economics, I think it comes with poor grace for any Member of Congress, in view of the position Congress has taken in the last few years, to have to go to the executive department for all information, and be handed only what the powers of the administration see fit to give us.

In the near future I shall reintroduce the measure which I offered some years ago. I have no criticism to make of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, but the next day the Senate convenes I shall reoffer the measure to provide for an independent council, not subject to the control of any Senator, but subject to the control of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a young Member of this body, I shall not undertake to contribute to the deliberations of the Senate, but I am frankly astonished at the horror in which Senators view the responsibility of apportioning salaries among their office force. In my years of experience in the House of Representatives that responsibility has been generally exercised over there, and I never heard of any Member of the House who found any difficulty with it. I am quite sure that, if the pending amendment should be agreed to, the fears which have been expressed will be found to have been unfounded. I feel that the Senate is fully as competent as is the other body, although we should not mention it here, to exercise so onerous a duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). I have heretofore stated my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if the Senator from Mississippi were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and let my vote stand. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business in various Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—41

Adams	Downey	Murdock
Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Herring	Pepper
Bailey	Hill	Radcliffe
Ball	Holman	Rosier
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Bridges	Kilgore	Stewart
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	

NAYS—24

Bankhead	Ellender	McNary
Bunker	George	Norris
Byrd	Gerry	Shipstead
Byrnes	Glass	Smith
Caraway	Green	Spencer
Chandler	Guffey	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Hayden	Tydings
Connally	Houston	White

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Hughes	Schwartz
Barbour	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Langer	Truman
Bilbo	Lee	Vandenberg
Bone	McKellar	Wagner
Brooks	Murray	Wallgren
Brown	Nye	Wheeler
Davis	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Reed	Willis
Harrison	Reynolds	
Hatch	Russell	

So Mr. ADAMS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$2,640" and to insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the salary of the first assistant to the superintendent of the Senate document room. I offer the amendment for the following reasons: In 1929 the present occupant of this position was appointed index clerk of the Senate. There had never before been an index, and this man, Mr. Howell, instituted and has since continued the whole index system, and it is now one of the most valuable services rendered to the Senate by any of the employees of the Senate. At that time the salary of the first assistant superintendent of the document room was $3,400. Since that time, in the last several years, this man has come to combine the duties of index clerk and first assistant superintendent of the document room. It seems to me he is entitled at least to the compensation that was given heretofore to the assistant alone. In spite of the fact that the work of the document room has increased manyfold during that period, there is now one less man employed in the document room than before. I offer the amendment simply in justice to this man.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there were probably 40 or 50 cases that came before the Appropriations Committee for increases. The committee granted some of them. At every session of Congress it grants some increases, but it would be a grave error to pick out one such case and, without any hearing, lift the employee out of the category of all other Senate employees and give him a raise. That is no reflection upon the employee to whom the Senator from Missouri refers. I have no doubt that everything the Senator says is exactly as he relates it. The point is that we cannot on the floor of the Senate pick out one or two persons, simply because they have given splendid service, and promote them and leave out of consideration all the others.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the amendment is open to the objection that it was not presented to the committee. It was not presented to the committee, although it was intended to have been presented by my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN]. He was called unexpectedly out of town, and the result was that it was not possible for him to present the matter to the committee.

It seems to me this is such an extraordinarily meritorious case, and has been so long deferred, that is should be acted upon. Therefore I offer the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate what the Senator from Missouri says, and we would have been glad to consider this matter had it been presented to us. I may say to the Senator that since the committee completed its hearings no less than 10 employees have come to me, as chairman, or to other members of the committee, and brought to our attention matters that did not come up when the committee was in session. It would be wrong to bring those cases here without consideration by the committee. I hope the Senator will appreciate our situation. Therefore, I must make the point of order against his amendment. But I will say that if he will bring this matter to our attention in time for inclusion in the bill at the next session we will give it our most careful and considerate attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer an amendment, which will probably receive the same action as the one I previously offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 18, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Radio Press Gallery—superintendent, $3,000; assistant superintendent, $1,960.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the radio press gallery furnishes a very important service to the Senate and to the country. The bill makes no appropriation for the superintendent and assistant superintendent of the radio press gallery. That is an entirely new feature. If I cannot win approval of an amendment under a suspension of the rule I do not know how to win approval when the rule is in force. So I wish the Senator from Maryland would accept this amendment. It does not require the expenditure of very much money. These men might consider talking in a more friendly way about him if the amendment were accepted. However, that is merely a facetious suggestion, and I do not know whether it will have any influence on the Senator. The matter amounts in the aggregate to less than $5,000. In view of the beating given me earlier today it seems to me the Senator from Maryland could be generous and accept the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to withhold my support from anything the Senator from Kentucky wants, but for the reasons I have mentioned before we cannot legislate on these matters without consideration having been given them by the committee, and I am forced to make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have no amendments to offer. However, I should like to make a remark at this time. I have been a Member of the Senate for 6 years and 5 months. During that time 18 Members of this body have died; 2 from automobile accidents, 2 from airplane accidents, 1 from a gunshot wound, 5 from ordinary natural causes, and 8 from overwork and heart trouble.

Mr. President, I think we in the Senate are cowards if we do not have courage enough to vote ourselves sufficient money for adequate clerk hire. I have previously said, and I now repeat, that if we continue working at the present feverish rate, I have no doubt there will be two or three more deaths before the present session is ended. We shall still continue to vote millions of dollars to the various departments for clerk hire, at the request of the heads of department or Cabinet officers, who come before us and ask for such appropriations.

Mr. President, I think it too bad we did not today increase the amount provided Senators for clerk hire. I have made such a statement before, and I simply wanted to make it again at this time in connection with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4756) was passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3782) establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ACQUISITION AND EQUIPMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4545, Calendar No. 410.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I wish to say for the benefit of the Senate that when the bill referred to by the Senator from Connecticut shall have been disposed of, as I hope it will be today, it is my purpose to ask that the Senate recess until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am very pleased by the statement made by the able Senator from South Carolina. I wish to inquire if the proposed recess is to be taken with the understanding that we shall take up the measure to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, Senate bill 1580, on Monday?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have told the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that if the measure referred to by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] shall be disposed of, I would be agreeable to having him move to make the so-called road bill the unfinished business.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a further inquiry. When does the Senator want the Senate to consider House bill 4671, reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], which was put over until today?

Mr. BYRNES. I have discussed that matter with the Senator from Massachusetts and it is entirely agreeable to have the bill considered on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the fact that there are two treaties on the Executive Calendar which should be disposed of today.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it is my purpose to have an executive session at the conclusion of the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut for the present consideration of House bill 4545.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, Senators will recall that in the Seventy-sixth Congress we passed what has since become Public Law No. 849, known as the Lanham Act, which provided $150,000,000 for national defense housing. Sometime thereafter, or early in the present session of Congress, that act was amended to provide an additional $150,000,000 for defense housing. The housing program is coming along rapidly, but in the development of that program it has been found necessary to provide funds for facilities which are largely made necessary as a result of the defense housing program, and likewise made necessary as a result of the general defense program, and the large numbers of men called to the military and naval services.

In connection with a statement on the bill I ought to say that when it was considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds we also considered Senate bill 1375, which was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and point out that he has been intensely concerned with and interested in this subject, and has been among those appreciative of the needs and most anxious to see this kind of legislation.

I think the majority of Senators, if not all Senators, are familiar with the pending bill, because it has been so widely discussed. It is important that the bill be passed at the earliest possible moment because among the greatest needs under this community services bill is provision for school facilities, and recreational facilities at the training camps, and in the nearby communities, as well as the provision of funds to correct certain serious situations in industrial areas which have become national-defense centers. I particularly refer to such projects as sewage disposal plants, water-treatment plants, and provision for additional water.

The Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds made little change in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. The bill provides that it shall be administered by the Federal Works Administrator, although it also requires that whatever he does must be with the approval of the President of the United States, and that nothing may be done except with the President's approval. The language of the bill does not provide that other governmental agencies shall actually have a voice in carrying out the act, but Senators will understand, and those who have read the hearings know, that it will be necessary to call upon other agencies of the Government for advice, suggestions, and recommendations.

Under the Coordinator of Federal Activities in the field of health, recreation, welfare, and related activities a study has been going on for some time as to the needs of the various communities and defense centers. The authorities have submitted to our committee, and I presume that if and when the bill becomes law, they will promptly submit to the Federal Works Administrator a list of the communities and neighborhoods desiring to participate, with recommendations as to the communities which should be served and which should first be served.

In some instances, Mr. President, the need is acute. In some communities there is great fear that because of overcrowded school conditions the anticipated cost would be unbearable for the communities, even if it were physically possible to provide the facilities.

Let me say at this point that the bill provides for grants or loans in connection with the facilities to which I have referred. The Administrator, under the direction of the President, would have broad authority to determine whether or not a community should make a contribution, and likewise, with the President's permission, to determine whether or not there should be a loan or grant.

We held rather extended hearings. We listened at length to all who desired to be heard. We had the benefit of the extended hearings in the House, and I may add that the committee was unanimous in its decision to favorably recommend the bill to the Senate.

The bill first provides that the President himself must find a need. He must authorize the work; and thereafter, if we pass the bill in its present form, the Federal Works Administrator and those under him will proceed with the work.

I am sure it will be interesting to the Senate to know that under the Federal Works Administrator there remains at least the skeleton of the old Public Works Administration, and that there is still in the organization the gentleman who was the head of the Public Works Administration. The Federal Works Agency has all the records which were collected during the period of time the Public Works Administration operated. This Agency has a peculiar knowledge of the communities, their needs, claims, and demands, and to a

very great extent has on file the applications of the communities. In my judgment—and I think the committee pretty generally would agree—the Agency is about ready to go forward very rapidly with this extremely important work.

I should like, respectfully, to admonish Senators that without question there will be pressure of one kind or another upon them to exercise their physical energies and all their efforts to assist communities in their States to receive benefits under the terms of the act.

The committee has been extremely careful, and has limited the language as best it could in that respect, to make certain that the law will operate only in those communities which have been substantially expanded as a result of the national-defense program. Were the Federal Government to attempt to meet the requests of the communities of the Nation the amount of money provided in the bill, which is $150,000,000, would not begin to meet the demands. Before long I fear there is likely to be a request for more funds unless very great care is exercised.

We have had the benefit of expert opinion on the bill. Administrator Carmody and Administrator McNutt appeared before the committee; and it would be unfair not to mention also the name of Mr. Taft, the distinguished brother of our able colleague, who, it seems to me, has made a most intensive study of the work to which he has been assigned. It pleases me in the committee to hear Mr. Taft agree with the Federal Works Administrator that the $150,000,000 provided in the bill would, in his opinion, be a sufficient amount with the exercise of fair requests and proper care. At least, as far as they could see, that amount of money would be sufficient.

I may be compelled, as chairman of the committee, to return to the Senate some time in the distant future or thereafter to ask for additional funds; but I should like to say to the Senate now that I will resist doing so as long as it appears reasonably possible to get along with the amount of money provided.

Mr. President, because the Senate has been in session so long, I do not desire to occupy the floor unnecessarily in a discussion of the pending bill. I think I have reasonably, although briefly, stated its purposes and its philosophy. I have no desire further to explain, except as Members of the Senate may desire to ask questions.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank my colleague. I should like to call his attention to page 6, and to the committee amendment appearing in lines 18 to 26, inclusive, and lines 1 and 2 on page 7. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will explain wnat the objective is in attempting now to deal with a problem of that sort, which obviously is some distance in the future.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator wait until I read the particular language referred to?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. MALONEY. Now that I have read the language, let me say that I am not entirely sure, but I think that, as the result of a suggestion, or at least in part as the result of a suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was most anxious that we establish a policy in connection with this bill, or reestablish one, we took what is now section 301—and I think that is the language to which my colleague refers—from existing law, and we added only the language which is found in parentheses on the last line, "including schools and hospitals."

If the Senator would like to have me do so, I will read to him the part of the report which refers to that subsection:

> Subsection (a) of section 4 of the bill renumbers section 4 of Public, No. 849—

That is the original Lanham Act, to which I earlier referred—

> and amends it so that the authority contained in section 202 of the bill shall terminate in the same manner that the authority granted in section 1 of such act terminates. It will be noticed that this section also provides for the disposal of property acquired or constructed under titles I and II as promptly as possible in the public interest.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I want to thank my colleague, and to say that it is my own hope that the Senator may be persuaded on behalf of the committee not to insist upon that proposed committe amendment at this time.

Let me say, in support of the suggestion, that while I have not had an opportunity to look up the matter since this bill came into the file, I recall that about 18 or 19 years ago, after the last World War, the Congress found itself and the departments found themselves in very considerable difficulty about the disposition of property that had been acquired for wartime use. There is an opinion which was written by the Attorney General about 1922, the citation for which I shall be glad to submit to my colleague if I can put my hand upon it, which reviewed the entire subject; and the Attorney General ruled that an option which had been granted to the city of Philadelphia was invalid on the ground—and it involved hundreds of thousands of dollars, as I recall—that the Congress, in the act relating to the disposition of the property, had not made regulations, had not set up standards, had not, in other words, outlined the method which should be specifically set forth to deal with the disposition of the property.

This particular section, very obviously, is broad. It does not even require that the property be disposed of advantageously, but only that the disposal be made as promptly as may be advantageous. In other words, it is so broad that I suspect, without being certain, that perhaps it is susceptible to further consideration; and I should like very much to have the Congress deal with the matter of disposition of property at some later time, when all of us know just what is the situation confronting us, for it well may be that we will not want to unload the property at all as some administrator downtown might decide. Therefore, let me say to my colleague that I do not like the blanket authorization provided in this amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out to my colleague, who is a most able lawyer, that this is the existing law.

Mr. DANAHER. In the Lanham Act.

Mr. MALONEY. And we merely apply the language contained in the Lanham Act to this bill.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. While it is broad, it is not nearly so broad as if we left the language out entirely. Provision is made that the property be disposed of not only as promptly as may be advantageous, but also "in the public interest."

While I have great respect for my colleague, as all Members of the Senate know, I am very hopeful that he will not protest about the inclusion of this language, which the committee unanimously felt should be included in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank my colleague for the explanation and for the assurances of the committee's attitude, as to which now I rest.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, since there appear to be no further questions, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider first the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in title II, page 2, line 9, after the word "facility", to strike out "useful or"; in line 10, after the word "life", to insert "substantially expanded by the national-defense program"; in line 12, after the word "waterworks", to strike out "works for the treatment and purification of water"; and in line 14, after the word "facilities", to insert "works for the treatment and purification of water", so as to make the section read:

> SEC. 201. It is hereby declared to be the policy of this title to provide means by which public works may be acquired, maintained, and operated in the areas described in section 202. As used in this title, the term "public work" means any facility necessary for carrying on community life substantially expanded by the national-defense program, but the activities authorized under this title shall be devoted primarily to schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, and streets and access roads.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 24, after the word "needed", to insert "or could not be provided without the imposition of an increased excessive tax burden or an unusual or excessive increase in the debt limit of the taxing or borrowing authority in which such shortage exists."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after the words "Attorney General", to insert "if necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, after the words "Attorney General", to insert "if necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 9, to strike out:

(c) To maintain and operate public works.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 11, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)", and in line 16, after the word "interest", to insert:

As used in this paragraph, the term "private agency" means any private agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

(4) public works shall be provided on the basis of need and in determining need no discrimination shall be made on account of race, creed, or color.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC 301. When the President shall have declared that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist (a) the authority contained in sections 1 and 202 hereof shall terminate except with respect to contracts on projects previously entered into or undertaken and court proceedings then pending, and (b) property acquired or constructed under this act (including schools and hospitals) shall be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 3, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "(b)"; in the same line, after the word "sections", to strike out "4"; in line 4, after the words "as follows", to strike out "301,"; and in line 8, after the words "United States", to strike out "Such section 4 (relating to termination of powers) of such act is amended by inserting after 'section 1 hereof' the following: 'and the authority contained in section 202 hereof' ", so as to read:

(b) Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of such act are renumbered, respectively, as follows: "302", "303", "304", "305", "306", "307", "308", "309", "310", and "311", and as used in such sections the term "State" includes any Territory or possession of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I concur in the report in favor of this bill, but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a number of matters.

This bill seeks to provide, roughly, for two different kinds of areas: First, those in which there are military camps, around which a very considerable population always grows up; and the other where there are new industries, particularly those in areas distant from cities, where various facilities must be provided, and where the locality is unable to do so.

The principal things that have to be supplied in those localities are schools, hospitals, sewers, disposal plants, and water-supply and recreational facilities. Those are recreational facilities only around the camps, where the boys go into town or go on leave from the camps, to provide some sort of decent place which may be leased or is intended to be leased to the United Service Organizations that are now raising money to operate those recreational facilities. The thing which has concerned me is that the Federal Government for the first time is proposing to spend, of this money, about $60,000,000 on schools. Unlike the P. W. A. program, in which there were only loans and grants, the Federal Government itself is authorized here to build, and may have to build, schools which are to be owned by the Federal Government.

I have been concerned that that should not be a permanent policy of the Federal Government; and that is the reason for the inclusion of the section referred to by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], establishing a policy at least of getting rid of these facilities when this emergency is over. The same thing is true of hospitals. Last year we passed a Federal hospital bill, but that bill carefully provided that hospitals should be provided for all the different localities.

We also have a situation as to water supply which is illustrated by a case we have in Ohio, above Youngstown, where one of the matters mentioned by the Coordinator in the hearings on page 94 is the building of a dam to provide a larger water supply in the area covered by the new Ravenna shell-loading plant and also in the industrial area of Youngstown, where the water is sufficient only for normal times, and the demands for it are actually limiting the production of steel because the increased population is taking the water away from the industrial production of steel.

The only thing about the bill of which I do not entirely approve is the fact that the entire discretion in this matter is given to the Administrator of Public Works. The President finds where a defense area is; but, after he has determined that, the question whether a particular area is to get a school or a hospital or a water supply or recreational facilities is left entirely to the Administrator of Public Works, who is not particularly qualified to pass upon or interested in those various technical operations. He, in fact, is given authority to administer the schools and hospitals after they are built. He is given authority, for instance, to administer this dam in the Mahoning Valley, though it is part of the general flood control of that particular valley.

It seemed to me that at least between different schools the Office of Education ought to determine that question; as to hospitals, it ought to be determined by the Division of Public Health; and, as to water supply, by the Army engineers. The committee felt, however, that it should go to the Administrator of Public Works, and I have agreed to that, because in this section from the old act, the Lanham Act, sections 7 and 8, which are referred to and reenacted on page 7, there is a provision by which the Administrator of Public Works may assign this work to other divisions. Section 7 of that act authorizes the Administrator of Public Works to deal or maintain, operate, administer and insure, and so forth. Frankly, I do not think the Administrator of Public Works ought to operate a school or ought to operate a public hospital. I do not think he ought to operate a waterworks. But the act goes on to provide that in carrying out the provisions of the act the Administrator is authorized to utilize and act through the Federal Works Agency and other Federal agencies and any local public agency.

I think it should be stated that I, at least, expect that the Administrator will proceed in the way he ought to proceed; that he will assign to the divisions of the Government which actually know these subjects, the operation, and, in the case of the dam to which I referred, in the Mahoning Valley, that he will assign the actual construction to the Army engineers, who are equipped to construct and should construct such works.

I have been concerned particularly with the operation of these works after they are constructed. If they are not leased to local authorities—and the act provides that they shall be leased to local authorities in every case in which that can be done—then I expect that the Federal Works Administrator will assign to other divisions of the Federal Government the actual operation of the various plants.

With that statement, Mr. President, it seems to me that we have a constructive bill. In the little hospital act which we passed last year we provided in detail, as I think we really should provide here, how they shall be operated, and how the Federal Government may make grants to local authorities to assist them in the operation; but this is an emergency. It is important that the bill shall be promptly acted on. It would take a long time to spell out all the different details of the proper method of operating schools and hospitals that are to be constructed under this bill. So I am willing to accept the bill as it now is, with the distinct statement that I, at least, expect the Administrator to delegate to other divisions of the Federal Government the various powers which are contained in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator what his understanding may be of the language at the bottom of page 4 which provides that—

No contract on a cost plus a percentage of cost basis shall be made, but contracts may be made on a cost plus a fixed-fee basis: *Provided*, That the fixed fee does not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost.

Notice, it says "the estimated cost"—not the real cost; not the actual cost. What is the explanation for that, if the Senator knows?

Mr. TAFT. If we are not going to have cost plus a percentage of cost—the old famous cost-plus contracts—then we must have a fixed fee. How are we going to fix that fee? We are going to fix it by

negotiation with the contractor, and it must be a fixed amount. This provision says that it may be any amount, provided that in no case shall it exceed 6 percent of the cost which the Administrator of Public Works estimates for the particular job. It seems to me that is a perfectly clear limitation on the power of the Administrator to prescribe a fixed fee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator understands that the Federal Works Administrator is the one who is to do the estimating of the cost?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. All right. Let me ask the Senator, with reference to page 3, lines 4 to 15, inclusive, if he knows of any limitation upon the length of time for which the Federal Works Administrator may negotiate a lease.

Mr. TAFT. I know of no limitation upon the length of time. The language is very broad, and it is covered by section 7 of the former Lanham Act, which says that the Administrator may rent, lease, exchange, sell for credit or cash, or convey portions of the work to local municipalities, and that the Administrator shall fix fair rentals.

I think the Administrator may make any kind of a lease, on any terms, under the terms of the act; yes. I do not think there is any limitation on the length of the term, except that he must bear in mind that the Government is supposed to dispose of the work when the emergency is ended; and he could provide in the lease for the privilege of purchase by the local authority to whom the work is leased, or provide, and I think he should provide, some means of finally ridding the Government of the total cost of the provisions of section 4.

Mr. DANAHER. Therefore, it is the Senator's conclusion that whatever lease is made under the provisions of section 202 (a) will also be subject to the termination provisions of section 4 (a), the new section 301?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is absolutely legally subject to it, but I think the Administrator is bound to abide by the principle there laid down.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator understand the term "improved lands" to mean lands with buildings on them?

Mr. TAFT. "Improved lands" means lands with buildings on them; yes. He might buy a school building, or he might buy a building and turn it into a school.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. Is it the view of the Senator that the Federal Works Administrator would have sole discretion to make allocations and grants-in-aid under the bill?

Mr. TAFT. He would have sole discretion in any area which the President has determined, in his own discretion, to be a defense area, but not outside any such area.

Mr. MALONEY. With the approval of the President.

Mr. BONE. Let me get the matter straight. I ask the Senator from Connecticut to correct me if I am in error.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw my statement. It is with the approval of the President. I perhaps overlooked that, because Mr. Carmody stated to our committee that he always got the approval of the President.

Mr. MALONEY. I have not been able to find in the hearings where Mr. Carmody said that. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Carmody's testimony was on the renewal, the $300,000,000 bill.

Mr. BONE. Let me understand if this assumption is correct, that under the bill the President will define the defense areas, and having made such definition, the sole discretion to give or withhold grants-in-aid or outright grants will vest in the Administrator. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. Under the bill he is authorized, with the approval of the President, to do these various things; so that the President must approve.

Mr. MALONEY. The President has sole discretion, as a matter of fact.

Mr. TAFT. Only the Federal Administrator may initiate, but the President must approve.

Mr. BONE. In other words, if there were a grant of a thousand dollars, it would have to go across the President's desk, and that busy man would be burdened with all these minutia of detail. I understand that is the theory on which the bill is built.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no, a small item like that would not have to go across his desk.

Mr. BONE. I withdraw the question, and ask that it be stricken from the RECORD. I know it is a perfectly vulgar assumption. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. I think this is a desirable provision. It means that if the Office of Education or the Public Health Service or the Army engineers question Mr. Carmody's judgment, they can in effect appeal to the President; and I think that is a very wise provision. As a matter of fact, the President's approval in most cases will be merely a matter of form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4545) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MALONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BARBOUR conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS NEEDED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, merely for the purpose of making it the unfinished business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1580, to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, to authorize an appropriation for immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1580) to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with an amendment.

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY CADET L. D. HILL AT VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE COMMENCEMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, the 11th of June was graduation day at the Virginia Military Institute. I was one of the many who witnessed the exercises, and I was very much impressed with the valedictory address delivered by Cadet Luke D. Hill, III, of San Antonio, Tex. It expresses the true spirit of the hundreds of youths who are graduating this year from the many schools of our Nation, where they are made eligible for the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the address, which appears in the V. M. I. Cadet, of Lexington, Va., the issue of June 11, 1941, be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the V. M. I. Cadet of June 11, 1941]

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS

(By L. D. Hill)

Members of the Board of Visitors, General Kilbourne, General Grant, members of the faculty ladies and gentlemen corps of cadets, and brother rats: On September 13, 1937, a group of young men stood looking up at the gray walls of the V. M. I., fully conscious, for the first time, that they were about to begin a unique career.

In 2 hours less than half of the men in that group will receive their last official order from the institute—an order which will relieve them from duty as cadets.

Thus, after 4 years the class of 1941 becomes the ninety-ninth body of men who have lived and worked under a system founded upon the simple principles and ideals of discipline, loyalty, fellowship, and honor.

Based upon such ideals, the reputation of V. M. I. has grown through 102 hardship-ridden years, and today her name is the symbol for those ideals.

It is needless to point out then that the value of this 4-year period through which we have just passed has long been established.

It is customary at graduation time to bid farewell, but, today, the classes of 1941 throughout the Nation are being graduated into the midst of a world of uncertainty

As in the past V. M. I. and her sons are again being called upon to play no small part in the emergency now confronting our Nation. Many of our plans have been altered in order that we may fulfill our obligations as citizens of a menaced nation, and, in order that we may aid V. M. I. in maintaining today her glorious record of service. With such a future confronting us our training here takes on new and greater importance.

Rather than say farewell to 4 years upon which our future will depend, we should strengthen our grasp upon the heritage and opportunity that V. M. I. has handed down to us. To realize the full effect of this heritage we have but to look back 4 years when we first entered this hall. At that time most of us knew little or nothing of military training and discipline—honor, naturally, was not new to us. But it was new and gratifying to find more than 700 men who accepted one another's word without question and who

would not tolerate a breach of their high code of honor. And, finally, we were strangers even to one another.

The fact that we are graduating today is fair indication that we have an understanding of those ideals which were relatively new to us when we entered. Throughout our endeavors to cultivate these ideals we were confronted by numerous hardships. And, in overcoming these hardships, we were learning, perhaps, the greatest lessor that V. M. I. impresses upon her sons, for, as we watched men drop out—one by one—we were brought to realize that a continuity of purpose and a determination for achievement are requisites to success. The institute was presenting us with an object lesson in her greatest asset. For this rugged determination to forge ahead has been a characteristic of V. M. I. which has seen her through many troubled times.

It was this trait that inspired an ex-professor of V. M. I., at the Battle of Chancellorsville, to say, "The institute will be heard from today." Later Stonewall Jackson was mortally wounded, but here with us today are those seven words which express a great leader's faith in the courageous will to achieve which V. M. I. imparts to her men.

The pursuit of these ideals, however, is but one part of the heritage of the class of 1941. In the future, when any of us meet again, we shall take for granted our understanding of those ideals. Our thoughts and conversation will turn back to that memorable night of ring figure, when we received our class ring, which served to bind us more closely together. We shall recall those pleasant 6 weeks at summer camp when we mixed intensive training with pleasure; and we shall talk of the finals which end today.

These experiences will be tomorrow's warm memories, and together they make up a kind of personal history of our class.

This history seems inseparably linked with two words, the meaning of which only V. M. I. men understand. In those meetings in future years, a warm handshake and the words "Brother Rat" will suffice to bring back the 4 years we worked together, and the warm fellowship which we feel today will be rekindled.

General Kilbourne, who, like us, is completing 4 years at the V. M. I., has already received the fullest extent of gratitude and respect a class can extend to an officer of the institute, for he has been invited to become an honorary member of '41.

But for us to extend our gratitude to the officers and professors of the institute is not enough. These men have worked patiently and diligently in the classroom, at drill, and at camp to pass on to us the fundamentals of training at V. M. I. Also, by setting examples themselves, they have led us to follow the chivalrous traits of the men who have worn the cadet grey before us.

These men will receive their reward in our future achievements.

With this in mind, despite the warm emotions which swell up within us as we leave, we must remember to say good-bye only to the tangible things of V. M. I. while we carry with us those teachings and that spirit which make us V. M. I. men. We must remember, too, that the Nation is again awaiting fulfillment of Jackson's immortal words, and as many of us exchange the grey uniform of the cadet for the olive drab of the service, it is for us to make certain that "The institute will be heard from today."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has just inserted in the RECORD the valedictory address delivered yesterday by Cadet L. D. Hill at the Virginia Military Institute graduation exercises.

Cadet Hill is the grandson of a very able judge and distinguished citizen of my State, one of the best and warmest friends I ever had, the late Judge L. D. Hill, of Sparta, Tenn. I am delighted to know that his grandson has acquitted himself so well at this wonderful institution in Virginia, and I congratulate the boy with all my heart. His record is in keeping with his ancestry, in keeping with the distinguished ability which has always characterized the family, and I wish for him the best there is in life. The address itself is an inspiring one, worthy of all our best American traditions and ambitions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL CONCERNING FOREIGN COMPANIES IN THE COUNTRIES OF AMERICA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the nominations are taken up, I should like to call up two treaties on the Executive Calendar, the first being Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. The pending motion in connection with that treaty is on agreeing to the reservations made by our Government.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when this matter was called up a week ago I objected to its consideration because of the absence of two Members of the Senate. Subsequently, I conferred with those Senators, and they have no objection, so I make no objection today.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the protocol, Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, A protocol concerning recognition of the judicial personality of foreign companies in the countries of America, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union on June 25, 1936, and was signed for the United States on June 23, 1939, subject to two understandings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the reservations reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which have heretofore been read to the Senate.

The reservations were agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the treaty is passed upon, I think it altogether proper that I should make a statement.

The Secretary of State, noting the questions which had arisen in the Senate regarding this particular treaty, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter dealing with those objections. In the letter the Secretary points out that no corporation could come into the courts of any one of the American countries without complying with the laws of the country in question, nor could it come in with respect to any commercial activity which is contrary to the laws of any of the States affected.

I think the Secretary's letter answers the objections raised, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 29, 1941.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In connection with the discussion in the Senate of the resolution giving advice and consent to the ratification of Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, I note that Senator O'MAHONEY made the following inquiry with respect to the effect of the protocol concerning recognition of the juridical personality of foreign companies in the countries of America:

"Does that then give the right to such corporation to bring suit in any State of the United States, without compliance with the laws of the State as to domicile?"

Subsequently in connection with the discussion of the first reservation, Senator O'MAHONEY stated:

"Then our representatives are asking us to approve a reservation which merely says, 'We want it clearly understood that these foreign corporations may sue or be sued without complying with State laws.'"

With respect to the questions of Senator O'MAHONEY attention is invited to the fact that the protocol relates to corporations incorporated in other pan-American countries that are bound to give reciprocal effect to it and that the protocol requires in respect to suits that such foreign corporations shall "comply with the laws of the countries in question." As stated in this Department's letter of April 16, 1941, which accompanied the protocol, "It is believed that the provisions of the protocol would not change any law of the United States, State or Federal," and "It would, however, have the effect of preventing the establishment of a requirement of registration or domestication as a prerequisite to bringing or defending suits by foreign corporations."

As stated on page 3 of Executive E, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the first of the understandings with which the United States signed the protocol arose out of a suggestion made by the Department of Justice and was for the purpose of eliminating the cost of registration or domestication in other American republics, "it being the practice of some of the American republics to require companies which have no permanent establishment, branch, or agency in the country to register or domesticate themselves before they may become party to a suit, which registration or domestication would require payment of large fees, or subjection to taxtation in some of the countries." The first understanding would therefore be of benefit to American corporations carrying on business in other American republics.

It will further be noted that the commercial activity carried on by such foreign corporation is limited to "commercial activity which is not contrary to the laws of such states." The provisions of the protocol would apply particularly to cases where orders were obtained by the foreign corporation by mail or by drummers who solicited orders without having "a permanent establishment, branch, or agency" in the jurisdiction in which suit is brought.

In this relation it is pertinent to set forth the following provisions of article XIII of the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights between the United States and Honduras, bearing date of December 7, 1927.

"Limited liability and other corporations associations, whether or not for pecuniary profit, which have been or may hereafter be organized in accordance with and under the laws, National, State, or Provincial, of either high contracting party and maintain a central office within the territories thereof, shall have their juridical status recognized by the other high contracting party provided that they pursue no aims within its territories contrary to its laws. They shall enjoy free access to the courts of law and equity, on conforming to the laws regulating the matter, as well for the prosecution as for the defense of rights in all the degrees of jurisdiction established by law.

"The right of such corporations and associations of either high contracting party so recognized by the other to establish themselves within its territories, establish branch offices, and fulfill their functions therein shall depend upon, and be governed solely by, the consent of such party as expressed in its National, State, or Provincial laws. If such consent be given on a condition of reciprocity, the condition shall be deemed to relate to the provisions of the laws, National, State, or Provincial, under which the foreign corporation or association desiring to exercise such rights is organized."

It will be observed that the provisions of the first paragraph of the quoted treaty articles are not essentially different from those of the protocol in question.

Similar provisions are found in treaties or agreements concluded between the United States and other countries as indicated in the attached memorandum.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Enclosure: List of treaty provisions.]

LIST OF TREATY PROVISIONS SIMILAR TO ARTICLE XIII OF THE TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND CONSULAR RIGHTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND HONDURAS OF DECEMBER 7, 1927

Austria (treaty series 838): Treaty of June 19, 1928, article IX.

El Salvador (treaty series 827): Treaty of February 22, 1926, article XII.

Estonia (treaty series 736): Treaty of December 23, 1925, article XII.

Finland (treaty series 868): Treaty of February 13, 1934, article XVI.

Germany (treaty series 725): Treaty of December 8, 1923, article XII.

Greece: Protocol dated January 30–February 10, 1890, explanatory of article I of treaty of December 10–22, 1837 (Malloy Treaties, etc., vol. 1, p. 854).

Honduras (treaty series 764): Treaty of December 7, 1927, article XIII.

Hungary (treaty series 748): Treaty of June 24, 1925, article IX.

Japan (treaty series 558): Treaty of February 21, 1911, article VII.

Latvia: Treaty of April 20, 1928, article XIII.

Liberia (treaty series 956): Treaty of August 8, 1938, article XVII.

Norway (treaty series 852): Treaty of June 5, 1928, article XII.

Poland (treaty series 862): Treaty of June 16, 1931, article XI.

Russia: Agreement signed June 25/12, 1904, regulating the position of corporations and other commercial associations (Malloy Treaties, etc., vol. 2, pp. 1534–1535).

Siam (treaty series 655): Treaty of December 16, 1920, article V, which has been replaced by treaty of November 13, 1937, article V (treaty series 940).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservations. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the reservations, is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

TEMPORARY DIVERSION FOR POWER PURPOSES OF ADDITIONAL WATERS OF THE NIAGARA RIVER

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive F, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the texts of notes exchanged at Washington on May 20, 1941, between the Governments of the United States and Canada, amending in its application article 5 of the treaty signed on January 11, 1909, between the United States and the United Kingdom, to permit for the duration of the emergency and in all events subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion for power purposes, of the waters of Niagara River above the Falls, which was read the second time, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 20, 1941.

The Honorable LEIGHTON MCCARTHY,
Minister of Canada.

SIR: I have the honor to refer to conversations which have taken place recently between officials of the Governments of the United States and Canada with respect to the immediate and pressing needs for additional power in the Niagara Falls area for national-defense purposes. Throughout these conversations, as well as in previous conversations during the course of years, on the general subject of the Falls at Niagara, two objectives have been kept in mind: First, the scenic beauty of this great heritage of the two countries; and second, the utilization of the power resources available there, consistent with the primary obligation of preserving the scenic beauty of the Falls.

Recent surveys have indicated that there is now idle equipment available and set up which could utilize at once an additional diversion for power purposes of 5,000 cubic feet per second on the United States side. I am informed by the defense authorities of this Government and by the Federal Power Commission that this additional power is urgently needed in connection with the Government's national-defense program. It is likewise understood from conversations with the appropriate Canadian officials that 3,000 cubic feet per second could be used immediately on the Canadian side in connection with the furtherance of the war efforts of Canada. These figures represent the immediate needs of the two Governments and do not pretend to take into consideration all industrial requirements of the two countries in the area by reason of the present emergency.

In view of the above, and having in mind assurances of engineers that there will be no material adverse effect to the scenic beauty of the Falls, I propose through this exchange of notes that for the duration of the emergency and in all events subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion for power purposes of 5,000 cubic feet per second be utilized on the United States side of the Niagara River above the Falls. In making this proposal this Government is prepared to give assurances that no objection will be raised to an additional diversion of 3,000 cubic feet per second on the Canadian side of the Niagara River above the Falls. It is also proposed that the engineers of the two Governments be instructed to take such steps as may be necessary with a view to initiating forthwith the construction of works designed to distribute the flow of water over the Falls in such a manner as to preserve their scenic beauty.

Moreover, the American Government proposes that upon the entry into effect of the agreement for the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin signed on March 19, 1941, the foregoing arrangements will be subject to the provisions of Article IX of the agreement, and that it will be open to the Commission appointed under the provisions of the agreement and carrying out the duties imposed upon it, to take such action as may be necessary, and as may come within the scope of the agreement with regard to diversions at Niagara.

If the foregoing is acceptable to the Government of Canada, this note and your reply thereto, when approved by the Senate, shall be regarded as placing on record the understanding arrived at between the two Governments concerning this matter.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

For the Secretary of State:

(Signed) A. A. BERLE, Jr.

Certified to be a true copy of the signed original.

CORDELL HULL.

CANADIAN LEGATION,
Washington, May 20, 1941.

No. 301.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: With reference to your note of May 20, 1941, concerning the immediate and pressing needs for additional power in the Niagara Falls area for national-defense purposes, I have the honor to inform you that the Government of Canada concurs in the arrangements set forth in your note and is prepared to give assurances that no objection will be raised by the Government of Canada to an additional diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second on the United States side of the Niagara River above the Falls.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

H. H. WRONG,
(For the Minister).

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement for the RECORD on this matter for reasons which I shall presently explain. This agreement constitutes a temporary modification of the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Canada, and provides for an additional 8,000 cubic-second feet of water at Niagara Falls, 5,000 cubic-second feet on the American side and 3,000 on the Canadian side.

The purpose is to provide necessary power for national-defense purposes. It was shown before the committee that plants are already in stand-by condition to receive the water and to use it.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has addressed to me a letter, to which he has attached a letter from the Governor of New York, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, regarding the proposed ratification or approval of the notes which were exchanged between the Canadian Government and our Government. No objection is raised to the ratification of the notes modifying the treaty to which I have called attention, but, in view of the long history lying back of the controversy between the State of New York and the Federal Government and the Canadian Government over the diversion of water at Niagara, the Governor of New York is most anxious that it be known that the State desires to assert its right to be heard on the question of the license, when the license is granted to use the power.

Mr. President, the letter which the Senator from New York addressed to the committee, he himself being a member of the committee and not able to attend

the present sessions of the Senate because of illness, and the letter from the Governor of New York addressed to the Senator from New York, in which the whole matter is discussed, should, I think, go into the RECORD for very good reasons.

I express the hope that the administrative officers of the Federal Government will confer with and consult the proper officials of the State of New York on the question of the terms and conditions of the license that may be granted to the users of the power generated by the diversion of these extra cubic second-feet of water at Niagara Falls.

Mr. President, a great many persons interested in the diversion of the water at Niagara Falls have appealed to me and have discussed with me the question which was raised, to wit, whether the confirmation of this agreement, which must be considered merely as a modification of an existing treaty, would in any wise affect the St. Lawrence waterway project. I am authorized to say on behalf of the State Department—and I say it also upon my own responsibility, after having given full consideration to the question—that the approval of the agreement set out in this exchange of notes in no wise affects the question of the St. Lawrence waterway project. It does not in any sense bind or affect the full freedom of the Senate or the House in any subsequent consideration of that project.

I should also say that, of course, this diversion of water at Niagara Falls will not lower the water level, because the water is simply taken out above the Falls, and is put back in the river just below the Falls, and it is the same water which would otherwise go over the Falls. It is simply being diverted for the purpose of producing hydroelectric power to meet an urgent demand on the part of the War Department and other agencies of the Government that are concerned in our national-defense program.

Mr. President, I ask that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The letters are as follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1941

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received the enclosed letter from Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, making certain comments and suggestions regarding the proposed treaty between the United States and Canada for the increased diversion of water in the Niagara River.

I am advised that the State is eager to cooperate with the Federal authorities; and, to that end, requests the opportunity of presenting to the Federal Power Commission its views on the terms of any license to be issued for the development of the additional water power.

I trust that the Governor's letter may be given appropriate consideration.

Copies of this correspondence are being furnished to Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, June 7, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: On May 29, 1941, an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, dated May 20, 1941, was submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval. This agreement constitutes a temporary modification of the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and provides an additional diversion of 8,000 cubic second-feet at Niagara Falls, 5,000 cubic second-feet of which will be utilized in New York State. The agreement is predicated upon the existence of a power shortage for national-defense industries located in New York State and is subject to reconsideration by the two Governments on October 1, 1942.

Heretofore the State of New York has not been consulted with regard to this agreement which concerns one of its vital natural resources. Hence there has been no opportunity for State authorities to express their views. I wish to take this opportunity to state that where the promotion of defense industries is concerned, the Government of the United States will find the State authorities ever ready to cooperate Since there is a threatened shortage of power in New York State, particularly for the expansion of defense industries, the State is only too glad to cooperate in any arrangement which will meet this need, even if it is only a partial solution of the difficulties. But in making this offer State authorities must consider not only the immediate needs, which are universally recognized, but must also protect the broad interests of the people of the State.

The State is vitally concerned in this instance because of its long-established policy to develop the people's water-power resources in the public interest. This is a policy in which the State authorities have had your valued support. I recall that in connection with the convention and protocol of January 2, 1929, between the United States and Great Britain (Canada) for the development of Niagara Falls, you wrote to then Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"I need hardly add that were this a proposal for a totally new grant of water power for private development rather than a temportry experimentation, I would be unalterably opposed to it. As you well know, I advocate that the State retain the ownership and control of water power at its source."

In reply, my distinguished predecessor wrote to you on February 9, 1929:

"It is, of course, clear that the proposed treaty with Canada is a temporary measure only, running for the diversion period of only 7 years, and that the State of New York is in no way restricted as to its full control of this water after the 7-year period has run. The stipulation received by the State of New York clears up the matters long in dispute between it and the private company and makes it perfectly clear that the State has the full sovereignty and control over the water on the American side of the Niagara River for all time."

In this policy the government of the State of New York has not wavered. As recently as January 15, 1941, I addressed the legislature of this State as follows:

"I hope to see a public development of the latent power resources of Niagara so that the people of the State, whether in New York City, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany, or on the farms, may participate in its benefits as well as those of the St. Lawrence."

I mention this to show that the Governors of the State of New York have a consistent record in the policy of public development of the people's water-power resources. This policy has been implemented by plans of the Power Authority of the State of New York for the joint development of the resources of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers which promises to become a reality by the enactment of H. R. 4927, now before Congress.

You will recall also that in 1918, at the behest of the War Department, the State of New York enacted legislation which permitted the Niagara Falls Power Co. to divert an additional 4,500 cubic second-feet of water at Niagara, under conditions agreed upon with the Governor of the State at that time. And be it especially noted that the State of New York has been constantly in litigation with the Niagara Falls Power Co. ever since in an endeavor to make it abide by the terms of its agreement. Even to this day the State has not succeeded in enforcing all of the terms.

It is now proposed to permit this company to divert an additional 5,000 cubic second-feet from which the company will derive a revenue of approximately $1,500,000 without any additional investment on its part. This would appear to be duplicating the situation of 1918 unless due diligence is exercised in formulating the terms on which any license is issued and it would seem at variance with President Roosevelt's position as stated in his speech of May 27, when he said, "This is no time for capital to make or be allowed to retain excess profits."

The situation is further complicated by the recent report of the "Examiner" in the Federal Power Commission case in which he recommends to the Commission revocation of the Niagara Falls Power Co.'s license unless the company can clean house within six months.

In view of this long history, you will agree with me that nothing should be done by the Senate of the United States to prejudice the interests of the State of New York. Although the State authorities are glad to cooperate at this time of emergency by consenting to a temporary diversion of additional water at Niagara River for the use of defense industries, we should like it understood that the State still adheres to its policy of public development of water-power resources, and would like it further understood that, in line with the policies repeatedly annunciated by the President of the United States and incorporated in the Federal Power Act of 1935, the interests of the State will receive prior consideration in the ultimate disposition of the latent power of Niagara Falls.

To secure this protection of the rights of the State, it is suggested that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate stipulate in its recommendation to the Senate that the agreement be approved on the following conditions:

(1) That when the agreement comes up for reconsideration on October 1, 1942, such reconsideration should again be referred to the Senate for approval;

(2) Any license issued by the Federal Power Commission under this agreement should be temporary and concurrent only with the life of such agreement;

(3) License should be issued subject to the existing laws of the State of New York;

(4) License should be revocable if and when the State of New York shall proceed with the development of this resource;

(5) That the State of New York be consulted by the Federal Power Commission as to the terms of the license.

I know you are deeply interested in protecting the interests of the State of New York and I am confident you will take appropriate action. I would also appreciate your submitting a copy of this communication to the Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Executive F is before the Senate and open to

amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, Executive F will be reported to the Senate.

Executive F was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, comprising an arrangement between the Governments of the United States of America and Canada to permit an additional, temporary diversion for power purposes, of waters on both sides of the Niagara River above the Falls for the duration of the emergency, and subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, as set forth in notes exchanged at Washington on May 20, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and Executive F is ratified.

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, on the calendar is the nomination of Luther Harr, of Pennsylvania, to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. I ask that that nomination be passed over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, an agreement, participated in by the two Senators from Pennsylvania, was reached that that nomination be considered on Monday next in executive session.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. Therefore I ask that the nomination be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will state the other nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRNES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 12 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from May 25, 1941:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Commander John S. Baylis
Commander Charles G. Roemer

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Harlan F. Stone, of New York, to be Chief Justice of the United States, in place of Charles Evans Hughes, who has retired as of July 1, 1941.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES FRANCIS BYRNES, of South Carolina, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in place of James Clark McReynolds, retired.

Robert H. Jackson, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in place of Harlan F. Stone, this day nominated to be Chief Justice of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES FRANCIS BYRNES to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Oscar H. McCollum, Atkins.

FLORIDA

Thomas West Gary, Bartow.

GEORGIA

Orlan A. Moorhead, Greensboro
Roy B. Allen, Lenox.

HAWAII

Albertina M. Redfearn, Kaneohe.

LOUISIANA

John Gordon Hewitt, Mansfield.
Lowery L. Matthews, Vidalia.

MARYLAND

John C. Frasch, Edgewood.

MISSOURI

Martin C. Mikkelsen, St. James.

NEW YORK

John E. Savage, Holland.

NORTH CAROLINA

Perry C. Millikin, Halifax.
Ada G. Badgett, Pilot Mountain.
Oliver L. Ammons, Robbinsville.
William R. Holmes, Shallotte.
Theodore T. Thomas, Tarboro.

PENNSYLVANIA

George N. Horlacher, Allentown.
Eugene C. Wonder, Chalfont.
Milton M. Brooke, Confluence.
William G. Walker, Coplay.
Margaret M. Wink, Eddington.
Paul W. Koblarchick, Ellsworth.
Harry W. Fee, Indiana.
Carl E. Reisch, Lemoyne.
Frank E. Neumeyer, Macungie.
John M. Hartman, Millersville.
Horace H. Cornell, Newtown.
John P. Johnson, Pocono Pines.
Carl D. Kohl, Stroudsburg.

TENNESSEE

Mattie H. Swallows, Algood.
John E. Malone, Adamsville.
Joseph A. Muecke, Kingston.
Mumford S. Stewart, Mount Pleasant.
Ernest P. Lassiter, Smithville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of truth, whom reverent souls adore, dispel the gloom of error's night and ignorance until the wisdom from above shall make clear our pathway. Oh, lift our hearts to brighter hopes, beyond the visions of fruitless gains of tarnished honor and all its present deeds of wrong. From the great name of our Heavenly Father come rushing down to us the melodious sounds of patience and long suffering. We rejoice that of all things which are powerful in the realm of man is the love that passeth all understanding; in our blessed Saviour was the consummation of everything that was noble and beautiful. We pray Thee to hold us to the conception of Him who was invested with vigor and force and was the incarnation of justice for the protection to those whom He loves and for the restoration of those who have been smitten, grieved, and made to suffer. Rebuke us in Thy loving mercy for our unfaith and for our failure to bring to Thee a perpetual bounty, and allow not our heavens to be overcast. Establish Thy cause in the heart of humanity, that the time may soon come when this world shall no longer roll eclipsed, but shall be an orb redeemed and ordained by the power of the indwelling Redeemer. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MRS. WINIFRED HARLIN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 232) from the Committee on Accounts for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Winifred Harlin, mother of Joe Eaton, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount, not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Joe Eaton.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway from the Pontiac Daily Press; and also a short editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city, on Strikes Please Nazis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing therein the address delivered by our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made on the occasion of the seventy-fifth commencement exercises of Dean Academy, Franklin, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

UNCLE DAN BEARD

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Carter Beard died yesterday, after a short illness, at his home in Suffern, N. Y. Had he lived until June 21, he would have celebrated his ninety-first birthday.

Because of his pioneering efforts in building the Boy Scout movement in the United States, he was affectionately known to millions of American boys as "Uncle Dan."

He was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1850 and spent his early life in that city and in Covington, Ky.

"Uncle Dan" was one of the founders of the Boy Scouts of America, was national Scout commissioner, honorary vice president and chairman of the national court of honor.

Back in the 80's, as a young man, Dan Beard was deeply impressed with the plight of boys in New York City. He found that they had no place to play except in the streets, and he then resolved to do something to restore to them what he felt to be their rightful heritage, the open fields and the blue skies. While a resident in Flushing, N. Y., he organized, there, the first troop of Scouts in my State.

Practically up to the time he died Uncle Dan continued an active association with the Boy Scout movement and each month contributed an article to the magazine Boys Life, the official publication of the Scouts.

I understand that President Roosevelt, an old friend of Mr. Beard, has accepted an invitation to be an honorary pallbearer.

Millions of boys have been influenced by the life of Daniel Carter Beard, because he was the living example of what the average American boy would like to be. "Uncle Dan" was a great leader of men and a wonderful teacher of boys. He had an unlimited enthusiasm for the great outdoors—hiking, woodcraft, and all wholesome sports. Last year, on his ninetieth birthday, he was the guest of honor at one of the biggest birthday parties ever held. More than 50,000 Boy Scouts from the eastern seaboard States gathered in the Court of Peace at the New York World's Fair to sing Happy Birthday to Uncle Dan and to shout their greetings to the Scouting pioneer.

It was my pleasure to have read some of the books written by Daniel Carter Beard, and I recall with particular joy the following: Moonlight and Six Feet of Romance; The American Boys' Book of Wild Animals; Do It Yourself; Wisdom of the Woods; and Signs, Signals, and Symbols.

Through his writings and by his example he taught boys to stand on their own feet and do things for themselves in what he repeatedly referred to as the American way.

The story of the Boy Scout movement is the story of the life of Daniel Carter Beard. When one considers that almost seven and one-half million copies of the Boy Scout Official Handbook have been published, we get some idea of the influence for good that this great American had on the lives of our young people.

In spite of his years, he retained his youthful outlook and spirit as is evidenced by a message he recently addressed "to all my friends":

Old age is stepping on my heels, but why be downhearted? Life and death are what we make them. Joy and sorrow, heaven and hell are in our hearts. Then let's go through life with a song on our lips and when we cross the Great Divide, don't allow old kill-joy Charon to put gloom in our hearts, but sing him a jolly sailor's chantey song, keeping time with the stroke of the oars. It stands to reason we will be gladly welcomed by the waiting ones on the shining shores of Infinity.

I am taking the liberty of including an editorial which appeared in the New York Times this morning because I believe it is an appropriate and fitting tribute to a person whose life was devoted in a most unselfish manner to the welfare of his country and his countrymen.

[From the New York Times]

DAN BEARD

How many lives have been as innocent, happy, and fruitful? Whatever the count of his years, he was always young. His American Boys' Handy Book will be 60 next year. Two generations of lads have grown up under its teachings, learning to "do" so many things worth doing. His was the inspiration that sends to the woods and waters the never-failing squadrons of Boy Scouts.

Artist in a family of artists, he could draw the wild things he loved. Master and teacher of woodcraft, he led the good life on the paths of the forest and under the greenwood tree. Looking at some of the honors bestowed upon him, the Silver Buffalo, the Silver Wolf, the Golden Eagle, we are back among Cooper's Indians. An old man trying to be young is sure to make himself ridiculous. There was no affectation about Daniel Carter Beard. We might call him a boy who had to struggle to be old.

There was no Panglossism in his assertion that "all boys are fundamentally good." He meant the boys trained right, the marchers and fire makers, the wanderers and sleepers under the open sky. Pioneer, guide, counselor, good companion, he will still be at the side of his boys, a friendly memory when they are as old as he.

Robert G. Ingersoll must have had Dan Beard in mind when he wrote—

He added to the sum of human joy, and were everyone to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the extension of remarks I secured yesterday exceeded the amount allowed, and I have an estimate from the Public Printer. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be placed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have the same request to make with reference to permission to extend my remarks yesterday. Notwithstanding the estimate of the printer, which I have received, I renew that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a letter from Attorney James P. McGovern, of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an article by Judge Goldstein of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CAPOZZOLI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio speech which I made on the longevity pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a reprint of an article in the April-June issue of the Westerner on what the seaway means to the State of New York and the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with a letter introduced yesterday from Governor Jones, of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter sent by me to Mr. Knudsen, and his reply, and a letter sent by me to the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, and her reply, on the subject of the effect of the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAXIMUM PRODUCTION FOR DEFENSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the production of magnesium.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PHILIP MURRAY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Philip Murray's conversion to the doctrine that national defense comes first seems to have been short-lived, for the Times-Herald this morning tells us that he bitterly condemned the use of troops by the President to break a picket line. After a time possibly Mr. Murray and some others will discover that a man has a right to work as well as the right to strike. Here are two groups of men. One group is dissatisfied, quit work, strike. Other men want to work. The first group say they shall not, and by force prevent the men who want to work from working. Conceding the right to strike, must not Murray recognize the right of others to work? All the Army seeks to do is to enable American citizens to exercise their right to work. Here is a headline in the Washington Evening Star, this noon's edition:

United States held ready to act against subversive strike promoters.

I hope the United States, including, of course, the Army, has better luck with Communists than the employer, who has tried to fire them and has been ordered by the National Labor Relations Board to take them back and pay them for lost time. It will be interesting to note what happens when employees are discharged because of subversive action, their friends strike, a picket line is opened by the Army, and then the N. L. R. B. orders the employer to take back the Communists and pay them for lost time, especially if the employer happens for the time being to be the Government, at the moment operating the plant.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article on substitution of scarce materials in war defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk today and any other special orders, I may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New Orleans Times of June 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF DEFENSE SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to convey, through you, my colleagues, a challenge from the Tuscaloosa Exchange Club to all civic clubs in the United States by reading a telegram just received:

The Exchange Club of Tuscaloosa, Ala., composed of 71 young business and professional men, has this day subscribed 100 percent to the national-defense program by each member purchasing one or more defense savings bonds in the denominations of from $25 to $1,000. The Tuscaloosa Exchange Club is prepared to go all out for the national-defense program and we challenge every civic club in the United States to do likewise.

THE TUSCALOOSA EXCHANGE CLUB,
OLMSTED COPELAND, *President*.

May I add the suggestion that should the majority of the civic clubs of the United States seriously accept this challenge much progress will have been made toward raising the funds in small amounts to defray the great expense of this vast program.

This club is composed of a group of unusually active, wide-awake and patriotic young businessmen of the delightful city of Tuscaloosa. I regard their action in this matter as most commendable and hope and believe that by it they have commenced a movement which will spread throughout the United States and contribute very materially toward the success of our defense program. Not only in the matter of dollars, but since we are all naturally prone to be more greatly interested in movements in which our finances are involved, it should very materially increase the already widespread interest of the people of America in all-out total national defense.

AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4158), to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Indiana kindly explain the bill?

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply amends three sections of the Internal Revenue Code and one section of the Tariff Act of 1930, correcting some inequities that have crept into the law as a result of the failure to permit drawback on distilled spirits moving into the insular possessions of the United States.

It comes with a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means. It also comes with a favorable report from the Treasury Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does it mean any loss of revenue to the country?

Mr. BOEHNE. It does not. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is the author of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the minority leader that it will not occasion any loss of revenue. It is in accord with the program of the Budget Bureau and also the Treasury Department, and carries a favorable report. It does nothing more than iron out some inequities that have crept into the internal revenue law over a period of almost 60 years, and is a matter of considerable merit. I could explain it in more detail if that were necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It comes with the recommendation of the Treasury and is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHNE. I yield.

Mr. CROWTHER. This is a unanimous report and is in entire agreement with the minority membership.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHNE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. This does not permit the elimination of the tax on rum coming in from the Virgin Islands?

Mr. BOEHNE. It has nothing to do with that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3341, Internal Revenue Code, be amended to read as follows:

"(c) Draw-back of tax paid in the United States: All provisions of law for the allowance of draw-back of internal revenue tax on articles exported from the United States are, so far as applicable, extended to like articles upon which an internal revenue tax has been paid when shipped from the United States to the Philippine Islands."

SEC. 2. That section 3351, Internal Revenue Code, be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(c) Draw-back of tax paid in the United States: All provisions of law for the allowance of draw-back of internal revenue tax on articles exported from the United States are, so far as applicable, extended to like articles upon which an internal revenue tax has been paid when shipped from the United States to the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 3. That subsection (c) of section 3361, Internal Revenue Code, be amended to read as follows:

"(c) Draw-back of tax paid in the United States: All provisions of law for the allowance of draw-back of internal revenue tax on articles exported from the United States are, so far as applicable, extended to like articles upon which an internal revenue tax has been paid when shipped from the United States to Puerto Rico, Guam, or American Samoa."

That section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be further amended by inserting after the words "internal revenue tax" a comma and the words "or from any internal revenue bonded warehouse, from any brewery duly qualified under the provisions of section 3155 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, or from any winery premises or bonded premises for the storage of wine, free of internal revenue tax."

That section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code be repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 25, strike out all of line 25 and the words "the Internal Revenue Code," in line 1 on page 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS ARRESTED AND SUBSEQUENTLY RELEASED WITHOUT CONVICTION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2844) to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "court", insert "having jurisdiction of the trial of the case, including cases where arrests have been made and no indictment returned, in its discretion."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Andrews	Buckler, Minn.	Celler
Bolles	Byrne	Chenoweth
Boykin	Byron	Clason
Bradley, Mich.	Camp	Clevenger
Buck	Cannon, Fla.	Cluett
Coffee, Wash.	Hope	Romjue
Cooley	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Copeland	Jennings	Schuetz
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Pa.
Culkin	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Curtis	Kirwan	South
Delaney	Lea	Sparkman
Dies	Maciejewski	Stratton
Fish	Magnuson	Sumner, Ill.
Fitzgerald	Mason	Sweeney
Gifford	Nelson	Tarver
Guyer, Kans.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thill
Hare	O'Day	Traynor
Hinshaw	Pearson	Treadway
Hobbs	Pierce	Voorhis, Calif.
Holmes	Ploeser	Wadsworth
Hook		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a table relating to W. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by His Excellency Archbishop Curley, of the diocese of Baltimore and Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Harold V. Reilly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. GEYER of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, for work relief and relief, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. In view of the fact that this is not a regular appropriation bill, although it comes from the Committee on Appropriations, it will not be read by paragraphs but will be read by sections notwithstanding the fact that appropriation bills are generally read by paragraphs. Is my understanding correct? I make this inquiry so the Members may know just how they should proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. As this is not a general appropriation bill, although it is reported by the Committee on Appropriations, it has previously been held that it should be read by sections and not by paragraphs.

The Clerk will read the first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942."

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 1. (a) In order to continue to provide work for employable needy persons on useful public projects in the United States and its Territories and possessions, there is hereby appropriated to the Work Projects Administration, of the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, $875,000,000, together with all balances of appropriations under section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, and under Public Law 9, Seventy-seventh Congress, which remain unobligated on June 30, 1941, including such unobligated balances of funds transferred to other Federal agencies for nonconstruction projects under the provisions of section 10 (a) of such act for the fiscal year 1941, as supplemented by such Public Law 9, or set aside for specific purposes in accordance with other law: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds heretofore irrevocably set aside for the completion of Federal construction projects under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1938 and 1939 and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as amended, and supplemented, shall remain available until June 30, 1942, for such completion, and any such funds which remain unobligated by reason of the completion or abandonment of any such Federal construction project shall be returned to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That $50,000,000 of such appropriation shall not be subject to any of the other provisions of this joint resolution and shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture and combined with the appropriation contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, under the heading "Disposal of Surplus Commodities" and shall be subject to all of the provisions of law applicable to such appropriation except that such sum of $50,000,000 shall be devoted entirely to a stamp plan for the removal of surplus commodities.

(b) The funds provided in this section shall be available for (1) administration; (2) the prosecution of projects approved by the President under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1938 and 1939 and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as amended and supplemented by Public Law 9, Seventy-seventh Congress; and (3) the prosecution of the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President, namely: Highways, roads, and streets; public buildings; parks and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein; public utilities; electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas, including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of nonprofit and cooperative associations; sewer systems, water supply, and purification systems; airports and other transportation facilities; flood

control; drainage; irrigation, including projects sponsored by nonprofit irrigation companies or nonprofit irrigation associations organized and operating for community benefit; water conservation; soil conservation, including projects sponsored by soil-conservation districts and other bodies duly organized under State law for soil-erosion control and soil conservation, preference being given to projects which will contribute to the rehabilitation of individuals and an increase in the national income; forestation, reforestation, and other improvements of forest areas, including the establishment of fire lanes; fish, game, and other wildlife conservation; eradication of insect, plant, and fungus pests; the production of lime and marl for fertilizing soil for distribution to farmers under such conditions as may be determined by the sponsors of such projects under the provisions of State law; educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, and service projects, including training for manual occupations in industries engaged in production for national-defense purposes, for nursing, and for domestic service; aid to self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons; and miscellaneous projects: *Provided*, That all persons employed on work projects shall, so far as practicable, be employed on projects nearest their respective homes.

(c) The funds appropriated in this section, exclusive of those used for administrative expenses, shall be so administered that expenditure authorizations for other than labor costs for all the work projects financed from such funds in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia shall not exceed an average for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, of $6 per month per worker, except that the Commissioner of Work Projects (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") may authorize an increase in the average in cases where the increased cost of materials would have the effect of raising such average above $6, but in no event shall the increase in such average exceed the amount necessary to meet such increase in material costs, and in no event shall such average exceed $7: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated in this section shall not be used for the purchase of any construction equipment or machinery in any case in which such equipment or machinery can be rented at prices determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable, and his determinations, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $40,000,000 of funds herein appropriated to the Work Projects Administration may be used by the Commissioner to supplement the amounts so authorized for other than labor costs in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia in connection with the prosecution of projects which have been certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes.

(d) In administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects approved after January 1, 1940, to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to projects (1) which have been certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes, or (2) which authorize necessary temporary measures to avert danger to life, property, or health in the event of disaster or grave emergency caused by flood, storm, fire, earthquake, drought, or similar cause. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determinations, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

(e) The funds appropriated in section 1 (a) hereof shall be available to provide, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner, for medical and hospital facilities for work camp project employees and burial expenses of deceased work camp project employees, including the transportation of remains to place of burial: *Provided*, That deductions shall be made from the earnings of all project employees quartered in such camps in an amount sufficient to offset the estimated cost to the United States for furnishing the foregoing.

(f) When it is found that as a result of bad faith, fraud, or misrepresentation on the part of the sponsor, any land, building, structure, facility, or other project, or any part thereof, upon which funds appropriated in this joint resolution have been expended, is used, transferred, or disposed of without retention and control for public use, the sponsor of the project and the person or organization to which the land, building, structure, facility, or project has been sold, leased, or given, shall be liable, jointly and severally, upon demand of the Commissioner or his duly authorized representative, to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds expended on such land, building, structure, facility, or project.

(g) The amount which may be obligated for administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration in the District of Columbia and in the field shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $35,466,000 during the fiscal year 1942, of which sum the amounts so to be obligated for the following respective purposes shall not exceed these sums: Salaries, $29,016,000; communication service, $500,000; travel, $2,800,000; and printing and binding, $300,000.

(h) The Federal Works Administrator shall transmit to Congress, on the first day of each regular session thereof, a statement showing for each State the names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Work Projects Administration whose compensation is at the rate of $1,200 per annum or more. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall include the Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

(i) The Work Projects Administration is hereby extended to June 30, 1942, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, and the Commissioner, with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions in connection therewith.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, not having spoken on this bill and being a member of the committee which reported it, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, a member of the deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee hears almost every Government department and agency request funds for its work. The witnesses presenting the needs of the departments invariably display great zeal for their department and their work. As a rule, they resist to the last ditch any effort to reduce the estimates one penny. There seems to be an almost universal attitude to use up appropriations, so that there will be no balance to be returned to the Treasury. Apparently most of the departments are ever alert to find some reason for increasing the amount each year with which to operate, and very seldom have I had the experience of hearing a witness tell the committee that his agency can exist on less. On the contrary, the cry is for more and more and more money each year, and the heads of departments seem to glorify their work and magnify their duties in order to secure greater appropriations. The proof of good executive management in their eyes seems to be the magnification of their needs and their budget. In good business practice it is not how much you can spend that makes for the success of a business, but how much you can save over previous years, and you try to accomplish as much or more on less money. I have rarely heard a witness say a word that he or the heads of the department are interested in economy. The term "thrift" is the forgotten word. Apparently the heads of departments seek glory by spending, and there is little evidence, from my observation, that the universal business principles of constant reduction in operative cost is an object of sincere effort on the part of the executives. There is no vigilance being displayed, to need less, and to reduce the gap between income and outgo. A great committee of this House is meeting daily to find ways to extract by taxation vast sums of money from loyal Americans. Why should not the departments be equally patriotic by making thrift and economy part of the esprit de corps, and thereby assist in relieving the future tax burden? "Spend on" is the present slogan. I trust that the executive heads of the departments will try to arouse their employees and send them to battle under the strange device of "save."

Everyone knows that speed in national defense necessarily implies some waste. But national defense should not be an excuse for failure to try to save wherever possible—national defense should not cloak a useless expenditure—it should not be used as an opportunity to acquire something not primarily for national defense, in the name of national defense, so as to build up the tangible assets of a department. An honest attitude toward national defense is a patriotic duty and an integral part of national defense. Even now such an attitude on the part of the departments, insisted upon and cooperated with by Congress, would be heartening to defense-minded and worth-while American citizens.

There are exceptions to the attitude of wastefulness discussed above, and my reason for rising at this time was to pay tribute to an agency and to a patriotic public servant.

The reason I rise at this time is because there are exceptions to the rule of wastefulness discussed above and I wish to pay tribute to an agency and a patriotic public service. The next section of the bill to

be read, section 2, deals with administrative agencies. The agency of Treasury Accounts is headed by Mr. Bartelt. I have known him only in our committee meetings, but I have observed that he has worked constantly to develop the most scientific and adequate accounting system. He has done an unusually intelligent job and has an interest in doing the job in the most inexpensive manner. Mr. Bartelt has reversed the process usually followed. Customarily when the amount of money to be expended is reduced there has not been a proportionate reduction in administrative expenses. In the case of Mr. Bartelt's agency not only has he made a proportionate reduction in administrative expenses, but he has gone far beyond and reduced the administrative expenses far beyond the reduction in the actual outgo.

In 1936 the number of collection and disbursement items in his bureau was 67,000,000. He estimates that for 1942 the number will be 30,000,000, or about one-half of the business that was done in 1936; yet in salaries paid the amount asked for 1936 in his agency was $5,800,000, but today he is asking for only $1,070,000. This is a reduction of about one-fourth of what his salaried lists were before. I would like to call this outstanding, patriotic, intelligent attitude on the part of Mr. Bartelt and his agency to the attention of the other agencies, and I would that all of the Government departments would catch the spirit of this valued public servant and his agency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, in line 5, strike out "$875,000,000" and insert "$437,500,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, about a month or so ago the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and urged an additional three and one-half billion dollars in taxes, and he said at that time that Congress could save a billion dollars if they would go at it right. Amongst those places where he stated a very liberal cut might be made was in the appropriation for the W. P. A.

Let me give you the picture as it presents itself today. In the first place, we have Howard Hunter and David Lasser running W. P. A. Howard Hunter is the same fellow who put in a claim against the Government for about eighteen or nineteen hundred dollars for traveling expenses, and that he knew was invalid, and that was disallowed by the General Accounting Office. David Lasser is a former head of the Workers Alliance. He led the raid on the capitol at Harrisburg, Pa., 4 or 5 years ago.

In the next place, we have a situation where, according to the evidence of Sidney Hillman this morning, the unemployed roll in this country is down to between four and five million from a high of upward of eleven or twelve million, and he expects increased employment to the tune of upward of a million in the next summer.

Right at this time the W. P. A. has thrown down the bars. They are practically advertising to keep their rolls up. They have sent out a circular in New York State, in which they say that the former requirements are not going to be made for certification for W. P. A. work. If they have had as little of surplus commodities as a peck of apples or an old pair of shoes, or anything of that kind, from a relief agency, they are eligible for certification. When an outfit of that kind gets to advertising to keep up its members and to keep up its morale, this country is in a terrible situation.

With the amount of money I have left in this bill, it would provide employment for 500,000 people, which would be more than enough, if properly apportioned in territories where it is needed to take care of legitimate requirements. If the relief were managed on an intelligent basis, and not by Howard Hunter and David Lasser, it would be easy enough to get along on one-half of what I am proposing for relief, and, at the same time, do a very liberal job in cases where it is really needed.

Many, many individuals go off of relief on account of the increase of employment. If a fellow on relief does not get a job, oftentimes his boy or his girl gets a job. Oftentimes the employment of one in a family takes the whole family off the roll.

I hope that this House will show some courage, some patriotism, and will show some consideration for the fellow whom that certain group led by Hunter and Lasser are trying to demoralize. I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment and reduce the terrible charge upon the Treasury that results from an appropriation of $875,00,000 carried in this paragraph.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will not be adopted; likewise I hope the amendment presently to be offered by my good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. CASEY, to increase the amount will not be adopted. In other words, I hope it will be the pleasure of the Committee to find in its wisdom that the Committee on Appropriations has done a fairly good job and has brought in a bill that is just about as good as you can secure under the circumstances.

We had for this current fiscal year $1,350,650,000 for the W. P. A. program. The amount recommended in this bill of $875,000,000 is a 35-percent reduction in that amount and in the number to be employed there is a 44-percent reduction. Speaking entirely personally, if I had to revamp this W. P. A. program, there are many changes I would make in it. Maybe I would make it worse than it is now. But looking at the program as a whole, I believe we cannot improve upon that. A 44-percent reduction in the W. P. A. rolls is a substantial reduction, though I think just as the President thinks in this instance and as the W. P. A. thinks; it can be justified because of the statistics and the facts which have developed showing the rate of employment in private industry in this country, and considering the stupendous sums which we are spending for the defense program.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is no appropriation that has been brought into this House at the present session of Congress that has been reduced anywhere near the amount this appropriation has been reduced?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. If every appropriation bill that has been brought into this House had been reduced, say 20 percent, we would have saved over a billion dollars; but here we are taking a half billion dollars from the poor, needy people of this country, still the gentleman from New York wants to cut that in half?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I say, I feel we have done as good a job as can be done under the circumstances. We have reported in this bill the total amount recommended by the President for the relief program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true, in addition to a 44-percent reduction in workers, the committee has made a further reduction by earmarking $50,000,000 for food stamps and about $300,000,000 for defense projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The defense projects do not represent a reduction, because W. P. A. workers are employed on them. The reduction on account of $50,000,000 transfer is included in the 44 percent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentlemen is correct, but he knows the limitations on wages, hours, and so forth, are removed when applied to defense projects, thus increasing the project cost, and in the end cutting down the amount available for W. P. A. workers.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true to some extent.

Now with reference to the $50,000,000, the committee has earmarked $50,000,000 for the food-stamp plan. I hope it will be the pleasure of the Committee to permit the bill to go as the committee has reported it. If in the ultimate judgment of the Committee you feel this $50,000,000 should not be earmarked, then cut out the earmarking; but I ask you not to increase the total amount of the bill. The committee has reported $875,000,000 in this bill, as requested by the President. If you do not like the earmarking, then you can act on that, but I do hope that the Committee will not seriously consider adding any amount to this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from Virginia stated that we will have a reduction of 44 percent from last year.

The earmarking of this $50,000,000 does cut the employment by 58,000 from what is recommended by the President.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. It seems to me that when the gentleman makes the statement that you are going along with the recommendation that comes from the President, the gentleman should emphatically state that that is not so; there will be a reduction of 58,000 below what is recommended by the President. That is the fact, is it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; that is not the fact. We have reported for work and work relief $875,000,000, as recommended by the President, but the committee has earmarked $50,000,000 of it for a particular plan—the food-stamp plan.

Mr. BOLAND. The President does not recommend that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the President does not recommend that.

Mr. BOLAND. The Bureau of the Budget does not recommend it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course not.

Mr. BOLAND. The Department of Agriculture has not asked for it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true. The gentleman might also add, if he wants to carry it a little further, that the President and the Bureau of the Budget recommended removing all the restrictions Congress has placed on the W. P. A. program. We did not do that, either. I believe the legislative body has some rights, and I think when we come here with the ultimate amount that has been reported we have complied substantially with the Budget.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when we were discussing a similar appropriation bill and cutting down on W. P. A., I made this observation. I said:

> You are striking at a group of low-income workers who are the victims of this depression, a group that does not practice birth control, a group from whose homes will come the soldiers if we ever have a war. They are feeding on a diet of cabbage, prunes, and potatoes, with the only variation of diet being potatoes, prunes, and cabbage. Many of these boys, when called for military service, will be rejected because of physical disability.

What I predicted then has come true. The time has come when the blame is on the Congress. The record shows that today the boys called to military service who are coming from those homes, because of the failure of Congress to appropriate money to allow the breadwinner to purchase foods containing sufficient vitamins to build up their bodies, are in such physical condition that 40 percent of the draftees are being rejected because of defective teeth and defective bone structure. Recently the Secretary of Agriculture, in commenting on this high percentage of rejections, said it was caused by malnutrition.

Now you are asking to cut this appropriation in half as a measure of economy. I am going to support the Casey amendment to increase the amount and I ask you to support it also. Let us do something for the American workingmen. If we can spend $7,000,000,000 for the people of England and China, why can we not do something for the workingmen of America, the millions who are still unemployed and who will remain unemployed, most of them, despite the defense program? Every Member of the House who lives with the problem and who has to meet a hundred of those men a week when he is home knows that they cannot be taken into industry. Industry wants youth; it wants bone and sinew. Men of 45 are scrapped today, and there will be millions of them who will not be able to get into defense industry.

Let us think about America now. Those of you who voted for the $7,000,000,000 for Britain and China have the courage to stand up for your American brothers who are down and out and unemployed now, and put them to work. That is my plea to this Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 24, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts: On page 2, line 5, after "1942", strike out "$875,000,000" and insert "$1,250,000,000".

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] say that the legislative branch of this Government has some responsibilities and that we should exercise them. I do not agree with the President when he recommends $875,000,000 for current W. P. A. appropriations. I believe he is altogether too taken up with matters of defense, so that his viewpoint is probably not as completely clear as it has been in the past with respect to unemployment.

I know there are men in this House who would like to cut this appropriation in half. I know there are men in this House who, if they followed their real feelings, would do away with it altogether. That is not a new attitude in government. Marie Antoinette expressed it years ago when she said, "Let them eat cake."

I want to talk to the men and women in this House who have a reasonable attitude about these things, who have open minds, minds that can be convinced.

I say to you it is about time we started taking care of our people here in America. We have spent or authorized $40,000,000,000 for defense, and much of it has gone abroad, as you know. Here we have the spectacle, according to the committee report, of 2,500,000 American men and women in need, who are able to work and want to work. You will not be able to take care of them with this $875,000,000. You will not be able to take care of 1,000,000 of them. I am not talking about the 5,000,000 or 7,000,000 unemployed; I am taking the committee's own report:

> Taking into consideration all factors of increased private employment, increase in the labor force, dislocation of employment, etc., the W. P. A. estimates that the number to be eligible for W. P. A. employment in the fiscal year 1942 will be 2,500,000. This seems a high figure, but, assuming it to be a good estimate, the W. P. A., under the appropriation in the joint resolution, could employ 37 percent of the estimated eligibles.

This year we are going to employ a less percentage of eligibles than ever before, because during the last 2 years about 65 percent of those in need and eligible to be employed were employed.

Consider that, members of the committee. During this time when we are trying to make democracy work, when we are spending billions and billions of dollars for destruction and for defense for peoples in other countries, when we have proclaimed that our hearts are bleeding for the oppressed in other countries, I call your attention to the fact that it is about time to shed a few drops of blood for the depressed in this country. You have 2,500,000 potential workers in need, many of them too old to get work in private employment, over 50 percent of them being over 40 years of age and more than 60 percent over 45 years of age. You know they cannot get work in private employment. They are good American citizens who are anxious for an opportunity to be given them so that they might work and as a result of their work feed themselves and their families. And that is the plea I make to you today—to vote for my amendment. It is less than last year's appropriation. It is only $1,250,000,000. It will take care of only 1,300,000 men, to be sure, but it is a much better appropriation than the one the committee has brought in.

I yield to no man with respect to trying, calmly and in a reasonable way, to save dollars on nondefense projects, but, good God, gentlemen, consider this. This W. P. A. bill is cut more than any other appropriation bill that has come before us. Consider that we are making the most drastic cut out of the hides of those who can least afford it, the men and women who are eligible, certified as eligible, and in need of employment.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. Speaking of the age limit, I received a letter this morning from one of my constituents whose brother was a World War veteran, and he states that he has been trying to get employment in private industry, and applied at one of the large industries in the district that is engaged upon defense work, but on account of his age the

factory has turned him down because they have an age limit of 40 years with respect to new men they are hiring.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments to be offered to this bill that I deem are very important. One is this Casey amendment to increase the amount to respectibility, the other to do away with the 30 days' lay-off.

We are told there are as many people certified and on the waiting list as there are now on the W. P. A. rolls. Who are these people on the rolls and on the waiting list? They are our own people whom those engaged in the defense program and other private industry will not employ. What is their crime that they are denied the right to earn an honest living for themselves and families?

They have committed the unpardonable sin of passing their forty-fifth birthday. And for this, after they have assisted in building this great country, we are denying them the real blessings of the democracy to which we are urging them to be loyal. If our Government owes its people anything, it owes them the right of a job at a decent living wage when business, industry, and finance have refused them that job.

What type of loyalty have we a right to expect from these people when they see us voting billions of dollars to help finance the perennial wars of Europe, in which we have no business, yet refuse the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to our own citizens.

I say, first let us care for our own even though someone does not make a large profit on the expenditure and next worry about the troubles of foreigners.

The 30-day lay-off was incorporated into the law on the theory that there were many people who preferred to say on W. P. A. rather than to seek employment with private firms.

This is not the case. I know many W. P. A. clients personally and there is not one of them that would not gladly work in private industry rather than remain where they are.

Then again this rule hinders our educational and recreational program. The end of the 18-month period usually comes during the school year. The instructor is discharged for a month and then there are serious interruptions in the school work. As one who has been principal of a high school for adults, I speak from experience.

This rule is so unjust to the client. First, we pay him such a pittance that it is practically impossible for him to keep body and soul together and, next, we expect him to save enough on it so he can live 30 days without employment.

I certainly hope both of these amendments will be adopted.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to make any talk on this matter. I expressed my views upon any cut in the appropriation for the W. P. A. workers when this bill was under general debate. I cannot subscribe to economizing at this time at the expense of the poor people of this country. If the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] carries, we can take care of the load in Montana. I am for the amendment. If it does not carry, we will have 4,800 families in Montana that will have to be cared for in another fashion.

I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that the money you give to this cause is not lost. In my own State we have built churches, we have built courthouses, we have built roads, we have built recreational centers, we have built schoolhouses, and every single dollar that has been expended has brought about a permanent improvement in my State.

I do not need to call your attention to the fact that we see want 3,000 miles away with much clearer and more sympathetic eyes than we see want at home. You can find want in every city in the United States. You can find young people, old people, middle-aged people, and all kinds of people that are in want in the United States today. Yet we are concerned about the people who are in want in nearly every nation that has any sort of government that we construe to mean a democratic government. We advocate the four freedoms, and, of course, Christ advocated that. That would work in a perfect world; it is a great thought, a great ideal, but it is in the moon. We must work in the kind of world in which we find ourselves.

We cannot establish freedom of want throughout the world, we cannot answer that call in every nation in the world, when we have not answered it in the United States. We have not relieved our want situation in the United States, we have not answered the question of unemployment in this country. The statesmanship of the country has not answered that question so far. I am for national defense and I have voted for every appropriation for national defense, but our unemployment problem is staring us in the face and stalking us just the same as it has in the past in my State, as we have no defense projects. The only answer we have or the only partial answer we have is to put all of the people to work that we can in this W. P. A. program. Two hundred and fifty million dollars or three hundred million dollars does not mean anything when we are appropriating $10,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 in one crack for our defense program. Defense means, as well as material, a satisfied people; it means a country whose people love their government. A people that is hungry, children who are hungry, women who are hungry, and husbands and fathers who cannot find a job, provide a mighty fertile field for any kind of ism, because it seems to them that any change would have to be for the better. Mr. Chairman, hunger is driving poor France into the arms of Hitler. England is blockading her and we are not helping her. Empty bellies become desperate.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Several weeks ago it was my privilege to listen to Lord Halifax tell about the difficulty of the British Government to maintain morale amongst the British people. In doing so he cited the effect of his Government permitting foodstuffs to be sent into occupied France and the great effect it would have on the morale of the British people since they are constantly faced with the rationing of food due to shortages. If we appropriate sufficient funds to care of the unemployed, they can purchase food and other commodities of life. Therefore in this way not only will we maintain the morale of our own people, but will make a definite contribution to the national defense of the Nation. In fact this bill can be labled a national-defense necessity.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly, and in addition to that it will be an answer to this communistic wave that is sweeping over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, we have in the last few months expended or appropriated billions of dollars for munitions, but when it comes to the expenditure of funds to sustain the morale of our people, we cut it down to a few paltry millions. That is why I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is my honest opinion that the amount appropriated in House Joint Resolution 193 is so small as to be entirely inadequate under the conditions that obtain in many States, including my own. And I am deeply disappointed to find that the 18 months' provision has not been eliminated. Experience has proven this provision to be cruel and indefensible.

The committee argues that defense expenditures will continue to open jobs for those seeking work. Unfortunately, that does not apply to all job seekers and most especially to those now on or trying to get on W. P. A. Since the average age of workers on W. P. A. is 43 years, it is readily seen how very difficult it is for them to break into private industry. Persons between 40 and 60 have practically no chance at all of getting employment in defense industries. These industries, particularly airplane, shipbuilding, and machine-tool industries, demand young employees. If these young employees are not skilled, industry sees to it that they are trained. They will not employ the middle-aged men and women who need jobs in order to live.

I personally know in my district scores of men and women who are no longer young, but who have the will and the

ability to earn a living and who are denied the opportunity. For these people and countless like them the W. P. A. has proven a godsend. This applies especially to the white-collar projects, to the arts projects, and to the sewing and related projects. Employment on these has been the salvation of many who otherwise would literally have perished. I cannot bear to think of what is going to happen to those who are turned off for lack of adequate appropriations. They cannot turn to defense industries; they cannot hope to find employment in any industry. Perhaps it is true that many of them are not able to earn the prevailing wages in industry. At any rate they are not given the chance and that is the tragic truth.

While we are spending billions for defense—and I think this spending is imperative—we should appropriate at this time the needed extra millions to support the lives and sustain the morale of that portion of our population who find in the W. P. A. their only chance to make a living. Instead we cut down the appropriation and thus drive people who will be separated from the W. P. A. to despair and to face starvation.

To my mind there is no justification for this. I honestly think that every man and every woman who needs a job and is willing to work should have a job. And I think that this can and should be provided now. The additional expenditure will look small in comparison to what we are spending, necessarily and rightly, for defense. Certainly, the first necessity for real defense is to defend our people from unemployment and from want. What good is democracy if it can not give opportunity to all?

I would offer two amendments to the pending bill, but find that others are anxious to do this. I am glad to support any and all such amendments offered. I wish that this Congress would double the appropriation; I hope that at least half a billion dollars will be added to it. That will approximate the absolute need that exists in this Nation at this time. And I hope that the 18 months provision will be eliminated, as recommended by the President.

In passing may I say that when it comes to making appropriations to bolster up the farmers' income this House never falters. But when W. P. A. appropriations are under consideration, then the word "economy" becomes the slogan. And yet everyone knows that starvation haunts the city dweller who is out of work and in a way that only the smallest percentage of farmers ever experience.

Fair play, justice, real national defense, all these demand that this appropriation be increased.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, many times the question has been asked recently why we should not cut W. P. A. expenditures because of the large number of W. P. A. workers, hundreds of thousands of them, who have gone into defense industry. The people who ask that question seem to overlook the fact that today there are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people dependent on local relief, dependent on local welfare, who are not taken care of by the present W. P. A. appropriations. Twenty percent of the W. P. A. workers are women. Then there are the white-collar people and the manual workers who are getting on in years, who are not being absorbed by the defense program. They will remain virtually as paupers if this amendment is rejected. The committee's estimate indicates that about 1,500,000 people will be on local relief, unable to get on W. P. A. rolls, unless this amendment is adopted by the House of Representatives. That estimate, they say, seems high, but I wonder if changing events do not require that we should raise that estimate. We all know that all over the country today various factories are facing a serious situation due to the clamping down of priorities. In many cases factories will have to close because they cannot get materials which have to be used in defense industries. The committee mentioned dislocation, and there will be more of it than perhaps we realize. Fortunately, the Congress 6 years ago passed the Social Security Act, which established a Nation-wide system of State unemployment compensation laws. The unemployment compensation laws will take care of that dislocation for a little while. People who have been working in factories and thrown out of work will get unemployment insurance, but it is only for a few weeks or a few months, and the dislocations will last longer than that. So in these coming months we can look forward to an increase in unemployment, not spread generally all over the country but in centers where industries producing consumer goods have been curtailed due to the demands of national defense.

Frequently here we have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] ask, "Where are you going to get the money?" But if we reject this amendment we are going to hear 1,500,000 voices asking, "How are we going to live? We are Americans. We are citizens of a supposedly rich and civilized country. We want a chance to earn a living. We are willing to work for it. How are we going to live?" I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Casey amendment. The excuse advanced for a reduction of 44 percent under last year in the number of unemployed on W. P. A. and of 35 percent in the sum is that the so-called national-defense industries will absorb those men and that unemployment will thereby be cut to such an extent as to justify the cut which this committee has made at the recommendation of the President, for the sum proposed comes within $95,000 of the figure submitted by the President to the Congress.

An analysis of the situation will show that instead of having a decrease in unemployment, in many sections of the country we have had an increase in unemployment. For instance, it will show that in the construction industry, as I pointed out the other day, there has been a drop of 145,000 in April in the number of men working on camp construction, from 369,000 in February. If a real study were made of the situation, we will find that this drop has taken place in many other industries, particularly due to the system of priorities and the ensuing curtailment in the production of consumers' goods. The purpose of priorities is the rationing of materials when the demand exceeds the supply. I shall on some other occasion describe how the American people are being defrauded by the dishonest use of this system, which now forces the displacement of production of consumers' goods with armament production. Thus as a result of priorities, while it is true that we have placed some men to work in so-called national-defense work, we have forced thousands of workers out of work in the consumers' goods industries.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has revealed that we still have 9,000,000 unemployed, yet we cut W. P. A. by 44 percent. But the real reason for this cut is not that unemployment has so decreased as to warrant a 44-percent slash, as the committee would have us believe. The real reason for this cut is the program of armaments, conscription, war, and dictatorship. We have sacrificed our entire social program and our entire economic welfare program on the altar of war and war preparedness. We have sacrificed our housing program. Our health legislation has been sacrificed. The unemployed have been sacrificed. Labor has been forced to a state of enslavement by bayonets, and the unemployed are now being further impoverished, all in the name of defending a so-called democracy which is diminishing every day in these United States. The American people, however, are beginning to realize that this destruction of their welfare is done in the interests of a war for empire and profits, a war waged by two sets of their enemies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute of the Committee's time to read a few excerpts from a letter which I have received from the Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Sam H. Jones.

It reads as follows:

> If it becomes necessary to reduce the W. P. A. rolls by 44 percent, more than 12,000 heads of families, representing approximately 48,000 individuals, will be released by the W. P. A. in Louisiana. The State does not have the money to carry this additional relief burden. It is our duty, mine as Governor and yours as a Member of Congress, to see that adequate Federal funds are provided to meet the unemployment problem.

We have heard a great deal of discussion on the floor of this House about defense industries absorbing all of the unemployed. I maintain that this may have been true provided there had been in the first place some planning and some equitable distribution of defense contracts.

I have in my hand a map dated June 6, 1941, published in the National News

Week, which shows that during the month of April 78 percent of all contracts went to four States. My State got barely $200,000 in defense contracts. The State of Arkansas and four other States did not get one red cent. The same thing applies with reference to putting people out of work as a result of the defense program. We have withdrawn, for instance, from the Gulf trade about 50 percent of our ships, which means that in the port of New Orleans and other ports of that area the stevedores, men working on the docks, white-collar workers, and thousands of other related workers in those industries instead of being employed by the defense program are now out of work.

I say to the Members of this House that the defense program cannot be used as a basis for cutting the W. P. A. appropriation almost in half, unless the figures and facts can be shown that this program has absorbed the unemployment load throughout the country and not within a few isolated, restricted, concentrated areas of this Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Casey amendment, which provides an increase of $300,000,000 for W. P. A. over the committee bill, because I feel that the present is not the time to cut down on appropriations for those people who are in need of work and cannot get it. As was said just a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, it is a question not only of the distribution of work, but also of the age of the worker. I know that in my own district, and I have said so on the floor before, there are hundreds upon hundreds of mechanics past the age of 40 or 45 who have been unable to follow their trades in the last few years, who have been either wholly out of employment or on W. P. A. working out of their trades. As a result, today they are not able to get back into the regular routine of their business lives.

I received word this morning from Irving V. A. Huie, the New York administrator of W. P. A., that in Bronx County the number of people on W. P. A. on the 4th of June of this year was approximately 12,800. A reduction of 44 percent has been suggested. To apply this to Bronx County would mean a reduction of the number on W. P. A. rolls down to around 6,000 or 7,000. We know there are thousands upon thousands of needy families where the worker has not been able to get employment. If we do not have this increased appropriation I am convinced that these families will have to go back on the local relief agencies. This will increase the burden insofar as the people of our city are concerned. I hope, therefore, that under all the circumstances, and when we take into consideration the fact that we have appropriated so many billions of dollars to aid foreign countries, that we will appropriate just a few more millions to extend this welfare and work-relief program to the people of our own country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as far as I can recall, every time we consider a W. P. A. bill, the thought is advanced that the big cities are the ones which benefit most from these appropriations, and for this reason there is always an apparent line of demarcation between city and rural Members with respect to support or lack of support of these appropriations. I think as a policy, certainly in my own case, I have never supported W. P. A. appropriations solely because of the benefits which came to my own city, because in my own city—Philadelphia—we have always been 20,000 people short of the number we are entitled to because of the lack of cooperation on the part of our local officials.

We have heard that because of the defense program these W. P. A. and unemployed workers are going to be absorbed. I would like to offer the thought and the suggestion to those from the smaller communities that the defense program will not put to work the people in their communities. Some of the unemployed in the big industrial cities of the country will go to work, but in the thousands of other communities throughout the country no defense work is being undertaken, and there is where the greatest need will arise and the greatest benefits from W. P. A. appropriations go. I ask you to give some attention to this when it comes to voting upon the proposition. I think you should bear in mind that the 400,000 additional workers the Casey amendment would take care of will come more from the small communities than from the big cities. So if you from small communities vote against this amendment on the ground that your community will not benefit equally, I think you will be making a tragic mistake. I am not supporting this amendment because of the benefits that may come to my own city, for we will not gain one worker, because, as I said, we do not receive our full benefits even at the present time. You should vote for this amendment because of the thousands of communities and the hundreds of thousands of workers who will benefit throughout the entire country. The big communities will not benefit so much, because hundreds of thousands of people living there will go to work on the defense program. It is the small communities all over the United States that will benefit to the greatest extent. I feel that for these reasons you rural Members should support the Casey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLANNERY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Chairman, much has been said pro and con about the impetus to unemployment that national defense will give. The overwhelming probability is that curtailments, by reason of priorities, will more than offset the increase in employment. I am afraid some of the estimates of the effect on the system by priorities will be far exceeded. We are told we must expect shortly a curtailment of automobile production, and we expect shortly curtailment in other directions, in other lines of industry, in order to make way for national defense. So, at least in a certain measure, the gains in one direction will be offset by losses in another.

Throughout the debate no mention has been made of dependent widows and mothers with dependent children, yet these constitute a large section of the needy population and they cannot participate in the national-defense program. There has been reference made to regions such as mine, which have a terrific unemployment problem. The condition in my area will not improve materially by reason of the national-defense program. Despite the most earnest efforts on the part of its representatives in the Government, there has been no effort made on the part of the War Department to help solve our social and economic problems by the location of industries. It would not conform to its policy nor will it serve the success of the program—or so I am told.

Everything is being done in the name of national defense. We have appropriated and authorized approximately $40,000,000,000 in the name of national defense. I say that the most fundamental element of national defense is on the home front. I ask you in behalf of that one phase of national defense to support the Casey amendment. After all, these men are going to fight—if they fight—for what? They are going to fight for their home communities, they are going to fight for their way of life and for the privileges that they enjoy under a democracy. If their communities are faced with want, if their way of life is to walk the streets with starvation staring them in the face, if their way of life is need, unhappiness, and discontent, then I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the men will fight with very little heart.

If you believe in national defense, it begins at home. I advocate support of the Casey amendment as perhaps the most necessary and vital element of national defense. For God's sake give them a community life worth fighting for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to express the appreciation of the city of New York for all the help that we have received from W. P. A. Certainly many of the improvements that have been made in our city during the past 7 years would not have been made possible were it not for the fact that W. P. A. funds were available with which to hire the necessary men and women.

I think an unfortunate impression exists so far as W. P. A. is concerned. I have heard of people who refer to W. P. A. workers as shirkers, idlers, and as people generally who do not care to work steadily or at a hard job. This is not so. If you live in a big city like New York and are surrounded by millions of people who have found it impossible to earn a living or to obtain gainful employment, you realize the importance of the W. P. A. projects. It is not just a means of spending money. It is a means to help all the

people in a very wholesome and constructive way.

The W. P. A. has contributed to national defense by improving our schools, hospitals, and other valuable activities. Our hospitals would have been seriously handicapped during the past 5 or 6 years if they had not been able to utilize W. P. A. workers. Many of these men and women have been taught to perform necessary jobs in the hospitals. Recently the man in charge of passing upon these expenditures withheld approval from those hospital activities because he did not feel it was ever contemplated within the philosophy of W. P. A. to put people to work in hospitals. He thought they should be out with a pick and shovel, which is a fine and very useful thing; many persons on W. P. A. are not fitted for that type of work but are qualified for service in our hospital systems and in our schools.

If we do not have the money provided by the Casey amendment, I am fearful we will have many additional hardships to face in our big cities. The President, in his letter addressed to the committee, asked that the 18-month period be eliminated. I am sorry to say that the committee has not adopted the suggestion of the President. That, too, is a very difficult problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the annual relief bill is a very important appropriation measure. Since becoming a Member of Congress I have had the privilege of considering three annual relief bills and also deficiency measures. In each instance I have relied on conditions in my own congressional district to provide me with the necessary knowledge to clearly understand the problem of adequate relief for the thousands of deserving Americans who, through no fault of their own, must seek employment on W. P. A.

The important question facing any Representative in Congress in considering W. P. A. legislation is the recognized plight of the W. P. A. worker and his dependents. It is refreshing to me to know that on every occasion I have cast my vote in a sincere effort to improve conditions incident to W. P. A. employment.

This year we are faced with a different problem than at any other time in the history of the W. P. A. Because of the national emergency our Government is spending billions of dollars to build an adequate national defense. At the same time, through other governmental agencies, millions are being released to assist foreign nations in working out their destiny.

Contrary to public opinion, the national-defense program, with its increased expenditures, has not resulted in widespread employment. In fact, in order to speed up production, contracts have been placed in certain sections of the country where plants were already in operation or facilities could be expanded with a minimum of delay.

As an illustration, as of March 31, 1941, according to a report of the House Committee on Appropriations, 20 industrial areas in the United States received 69 percent of all defense orders; yet these areas had only 28 percent of the population and 24 percent of the W. P. A. workers. Out of 3,073 counties in the United States, 761 of them received defense contracts, leaving a large portion of the country without any direct benefits from the national-defense program.

The truth of the situation is that employment gains have been confined to certain industrial areas, and while improvement in unemployment conditions is noticeable in those sections, yet the country as a whole, according to well-informed observers, will still be faced during 1942 with over 7,000,000 unemployed persons. According to these informed sources, the national-defense program for the fiscal year 1942 is expected to absorb approximately one million and a half unemployed persons. This slow absorption of the unemployed is due principally to the fact that industry with modern mechanized methods has reduced the need for manpower, and, in addition, each year 600,000 young men and women enter the field as new workers.

In short, it must be recognized that despite the effect on employment by reason of the national-defense program, the number of unemployed persons absorbed by industry will not result in the hoped-for decrease in unemployment thought possible as a result of the huge expenditures for national defense. Therefore we are still faced with providing the necessities of life for approximately 7,000,000 unemployed American citizens.

The work-relief appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was $1,350,650,000 and provided average employment for the fiscal year of 1,700,000 workers.

The original Budget estimate upon which this joint resolution is based was projected by President Roosevelt in the Budget for the fiscal year 1942, transmitted in January last, in the sum of $995,000,000. However, this estimated amount was revised and resubmitted by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress May 20, 1941, at which time he recommended that the sum be reduced to $886,000,000, a decrease in the original figure of $109,000,000.

The House Committee on Appropriations slashed the President's revised recommendation for $886,000,000 to the amount of $875,000,000 asked for in the present resolution and which is based upon the average employment of 1,000,000 persons during the year. However, a still further reduction has been made in the appropriation of $875,000,000 from the fact that $50,000,000 has been earmarked for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for the administration of the surplus food-stamp plan; thus reducing the average annual employment estimated at 1,000,000 to 941,315, a reduction of 58,685 persons.

At this point it is well to remember that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, has directed our attention to the fact that President Roosevelt and the House Committee on Appropriations are insistent that the appropriation of $875,000,000 remain at its present level. The gentleman from Kentucky in addressing the House this date said:

> The President and the Bureau of the Budget have studied this matter carefully and have recommended a certain amount, which the committee is asking you to accept as a proper contribution on the part of the Federal Government to the cause of the unemployed. The committee has studied the subject and believes that by voting the amount in this bill and by not voting the amount in the Casey amendment you will be providing fairly and adequately for the unemployed, in whom the committee is interested as well as the gentleman offering the amendment.

I regret that I cannot subscribe to the above sentiments.

Assuming that the lowest possible unemployment figure for 1942 would be five and one-half million, the appropriation would permit employment of only 17 percent of the employable unemployed certified for W. P. A. employment.

Gentlemen, it is a fair question to ask—What is to become of the remaining 83 percent of our unemployed?

Frankly, the facts and figures released by various governmental agencies convince me that there has been slight improvement in unemployment conditions, and not enough to warrant such a drastic reduction in this year's appropriation which will make necessary a reduction of W. P. A. employees—in some instances from 40 percent to 50 percent over the present year.

As a Representative in Congress charged with the responsibility of providing for the welfare of my people, and conscious of the fact that my congressional district has not benefited to any marked degree from the expenditures for national defense, I feel it is my duty to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] providing for an appropriation of $1,250,000,000 instead of the proposed $875,000,000.

If the Casey amendment is adopted, it will provide funds for the possible employment of 1,300,000 persons, or approximately 26 percent of the employable unemployed. In addition, it guarantees that the entire appropriation will be used for W. P. A. employment, and funds earmarked for the food-stamp plan or for other purposes will have to be embodied in other appropriation measures.

Another compelling reason for my support for an increase of the appropriation from $875,000,000 to $1,250,000,000 is that such a sum will provide funds for a possible increase in the wages of W. P. A. workers.

In reviewing the hearings on the present relief bill, I am greatly disappointed to note that little reference was made to the inadequate wage scales now in effect. To my mind the question of an increase in wages was never more justified. Faced with the mounting cost of living on one hand and our generosity to foreign nations on the other, we have been guilty of neglecting our own people when we expect them to live and rear their families on as low a sum as $39 a month.

We know that when the Relief Act of 1939 was passed, authority was given the Administrator of W. P. A. to establish wage scales based on the cost of living. The unfairness of these wage scales is well known to all of us, because the drastic reductions brought untold hardship to thousands of W. P. A. workers, and especially in my own congressional district, where an all-time low was reached in paying a wage of $39 monthly.

On various occasions many of us have appealed to the Administrator of W P. A. asking that recognition be given the increased cost of living and that wage scales be adjusted accordingly. But our pleas fell on deaf ears, and the W. P. A. worker was forced to suffer in silence.

During the recent hearings, Mr. Howard Hunter, Administrator of W. P. A., in response to a question of the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman JOHNSON, concerning the increase of W P. A. wages, said:

> We have authority to raise the W. P. A. wage if we wanted to by Executive order.

Gentlemen, with the marked increase in the cost of living and the assertion of economists within and without Government circles that further advances in living costs are assured, it would seem in simple justice to the W. P. A. workers that Congress should take immediate action in remedying the intolerable situation caused by the existing W. P. A. wage scales. In my opinion, there is a definite need for a minimum wage on which the W. P. A. Administrator should be required to use as a basis in establishing a fair and equitable wage scale.

It is my intention in fairness to W. P. A. workers to support the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FENTON, in his effort to establish a minimum wage of $60 monthly.

Is it unfair, gentlemen, to ask approval of a minimum-wage scale of $60 monthly to a W. P A. worker and his dependents? The average age of the W. P. A. worker is nearly 43 years, and the number of dependents is estimated at three and one-half for each head of a family.

There can be no greater contribution to the welfare of this country and the national-defense program than to build a race of sturdy bodies and strong minds. It will result in maintaining self-respect and develop the morale of millions of deserving American citizens now unemployed through no fault of their own.

Yesterday I listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] make the astounding statement that anybody over the age of 50 years could get a job if he desired employment. I wish I could accept the statement, but it is an insult to the intelligence of the average American citizen who has, footsore and weary, trudged from one industrial plant to another, only to be told that his age is a detriment and that those under the age of 35 years are preferred.

The gentleman from New York as a member of the House Committee on Appriations knows that the recent hearings developed the fact that 68 percent of all employables on W. P. A. are over the age of 35 years and that the doors of industry are closed to them.

It is likewise common knowledge that the overwhelming majority of W. P. A. workers would much prefer employment in private industry than be forced to accept W. P. A. assignment which has as its requirement that applicants be on the relief rolls of the Nation.

However, I will agree with the gentleman from New York that the overhead expense in the Washington office of W. P. A. should be reduced.

I was amazed to learn from the testimony of Congressman TABER that there were 1,709 employees in the Washington office receiving an average annual salary of $2,436; and that recently 53 positions were abolished; yet the average salaries of those remaining after this so-called economy move actually were increased to an annual average of $2,448.

When I recall my unsuccessful efforts to convince the W. P. A. Administrator of the gross discrimination due to the present wage scales, his action in raising the salaries of those employed in the Washington office of the W. P. A. is a stench in the nostrils of every fair-minded citizen.

The present bill contains the provision that a 30-day furlough be taken after 18 months' employment. This requirement has worked untold hardship in countless cases, and it is questionable whether any worth-whole benefit may be obtained by continuing it in force. Since the great majority of the workers on W. P. A. are beyond the age required by industry, it is evident that they must look to the W. P. A. for existence for themselves and families.

We have provided a means of review to definitely establish the need of every W. P. A. worker, and where such need exists it is necessary that employment be continuous in order to provide the necessities of life. In addition, the various States have a system for certifying persons for W. P. A. employment which, with the W P. A. review, gives double guaranty that only eligible persons will be assigned to W. P. A. employment.

As previously stated, there is no doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of those employed on W. P. A. would gladly accept private employment if offered them. Therefore I am in favor of elimination of the 30-day furlough after 18 months' employment.

My interest in the veterans of the United States is well known to all of you. From time to time Congress has taken a definite stand in favoring preference to veterans, their widows, and wives of disabled veterans where the veteran is unemployable. Regardless of the intention of Congress, it is a known fact that certain State administrators of W. P. A. have made their own interpretation of veterans' preference with the result that discrimination has been prevalent throughout the country. At the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment which will, in unmistakable terms, provide the preference for veterans that Congress has always intended. At this time I ask your support for my proposed amendment.

Before concluding my remarks a study of this bill reveals that approximately one-half of the appropriation of $875,000,000 will be used on national-defense projects and that half of those to be employed by the W. P. A. during 1942 will be engaged in defense work. This means that nondefense projects will be retarded while the W. P. A. is engaged in work that principally belongs to the Army and Navy. In addition, increased working hours and labor costs, together with waiver of the sponsor's contribution, constitute a huge drain on W. P. A. funds and mean less jobs for the unemployed on nondefense projects. This situation is of vital concern to my district, which has to depend solely on nondefense projects.

I am deeply interested in national defense and have voted for every single penny requested by President Roosevelt. However, I am loathe to stand by and see the relief appropriations diverted to the Army and Navy under the guise of national defense when these two Departments should request the necessary funds in their own name. If the Army and Navy would secure the necessary appropriations in the regular way instead of depleting the relief funds, such worthwhile programs as the W. P. A. sewing projects would not be faced with curtailment and thousands of deserving American women left without any visible means of support.

At the same time we have the picture of W. P. A. workers engaged in national-defense work at the deplorable wage scale of $39 a month while their fellow Americans in the navy yards, powder factories, arsenals, and related industries have the benefits of wages paid in accordance with the high standards of the American workman.

Like many of you, I have constantly studied the plight of the W. P. A. worker. We all must realize that until industry absorbs our unemployed or social legislation provides adequate benefits for them, we are faced with the problem of providing a means of existence to a group of fellow Americans who are deserving of every consideration.

I cannot accept the theory of practicing economy at the expense of our own American citizens while we pour out billions of dollars to foreign governments.

In conclusion, I can think of no better application of the principle of true Americanism than by seeing that the W. P. A. worker and his family has the necessary food to sustain their bodies and thereby continue the development of our race according to the American standards of living.

With the welfare of my fellow Americans and the Nation at heart, I gladly support the increase in the present appropriation to the end that a living wage may be paid every W. P. A. worker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the question, Is the New Deal a success or a failure? The best answer to that question came from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]. I have

never heard a worse indictment of the New Deal than we had from him.

In spite of the fact that the Army and Navy have absorbed 1,200,000 men—more than have been dropped by the W. P. A.—we still have this vast army of unemployed. Mr. Roosevelt has so confused the economic processes that in spite of our national income of $90,000,000,000 we find ourselves faced with the problem of millions of our people facing starvation. Repeatedly this afternoon our New Deal brethren have complained of this.

Back in 1929 the national income was somewhere around $85,000,000,000. It is now $90,000,000,000. In spite of that, we are called upon to increase the amount of the appropriation for W. P. A. Several weeks ago Mr. Roosevelt declared an unlimited emergency. Ever since we have had Mr. Roosevelt we have had an unlimited emergency and will continue to have an unlimited emergency as long as he is President. I do not know of a greater failure as a President than we have in the present occupant of the White House, Mr. Roosevelt. What the gentleman from Massachusetts complains of is in a measure correct. Only yesterday 27 people came to my office in Cleveland who were unemployed, looking for work either on W. P. A. or elsewhere.

The record of New Deal performance is amazing. Eight years ago they blamed the Republicans. They used to talk about the Hoover administration. Roosevelt has been running the whole show for the last 8 years, and he has had unlimited power. I repeat, his record is one of complete failure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can make any particular contribution to the discussion here, but it occurred to me that it might be somewhat interesting to discuss our fiscal situation to some degree. You may be interested in knowing what the Committee on Ways and Means has confronting it in the proposed three-and-one-half-billion-dollar tax bill. Of course, I have neither the time nor the inclination to go into the ramifications of the proposed tax bill.

Secretary of Commerce Jones, a week or so ago, predicted that before long we would have a $90,000,000,000 public debt. He revised that a little in a day or two, but the statement remains. The public debt now is $47,000,000,000, with $12,000,000,000 in commitments, making what amounts to a public debt of substantially $60,000,000,000.

When we first began to discuss the tax bill, it was proposed that we spend $39,000,000,000 for defense—$39,000,000,000, if you please. Since the time it was announced that we should spend $39,000,000,000 for defense, the President has sent up Budget estimates of between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000 more, so that we are confronted with a defense program of more nearly $45,000,000,000 than $39,000,000,000 at the present time.

Making all due allowances for the suffering that will ensue whether or not we pass this bill in its present form or even quadruple it, let us take some stock of our fiscal situation. Like the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY], we in Oklahoma are grateful for the good things that have been done for us, but I am going to paraphrase his statement that New York is grateful to the W. P. A. for what has been done for them in New York, by saying that we in Oklahoma are grateful for what the taxpayers of the United States have done for the State, not for what the W. P. A. has done.

Regardless of amounts, any department of the United States can make a perfect case for every dollar in its Budget and ask for more, and still not have enough to satisfy that department. If you do not believe it, just recall that 25 years ago our total Federal Budget was $1,034,000,000, and last year it was $9,000,000,000—10 for 1, substantially, in 25 years. Look forward 25 years, if you will, or look forward 7 or 8 years to the $90,000,000,000 public debt, the interest on which will be more than what we spent in 1918's and 1920's.

Take it home to yourselves. Just remember that in about 3 or 4 weeks, if the Committee on Ways and Means can untangle itself from that $3,500,000,000 tax bill, we will be in here with it for you.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] said, "What are you doing for the little fellow?" This bill you will have to vote for will do this to one of the little fellows. A man with a $1,800 gross income, now paying $25.30 taxes, will then pay $128.60 taxes. Keep that in mind when you are not even attempting to economize here. Take it home to yourselves.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I have been following the debate on the work-relief appropriation bill, and I am not convinced that the committee acted wisely in reducing the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. It is true that relief rolls have been reduced, and that many of the unemployed of a few months back are now happily employed on defense projects in private industry. But we must remember that the money appropriated for W. P. A. is used to keep people from starving and those who cannot be absorbed in defense work are deserving of continued aid.

The reduction recommended by the Budget Bureau, of $109,000,000 in the present relief appropriation will bring about a huge cut in the rolls from the peak totals of last year, and the committee's action in further reducing this amount will work a real hardship on many workers and their dependents. I urge that the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee be restored, and that the full amount proposed by the Bureau of the Budget be approved. The Work Projects Administration and the Budget authorities have made a prolonged study of the needs of this agency, and I am inclined to follow their recommendations. They know what effect the defense expenditures will have upon employment, and that the defense program cannot be expected to absorb all of the unemployed.

There are large areas in the country having no defense projects or contracts of any kind. In these localities the unemployment situation remains about the same. Then there is the problem of the man over 40 or 45. He finds it increasingly difficult to secure employment in private industry. These problems have not changed because of the defense program.

We must take into consideration, too, the fact that $50,000,000 of this proposed appropriation will be used for the food-stamp plan. This means that this amount will be available for those on home relief and will not be used to provide employment. It seems to me that the food-stamp plan should have a separate appropriation and that funds for its operation should not be taken from the work-relief fund.

It is my earnest hope that Congress will give this matter the serious consideration it deserves.

I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], which indicated that the W. P. A. administrator for New York accepted for W. P. A. employment persons who are not actual relief recipients. I am going to read to the House a letter I have received from Mr. Herzog, W. P. A. administrator for New York, which refutes this charge, but before doing so I want to state that persons employed on projects in New York State have been referred to W. P. A. as in need of relief by local public-welfare agencies. I might remind the gentleman from New York that these public-welfare agencies, for the most part, are under the jurisdiction of Republican-controlled county supervisory boards. It seems to me, therefore, that my distinguished colleague is barking up the wrong tree, and his charges should be directed at public-welfare agencies rather than the Work Projects Administration. Mr. Herzog's letter is as follows:

[Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration of New York State, exclusive of New York City]

ALBANY, N. Y., *May 29, 1941.*

Congressman ALFRED F. BEITER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEITER: I understand Congressman TABER has accused this administration of employing W. P. A. workers who have not received direct home relief and further understand that Congressman CANNON will probably answer this on the floor.

I believe you are fully aware of the very strict regulations in effect in this administration, and I am sure you will be interested in the fact that because the act permits it and because we can do it within our quota, we have now broadened our eligibility rules to accept persons who are certified by the welfare departments but who have not as yet been actually granted a relief order.

I give you this information, due to the fact that questions might arise and because it is New York State you might become

involved, and I think, if so, you certainly know how strict we have been in our assignments to W. P. A.

Very truly yours,

LESTER W. HERZOG,
Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, every year when the W. P. A. bill comes before the House there is an effort, irrespective of the amount, to raise that amount. The same arguments are made, the same dramatic speeches, and the same appeals to sympathy.

This year the author of the amendment stated that the President was probably too busy with the national defense to give the subject matter proper attention. I do not believe the author of this amendment or any other man is more interested or more concerned about the unemployed than the President of the United States. I do not believe he has ever been careless, and I certainly believe he has never been parsimonious, with reference to those out of work.

The President and the Bureau of the Budget have studied this matter carefully and have recommended a certain amount, which the committee is asking you to accept as a proper contribution on the part of the Federal Government to the cause of the unemployed. The committee has studied the subject and believes that by voting the amount in this bill and by not voting the amount in the Casey amendment you will be providing fairly and adequately for the unemployed, in whom the committee is interested as well as the gentleman offering the amendment.

The amount was based on estimates gathered from many sources. They testified that this amount was arrived at because of there being 7,000,000 unemployed in the country, 2,500,000 of whom were certified by the W. P. A., and the Federal Government was to take care of approximately 40 percent of those certified.

That is the amount in this bill. Since that time other statistics and other experiences have come along. Mr. Sidney Hillman, of the O. P. M., testified before our committee this morning and stated that the facilities of his office were as great as the facilities of any office anywhere in the United States for understanding the unemployment problem. He stated, as I understood it, that at the present time there are four and a half million, and not 7,000,000, unemployed, and he also stated that they had every reason to believe that the number will be substantially reduced in 1942.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the national income will be the greatest in all American history for the year 1942, about $92,000,000,000. This money goes all over the United States. Some have claimed they have received no benefit from defense orders, but the statement was made before our committee that in the manufacture of a defense bomber there was not a State in the Union from which some part of that bomber did not come; in other words, every State in the Union benefits by the manufacture of such a bomber.

The Federal Government is not the only agent to take care of unemployment. Every speech made here would indicate they believed the responsibility for the care of the unemployed is only a Federal responsibility. I think the States, the counties, the cities, yes, and the families of these people should be equally concerned with the problem. I think it is time for the American spirit to rise and where this income is coming all the way down the line to every one there should be a revival of the old family idea that we will take care of the need in our own family and we will not call upon the Federal Government to take care of it. There will be sufficient income to take care of the present need. This amount is the recommendation of the President and of this committee, and I trust the Committee of the Whole will back the committee in voting down the Casey amendment and approving the amount that is recommended in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, there were—ayes 93, noes 139.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 114, noes 156.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr DIRKSEN: On page 2, line 24, after the colon, insert "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the people of the country read in the press that David Lasser, one-time president of the Workers Alliance, is now associated with the Government at $4,400 a year, they must necessarily believe that left-wing and ultra radical activities are receiving sanction in the Government. When those who are identified with radical activities read that David Lasser is drawing $4,400 a year from the Federal Treasury, they cannot help but feel that that constitutes encouragement for that kind of activity.

I find no particular pride in this kind of procedure of offering a limitation to an appropriation bill, but I know of no other way to get at it.

This is the same David Lasser who is now engaged in going about the United States visiting 15 or 16 States in the interest of the transition of workers from W. P. A. to private industry. This is the same David Lasser who was president of the Workers Alliance, and who, in April 1939, came before the Appropriations Committee and there testified that he had attended the Russian Internationale on its twentieth anniversary. This is the same David Lasser who, on April 13 1937, issued a press release which is found in these hearings and which reads as follows:

We believe that the reactionary congressional group that approved the $50,000,000 cut, secured a majority only as a result of misrepresentation, outright lies, parliamentary tricks, bluffs, and threats.

This is the same David Lasser who has impeached the integrity of the Congress of the United States. This is the same David Lasser who, on page 178 of the hearings in April 1939, testified, in response to a question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr O'NEAL], that on the basis of information which was presented to the committee by a known Communist, Mr. Herbert Benjamin, that in his judgment such material did not indicate that the Communist Party was subversive. This is the same David Lasser who, for almost 4 years, was associated with Mr. Herbert Benjamin, the secretary of the Workers Alliance, the same Mr. Herbert Benjamin who stated before the committee that for 18 years he had been a member of the Communist Party. This is the same David Lasser who has been associated in that kind of activity for a long time, and, today, he is a member of the W. P. A. staff, drawing $4,400 per year, holding a very responsible job and in a position to carry on missionary activities in all of the States of the Union.

I frankly say to you that this sort of thing, whether from a card-carrying member of the Communist Party or not, constitutes encouragement to subversive activities in the country and impairs the confidence of the people in the structure of government. There is no other way I know of, outside of substantive legislation which we have difficulty in getting into and through the Congress, to get at Mr. Lasser except by means of a limitation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman that this David Lasser is not the only Communist in the Government at Washington. The F. B. I. made a study of this question more than a year ago, and compiled a list containing more than 3,000 names, which, for some reason, has thus far been suppressed. I am this morning introducing a resolution calling upon the Attorney General to make that list available to the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is a proper proceeding. This is a very simple amendment, and I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. If communism is so subversive and against the laws of this country, why cannot these peace officers in the F. B. I. drag these Communists out and bring them before the courts and punish them as they ought to be?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is a member of the administration party. I should ask him that question, instead of his asking me that question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman from Illinois has forgotten to mention the fact that David Lasser is the man who led a parade on the Pennsylvania State Capitol.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true. I submit to you the necessity for supporting this amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am fully sensible of the difficulty of my position. Hysteria that we would have thought ourselves incapable of a year ago, is now being indulged in in this great deliberative body, the House of Representatives. Understand, there have been a lot of insinuations about this man David Lasser, but there has been no charge of any violation of law. No; not even a charge of inefficiency. Someone simply says that he led a group of workers on the capitol of Pennsylvania in some political outburst against the failure of the Government in Pennsylvania to take care of the relief situation. I say that he was exercising his right as an American citizen if he did so. I may not have agreed with him. I do not know enough about the situation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I refuse to yield at this time to the gentleman from New York who may make more and more insinuations. I do not yield. I am trying to search out the truth in this case as carefully as I can. The charge has been insinuated but has not been made that David Lasser is a Communist. On that flimsy basis, with no evidence to back it up, this great deliberative body of Congress is reaching down for some little fellow in the midst of a hysteria and is going to tack onto an appropriation bill an amendment denying him the right to his salary under the bill. It is a vicious proceeding, it is an unparliamentary sort of attitude, but even though it is, if David Lasser is a Communist, I would not quarrel with it; but what are the facts? Let us look at this thing sanely. David Lasser was born in Baltimore in 1902. He served in the United States Army at the age of 17, and was gassed while in France fighting for his country. In the Workers Alliance when he found that the Communist influence was getting stronger, he had a fight with David Benjamin, a known Communist. The Dies committee was created by the Congress to investigate and determine the facts with respect to un-American activities. I quote what it said about David Lasser in its report to this Congress in January, about the Workers Alliance. It said—

> The non-Communist element in the Workers Alliance withdrew under the leadership of David Lasser in June of that year and that the Workers Alliance became a shadow of its former self.

So the non-Communist element withdrew under David Lasser. There is real evidence that he is not a Communist and, furthermore, that he is opposed to Communists. Perhaps he is a liberal, perhaps he is an ultraradical, perhaps he is politically opposed to you and me and we do not agree with him. Perhaps he has manifested an interest in the underdog that is too ardent for some of us, but, Members of this Congress, are you going to adopt any such method as that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois because of a man's beliefs and because it has been insinuated, but not directly charged, that he is a Communist? I say that he is not a Communist, and I offer proof. If he is not a Communist, but merely differs with you gentlemen or with me on political views, then I say that we should not vote against him. Are we to bow our heads to this hysteria? We would do better to stop and quote Voltaire:

> I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

In that direction lies sane statesmanship at a time when our country, which we all love, sorely needs it.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is not the best method of legislating, but I feel that this problem is fundamental. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has correctly said, how can we make it unquestionably evident to the Government departments that we will not stand for coddling of this kind unless we take action of this character? This is exactly the same thing we did in the case of Harry Bridges, and I think it is the thing we should have done in that case.

I do not say that David Lasser is an active Communist. If he is not a Communist, why did he go to Russia to attend the celebration of the Third International? If he is not a Communist, why did he bed down for 4 or 5 years with Herbert Benjamin, who was writing for the Daily Worker and who was an avowed Communist, and who, I understand, at the present time is either serving or about to serve a sentence for using a fake passport to Russia? I only say that if he is not a Communist, he runs with the wrong crowd. They are not the crowd to entrust our Government to.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I decline to yield for the same reason that the gentleman from Massachusetts declined to yield.

If he was not a Communist when he sent his organizers into Oklahoma to organize the workers, why was he associated with Wood, a man who has been indicted under the antisyndicalism law of Oklahoma? Why did Wood accompany the State organizers into their first meeting and why did they then veer away from him when they found out that the people of Oklahoma would not stand for a person so closely connected with communism?

I admire the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] personally and his work here. I know he is sincere, but he says that this amendment is hysteria that we would not have engaged in 2 years ago. This amendment has no hysteria in it. This is not a thing that has come up on the spur of the moment by any means.

I hold in my hand the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from January 3 to March 28, 1939. On page 321 is my speech, in which I pointed out what the Workers' Alliance was then—a Communist-dominated organization. I pointed out that not all of its members by any means were Communists, but that it was the central office maintained by Herbert Benjamin and David Lasser that was dominated by Communist influence and was dominated by Communists themselves. As a result of that speech in January 1939 a little country newspaper down in Oklahoma carried an account of it and that clipping was cut out by a member of the Workers Alliance and sent to headquarters. Then David Lasser came to my office with that clipping in his hand and he said—these are my remarks on page 524 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1939. That is more than 2 years ago. He said:

> Our organization in Oklahoma forwarded up to us a newspaper clipping. I thought I would come up here and find out all about it, whether or not it was true.

I told him it was an accurate statement of my position. I want to call attention to these words:

He said:

> We wanted to be certain whether or not these words were true—

And so forth—

> because, of course, what you have said is an attack on us which we will be compelled to answer.

He was compelled and his organization was compelled to answer a clipping from one little country newspaper. Then I said later in discussing the matter:

> I have read a book written by Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of America, which says, "All Communist Party activities are welded together in the popular front called the Workers Alliance of America." That statement is in the published book by this avowed Communist leader. Undoubtedly you have read it. Why haven't you felt called upon to challenge the truth of that statement?

Then he replied:

> Well, now, we can't just go around challenging every statement that is made about us.

There is your same David Lasser that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is talking about. I went down to see Howard Hunter. I have always heretofore thought well of Howard Hunter. I thought he was a fine gentleman. I wrote him a letter and I said, "I read the statement that David Lasser was on the W. P. A. I cannot believe that this is true. I wish you would advise me that it is not true, that I can squelch these rumors." He replied in about 3 or 4 weeks that David Lasser was employed by W. P. A. as his personal assistant, traveling over a number of States, I understand at a salary of $4,600 and an expense account; enough money to keep 30 or 40 W. P. A. workers, honest men, real Americans, at work. Then when I asked Howard Hunter what we, as Members of Congress, who found this sort of characters objectionable, were to do; I said if there is any doubt about it he ought not to be put in here as a high Government official; important men in public office

should be without cloud. I said, "What are you going to do with him?" He said, "Nothing."

It is my position that in a nation of 140,000,000 people, someone can be found to do that job that does not have a clouded background.

I do not like to be an advocate of legislation affecting specific individuals, but, by the eternal, if that is the only practical method of protecting this Government from the "fifth columns" that destroyed France, then I am ready to use that method. I hope the resolution of the gentleman from Georgia will bring to the Congress the name of every known Communist employed in Government; then I will be ready to legislate every one of them off the pay roll by name.

As for me, I am determined to do what I conceive best for my country, whether in small matters or large. No task is too great and none too small to have my attention and effort if my country's interest is at stake.

This amendment should pass, because no man should be administering W. P. A. who once took 10 cents a week from the destitute under the pretense of his power to cause Congress to increase W. P. A. appropriations. No man should be in any Government position who knowingly forms an alliance with Communists, whether he is a Communist or not. And this amendment affords us an opportunity of announcing to Government departments that there is a limit to our tolerance of their misuse of responsibility which we have delegated to them.

It has been said here that it has not been proved beyond a question of doubt that Lasser is a Communist and that in a democracy a man should not be penalized until convicted beyond a question of doubt. In criminal matters decided in courts this policy is established, but before power and responsibility in government is given to a man, whether he be judge, bureaucrat, or Army officer, I want it proven beyond a question of doubt that he is not a Communist. I think that is important to America. I think that makes this issue fundamental and important.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, what I say on this occasion is my own personal view, expressed in my capacity as a Member. It may be that I am wrong in some of my viewpoints of life, but they are viewpoints that I am pretty well wedded to, and I doubt very much if I am going to be able to change some of them now or later in life. One of them is that I value my reputation. Another is I value the reputation of my fellowmen. Whatever reputation I have is something I have earned. It cannot be bought. The same applies to all other persons.

Mr. Lasser, to me, is just an individual whom I have met on a few occasions. The first time I saw the man was when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee when amendments to the Social Security Act were under consideration. I have a copy of the hearings in my hands. I had a very unfavorable impression about him when I heard he was going to appear before the committee, and at that time I gave him a rather searching cross-examination; but, Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the examination I changed the tentative opinion of an adverse nature that I had entertained toward him and which was formed as a result of reading the newspapers and as a result of other information, emotional, it is true, that had been called to my attention. I found him to be a constructive witness. I found him to be a reasonable witness. He made one or two proposals that I took occasion to compliment him about, and he made at lease one proposal which was incorporated in the bill reported out of the committee because it was a sound, constructive proposal.

Back not so many years ago, when there was a sharp cut in W. P. A. funds, thousands of men had to be dropped. Unintended discriminations resulted—men with 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 children were dropped and single men were retained. We all received communications about it and a committee came to see some of the Members. I believe it was our former colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Boileau, who called me out and asked me to have a talk with the committee. Mr. Lasser was one of them. Several members of the committee made extreme recommendations. I turned to Mr. Lasser and said:

What have you to recommend, Lasser?

He had not said much.

He said:

I know it is not intended, but the results are that these men have been discriminated against. I think the way to meet this is to have W. P. A. authorize the appointment of appeals boards in each State, to which these men with large families can present their cases and have the appeals board go into the situation.

You remember such a board was created at that time. Lasser implanted that in my mind. I thought it was a constructive and logical way to meet an acute situation. Certainly there was nothing destructive about the man on that occasion.

Just because I disagree with a man, I do not believe he is a Socialist, or Communist, or anything else. I was chairman of the committee that investigated nazi-ism and communism. I am the author of the bill under which all individuals charged with subversive activities are being prosecuted by the Federal Government—failure to register when they are agents engaged in propaganda in this country for foreign nations, states, or agencies. A trial is proceeding now in this very city against three men who have been indicted under this law. Numbers of others have been convicted. That law was aimed at the Communists and the Nazis. No one has fought and will continue to fight nazi-ism or communism more vigorously than I. My observations of Mr. Lasser do not justify me, disagreeing with him though I might on some of his views on other public questions, to classify him as a Communist.

We are the Congress of the United States. If I thought today that the interests of this country required it I would not hesitate to do anything necessary for the best interests of my country. Certainly we do not want to be carried away by emotionalism. I am expressing my own personal views, but from my contacts with him and what I have observed of him I do not think this man is a Communist. This man is trying to clean communism from the ranks of W. P. A. in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. At the time debate on this amendment was limited to 10 minutes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER] were the only two Members asking recognition. The Chair feels therefore that the remaining 5 minutes should be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, from my earliest infancy I was taught at the knee of my late revered mother that I would always be judged by the company I kept. Regardless of where a man is born, regardless of what his education has been, and regardless of how he may cast his vote in the secrecy of a ballot, we are entitled to our suspicion of what his inclinations are by his public actions and conduct.

I have a very vivid recollection of an incident that occurred in this House in March of 1939 when the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yielded to me in the debate to relate some experiences I had had with David Lasser and the Workers Alliance. I received a letter from Mr. Lasser asking me to name certain individuals. I assured him that if he could convince me that they would take the necessary action I would place the names of the individuals in the RECORD and I would place them before the officials of the W. P. A. I did not hear anything further from him.

A little later those of you who were then serving in the House will remember with what astonishment we were confronted with evidence that the Workers Alliance had plotted to kidnap me if I appeared at the laying of the cornerstone of the post office in Reading, Pa. I immediately received a telegram from David Lasser pointing that this was proferred by a bunch of "hoodlums or stoolpigeons that may have been sent into his organization by reactionaries." I have that telegram in my possession. I will not burden those who are smiling and who were here and heard the discussion on the occasion when our distinguished majority leader was in the chair and recognized me for extra time, which was duly appreciated, but I want to point out that following this, when David Lasser made his announcement over a year ago, in February 1940 to be exact, that anybody who challenged him or that there were any Communists in the Workers Alliance would have to answer

to him personally. I thereupon wrote him a letter, and I said I accepted his challenge and was ready to name them. I did not hear from him.

In March of last year he announced his purpose to go to Chicago to back an organization for the protection of people who were working on work relief and purging them of the ominous charges of association with Communists he admitted were in the Workers Alliance. The next heard of him was when he was connected with the present outfit under Mr. Hunter.

I thereupon wrote to Mr. Howard Hunter, and after some weeks duly received a reply, in which he said Lasser was doing a good job. It so happened, however, that I was in the city of Harrisburg and called on Colonel Matthews, the State administrator of W. P. A., and he expressed his astonishment that David Lasser, who had caused him so much trouble, would be back in the W. P. A. set-up.

We went over what occurred there in Harrisburg and before the Senate of Pennsylvania. They took packing cases and boxes, and went up into the senate chamber, and pounded on the brass rails, tore up the seats, creating all kinds of disorder. Whether or not a man can be judged as being subversive when he leads a group of people to do acts of that kind, when by his own confession he left the Workers Alliance to set up a new organization to purge them of Communists, is a matter for the determination of the Committee at this particular time.

I deplore the fact that the necessity exists when Members of Congress must give a man of this character the publicity that he is receiving here today and of which I personally hold him to be unworthy, because we cannot effect a proper adjustment of the situation as it exists down in the management of the W. P. A. Colonel Matthews, however, told me that in a short period of time more than 27,000 people on the W. P. A. in the State of Pennsylvania had been recalled to private industry and that during the month of April, when I was discussing it with him, he told me there had been more than 2,700 defections to that date of the month, and he was quite sure David Lasser had not contributed anything to it to his knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER), there were—ayes 131, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 2, commencing in line 24, after the word "appropriation", strike out the remainder of the page, and, on page 3, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, all that this amendment of mine does is to get the bill back to the recommendation of the President of the United States to the Congress. The President recommended to Congress an appropriation of $875,000,000 for W. P. A. relief. The Bureau of the Budget recommends $875,000,000 and the committee brings in a bill here under the assumption, as stated by our friend from Kentucky, that they are bringing in the bill as recommended by the President. These are not the facts, because the committee has deliberately taken $50,000,000 of the $875,000,000 and allocated that to the surplus-commodities fund to be handled by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, in these trying days, with the situation the country is in, we talk much about communism. Prior to the offer of my amendment we heard plenty about it. The one thing that will make communism in this country more pronounced is an empty stomach, as has been stated heretofore on the floor of the House today. Nothing will produce communism more than empty stomachs.

The President made a recommendation to the committee, yet the relief rolls in W. P. A. were reduced 44 percent, or in round numbers, 758,000. But that is not enough. They reach further and take $50,000,000, which will reduce the rolls 58,000 in addition.

May I say to you that in the report of the committee itself, it has this to say:

Specifically, a very potent factor militating against the general absorption of unemployed workers eligible for W. P. A. in the defense industry is the lack of distribution of the defense contracts. Due to the speed of the program it has been necessary to place contracts where facilities were already available or could be made speedily available, taking into consideration such factors as available labor, power supply, transportation facilities—

And so forth. And rightly so. There is a lack of distribution of defense contracts

Mr. Chairman, I want to paint the picture to this House, if you please, of the district I represent, the anthracite area. There are no defense contracts up in that area. The average family, as stated in this report, is a man and wife and 3.5 children. You are going to take 58,000 more employees off W. P. A. than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. That will include these families of 3.5 children. It is stated that this $50,000,000 is going to help the unemployed and relief because they can get $1.50 worth of food stamps for a dollar; but, in the name of heaven, where are they going to get the dollar?

I ask this Committee in all fairness to do something for the W. P. A. today. You have refused to raise the appropriation, but in the name of heaven do not cut it more than has been recommended. I implore this Committee to do the right thing The Senate has passed a bill appropriating $135,000,000 for surplus commodities as recommended by the Bureau. We have not heard anything about the conference report, and we do not know whether they are going to accept the $135,000,000 or not. If they do, then you are adding $50,000,000 more, taking it out of the pockets of these poor people, who have no way to get employment, and you are adding it onto the $135,000,000, if that prevails, and it may prevail. So please adopt my amendment and take this earmarking of $50,000,000 out of here. It has no right here. It was not recommended by the Budget, it was not recommended by the President, and it was not asked for by the Department of Agriculture. How this committee could come in here with this appropriation earmarked is beyond me. I implore you to adopt this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will you permit me to say just a word for the most appealing class in America today, those who gather at mealtime about a family table on which there is not sufficient food to stay the pangs of hunger—those who go to the cupboard and find it bare. This $50,000,000 as it was reported out by the committee, and as it is now carried in the bill, is to buy food for hungry families who can procure it from no other source. It is true, as the gentleman has said, that it will provide jobs, but there is $825,000,000 left in the bill to provide jobs. And the comparatively few who would get jobs from this $50,000,000 always have a chance to secure employment, while these hungry families have no chance or possibility of securing food from any Federal source. According to the testimony given before our committee only this morning the prospects are that vastly more than the number of jobs which could be provided if this food-stamp money is taken away from the hungry and used for jobs will be called for employment by the time this bill can go into effect. Mr. Sidney Hillman, from the Office of Production Management, appearing before a committee of the House this morning testified that employment in the United States is not only at the peak today but is rapidly increasing. He said that the previous high level of employment was in 1929 but that industrial activity has increased so rapidly that today there are over a million more men employed than were employed in 1929. In other words employment has today reached the highest levels ever reached in the industrial history of the Nation and is still advancing. These comparatively fewer men who are waiting for W. P. A. employment will in all likelihood have opportunities for much better jobs in private industry. But a large percentage of the destitute families waiting for food will not be affected or assisted. They must get needed food, if they get it at all, from this money.

I cannot believe that the gentlemen who support this amendment realize what this $50,000,000 carried by the bill for food means to families all over the country. The Department of Agriculture tells us that you can provide a nourishing breakfast for five persons for 50 cents. That means that this money which the amendment seeks to divert would provide breakfast for 500,000 people. It will provide breakfast every day in the year for 1,370,000 people. This amendment takes breakfast every day for 1 entire year from 1,370,000 people. I do not believe this House wants to register a vote to take this food from the tables of the poor and the destitute and the helpless.

But the serious phase of this amendment and its far-reaching effects are that this food is taken principally from children. The relief authorities in their allotments favor the larger families and the families with small children. By voting for this amendment you are not taking this food principally from mature, able-bodied men who have a possible chance of going out and getting a job. You are taking it from children who, deprived of proper food at this crucial period of youth and adolescence, will bear the scars of it in stunted bodies and minds as long as they live. This is not an appeal to sentiment. These are facts, and this is common sense. When they stretch out their hands to you and ask for food, will you vote to give them a stone?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

The gentleman has made an appeal in behalf of the children of America who are starving and are hungry, and has indicated that if this deflection of $50,000,000 from the ordinary W. P. A. funds were retained in the bill and the money turned over to the Department of Agriculture to administer under the stamp plan, a certain number of hundreds of thousands of children would get breakfast that are not now getting it, or words to that effect.

The reason I have taken this time is that I should like to have the gentleman tell us just exactly how this $50,000,000 will provide breakfasts for the children in families that are not on W. P. A., or are not receiving Federal assistance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the present administration of the food-stamp plan, all those who are receiving assistance not only from the Federal Government but from local, municipal, and/or State sources, are entitled to participate in the food-stamp plan.

The only requirement is that they be on relief. That will materially broaden the field in which the benefits derived from money provided by this bill can be distributed. In the first place there are many W. P. A. workers themselves whose children are without adequate diet, and who are not receiving food stamps because there are not sufficient funds avaliable for that purpose, but who will be provided for out of this $50,000,000 which the bill appropriates for the stamp plan.

Further, all those who are receiving assistance of any character, including old-age pensions, social-security payments, pensions for the blind, allowances for dependent children, and all others who are receiving relief, either local, State, or Federal, will be entitled to participate. This provision which the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to strike from the bill will increase immeasurably the number of those who will be benefitted by the $50,000,000 over the relatively smaller group who will be benefitted by it if this paragraph is stricken from the bill.

And most important of all, the bill as reported to the House will provide for those who cannot provide for themselves. The group for whom the money would provide W. P. A. jobs is always in a position of potential employment. There is always a chance that employment may be found. For example, Mr. Sidney Hillman testifies that employment in the United States is now in excess of the number employed in any previous year—and is increasing. There is always a chance that they may secure employment and be self-sustaining. But many of those for whom food stamps are provided are without breadwinners and unless this food is available they will go largely without.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman this. I believe the gentleman made that quite clear yesterday, but I am earnestly seeking to understand the situation. You have an 18 months' lay-off provision in this bill.

We may assume a man has been working on W. P. A. and is laid off under the mandatory 18-month provision. The man has a family, and where does he and his family begin to share in this $50,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such a family is invariably on local relief and if you expend all the money in this bill for jobs alone without leaving any for food, he cannot get a job because the 18-month provision has cut him off, but if you leave this provision in the bill he can receive food irom this $50,000,000 and his children can be fed, while otherwise they could be on the slender rations grudgingly supplied by local agencies.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the gentleman's answer then is that when a man is thrown off of W. P. A. he will then be required to go on public relief, and if and when he is put back on public relief he will then be permitted to participate in the benefit of this stamp plan. Is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such cases have either been on local relief, being originally assigned to W. P. A., and only go back to their original status. This provision supplies food under the stamp plan, which has been found universally satisfactory both by the relief agencies and by the beneficiaries wherever put in operation.

Mr. KEEFE. Where is he going to get the money to buy the stamps if he is on relief or if he is waiting assignment? The gentleman knows that everybody has got to have the "dough" to lay down on the table to buy that food.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There has never been a case yet in which men laid off by the 18-month clause have not been provided locally with sufficient funds to secure the necessary stamps.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say that so far as I am concerned, I am wholeheartedly for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I believe this money should be left with the W. P. A., and if the Department of Agriculture wants to handle the stamp plan, let them handle it with their own funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

I think this is very bad legislation. I do not think this is a question of feeding hungry children. I think, if this were a labor dispute, it might be labeled as a jurisdictional strike. I think this is an attempt to take money from the work-relief projects and give it to the Department of Agriculture and not charge it directly to them. I think that is a serious mistake. When you are dealing with relief clients, you had better try to be reasonable with them. May I only say in explanation of that statement, I have tried to be a relief administrator in a county, in a State, and in a region. I have had the unpleasant task of trying to find food for 250,000 families as a relief administrator, and my advice to this House would be not to deal with it in this sort of way. I think the money should not be taken from the people who are on relief to take care of the food-stamp plan, and I want to suggest to you that if you will put this $50,000,000 back where it belongs and adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you will make it possible for 58,000 more families to use the stamp plan. I think that is important, and you should bear it in mind.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the food-stamp plan, but I do not think it is fair to take this money out of the W. P. A. appropriation bill and assign it for food-stamp purposes. We all know that the money allocated under this bill is not sufficient to take care of the needs of the people of this country.

Let me call your attention to a situation that exists in my district. Out in my State—and by the way my district is the northwest corner of the United States and borders on the Canadian line—the people in that area have lost all of their business, or virtually all of it, because they have been dependent upon Canada for a large portion of their business. They have lost it because of the existing regulations in Canada prohibiting Canadian citizens from buying in the United States. Now you are taking W. P. A. away from them and day after day I am getting letters from people asking how is it that in this land of ours we can give billions and billions away to other countries and we cannot get enough to take care of the people in our own country. I would like to ask some Member of the House to answer that question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the gentleman know how many States in the Union are participating in the stamp plan at this time?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not, and I will ask this question of the Members of the House: What about the States that do not participate in the food-stamp plan? How is this going to help them? I may say that my State is under the food-stamp plan, but this is certainly not fair to other sections of the country.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that I am heartily in favor of the food-stamp plan and have been ever since its adoption. Even before it was put in effect I had been arguing in favor of some such plan. I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because in order to participate in the food-stamp plan you must be eligible for relief or be working on the W. P. A. in order to be able to buy the food stamps. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says that this $50,000,000 will feed millions of families, seemingly because it is provided for in this appropriation, but evidently feels that it will not work that way if the Agriculture Department provides the money. That is not necessarily the case. I feel the Department of Agriculture is capable of handling the food-stamp program. Why, then, should we not confine ourselves to the $135,000,000 set aside for it in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill? If the $50,000,000 is so important in the W. P. A. bill and will do so much toward feeding the hungry, then the $135,000,000 will do three times as much in the agricultural set-up. I think $135,000,000 is sufficient to take care of the food-stamp plan, and that we should let this fifty million be applied to W. P. A. jobs. The $50,000,000 is earmarked, and all that we ask you to do is to take off the earmarking and leave this fifty million to be used for the additional W. P. A. jobs which are so necessary. My district has not had one single, solitary defense contract or site. My people need W. P. A., and every dollar taken from this program means less food in the mouths of our hungry people. I ask that you approve this amendment in the name of good administration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, there is one element in this double-entry bookkeeping which is being attempted here against the unemployed by this so-called earmarking that the Congress should know, and particularly gentlemen who represent farm districts. I believe it is intended to reduce the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill to the extent of $35,000,000 in the event this earmarking takes place. If that is not so, then I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to inform this House. He is the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Agricultural Department appropriation bill and in favor of this earmarking; and, as such, is in charge of the conference on that bill. I ask him to state to the House whether the $35,000,000 is or is not going to be taken off the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the conference report upon the Agricultural appropriation bill, to which the gentleman refers, was signed more than a week ago. That is water over the dam. The bill as it passed the House carried approximately $200,000,000 for relief purposes, of which something like $125,000,000 will be used in financing the food-stamp plan. It is now too late to make any further adjustments.

This is the last opportunity to vote additional funds above the $125,000,000 carried in that bill. If you desire to supplement the $125,000,000 for food stamps you must do it in this bill, and that is what you are voting on in this amendment. When you vote on this amendment you vote either to give $50,000,000 worth of food to destitute families or you vote not to give it to them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Giving it to destitute families? Why, you deprive them of the power to purchase the stamps by adopting your proposal. By this earmarking thousands more will be fired from W. P. A. What will they use with which to buy stamps? Furthermore, the conference report still has to be adopted by the House. What is to prevent the taking out of the 35,000,000 away from the farmers if we adopt this earmarking which takes away 50,000,000 more dollars from the W. P. A. workers?

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, in rising in support of this amendment, I do not wish my action to be construed as being in opposition to the stamp plan. I think the stamp plan is one of the best programs that has been conceived by the Department of Agriculture. But the stamp plan is an agricultural program. It has been excellently handled by Mr. Milo Perkins, who has done a splendid job. Mr. Perkins is not asking for the transfer of this $50,000,000 from the relief fund to the Agricultural Department. We should follow the Budget and not take this money over to the Agricultural Department. The W. P. A. funds have been cut down to $885,000,000. The chances of employment have been reduced 45 percent I think we should give the people who are trying to get jobs under the W. P. A. an opportunity to work, and we should not further reduce their chances of getting employment by transferring this sum over to the Agricultural Department, when the Department has not asked us to do it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman understands that this bill for the current year carries $100,000,000 for stamp-plan purchases added to the bill last year by an amendment in the Senate.

Mr. TERRY. If we give this sum to the Department of Agriculture for the stamp plan, we are adding $15,000,000 above the Budget on that item. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does not get my statement. I am referring to the law now in operation under which we are this year spending $100,000,000 for the stamp plan, $50,000,000 more than is carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with my colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that it is too late to take care of the situation in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. We have not voted on the conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. This House is in a position to vote down the conference report and then agree to the Senate amendment calling for $135,000,000. If the pending amendment is agreed to, when the conference report comes before the House if it is voted down I will offer a preferential motion to agree to the Senate amendment carrying $135,000,000, and the Department will have then the exact amount that it has for the present fiscal year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member who has given the subject any study, I think the stamp plan is one of the best evolved during this crisis. I am not opposed to it. I am absolutely in favor of it, but I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] if he was so disturbed about hungry children, why in God's name did he not make an effort to increase the present appropriation $50,000,000, so that if this were taken away we would still have the $875,000,000? I feel like everybody else, that little children ought to be taken care of, but it seems to me that what we are doing here is following out an old biblical phrase, "To those that have shall be given." It is all right to take it from the W. P. A., but how in God's name can a man take advantage of the stamp plan when he does not have a thin dime to his name?

Therefore I shall support the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the stamp plan has achieved wider support among all classes of people than any other relief activity that has been started. Farmers, businessmen, and those on relief commend it. So I do not want to be in the position of objecting to the stamp plan in any way. During general debate, my interrogation of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the agriculture subcommittee, was on the particular point that has been stressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and other preceding speakers. A person must be on Federal relief or local relief to be eligible to buy stamps under the stamp plan. He must have cash from some source with which to buy the stamps. So that this proposal to transfer this money is a proposal to give additional relief to those who already have some relief at the expense of those who will have none, the 58,000 who will be denied jobs.

This should not be done, for a further reason. In the committee report it is brought out that this work-relief appropriation bill attempts to clean up the bill by leaving out other kinds of relief activities. The committee report says:

The scope of this joint resolution differs from the emergency relief appropriation act for the fiscal year 1941. The rural rehabilitation and relief activities of the Farm

Security Administration have been transferred to the agricultural appropriation bill for 1942 and the relief and rural-rehabilitation activities of the Indian Service have been transferred to the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1942.

In other words, the committee has been trying to clean this bill up to make it purely a work-projects relief bill, and yet by this proviso earmarking $50,000,000 for transfer to agriculture we would be violating the very principle which the committee is attempting to set up, in removing these other items from it. We should help them to adhere to the principle advertised in the committee report and adopt the amendment striking out the transfer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may understand the parliamentary situation—my good friend from St. Louis [Mr. COCHRAN], assures you that he will offer an amendment to the item providing for the stamp food plan in the agricultural appropriation bill when it comes to the floor. It will never come to the floor. Opportunities to offer such amendments passed weeks ago when the bill was before the House. There will be no opportunity to offer any such amendment. You vote on it now once and for all. You either vote for the stamp plan now or you vote against it. This is the last call.

The line is clearly drawn in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out provision for the stamp plan. You are voting to provide food or to take away food from children who have no other means of securing it. You are voting on whether you will appropriate money sufficient to put breakfast on the table every day in the year for 1,730,000 people or whether you will send them to school or to work without it. That is the whole question before you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 96, noes 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN] has an amendment on the desk with reference to page 6. Does the gentleman desire to offer the amendment at this time?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEHRMANN: On page 6, line 3, strike out all of paragraph (d), lines 3 to 23, inclusive.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, this is the section that makes compulsory contribution by municipalities of not less than 25 percent of any project. I am sure many communities and municipalities are able to do that, but I know that in my section, where we have as yet to receive the first war contract directly or indirectly, it is just impossible. For years these municipalities have tried to get aid under the old P. W. A., but were not able to. They were absolutely unable to raise the money, badly as they needed the projects. I myself made several trips to Chicago to see the district P. W. A. administrator in an effort to get him to consent to place these projects, especially the schoolhouse projects, under the provision which would allow them to be built without the necessity of contribution by the municipality, but we were turned down. I know of schoolhouses in Superior, in Ashburn, and in several cities that have been condemned for a number of years. They are now holding school in barracks—that is all they are, regular barracks; tar-paper shacks, I call them—because they are unable to raise the money to make up the sponsor's contribution. They have been forced to issue scrip, and have even been unable to redeem the scrip. They are absolutely bankrupt and cannot comply with the requirement of the minimum sponsor's contribution; yet these projects are sorely needed. They were forced to give up a badly needed sewer project because they could not raise the 25 percent.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that many municipalities in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other States are bankrupt and cannot put up the sponsor's contribution?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Absolutely. That is why I favor leaving some discrimination in the administrators so they can use their judgment. I am sure the administrators, State as well as regional, wish they could be more lenient, but they have no leeway.

Mr. PITTENGER. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it places some discrimination in the Administrator, does it not?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes; they are allowed some leeway. The Administrator has discretion to make the sponsor's contribution proportionate to his ability to pay, so it could be made 10 percent in one section and 40 percent in another, just so long as the sponsor's contribution for projects over the entire State aggregated the 25 percent. It is, of course, impossible to do that in my State.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the effect of this provision such that those communities most in need of assistance are the least able to avail themselves of the provisions of the law because they, in all probability, have reached the limit of their borrowing capacity?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Absolutely; and we all know that in our section of the country the communities are not going to be able to recoup their finances through this defense program because they have not yet and probably never will receive any of the benefits of the defense program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Would not the gentleman's amendment help the drought-stricken section of the country, where we have not been able to get the money to raise the sponsor's share?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I imagine it would. It simply strikes out the compulsory provision that not less than 25 percent must be provided by a sponsor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That would be left within the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. GEHRMANN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The amount the sponsor would be required to put up would be determined by the Administrator.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes; and the allowance of projects in such instances as I have mentioned where the municipalities are absolutely unable to put up any part of the sponsor's contribution would be discretionary with the Administrator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman's amendment disturb the $6 limitation?

Mr. GEHRMANN. It does not touch that section at all.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman understand that this limitation applies to the aggregate of projects in any one State and does not apply to the specific projects?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I realize that. I just made the statement that the State administrator has that power, but I should like to see power lodged in the Administrator, for instance, so that Superior, for instance, would be required to pay only 10 percent and Milwaukee, for instance, 40. It just could not be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this proposition. As a matter of fact, I intended to offer a similar amendment myself. In our country, in the Northwest, we are prohibited by the Army and the defense authorities of this country from any participation whatsoever in this defense program, which, after all, is the principal reason for cutting down on present W. P. A. appropriations. We may not participate in defense contracts, according to the Army, because of our proximity to the Canadian border.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that in the States of Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Washington there are no defense projects.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Agreed; and I will say to my friend that we have none in my district in northern Michigan.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In cutting down on this appropriation it hits particularly the sections that I have referred to?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman's position and that is the reason why I wholeheartedly support this amendment. As the gentleman from New York said a few moments ago, this matter has been left more or less discretionary with the State administrator, but the fact is that we in our districts such as the gentleman from Montana mentioned are not receiving the benefit of the enormous defense expenditures and on the other hand political expediency is not a forgotten subject in any relief-fund allocation. When we had our deficiency W. P. A. appropriation bill up here for consideration this spring, I asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] whether or not in cutting these people off the rolls these particular districts without defense contract aid would be affected. He replied that was not the intent of the committee; nevertheless, the W. P. A. authorities have found it necessary to drastically reduce our W. P. A. rolls, just as they have done all over the United States. Our districts are forced to take onto the local relief rolls many more individuals than they previously had for local relief. They are also dipping further and further into their coffers to meet this 25-percent sponsor's contribution, and, failing to qualify under the 25 percent, they find themselves without W. P. A. projects, which offers a remarkable opportunity for the State administrator to wash his hands of responsibility by saying, "You have not sufficient people on the rolls there, or you cannot meet the sponsor's contribution, therefore you must carry them in your own welfare bucket at home."

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. Would not the gentleman's amendment make it more possible for white-collar projects to operate? I am thinking of sewing projects for elderly women in communities of a rural nature that are not able to put up the 25-percent contribution. Would not this amendment make it possible for those women to find some work to do?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There is no question about that. As long as we retain in here this $6 qualification, we are still tying this into relief, where it should be, and for which purpose it is aimed.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. It strikes me as rather interesting that Michigan is making this point, because Michigan has received major defense contracts amounting to $670,000,000, about the fourth State in the Union in total contracts.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman, but that is practically all allocated in the metropolitan area of Detroit. I am talking about the northern counties of Michigan which are roughly 400 miles north and west of the city of Detroit, practically farther from the city of Detroit than I am when standing in the well of this House. May I say also to the gentleman that that is the excuse the W. P. A. Administrator, to some here in Washington, logically offers for saying that we need no relief in northern Michigan, because we have these big defense sums coming into the State of Michigan, but not into northern Michigan. And, I repeat, that is a matter of definite Army prohibition.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course, the gentleman understands that 25-percent limitation is a State-wide proposition?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I appreciate that.

Mr. O'NEAL. It is an average. The poorer communities may have no sponsorship contribution at all, while the richer communities may have more than that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with that in theory, but, in practice, theory is not the paramount factor.

Mr. O'NEAL. A State with defense contracts amounting to $670,000,000 certainly should be able to take care of itself.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman can buy a bag of popcorn with the defense funds that go into my entire district of 16 counties, I will pay him $1 for the bag.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Coming to the point made by the gentleman from Kentucky, is not the Department and the Federal Government calling on the W. P. A. more and more to build strictly Federal projects like defense highways and defense facilities? Is it not necessary that we have some discretion in this matter?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly said that we are prohibited by Army regulations from participation in the defense program because of our proximity to Canada. I find no fault with the Army; in fact, I commend their position. But we are facing facts today. I hope, and I merely point out, that because of the huge defense sums poured into Detroit and other metropolitan areas of our State, our northern counties are suffering undue and unfair cuts in W. P. A., wholly out of proportion to their local relief load. And, again, I am not wishing to be critical of the W. P. A. local, State, or national officials. I simply refer to a factual condition which can and should be rectified by the adoption of this very worth-while and—for my district—meritorious amendment, which I hope will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would absolutely wreck the work-relief program. The effect of it would be not to require any local contribution whatsoever and no sponsorship contribution.

As has just been so pertinently pointed out, a very apt illustration of this situation is my distinguished friend from Michigan, who complains about part of his State having no defense contracts; therefore they were not able to put up the 25-percent sponsorship contribution.

I want to remind the committee that this 25-percent sponsorship contribution does not require each community project and each locality to put up that amount. That must be the State-wide average, and the committee arranged it that way just to reach such a situation as we find in Michigan, where they have more than $600,000,000 worth of defense contracts; therefore the State administrator of W. P. A. in Michigan can get more than 25 percent if he will administer the law properly in a number of communities, thereby enabling him to go into the poorer communities and give them relief.

To my mind, we could do no more shocking a thing to this whole program than to say now, with a $92,000,000,000 national income, we will wipe out all local sponsorship contribution.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Has the time been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS: Page 3, line 25, after the word "facilities", insert the following: "facilities for the training of personnel in the operations and maintenance of air navigation and landing-area facilities."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, it will not take me but a minute to explain the purpose of this amendment. It does not in any way affect the bill. It neither increases nor decreases the amount of money carried in the bill.

When the Select Committee on Aviation of the House of Representatives, of which I am chairman, started our investigation we found to our amazement that control-tower operators, who are the people in the control towers who give orders for the landing and taking off of planes, were for the most part untrained and an unskilled personnel.

Everyone must agree that an airport is the maximum point of hazard in flight, both for the services—the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—and for commercial aviation. The purpose of this amendment is to make it possible to use W. P. A. funds for the creation of two or three schools in the United States

wherein control-tower operators will be trained. This is in accordance with the views and the wishes of the President. I have introduced today a bill which will give authority for the creation of these schools. The only purpose of this amendment is to be sure that W. P. A. funds can be used by the municipalities in the erection of these facilities. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have seen the amendment and I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has also seen it.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As far as we are concerned, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 6, line 16, after "necessary", strike out "temporary."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered would strike out the word "temporary" in line 16 of page 6 of this bill. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the committee that have brought in this bill, and to extend them my thanks for inserting the language found in lines 16 to 23, inclusive, on page 6 of the bill. This language makes it possible for the Commissioner to waive the sponsor's share of the W. P. A. projects in localities where they have suffered from a disaster or a grave emergency caused by flood, storm, fire, earthquake, drought, or similar cause. This provision is in line with my recommendation made to the committee and found in the headings on pages 367 to 371, inclusive.

This provides that such W. P. A. would be limited to projects in disaster territories which were temporary only. I do not believe that we should so tie the hands of the W. P. A. Commissioner by using the word "temporary." You will notice that this paragraph further provides "the facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with the rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive." This gives the Commissioner ample power and authority to prevent this provision for the waiving of sponsors' contributions from being abused.

I contend that if we confine all of the efforts of the W. P. A., at the time of a disaster or emergency, to temporary measures, in many cases it will result in a huge waste of funds. In other words, we will by law be saying to the Commissioner "You cannot do anything that has any permanent value." We will in effect be saying, "You can spend thousands of dollars in an attempt to temporarily cure a situation, but no money to prevent it from happening again." We reverse the saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure."

For instance, in the case of a flood where a highway or a bridge is totally destroyed, in order to restore traffic, under this act the W. P. A. can go in and spend money, without a limit fixed by law, to temporarily make the highway passable. The W. P. A. could do nothing that would have any permanent value, neither could it spend a few dollars for such things as channel rectification which might prevent the bridge from going out again.

If this word "temporary" is left in this bill it means that in a drought-stricken area the W. P. A. can help farmers on a purely relief basis, perhaps after they have been dispossessed, but nothing can be spent for any lasting or permanent works of soil or water conservation to help that farmer help himself resist the ravages of drought.

I do not think that in an area that has suffered a disaster or grave emergency caused by flood, storm, fire, earthquakes, drought, or similar disaster should be taken care of totally by the federally financed W. P. A. I do think that the committee did a fine thing when they waived the sponsors' contributions in these areas in the discretion of the Commissioner of the W. P. A. I do not think that we should tie the hands of the Commissioner and prohibit him by law from doing anything that is lasting or worth while. Too often temporary measures do not go at the root of the problem or help in a solution of our problem, but are merely a waste of money. I hope that the House will join in voting for my amendment to strike from line 16 on page 6 the word "temporary."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that nearly all the work done by W. P. A. is of a permanent character, generally speaking?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They why should we discriminate in those areas which have been affected by the conditions of which the gentleman has spoken, and limit it only to temporary work, whereas all other work is of a permanent character?

Mr. CURTIS. I believe the committee had the correct idea in mind, but inadvertently used the word "temporary." I believe we are all agreed that these W. P. A. projects without sponsors' funds can very easily become an abuse and, therefore, they should be restrained considerably, but I do not believe we should go so far as to make it the law that these measures have to be of temporary nature only. I believe that many times they will and should be temporary in their nature. However, that is a matter that should be determined by the W. P. A. Commissioner.

I hope the Committee will see fit to accept this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska has been very ardent in behalf of this proposition and we were desirous of going along with him as far as we could. Unfortunately, I feel that the gentleman does not realize the full import of the amendment he is now offering. The word "temporary" and this whole section are to provide for some disaster, something immediate which threatens the people. This language was put in there to authorize the W. P. A. to undertake such projects, in an emergency only.

If you remove the word "temporary" you practically nullify the purpose of the section as to what should come under it and what should not. I believe if you will read the language used in connection with the word "temporary," you will understand that it refers only to immediate disaster or grave emergency caused by flood, storm, fire, earthquake, drought, or similar cause.

You will realize that every flood wall in America can be so considered with the word "temporary" removed. We could possibly even include the St. Lawrence waterway. I do not know how many projects could be included if you should take out the word "temporary." It would simply open the door to every kind of project, and it is contrary to the purpose of putting it in there, which was merely to take care of some immediate, direct emergency.

This amendment nullifies other purposes of the bill and goes into a field so large that we can hardly contemplate its effect. The committee, therefore, is very hopeful that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman will find that some provision authorizes the Commissioner to make his own rules and regulations interpreting this provision. He can and perhaps will—and perhaps he should do so—confine the most of these projects or works to those of a temporary nature. If he does do that, the matter cannot get out of control. There can be no appeal from his ruling. Here we are by law saying that you cannot spend this money in any way that has any lasting value.

Mr. O'NEAL. I may say to the gentleman, though, that if you remove the word "temporary," the St. Lawrence seaway and flood walls in every city of the United States could be constructed, and many of the controversial questions before Congress would be immediately solved.

We hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SANDERS. Would it solve the question there to use the word "emergency" instead of "temporary"?

Mr. O'NEAL. The "temporary" is in there and the idea of "emergency" is also in there. Both should remain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 7, line 25, strike out "$35,466,000" and insert "$39,690,000."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has several amendments with respect to administrative costs. Would the gentleman object to having them all reported and considered at one time?

Mr. PATMAN. I think they should all be considered at one time; and, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all the amendments be reported and considered at one time, since they relate to the same subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 7, line 25 strike out "$35,466,000" and insert "$39,690,000."

On page 8, line 3, strike out "$29,016,000" and insert "$32,240,000."

On page 8, line 3, strike out "$500,000" and insert "$600,000."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "$2,800,000" and insert "$3,600,000."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$400,000."

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the last four amendments just read indicate how the increase in amendment No. 1 will be allocated. The amounts are not increased all the way through. The first amendment carries the increased amount of $4,000,000 and the others merely allocate or show how the different parts of the administrative divisions will be increased. I suggest that if more people will be unemployed, as there will be under this bill, more people will file complaints. As you, as a Member of Congress receive a complaint you naturally refer that complaint to the W. P. A. district office. The district office now has sufficient personnel to make a thorough investigation of the complaint, explain to the one who desires employment that, possibly, there is no project operating there or there are others ahead of him, or for one of many different reasons he is not eligible at that particular time. He is perfectly satisfied and you hear no more about it, but if you have no one to investigate these complaints, to iron out these differences, the trouble comes right back to the Member of Congress.

The Member of Congress does not desire to dodge the complaint or the trouble if it is within his power to satisfy the one making the complaint, but the Member of Congress cannot satisfy him unless he has a field force of his own that can go out and investigate each individual claim and make a satisfactory report, which, of course, he cannot do. You do not have the office force, and it is not possible for you to do it. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that this appropriation for administrative expenses should not be decreased unduly, as it is. Today this bill carries a reduction to $35,000,000 for administrative expenses. Compare that with the present year of $44,500,000. Last year it was $53,000,000. All I am asking is to bring the figure back to where the Budget recommended. The Budget reduced the amount 10 percent, and I am not taking issue with the Budget. After a thorough and exhaustive investigation, the Budget said that administrative expenses should not be reduced more than 10 percent, but the committee has reduced them 10 percent more, which is a 20-percent reduction. So the amendment I have offered provides that we shall stay with the Budget figure of a 10-percent reduction, which I think is reasonable and is right.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not this additional 10 percent which the committee has reduced the administrative item, is the first time they have gone under the Budget recommendation?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not know that.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Is not that true?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not know that, but I presume the gentleman's information is correct, and he assures me it is, so I submit in all earnestness that it is in the interest of the people, it is in the interest of the W. P. A. workers, it is in the interest of the Government officials that this amount not be reduced below the Budget estimate, and when we stay by the Budget it occurs to me we are doing exceedingly well, and in this case we are asking for nothing more than staying with the Budget figures which were submitted to the Appropriations Committee.

In 1939, in the administrative offices of W. P. A., there was an average of 36,003 people working in those offices. In 1940 the number was reduced from 36,000 down to 26,000 and at the end of 1940, the number was reduced to 22,000, and now if this cut were to go into effect, the number would be reduced to 16,000.

There is no satisfactory way that you can administer relief. We must admit that, and concede that there is no satisfactory way to administer relief and, certainly, it is going to be more unsatisfactory if you do not have people in the field and on the ground to investigate all these individual complaints, iron out the differences, and show them why, under the law and existing regulations, they cannot get employment or that nothing more can be done for them than is being done.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with this amendment, supporting it. When I found what the committee did with reference to cutting the expenses 10 percent below what the Budget called for, I wired the administrator of the W. P. A. in Montana and received from him the following telegram:

HELENA, MONT.

Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR,
Care House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Retel your request relative to administrative expense regarding W. P. A. program Montana. At present cost we are operating one-fourth of cost in 1936 appropriation for further reduction of administrative expense will make it impossible to give necessary assistance in various counties to have engineers assist in setting up projects at least 5 percent should be allowed for this purpose due to large area in Montana and excessive cost of travel unless taken into consideration candidly do not know how we can operate.

JOSEPH E. PARKER.

As a matter of fact they are now operating in Montana for three-fourths of what they had in 1936. If we are to cut down an additional amount, the administrator, who ought to know what he is talking about, says that it will be nearly impossible for him to operate at all. Certainly the expense should not be reduced, particularly in those western, sparsely settled territories, where traveling is one of the largest items of expense, and I refer to such States as the Dakotas, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and in fact nearly all of those western States. I think, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has pointed out, that it would not be good business to cut down on this expense. Therefore, I am for the amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the House should know about what is being put up to it in this amendment. The amount of money has been cut 35 percent of the entire appropriation. The cut in administrative expenses is only 20 percent. These folks here in Washington in the W. P. A. have an average pay roll per individual of $2,448. It is one of the very largest in the Government. It is not under civil service and is composed of a lot of economists and all that sort of stuff that they do not need. They are nothing but a bunch of baloney. They can save enough by cutting their roll in Washington down to where it ought to be cut to compare with other departments here, to a fairly decent level of, say, a couple of thousand dollars, and take care of every single State office. Is there any man in this room who will say and say seriously that with $29,000,000 for personal services they cannot take care of their administrative expenses in Washington and take care of all of the supervision that they need? Why, this outfit, with a decrease over last year of $900,000,000 in expenses, has increased the number of administrative and supervisory employees, taken together. There is just no efficiency in it.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I realize the gentleman from New York is extremely

vigilant with reference to W. P. A. appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no more than with respect to any other appropriation.

Mr. McKEOUGH. And I ask the gentleman as a matter of information, not in a spirit of facetiousness, what is the administrative percentage for administration services on the part of the W. P. A., and also a comparison with the administrative percentage expenses for, say, the Treasury, the Interior, or any other department?

Mr. TABER. Oh, they are considerably higher, about 11 percent, when you come to consider the supervisory employees. The gentleman made a statement a little while ago that I think deserves a little attention, to the effect that this committee had never cut these administrative expenses before.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Oh, that is not correct.

Mr. TABER. Let me say to the gentleman that from the time we began to review these administrative expenses, we began to cut them. We found that they were sending telegrams from one floor to another in the same building, and everything else was being conducted along the same lines. They have a lot of that same sort of stuff which they can still eliminate, putting a little efficiency in their outfit and making it more reasonable. Instead of taking a 20-percent cut as we have proposed, they ought to take at least a 35-percent cut.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH rose.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not true that every dollar that is added, if this amendment is adopted for administrative expenses, is a dollar taken away from those who are in need?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it will take the money away from the project employees, who are supposed to be certified as in need. Everyone who is in favor of this amendment is in favor of taking bread away from these people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the W. P. A. is being called upon by the Government agencies, particularly the War Department, to carry through and construct Government projects that they are interested in, like highways, access roads, landing fields, and such things. They are in need of administrative expenses to pay administrative personnel. They are doing a splendid job. The Work Projects Administration has progressed from a purely relief administering agency to a constructive organization embracing the entire country.

I am in hearty accord with the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to fix the limitation on administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration at the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget's recommendation in itself amounts to a reduction of $5,000,000 from the amount used this year. The committee's recommendation would be a reduction of another $4,000,000. Considering the fact that to do its job, the Work Projects Administration must operate throughout the country and is now running 23,000 projects in more than 3,000 counties, it certainly must have enough administrative personnel to see that the work is done in the right way. The elimination of the majority of its district offices, which would be necessary under the committee's recommendation, could only work to the disadvantage of the whole work program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is some misapprehension as to just what the effect of this amendment of the gentleman from Texas will accomplish. Let us remember that in the bill we appropriate $875,000,000 for W. P. A. The figures on page 7 and page 8 which are involved in these amendments are not appropriations, but are limitations on the amount which W. P. A. may use for administrative expenses out of the $875,000,000.

Our committee on this bill, just as we have always done, tried to hold down the administrative expenses as much as we could. We pulled down the limitation of expenditure for administration between four and five million dollars under the Budget estimate, but we did not take the money out of the bill.

Therefore, if the bill is passed as the committee reported it, and the limitation on administrative expenses remains as the committee has reported it, there will be between four and five million dollars of additional funds in the Treasury of W. P. A. which they may use to employ about 5,000 additional project workers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If these amendments are carried, does it not increase the appropriation to the extent of the amount mentioned in the amendments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does it not increase the entire amount of the bill in that amount?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. This deals merely with a limitation. There is no doubt about that. So Members who are interested in W. P. A. project workers ought to sympathize with the effort of the committee to do everything in our power to keep the money going to project workers rather than to unnecessary administrative costs.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, this only involves $1 out of every $240 in the bill, and if it is adopted we can increase the aggregate by the amount that we have increased it here.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We could do it if we had the votes, but the House has already decided that it is not going to increase the amount of W. P. A., and it ought not to do it. This affects 5,000 project workers. If these amendments obtain you take the money away from 5,000 project workers and give it back for administrative expenses.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact that what we should do and what the gentleman is trying to do is to have less of these supervisors and more jobs for those who actually need it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is it exactly. My friend sees the point exactly.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. What about engineering facilities?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, we have too many engineers. The whole thing is engineered too much. What we are trying to do is to engineer and sidetrack some of this money away from Washington and take it to my friend's constituents who need W. P. A. jobs, and my friend ought to assist me in doing that.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman know that P. W. A. made a splendid record by its engineering and technical handling of these projects and does he not think that W. P. A. should follow the same example?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that W. P. A. has made a splendid record?

Mr. WHITE. They are making a fine record.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And we have always cut their expenses.

Mr. WHITE. You have cut them $9,000,000. Let us put $4,000,000 back.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that this is the only time the committee has gone below the budget estimate?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no. We have always cut below the budget estimate. I will be fair and say to my friend and to the committee that once or twice when W. P. A. came in and showed us that we had cut a little too much we came back and had the allocation increased, to loosen it up a little. There is no desire to prevent W. P. A. from having enough money to administer the fund, but $39,000,000 is a lot of money with which to administer an agency, and a lot of good administration can be done with that if they will try to do it.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman agree that a 35-percent reduction is a great reduction?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. Now, right on that point, here is what we did: We reduced the number of people W. P. A. can employ by 44 percent; we reduced their dollar expenditure by 35 percent; and we reduced their admin-

istrative costs only 20 percent. This is fair, this is reasonable, this is logical, and I believe it should stand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the several amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas, which are considered en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 2, line 24, after the word "appropriation", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used in furtherance of the so-called Jefferson National Expansion Memorial project at St. Louis, Mo., or for the improvement of the site thereof to any extent whatsoever."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does the same thing Congress has done on previous occasions. I cite the following proviso which appears in the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942 and quote from page 534 of the hearings:

That no part of the foregoing appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the payment of the salaries or expenses of any employee of the National Park Service assigned to duty in connection with the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo.

What has happened is that the Park Service uses funds supplied by the city of St. Louis to get around the specific provision I have cited that is in the law now. The National Park Service sponsors W. P. A. projects to do the very thing that Congress has previously prohibited. I feel that it is an unwarranted thwarting of the will of Congress. In other words, the National Park Service puts it into operation by using the funds of the city of St. Louis to get Federal funds from the W. P. A. relief bill to improve the grounds and the buildings of the St. Louis Jefferson Expansion Memorial. About $15,000,000 has been spent already and there is no end in sight.

Congress has said in the Interior appropriation bill for 1942 that we are not to expend any more money for this project, yet if this amendment is not adopted there is no assurance that future Congresses will accept this project when it is completed. At one time the Attorney General, then Mr. Cummings, said that no funds could legally be spent upon this project unless the funds available were sufficient to complete the entire project. Using W. P. A. funds to work on the project, doing this work by little dribs and drabs, is not completing it but is just an insidious way of getting around the law to do something which Congress has not wanted done.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the Jefferson Memorial project in St. Louis. Many years ago the Congress of the United States set up a commission for the purpose of getting some kind of memorial to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase. I handled that resolution. I said on the floor of the House then, and I say again now as I have many times remarked, that I would never ask the Congress for an appropriation to construct a memorial building on the project. I do not care what kind of appropriation you bring here for the purpose of erecting a memorial building on the project, I am not going to support it, because I promised I would not at the time the commission was established and I mean to keep my word.

What are the facts? This project was taken over under the Historical Sites Act. It belongs to the United States Government, and is in the hands of the National Park Service. The city of St. Louis contributed several millions of dollars toward the purchase of the ground. There was practically no cost in the removal of the buildings because the contractors salvaged the material in the buildings. They have there the old courthouse where the Dred Scott decision was rendered, and one or two other old buildings. The St. Louis Catholic Cathedral stands on that property.

After the National Park Service took over this area it sponsored a project to be done by the W. P. A., costing $678,980, and the sponsor's contribution was $336,480. That work is now going on. The hearing showed this project is currently operating, and the National Park Service has sponsored a second project, the W. P. A. providing $210,000 and the sponsor $115,035. Then there is a third project, to restore and rehabilitate the old courthouse, which I referred to. The W. P. A. appropriation for that project is $95,225 and the sponsor's contribution $63,063. When the courthouse is rehabilitated it is proposed to have Government agencies occupy the building.

It is simply making a park out of that area, making walks and jointly with the city improving the street that borders the area on the west. I do not know of any provision whatsoever or any legislation that has been suggested for the construction of any memorial building on the site.

Some of my Republican friends have indicated from time to time by their speeches that the city of St. Louis has secured a very large amount of money from the Government, for which the Government received no return. Let it be known that the Government of the United States now owns 40 square blocks of downtown property in the city of St. Louis which has been deeded to it by the city of St. Louis. The only part of that 40 square blocks that the Government does not own is the old Catholic cathedral, constructed well over a hundred years ago. By this statement you will see that the Government has received something in return for the money that it has spent.

The amount of money W. P. A. spends on this project, of course, is taken from the allocation of W. P. A. money to the city of St. Louis and the city of St. Louis paid the sponsor's contribution when that was necessary.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. Can the gentleman tell the House how much money has already been spent on this project for improvement of the ground and the clearing of slums in this area?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know exactly how much money has been spent on the project. Including the purchase of the ground and everything that went with it would probably run up to seven or eight million dollars, although I do not know exactly. The city paid several million in connection with the purchase of the property.

I never pay any attention to the project at all other than when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] continue to harp about the Jefferson Memorial project. It is not in my district. It looks like every time the city of St. Louis is mentioned the statement is made that it belongs to COCHRAN. There are three Congressmen from St. Louis.

We had a bill the other day providing for an additional judgeship, and there were seven congressional districts in Missouri involved. When they talked about the St Louis judgeship it was COCHRAN'S judge. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], introduced that bill on recommendation of the conference of circuit judges.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that the city of St. Louis was the sponsor of this project and made a contribution. Now, that is contradictory to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] said. He stated that the National Park Service was the sponsor of the project. It is my understanding that when a project is located in a community, the municipality in which the project is located sponsors it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the National Park Service was the sponsor of the last two projects, according to the hearings. As I said, I did not pay any attention to the project only when Members rise here on the floor and talk about it and mention my name. I am sure the last two projects were sponsored by the National Park Service, because it belongs to the Government now. They have taken it over. The city has ceded the property to the Government, the courthouse and everything else other than the cathedral.

Mr. BEITER. Is it the National Park Service that is making the local contribution or is it the city of St. Louis that makes the local contribution?

Mr. COCHRAN. The city of St. Louis made a local contribution every time it was called on to make one. In connection with one street there, I know the city of St. Louis has paid or is to pay part of it. It is the west boundary. Since the Government actually took over the project, naturally it will sponsor the projects other than the streets that are the boundaries of the area.

I say this amendment deals with an active project in connection with land that belongs to the Federal Government.

It no longer belongs to the city of St. Louis. No one objects to the amendment in the Interior Department appropriation bill the gentleman from Ohio spoke of. I never opposed it, but to say the National Park Service cannot sponsor improvements through W. P. A. for projects goes too far.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 47, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to allocate not to exceed $5,000,000 of the appropriation contained in section 1 (a) to other Federal agencies for the operation, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner may prescribe, of projects of the type specified in subsection (b) of section 1 which are within the scope of the functions usually carried out by such agencies, including administrative expenses of such agencies incident to such operation: *Provided*, That not to exceed 4 percent of the total amount so allocated to any such agency shall be used for such administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no project shall be prosecuted under any allocation under this subsection upon which the percentage of nonrelief persons employed exceeds 10 percent of the total number of persons employed: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $540,000 of the appropriation contained in section 1 (a) hereof may be allocated, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, for administrative expenses of Federal agencies incident to the planning and review of Work Projects Administration projects within the jurisdiction of such agencies.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood-control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion.

(c) No non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under appropriations under this joint resolution unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as the Work Projects Administration determines under the circumstances is an adequate contribution, taking into consideration the financial ability of the sponsor. The Commissioner shall prescribe rules and regulations relating to the valuation of contributions in kind by sponsors of projects through furnishing the use of their own facilities and equipment and the services of their own employees which shall represent an actual cash value, and such rules and regulations shall also allow credit only to the extent that the furnishing of such contributions represents a financial burden which is undertaken by the sponsors on account of Work Projects Administration projects or other sponsored projects.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this pro forma amendment is to clear up what seems to me to be some confusion in section 6 of this bill. I desire to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in reference to it. In section 6, line 10, there is a provision that $5,000,000 of this entire appropriation may be used for Federal projects. Then reference is made to language in section 1, and certain limitations are imposed in section 6.

For the current year we had $85,000,000, as I understand, to be used of exclusive Federal projects. What I am trying to get clear here is whether it is intended to have limitations here that will in any way restrict the use of this $5,000,000 to any of the various Federal agencies, and I particularly have in mind the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. Can this money be expended on Federal projects in the coming fiscal year in the same manner and with no greater limitations than there was on the $85,000,000 which was available for the current year, and is now being expended by Federal agencies, free from State project supervision and control?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The answer is that there will be about $125,000,000 available during the next fiscal year for Federal projects. The limitation to which the gentleman refers will not in any way curtail that program, the only change being that the Federal projects will be administered through the State agencies rather than through the Federal agencies.

Mr. LEAVY. What I am trying to make clear is that they have $5,000,000 available directly for a Federal agency. To be concrete, if the Forest Service sees fit to build a trail or a road in the forest, if the Parks Service desires to make an improvement in the parks, or if the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine desires to fight forest diseases in the forest, as a Federal project, can they use the money here provided in the same manner they are using this money for the current year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It would have to be a Federal project, but administered by the W. P. A. under the regular State program.

Mr. LEAVY. There would have to be a State contribution, then, of 25 percent?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; no State contribution. A Federal project does not require State contributions.

Mr. LEAVY. Are the limitations that are imposed in this act such as to differ from those that exist now in the Federal projects? I refer particularly to the Park Service and the Forest Service.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The only difference is in the method of administration, not in the amount of money that would be available for projects.

Mr. LEAVY. If the difference is that you have to go to a State administrator and take it out of the hands of the Federal agency that handles it, then it is a very wide difference. You then put a State administrator into a Federal forest or into a national park, or into any of these activities, and you make it entirely different from the situation now prevailing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the way they said they wanted it, I may say to the gentleman. They wanted it through their State programs.

Mr. LEAVY. Was it the intention to place that restriction on this $5,000,000 that is here allocated?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not on this $5,000,000; no. This $5,000,000 is not subject to that restriction.

Mr. LEAVY. This $5,000,000 is available just as the $85,000,000 was last year?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEAVY. That answers my question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 12, line 3, after the word "agencies", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds of this act shall be expended for any project sponsored by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government unless justification for the sponsor's contribution for such project is specifically included in the appropriation for such Department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. Obviously we cannot finish the bill today.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and some extracts from articles by Major Seversky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Argus-Leader on the work of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remorks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Judge John W. Haussermann, of Manila, on Japanese-Filipino relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Philadelphia Record of May 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KOPPLEMANN, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. REED of Illinois, for 10 days, on account of illness.

THE LATE JOE EATON

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I announce to the House the death this afternoon of Joseph Eaton, of Lawton, Okla., a faithful and extremely popular employee of this body, who was well known and dearly beloved by many Members of Congress and others who knew him.

Although Joe Eaton had worked in the Capitol less than 1½ years, he made a host of friends here who deeply mourn his untimely passing. During his illness for the past few days, hundreds of his close friends, including the Speaker of the House, the chairmen and members of several important committees, as well as elevator boys and pages, have inquired about Joe and expressed a wish for his recovery.

Joe Eaton was not only one of the most brilliant, loyal, and lovable Christian characters I have ever had the privilege of meeting and knowing, but he was a dependable, clean-cut, high-minded young man with firm convictions and high ideals. His personal life was one that all young men and women could well emulate. He made the world a happier and better place in which to dwell.

In this trying hour our hearts go out to his dear loved ones. May He who holds in the hollow of His hand the fate of nations, and yet who notes even the sparrow's fall, be their help and strength in this sad and sorrowful hour. May God bless and help them all.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3782. An act establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea; and

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet in accordance with its previous order, at 11 a. m. tomorrow, Friday, June 13, 1941.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, June 13, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to resume consideration of United States against Northern Pacific Railroad compromise settlement offer. (Postponement of meeting of Thursday, June 12, 1941.)

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873, a bill to limit the entry of certain aliens into the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer the jurisdiction over District of Columbia and the Comptroller of the Currency to the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

644. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 2, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on reexamination of Mississippi River with a view to determining the advisability of the improvement of a harbor at Winona, Minn., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted June 6, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 263); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 232. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Winifred Harlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4817. A bill to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety; without amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4988. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1065. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. H. R. 3798. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government"; without amendment (Rept No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5008. A bill to authorize a naval ordnance laboratory at the Navy Yard, Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5012) for the relief of Raymond Crosby, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 5041. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Little

Calumet River starting at mouth of Burns ditch and continuing to Illinois State line, Lake County, Ind., and its tributaries, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5042. A bill prohibiting membership in certain subversive organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5043. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5044. A bill to improve the efficiency of the armed forces by providing additional compensation for certain duties performed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5045. A bill for the relief of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Chinese Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 233. Resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House certain information in the Department of Justice relating to subversive activities on the part of employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5046. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. R. 5047. A bill granting a pension to Susanna White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5048. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1382. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., supporting Senate bill 860 and House bill 2475, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1383. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Mayfield, N. Y., urging passage of House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1384. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 47, relative to memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to aid in furthering the development of Highway 20; to the Committee on Roads.

1385. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Dr. James H. Richmond (chairman), Hugh M. McElrath, and Joe T. Lovett, representing the national-defense committee of Murray Rotary Club, endorsing 100 percent the President's fireside chat Tuesday night, May 27, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs

1386. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of various citizens of San Diego, Calif., and drawn up by J. C. Stevens, urging passage of House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1387. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of House bill 3852, which would authorize District of Columbia Board of Barber Examiners to establish opening and closing hours and a day on which barber shops shall remain closed irrespective of the religious faith of the barber; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1388. By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Local No. 35, Brotherhood of Pointers, Caulkers, and Cleaners, of Philadelphia, Pa., setting forth the necessity of providing real jobs for our people and endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan as adequate legislation to this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1389. Also, petition of Local No. 64, United Leather Workers International Union, of Philadelphia, Pa., setting forth the necessity o. providing real jobs for our people and endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan as adequate legislation to this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1390. Also, petition of the Bricklayers' Union, No. 1, of Philadelphia, Pa., setting forth the necessity of providing real jobs for our people and endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan as adequate legislation to this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1391. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Camden County, N. J., and vicinity, setting forth the necessity of providing real jobs for our people and endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan as adequate legislation to this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1392. Also, petition of Local No. 13, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Helpers of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., setting forth the necessity of providing real jobs for our people and endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan as adequate legislation to this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1393. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Brooklyn Civil Council, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging defeat of Senate bill 937 and House bill 3582; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1394. Also, petition of the Port of New York Authority, opposing the passage of Senate bill 937 and House bill 3582; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1395. Also, petition of the Unicorn Press, Inc., publishers, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging continuance of the 1½-cent-per-pound book postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1396. Also, petition of the Trufruit Syrup Corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of the Kefauver bill (H. R. 3383); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1397. Also, petition of the Transport Workers Union of Greater New York, urging support of the Casey amendment for increased Work Projects Administration appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1398. Also, petition of the New York State Council of Brewery Workers, Utica, N. Y., opposing additional tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1399. Also, petition of John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of Senate bill 937 and House bill 3582; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1400. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Chauncy Wood, of Charleston, and 139 others, of Kanawha County, W. Va., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852, because those measures would enable a majority of the barbers of the District of Columbia to effect a compulsory observance of a religious day; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1401. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions memorializing Congress in opposition to proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1402. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the International Hod Carriers Building and Common Laborers Union of America, Local No. 1261, Shelbyville, endorsing the construction of a dam in the Kaskaskia River in accordance with the Illinois State Planning Commission project No. 33; to the Committee on Flood Control.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Beneath Thy mighty hand, Almighty God, we humble ourselves as we say: "Holy, holy, holy." Thou art the Father of us all to be loved and trusted under all the conditions of human experience. With this blessed assurance, lay Thy hand upon us, and where'er the path may lead, we shall be unafraid. With our thanks for life and all that it means, enable us to live wisely, labor industriously, and at the last hand it back to Thee without any sense of shame. We pray Thee to fill the open spaces of our characters with those aspirations and loves that shall never die; that the spirit of the Christ may be more and more diffused among our people, making them more zealous as they take up the cross of Him who lived a life of self-denial and self-sacrifice for others. Wilt Thou be pleased to relieve those who are perplexed in their experience; to strengthen those who are weak; to encourage those who are timid; to give to those who are in doubt, and to build up in us those Christian virtues which were so thoroughly taught and exemplified by our Master when He moved among His earthly children. Grant that we may have a higher sense of His purity, of His mercy, of His meekness, of His patience, and of His spirit of forgiveness. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4545. An act to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BARBOUR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1524. An act to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 158. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a copy of a resolution adopted by the forty-sixth annual meeting of the New York Council of State, Knights of Columbus, held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on May 30, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I wrote the President regarding the appointment of Senator BYRNES to the Supreme Court of the United States, and his answer to that letter, and Senator BYRNES' letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OIL FOR NEW ENGLAND

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the oil shortage, caused by the loss of 50 tankers from the Atlantic seaboard, is going to hit hardest in the northeast United States. New England is in the northeastern corner of the Northeast, and so will feel the shortage most.

It is only fair, therefore, that New England be adequately represented on whatever advisory board or industrial committee is created to assist in this difficult situation. I am glad to say that I have been assured by officials now working on the matter that New England's interests will not be overlooked. They agree that that section of the country should have adequate representation.

We have heard stories about "gasless Sundays." I think that that is a very bad idea. If we have to have any "gasless" days, they should not come on the one day when the workingman can take his family to the country or the shore. Probably "gasless days" are not the right answer anyway; a 20-percent reduction in gasoline supply could be dealt with more justly by rationing, which would not cause any great hardship.

This problem goes beyond gasoline. Up in my section, the shortage will affect the delivery of domestic fuel oil to private homes. The homes now heated by oil will probably get along all right, if the people will just be careful, shut off unused rooms, and turn the thermostat down at night. But the installation now of many new oil burners would complicate the situation temporarily. Incidentally, I emphasize "temporarily" because the new pipe lines that should be completed within a year will bring plenty of oil to the Northeast.

I hope that in the interest of consumers, the importance of the domestic fuel-oil business will not be overlooked and that that branch of the industry will be given a voice in the councils of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1941, entitled "The Sore Thumb in the Draft."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution passed by the city of Manistique, Mich., on the Great Lakes seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of today is concluded, and other special orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN LABOR UNIONS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a copy of the Washington Post of today, Friday, June 13, 1941, which contains the following headlines:

Armed with names, United States moves to cleanse unions of Communists.

Second aluminum strike leader an ex-convict.

DIES termed these leaders of C. I. O. "red."

United States orders auto firms not to raise prices.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the United States Government for this, but I have not yet seen any move to cleanse the Government itself of the six or eight hundred Communists said to occupy positions therein. Neither have I heard of the Government telling these subversive "reds" to lower their money demands when it comes to raising the price of labor as it has done the automobile business, and I hope this will be one of the next one of their moves. I am sure, if the Government does these two things, the House of Representatives will back it all the way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the South Bend Tribune of June 8, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATOR JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 194) making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Andrews	Green	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Hancock	Rivers
Baumhart	Hare	Romjue
Beckworth	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Bloom	Hobbs	Scanlon
Boggs	Hope	Schaefer, Ill.
Bolton	Jenks, N. H.	Schuetz
Boykin	Jennings	Scott
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Maine
Camp	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Pa.
Cannon, Fla.	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Kirwan	Stratton
Chenoweth	Kleberg	Sumner, Ill.
Clason	Kopplemann	Tarver
Clevenger	Lambertson	Taylor
Cluett	McIntyre	Thill
Collins	Maciejewski	Thom
Costello	Magnuson	Tolan
Culkin	Mason	Treadway
Day	Monroney	Vinson, Ga.
Delaney	O'Brien, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Dies	O'Day	Wadsworth
Fellows	Osmers	Weiss
Fish	Pearson	Welch
Gearhart	Pierce	Winter
Geyer, Calif.	Ploeser	Wright
Gifford	Rabaut	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 345 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion by Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5049, Rept. No. 767) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 194) making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia please explain the joint resolution?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Permit me to say if consent is given for the consideration of this joint resolution I intend to ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and then go under the 5-minute rule and discuss it for a few minutes.

Mr. TABER. I think that would be all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and that the joint resolution be considered as being read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 194) is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $40,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority Fund, fiscal year 1942, for (1) beginning construction of two additional hydroelectric projects and two additional storage projects on the Hiwassee River and its tributaries, (2) installing additional electric-generating units in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, and (3) building the transmission facilities needed to connect these projects and units to the existing transmission system of the Authority and to deliver the power produced by these projects and units to the market; such sum to be available for the objects and subject to the conditions specified under the caption "Tennessee Valley Authority" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, and shall be available immediately.

SEC. 2. The appropriation to the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency for construction of temporary office buildings, contained in title III of the Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby amended by inserting the words "or near" after the words "on Government-owned land in."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 194 comes with the unanimous report of the committee reporting it.

It is a very short joint resolution. It contains two propositions. Proposition No. 1 is a change of language relative to the building of some temporary office buildings which were authorized for the War Department. In the Fifth Supplemental Appropriation Act we appropriated $4,100,000 for these temporary buildings. Some of them were for the War Department. In that language we provided that the buildings must be constructed on Government-owned land within the District of Columbia. It now develops after very careful survey that they are not able to find Government-owned land in the District of Columbia near enough to the present War Department buildings where they could put these temporary buildings. General Marshall came before our subcommittee and told us what they wished to do and what they will do if this joint resolution is passed. They intend to go just across the Lincoln Memorial Bridge on the Arlington farm land, which is owned by the Government, and erect these temporary buildings, where they will be within 4 or 5 minutes of the other War Department activities.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. As the gentleman stated this morning, these buildings are only for the duration of the emergency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. They are not to be constructed for any particular length of time longer than the emergency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They are two-story buildings of the very cheapest type of construction for emergency office space, very desperately needed by the War Department.

The other matter included in the bill is $40,000,000 of a $51,000,000 project for the construction of additional power facilities in the Tennessee Valley Authority area, made necessary because of the shortage of aluminum and the shortage of power for the manufacture of aluminum.

You will find in the report on this joint resolution, and I would like to repeat that this is a unanimous report from the committee, a clear summary of the situation with reference to the aluminum and power, insofar as we are able to get the picture at the present time. However, whatever may be the doubt as to the ultimate needs for new construction for power, there is absolutely no doubt that this new construction for 117,000 kilowatts of additional firm electric power for the Tennessee Valley Authority is badly needed for the operation at maximum capacity of the plants already constructed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is this giving more money to Mr. Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority who refused to submit his accounts for audit by the Comptroller General?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, it is not giving it to Mr. Lilienthal. It is appropriating money to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. COX. Nevertheless, it is to the Authority whose head refuses to submit their accounts for audit by the proper Government agency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is well within the province of Congress, whenever it wishes to do so, to settle that controversy between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the General Accounting Office.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] that he has certainly misunderstood the facts in this case. If he will read Mr. Lilienthal's letter that was inserted in the RECORD a few days ago, he will see that he is wrong. It is nothing to the discredit of Mr. Lilienthal or the Authority.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this is equivalent and tantamount to the problem we heretofore have been very much concerned about—work stoppages. We cannot stop the production of power, the manufacture of aluminum for bombing planes, while someone settles the more or less academic controversy between the General Accounting Office and the T. V. A. over the accounts. We have to have this power; we have to have this aluminum. We can settle the other question at the proper time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We are faced today with the spending of large additional funds for the further development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have been against the Tennessee Valley Authority ever since I have been here. The only reason we go along on this proposition is because we have faith in the gentleman and certain other members of this subcommittee. If for any reason the thing

cannot be substantiated, the absolute need for this power cannot be proved, then we shall have to hold this subcommittee responsible for recommending these projects to the full committee. We place our faith in the gentleman from Virginia and hope we shall never have reason to feel that we have been sold down the river.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. A few more sins on my head will not hurt me any, I guess. I can take it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who has any confidence whatever in the present management of the T. V. A.; in fact, I believe it is about as bad as it could be. Even the Attorney General on the 10th of June made a decision finally sustaining the position of the Comptroller General that the accounts of the T. V. A. must be audited by the Comptroller General. The policy and operations of the management of T. V. A. in spreading out and getting themselves hooked up with a lot of power demand that they cannot supply throughout the year has made it necessary to go ahead at this time and permit the development of additional storage basins on the Hiwassee River and its tributaries so there may be a more uniform flow of water throughout the year and that water may be stored for that purpose. They assure us this will increase the power facilities of the T. V. A. for the production of aluminum; and at the present time there is nothing else for us to do except to go ahead with it.

The dams are to be of earth and stone, quickly constructed. They will not be of concrete.

I had very grave doubts as to whether I should agree to this and I did not do it until I had gone into the thing thoroughly and until I had the assurances of such opponents of the T. V. A. and of public power as Mr. Kellogg, the Chief Consultant of the O. P. M. on power, and also head of the public-utility conference on these things. I think when he says it must be done there is not any use in our saying anything more at this time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is not this about the fact, that those of us who have opposed T. V. A. from the beginning made certain prophecies that we now see coming true? We said the things then done would be just the opening wedge to get more of the taxpayers' money. Millions of dollars have been spent on this project and they now come along and ask for $40,000,000 in one fell swoop to carry out one little part of the project, yet even after this expenditure is made it will still be an unfinished project. Before it is completed it will cost the Government probably more than $1,000,000,000, and the expenditures will go on and on and on with no apparent end.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it; and it is not well laid out either.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. My position is the same as that taken by the gentleman from Ohio. We have opposed this from the beginning, or I at least since I have been in Congress. We are doing this for national defense. They have got us at a disadvantage. We just cannot help ourselves because we want to do everything we can for our Nation's defense; but is somebody to assume responsibility that these moneys are wisely and judiciously spent?

Mr. TABER. I think it will be supervised so these particular moneys will be properly spent; and I am now sure, in view of the decision of the Attorney General that T. V. A. must submit their accounts for audit and check-up by the Comptroller General, that we shall have some safeguard on their performance.

Mr. RICH. We must have that even if additional legislation must be passed by Congress properly to empower the Comptroller General.

Mr. TABER. The Attorney General has ruled that the Comptroller General now has that power.

Mr. RICH. That is fine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman advise us in the light of all the hearings he has attended whether he is absolutely convinced there is a genuine shortage of aluminum-production facilities and aluminum tonnage at the present time?

Mr. TABER. There is not a shortage of aluminum production at the present time. There will be, however, by the 1st of April, as these facilities for the building of which we have already provided, come into production and as airplane production goes ahead to the point we must reach if we are to produce planes enough to clean up this situation.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Tennessee Valley law, the Tennessee Valley Authority is required annually to file with Congress a report of its activities, including a statement of all of its employees who receive $1,500 or more. This report has not been filed for the last fiscal year. I would like to have the question answered by some friend of the T. V. A. as to whether there has been any change in the law which makes it unnecessary for the Tennessee Valley Authority to file annual reports, or what justification there is for them to ignore the law in this regard.

Also, before the Committee on Appropriations not so long ago Mr. David Lilienthal, the arch conspirator of the Tennessee Valley Authority, its erstwhile general counsel and sometime chairman and now vice chairman of its so-called board of directors, stated that studies were being made to provide a balance sheet of their activities, which the average businessman could understand, to show whether or not T. V. A. power is produced at a loss or at a profit to the Government. I should like to know how Mr. Lilienthal and his associates are progressing in providing Congress and the American people with the balance sheet which they can understand and which Mr. Lilienthal admitted before the Committee on Appropriations is necessary.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman is one of the best-posted experts in this House or any place else on the Tennessee Valley Authority. I would like to ask him, is it not a fact that no one in the electrical world has ever come forward and stated with any degree of finality and able to prove it that electricity can be produced cheaper by water? Why is it that the administration does not proceed to bring to us the necessary power increases through the production of power by coal instead of spending the money on these foolish water projects?

Mr. McLEAN. Steam plants are essential to any electric-producing system. The Tennessee Valley Authority has found it necessary to have available steam-propelled plants in case of emergency from failure of the hydroelectric power and if we could get the truth from a recent conference that was held in the southeast we would know that a very serious situation existed because of the drought and the failure of hydroelectric operations. I understand an airplane carrier was taken into Mobile Bay to provide electrical power for some of the facilities there because of the failure of hydroelectric operations.

We used to hear a lot about "surplus" power. The idea of the T. V. A. was to sell surplus power, the power that was not necessary to operate the dams and locks and other Government works incident to flood control and navigation. The word "surplus" has been dropped from the picture. The truth of the matter is the T. V. A. is in the electrical power business. That is its primary objective. This idea of flood control and navigation are already of secondary importance.

I recently visited the Tennessee Valley. I went from one dam to the other. I saw just one barge being towed through a lock and it had material for T. V. A. uses only. It was the only navigation I saw on the Tennessee Valley project except around Chattanooga. We have not been told how much of their power operation should be allocated to navigation, how much should be allocated to flood control, and how much will be charged to electrical power production. They have not yet furnished the American people with the financial statement which can be understood. Mr. David Lilienthal himself said that such a statement would be furnished. In his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations this year Mr. Lilienthal stated that the T. V. A. is making a study in an effort to provide a balance sheet which the American people can understand. These are Mr. Lilienthal's own words. I hope someone in his confidence will tell us when that balance sheet will be available.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the joint resolution conclude in 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me criticizes the purpose for which the T. V. A. was organized and developed. Whatever criticism originally could have been directed at the T. V. A., it seems to me it is out of the picture now because of the war developments that have since occurred. The T. V. A. is desperately needed to carry out the national-defense program. Every ounce of electrical energy that can be developed in the T. V. A. and other sections of the country is most urgently needed by the Government and private industry at this time, not only from the original dams of the T. V. A. but all other dams and sources of power that can be made available, and they should be made available as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago I went to the national-defense officials and talked with them, and I have talked with the members of the O. P. M., about the urgent need for aluminum in this country and the power to develop it. Since we have gone into the 50,000-plane program it has been shown that we will have to enormously increase the production of aluminum. It so happens that in my State of Arkansas, within 25 miles of my home town in Pulaski County, and in Saline County adjoining thereto, is 95 percent of all the bauxite in the United States. About 60 percent of that 95 percent of all the domestic production is owned by the Aluminum Co. of America, and about 40 percent is under independent ownership. I have for many months tried to get the defense officials and others in authority to place in Arkansas a plant for the production of aluminum and to provide the power therefor. I am glad to see that the necessity for a power plant in Arkansas, at the source of the production of the raw material, is now being seriously considered, and that Arkansas now has a real chance of obtaining these much-needed facilities.

On page 47 of the hearings there is the following colloquy:

Mr. LUDLOW. I was going to ask if you can tell us something about your steam-investigation program—that is, what are you doing along that line? Can you give us any details about it?

Mr. BATT. No; I cannot, Mr. Congressman, because we have not got them. We have looked to the Government steam projects that are now under way as the quickest method of getting quick power, and I can only refer you to what is now under way.

Mr. LUDLOW. Have you any tentatively projected program relating to new steam projects?

Mr. BATT. Not so far.

Mr. LUDLOW. And if so, where would they be?

Mr. BATT. Well, certainly one ought to be in Arkansas, because that is where bauxite is.

Mr. O'NEAL. You are going to go into that?

Mr. BATT. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to having in Arkansas many of the critical and strategic minerals, including among others manganese, cinnabar, and bauxite—all waiting for adequate and cheap local electric power for their development—we have in western Arkansas some of the finest coal in the country for use in steam power plants; in southern Arkansas we have unlimited quantities of sour gas that can be utilized for that purpose; in the White River country of northern Arkansas and in the Ouachita River Valley we have magnificent sites for hydroelectric power production.

We want to take our rightful place in the defense program, and I hope that the opportunity will soon be given us to do so.

I am glad to know that those in authority have at last come to a realization of the fact that we should have a plant in Arkansas, where 95 percent of all the bauxite in the United States is located, and not take the raw product into other parts of the country for refining at greatly increased cost.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Answering the criticism of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], may I remind the gentleman of the fact that Mr. Gano Dunn, who is generally considered to be the best electrical expert in the world, testified on the application for a rule on the bill that aluminum could be manufactured by the Tennessee Valley Authority more cheaply than would be possible by the setting up of a steam plant for its manufacture, particularly because of the development that has already been made there. As a general proposition, however, as an original proposition, he testified, I believe, that it could be made more cheaply by the use of coal.

Mr. TERRY. I do not believe Mr. Gano Dunn at first realized the urgency of the need in this country, but those men in the O. P. M. and the Defense Council have come to the correct conclusion that we must have all the production of power and aluminum possible to be had in this country.

Mr. COX. That was the attitude of Mr. Dunn.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I had wished to address my remarks to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], but as he is not here at the moment I shall address my remarks to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

When the T. V. A. authorities came before the committee and asked for the construction of these dams for additional power, did the committee find out whether private corporations in that locality or in any other locality in this country would be able to furnish additional power for the purpose of manufacturing aluminum?

Mr. O'NEAL. The testimony before our committee was that a very thorough and searching effort was made to locate any private power, or power from any source, and they were not able to find it.

Mr. RICH. I understand that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has loaned some $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 for the building of additional plants for the manufacture of aluminum. Some of these plants are to be located in this vicinity. Is it expected that the Federal Government, besides making the loans for these plants for the manufacture of aluminum, will now go to the additional expense of building these dams to furnish the power for these particular companies? Is that in the picture?

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman understand that this is for plants already in existence? This does not increase the production of new plants or have anything to do with that type of work. It is entirely to give more power to plants now in existence.

Mr. RICH. Then the new plants for the construction of which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is loaning money will have to have power over and above this particular power?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct. This has nothing to do with additional construction.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There must be some misunderstanding, because the bill states that this is for beginning construction of two additional hydroelectric projects.

Mr. RICH. As I understood the gentleman from Kentucky, these hydroelectric projects are to serve plants already constructed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing, to say the least, to hear Members who were in the House 8 years ago say that they now have found the T. V. A. to be necessary. I knew it at the time. I led the fight here for the

creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has proved itself to be the greatest investment this Government has ever made.

The American people are realizing what electricity is for. They are beginning to use it for the purposes for which it was intended.

In 1932, the year before the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, the American people used only 62,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. Last year, 1940, they used 118,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. I predict that within less than 10 years from today they will use at least 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, especially if it is supplied them at rates they can afford to pay, rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution—the T. V. A. rates.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] continues to point out the fact that electricity can be produced with coal almost as cheaply as with water power. If that is the case, why in the world do they not bring down the rates the people in those States have to pay and stop overcharging them $1,000,000,000 a year for the electricity they now use?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want the gentleman to quote me correctly. I did not say they could make it nearly as cheap, I said they can make it more cheaply.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am glad to hear the gentleman's correction. I believe he is wrong, but he is not as far wrong as many Members of the House think he is. Electricity can be produced anywhere in the United States and distributed at the T. V. A. yardstick rates without loss on legitimate investments. If that were done, it would save the American people $1,000,000,000 a year on their present consumption, which would grow by leaps and bounds.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell me why the T. V. A. has to buy from Cincinnati now power produced by coal?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Ohio should know that we have had a drought in the Tennessee Valley. That has caused a shortage of water. At the same time, those dams are there, and when the rains come the water will be transformed into hydroelectric power to be sent pulsing over that country. If the gentleman from Ohio will join me, we will put it all over Ohio at the T. V. A. yardstick rates. That would save the people of Ohio more than $57,000,000 a year on their present load. That load would increase with the reduction of rates, and the savings would increase in proportion. Then we could electrify every farm home in Ohio at the T. V. A. rates.

The following tables will show the amount of electricity used by all three classes of consumers—residential, commercial, and industrial—in every State in the Union last year, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates.

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	221,000	227,814,000	$6,390,065	$4,249,394	$2,140,672	$3,840,430	$2,549,636	$4,389,975	$2,000,091	$3,290,884	$3,099,182
Arizona	82,000	45,800,000	2,050,733	844,902	1,205,831	762,873	1,287,860	873,612	1,177,121	654,184	1,396,549
Arkansas	139,200	78,497,000	3,836,221	1,776,170	2,060,051	1,603,540	2,232,681	1,833,714	2,002,507	1,373,367	2,462,854
California	1,805,000	1,425,978,000	45,428,363	29,346,722	16,081,641	26,484,736	18,943,627	30,300,718	15,127,645	22,714,182	22,714,181
Colorado	203,500	144,308,000	6,750,808	3,341,650	3,409,158	3,017,611	3,733,197	3,449,663	3,301,145	2,585,559	4,165,249
Connecticut	446,300	458,275,000	18,167,204	9,446,946	8,720,258	8,538,586	9,628,618	9,755,789	8,411,415	7,321,383	10,845,821
Delaware	51,100	44,162,000	1,979,093	940,069	1,039,024	849,031	1,130,062	971,735	1,007,358	728,306	1,250,787
District of Columbia	61,362	171,355,000	4,405,613	3,594,980	810,633	2,436,237	1,969,376	3,709,526	696,087	2,784,347	1,621,266
Florida	310,000	297,369,000	13,285,191	5,752,488	7,532,703	5,194,510	8,090,681	5,938,480	7,346,711	4,450,539	8,834,652
Georgia	300,000	347,378,000	9,805,216	5,912,606	3,892,610	5,343,843	4,461,373	6,108,650	3,696,566	4,579,036	5,226,180
Idaho	101,000	114,032,000	2,964,697	1,636,513	1,328,184	1,476,419	1,488,278	1,686,913	1,277,784	1,265,926	1,698,771
Illinois	1,790,000	1,557,509,000	61,954,827	35,066,432	26,888,395	31,658,917	30,295,910	36,181,619	25,773,208	27,136,214	34,818,613
Indiana	708,000	530,287,000	21,380,365	11,716,440	9,663,925	10,583,281	10,797,084	12,079,906	9,300,459	9,065,275	12,315,090
Iowa	454,000	315,410,000	13,486,531	6,905,104	6,581,427	6,230,777	7,255,754	7,120,888	6,365,643	5,340,666	8,145,865
Kansas	316,000	244,694,000	10,053,312	5,127,189	4,926,123	4,634,577	5,418,735	5,288,042	4,765,270	3,971,058	6,082,254
Kentucky	304,000	203,213,000	7,596,987	4,223,925	3,373,062	3,813,687	3,783,300	4,353,074	3,243,913	3,266,704	4,330,283
Louisiana	263,000	151,983,000	7,757,478	3,723,589	4,033,889	3,358,988	4,398,490	3,839,952	3,917,526	2,885,782	4,871,696
Maine	185,700	117,692,000	5,328,096	2,445,596	2,882,500	2,205,832	3,122,264	2,520,189	2,807,907	1,891,474	3,436,622
Maryland	426,638	294,616,000	11,357,797	6,564,807	4,792,990	5,928,770	5,429,027	6,780,605	4,577,192	5,088,293	6,269,504
Massachusetts	1,132,500	822,891,000	38,774,188	18,340,191	20,433,997	16,556,578	22,217,610	18,921,804	19,852,384	14,191,353	24,582,835
Michigan	1,257,000	1,310,810,000	40,625,040	25,390,650	15,234,390	22,953,148	17,671,892	26,203,151	14,421,889	19,662,519	20,962,521
Minnesota	484,200	476,983,000	15,926,569	9,078,714	6,847,855	8,201,183	7,725,386	9,364,823	6,561,746	6,784,718	9,141,851
Mississippi	123,000	77,516,000	3,228,500	1,775,675	1,452,825	1,601,336	1,627,164	1,830,560	1,397,940	1,375,341	1,853,159
Missouri	650,000	619,761,000	21,499,199	12,254,543	9,244,656	11,072,087	10,427,112	12,641,529	8,857,670	9,481,147	12,018,052
Montana	103,000	98,778,000	3,495,897	1,719,981	1,775,916	1,552,178	1,943,719	1,775,916	1,719,981	1,331,937	2,163,960
Nebraska	234,000	173,030,000	6,974,288	3,640,578	3,333,710	3,284,890	3,689,398	3,759,141	3,215,147	2,817,612	4,156,676
Nevada	22,000	19,670,000	730,739	300,334	430,405	271,104	459,635	309,833	420,906	232,375	498,364
New Hampshire	127,000	83,710,000	4,069,058	1,761,902	2,307,156	1,591,002	2,478,056	1,818,869	2,250,189	1,363,134	2,705,924
New Jersey	1,087,000	849,627,000	41,347,506	19,474,675	21,872,831	17,614,038	23,733,468	20,094,888	21,252,618	15,091,840	26,255,666
New Mexico	39,300	28,302,000	1,488,556	593,934	894,622	537,369	951,187	613,285	875,271	459,964	1,028,592
New York	3,410,000	2,658,571,000	119,669,009	60,073,843	59,595,166	54,210,061	65,458,948	61,988,547	57,680,462	46,431,575	73,237,434
North Carolina	350,000	250,345,000	8,447,784	4,832,132	3,615,652	4,367,504	4,080,280	4,984,193	3,463,591	3,742,368	4,705,416
North Dakota	66,400	59,982,000	2,410,209	1,135,208	1,275,001	1,026,877	1,383,332	1,171,362	1,238,847	879,726	1,530,483
Ohio	1,580,000	1,475,545,000	50,502,010	30,806,226	19,695,784	27,826,608	22,675,402	31,816,266	18,685,744	23,836,949	26,665,061
Oklahoma	270,000	189,386,000	9,043,375	3,997,172	5,046,203	3,608,307	5,435,068	4,123,779	4,919,596	3,092,834	5,950,541
Oregon	258,000	298,919,000	7,359,749	4,894,233	2,465,516	4,423,209	2,936,540	5,056,148	2,303,601	3,790,271	3,569,478
Pennsylvania	2,100,000	1,901,028,000	53,497,736	27,658,330	25,839,406	24,983,443	28,514,293	28,514,293	24,983,443	21,399,094	32,098,642
Rhode Island	182,000	121,330,000	6,591,958	2,972,973	3,618,985	2,682,927	3,909,031	3,065,260	3,526,698	2,287,409	4,304,549
South Carolina	145,500	120,265,000	3,852,115	2,315,121	1,536,994	2,091,698	1,760,417	2,388,311	1,463,804	1,791,233	2,060,882
South Dakota	77,000	63,302,000	2,663,067	1,182,402	1,480,665	1,067,890	1,595,177	1,219,685	1,443,382	916,095	1,746,972
Tennessee	317,000	308,392,000	8,768,974	7,041,486	1,727,488	6,357,506	2,411,468	7,269,479	1,499,495	5,454,302	3,314,672
Texas	800,000	616,165,000	26,512,557	13,203,253	13,309,304	11,930,651	14,581,906	13,627,454	12,885,103	10,233,847	16,278,710
Utah	117,000	114,386,000	3,884,039	2,182,830	1,701,209	1,969,208	1,914,831	2,252,743	1,631,296	1,689,557	2,194,482
Vermont	75,200	56,951,000	2,590,316	1,152,691	1,437,625	1,041,307	1,549,009	1,191,545	1,398,771	893,659	1,696,657
Virginia	354,000	323,241,000	11,873,737	6,281,207	5,592,530	5,675,646	6,198,091	6,483,060	5,390,677	4,868,232	7,005,505
Washington	441,000	638,542,000	14,343,148	9,710,311	4,632,837	8,763,663	5,579,485	10,025,860	4,317,288	7,515,810	6,827,338
West Virginia	234,000	191,811,000	7,544,510	4,058,946	3,485,564	3,666,632	3,877,878	4,194,748	3,349,762	3,146,061	4,398,449
Wisconsin	608,000	589,867,000	18,976,497	10,512,979	8,463,518	9,488,249	9,488,248	10,835,580	8,140,917	8,140,917	10,835,580
Wyoming	39,600	24,948,000	1,323,573	562,519	761,054	508,252	815,321	579,725	743,848	435,456	888,117
United States	24,850,500	21,334,126,000	791,992,501	431,520,561	360,471,940	388,887,196	403,105,305	445,304,887	346,687,614	333,730,514	458,261,987

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	36,848	214,014,000	$5,816,019	$3,268,603	$2,547,416	$2,669,553	$3,146,466	$3,530,324	$2,285,695	$3,222,075	$2,593,944
Arizona	15,397	71,198,000	2,227,377	946,635	1,280,742	772,900	1,454,477	1,022,366	1,205,011	933,271	1,294,106
Arkansas	32,317	100,352,000	4,078,471	1,692,565	2,385,906	1,382,602	2,695,869	1,823,077	2,255,394	1,664,016	2,414,455
California	364,908	2,368,783,000	52,976,582	33,057,387	19,919,195	26,912,104	26,064,478	35,547,287	17,429,295	32,747,645	20,228,937
Colorado	43,240	160,571,000	6,407,527	3,024,353	3,383,174	2,460,490	3,947,037	3,255,024	3,152,503	2,966,685	3,440,842
Connecticut	65,142	312,432,000	12,120,062	5,017,706	7,102,356	4,096,381	8,023,681	5,417,668	6,702,394	4,944,985	7,175,077
Delaware	3,182	49,341,000	1,332,750	606,401	726,349	494,450	838,300	654,380	678,370	597,072	735,678
District of Columbia	21,398	207,663,000	4,700,414	3,468,906	1,231,508	2,834,350	1,866,064	3,746,230	954,184	3,421,901	1,278,513
Florida	64,719	266,177,000	11,539,872	4,200,513	7,339,359	3,415,802	8,124,070	4,512,090	7,027,782	4,131,274	7,408,598
Georgia	55,620	363,499,000	10,406,169	5,005,367	5,400,802	4,079,218	6,326,951	5,400,802	5,005,367	4,922,118	5,484,051
Idaho	16,600	125,616,000	2,308,909	1,115,203	1,193,706	905,092	1,403,817	1,196,015	1,112,894	1,094,423	1,214,486
Illinois	251,262	1,605,268,000	53,180,700	25,101,290	28,079,410	20,527,750	32,652,950	27,122,157	26,058,543	24,782,206	28,398,494
Indiana	106,784	694,902,000	19,249,450	9,720,972	9,528,478	7,930,773	11,318,677	10,510,200	8,739,250	9,586,226	9,663,224
Iowa	89,215	335,136,000	11,884,166	5,953,967	5,930,199	4,848,740	7,035,426	6,417,450	5,466,716	5,858,894	6,025,272
Kansas	59,126	253,548,000	8,523,536	4,057,203	4,466,333	3,307,132	5,216,404	4,372,574	4,150,962	3,989,015	4,534,521
Kentucky	50,845	221,454,000	7,076,843	3,545,498	3,531,345	2,894,429	4,182,414	3,821,495	3,255,348	3,495,960	3,580,883
Louisiana	46,192	177,335,000	6,170,879	2,443,668	3,727,211	1,987,023	4,183,856	2,628,794	3,542,085	2,394,301	3,776,578
Maine	32,900	139,087,000	4,432,268	2,034,411	2,397,857	1,653,236	2,779,032	2,185,108	2,247,160	1,994,521	2,437,747
Maryland	52,389	328,085,000	9,974,017	5,465,761	4,508,256	4,458,386	5,515,631	5,904,618	4,069,399	5,385,969	4,588,048
Massachusetts	179,446	1,128,008,000	36,210,228	13,868,517	22,341,711	11,297,591	24,912,637	14,918,614	21,291,614	13,651,256	22,558,972
Michigan	168,222	1,190,971,000	34,270,673	16,861,171	17,409,502	13,776,811	20,493,862	18,197,727	16,072,946	16,621,276	17,649,397
Minnesota	93,633	406,661,000	14,155,892	6,539,930	7,615,762	5,322,540	8,833,152	7,049,535	7,106,157	6,426,684	7,729,008
Mississippi	28,035	91,112,000	3,505,499	1,479,321	2,026,178	1,205,892	2,299,607	1,591,497	1,914,002	1,454,782	2,050,717
Missouri	118,346	645,446,000	19,635,818	10,073,175	9,562,643	8,227,408	11,408,410	10,897,579	8,737,939	9,935,724	9,700,094
Montana	16,563	92,384,000	3,431,938	1,650,762	1,781,176	1,341,888	2,090,050	1,770,880	1,661,058	1,616,443	1,815,495
Nebraska	42,347	171,974,000	6,330,599	3,304,573	3,026,026	2,703,166	3,627,433	3,570,458	2,760,141	3,260,258	3,070,341
Nevada	4,418	32,150,000	932,092	427,830	504,262	349,535	582,557	462,318	469,774	421,306	510,786
New Hampshire	18,725	82,311,000	3,030,602	1,353,684	1,736,918	1,103,345	1,987,257	1,458,764	1,631,838	1,332,049	1,758,553
New Jersey	188,799	869,045,000	36,604,418	13,690,052	22,914,366	11,164,347	25,440,071	14,751,580	21,852,838	13,470,426	23,133,992
New Mexico	9,400	43,545,000	1,892,100	720,890	1,171,210	588,443	1,303,657	775,761	1,116,339	709,538	1,182,562
New York	602,634	4,420,435,000	148,630,896	58,709,204	89,921,692	48,007,779	100,623,117	63,316,762	85,314,134	57,817,419	90,813,477
North Carolina	64,404	310,371,000	8,422,363	4,472,275	3,950,088	3,638,461	4,783,902	4,809,169	3,613,194	4,396,473	4,025,890
North Dakota	21,766	61,924,000	2,613,833	1,076,899	1,536,934	878,248	1,735,585	1,160,542	1,453,291	1,061,216	1,552,617
Ohio	14,038	1,193,872,000	35,696,346	19,133,241	16,563,105	15,635,000	20,061,346	20,703,881	14,992,465	18,883,367	16,812,979
Oklahoma	699	345,134,000	10,268,446	4,374,358	5,894,088	3,573,419	6,695,027	4,713,217	5,555,229	4,302,479	5,965,967
Oregon	43,428	312,764,000	7,394,129	3,844,947	3,549,182	3,127,717	4,266,412	4,125,924	3,268,205	3,771,006	3,623,123
Pennsylvania	310,670	1,356,277,000	29,011,435	13,954,500	15,056,935	11,401,494	17,609,941	15,085,946	13,925,489	13,780,432	15,231,003
Rhode Island	26,649	88,886,000	3,961,762	1,505,470	2,456,292	1,224,184	2,737,578	1,616,399	2,345,363	1,473,775	2,487,987
South Carolina	28,975	125,577,000	3,830,587	2,011,058	1,819,529	1,639,491	2,191,096	2,164,282	1,666,305	1,976,583	1,854,004
South Dakota	21,902	69,552,000	2,908,884	1,207,187	1,701,697	980,294	1,928,590	1,297,362	1,611,522	1,183,916	1,724,968
Tennessee	48,974	258,826,000	8,138,254	6,014,170	2,124,084	4,907,367	3,230,887	6,478,050	1,660,204	5,916,511	2,221,743
Texas	157,309	924,944,000	26,865,543	12,626,805	14,238,738	10,316,369	16,549,174	13,620,830	13,244,713	12,438,746	14,426,797
Utah	12,530	82,651,000	2,729,307	1,241,835	1,487,472	1,012,573	1,716,734	1,337,360	1,391,947	1,220,000	1,509,307
Vermont	13,931	35,871,000	1,409,134	591,836	817,298	480,515	928,619	635,519	773,615	579,154	829,980
Virginia	57,669	295,749,000	8,949,477	4,134,658	4,814,819	3,373,953	5,575,524	4,456,840	4,492,637	4,072,012	4,877,465
Washington	67,398	582,623,000	11,230,774	6,839,541	4,391,233	5,581,695	5,649,079	7,378,619	3,852,155	6,738,464	4,492,310
West Virginia	34,404	216,990,000	6,541,870	3,277,477	3,264,393	2,675,625	3,866,245	3,532,610	3,009,260	3,225,142	3,316,728
Wisconsin	105,468	450,458,000	15,057,460	7,829,879	7,227,581	6,399,421	8,658,039	8,447,235	6,610,225	7,709,420	7,348,040
Wyoming	7,332	31,484,000	1,454,969	600,902	854,067	488,870	966,099	647,461	807,508	590,717	864,252
United States	4,175,198	23,912,456,000	729,581,139	343,142,556	386,438,583	280,054,052	449,527,087	370,040,680	359,540,459	338,109,131	391,412,008

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	34,484	1,262,016,000	$11,368,562	$8,310,419	$3,058,143	$5,195,433	$6,173,129	$8,117,153	$3,251,409	$7,639,674	$3,728,888
Arizona	2,896	409,530,000	4,469,976	2,212,638	2,257,338	1,385,693	3,084,283	2,103,468	2,306,508	2,033,839	2,436,137
Arkansas	10,641	414,228,000	5,139,118	3,078,332	2,060,786	1,922,030	3,217,088	3,001,245	2,137,873	2,826,515	2,312,603
California	106,012	6,440,382,000	69,009,610	64,316,957	4,692,653	40,232,603	28,777,007	62,798,745	6,210,865	59,141,236	9,868,374
Colorado	11,864	420,990,000	6,455,668	3,912,135	2,543,533	2,446,698	4,008,970	3,821,755	2,633,913	3,595,807	2,859,861
Connecticut	4,769	824,448,000	12,666,979	8,005,531	4,661,448	5,003,457	7,663,522	7,815,526	4,851,453	7,359,515	5,307,464
Delaware	843	143,219,000	1,588,990	1,053,500	535,490	657,842	931,148	1,028,077	560,913	967,695	621,295
District of Columbia	1,086	507,470,000	5,163,016	3,541,829	1,621,187	2,214,934	2,948,082	3,459,221	1,703,795	3,252,700	1,910,316
Florida	9,377	453,890,000	6,519,119	3,644,188	2,874,931	2,275,173	4,243,946	3,559,439	2,959,680	3,350,827	3,168,292
Georgia	4,274	1,187,228,000	10,845,077	7,678,315	3,166,762	4,804,369	6,040,708	7,493,948	3,351,129	7,060,145	3,784,932
Idaho	6,506	494,465,000	4,028,471	2,981,069	1,047,402	1,865,182	2,163,289	2,912,585	1,115,886	2,739,360	1,289,111
Illinois	60,508	5,517,468,000	62,269,560	35,742,727	26,526,833	22,354,772	39,914,788	34,933,223	27,336,337	32,878,328	29,391,232
Indiana	69,366	1,868,810,000	23,877,921	15,066,968	8,810,953	9,407,901	14,470,020	14,708,799	9,169,122	13,849,194	10,028,727
Iowa	40,635	861,080,000	10,661,633	6,844,768	3,816,865	4,275,315	6,386,318	6,684,844	3,976,789	6,290,363	4,371,270
Kansas	22,745	689,228,000	8,630,216	5,626,901	3,003,315	3,512,498	5,117,718	5,497,448	3,132,768	5,169,499	3,460,717
Kentucky	19,165	744,430,000	10,122,422	6,609,942	3,512,480	4,129,948	5,992,474	6,447,983	3,674,439	6,073,453	4,048,969
Louisiana	4,539	852,423,000	8,842,906	5,827,475	3,015,431	3,643,277	5,199,629	5,685,989	3,156,917	5,349,958	3,492,948
Maine	5,406	774,597,000	5,668,988	3,690,511	1,978,477	2,307,278	3,361,710	3,599,807	2,069,181	3,390,055	2,278,933
Maryland	26,074	1,335,045,000	13,858,228	8,411,944	5,446,284	5,252,268	8,605,960	8,217,929	5,640,299	7,732,891	6,125,337
Massachusetts	14,460	1,443,618,000	22,214,471	13,217,610	8,996,861	8,263,783	13,950,688	12,906,608	9,307,863	12,151,316	10,063,155
Michigan	24,277	2,889,573,000	33,560,501	18,491,836	15,068,665	11,578,373	21,982,128	18,055,550	15,504,951	17,015,174	16,545,327
Minnesota	20,979	949,322,000	13,198,382	8,248,989	4,949,393	4,160,567	8,037,815	8,051,013	5,147,369	7,575,871	5,622,511
Mississippi	11,930	289,498,000	4,241,638	2,566,191	1,675,447	1,603,339	2,638,299	2,502,566	1,739,072	2,358,351	1,883,287
Missouri	33,486	1,792,092,000	18,691,625	13,102,829	5,588,796	8,186,932	10,504,693	12,803,763	5,887,862	12,056,098	6,635,527
Montana	2,457	1,438,488,000	6,646,792	5,576,658	1,070,134	3,482,919	3,163,873	5,443,728	1,203,069	5,124,677	1,522,115
Nebraska	13,850	406,747,000	5,369,183	3,672,521	1,696,662	2,298,010	3,071,173	3,586,614	1,782,569	3,377,216	1,991,967
Nevada	327	73,397,000	955,274	782,369	172,905	489,100	466,174	763,264	192,010	718,366	236,908
New Hampshire	3,177	187,516,000	3,226,775	2,187,753	1,039,022	1,368,153	1,858,622	2,136,125	1,090,650	2,010,281	1,216,494
New Jersey	14,405	1,879,464,000	25,552,896	15,025,103	10,527,793	9,403,466	16,149,430	14,692,915	10,859,981	13,824,117	11,728,779
New Mexico	799	34,214,000	729,541	361,852	367,689	226,158	503,383	353,098	376,433	332,671	396,870
New York	53,268	8,534,487,000	80,572,364	46,893,116	33,679,248	29,328,340	51,244,024	45,765,103	34,807,261	43,106,215	37,466,149
North Carolina	26,087	1,873,814,000	19,085,211	14,103,971	4,981,240	8,817,367	10,267,844	13,779,522	5,305,689	12,958,858	6,126,353
North Dakota	2,403	40,938,000	890,560	487,136	403,424	304,572	585,988	475,559	415,001	447,061	443,499
Ohio	96,073	4,875,052,000	57,782,691	36,865,357	20,917,334	23,055,294	34,727,397	35,998,616	21,784,075	33,860,657	23,922,034
Oklahoma	19,043	629,574,000	7,151,141	4,748,358	2,042,783	2,967,724	4,183,417	4,633,939	2,517,202	4,362,196	2,788,945

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1940*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Oregon	12,908	668,941,000	$7,377,026	$6,218,833	$1,158,193	$3,887,693	$3,489,333	$6,071,292	$1,305,734	$5,717,195	$1,659,831
Pennsylvania	60,421	8,929,770,000	133,601,406	93,253,781	40,347,625	58,250,213	75,351,193	91,116,159	42,485,247	85,772,103	47,829,303
Rhode Island	2,226	452,750,000	6,548,681	4,125,669	2,423,012	2,580,180	3,968,501	4,027,439	2,521,242	3,791,686	2,756,995
South Carolina	8,503	1,065,800,000	9,899,033	7,345,082	2,553,951	4,593,151	5,305,882	7,166,900	2,732,133	6,751,141	3,147,892
South Dakota	3,678	60,953,000	1,420,815	733,141	687,674	458,923	961,892	716,091	704,724	673,466	747,349
Tennessee	10,797	1,053,436,000	11,387,174	10,180,134	1,207,040	6,365,430	5,021,744	9,941,003	1,446,171	5,397,520	5,989,654
Texas	40,414	2,062,810,000	22,996,134	14,970,483	8,025,651	9,359,427	13,636,707	14,602,545	8,393,589	13,751,688	9,244,446
Utah	2,308	660,698,000	6,154,560	4,336,965	1,817,595	2,708,006	3,446,554	4,234,337	1,920,223	3,988,155	2,166,405
Vermont	3,338	147,439,000	3,046,611	2,205,746	840,865	1,377,068	1,669,543	2,153,954	892,657	2,025,996	1,020,615
Virginia	14,919	871,832,000	9,781,430	6,964,378	2,817,052	4,352,736	5,428,694	6,807,875	2,973,555	6,406,837	3,374,593
Washington	26,726	1,700,764,000	11,951,292	9,561,034	2,390,258	5,975,646	5,975,646	9,333,959	2,617,333	8,784,200	3,167,092
West Virginia	24,482	1,406,680,000	14,219,679	9,456,087	4,763,592	5,915,386	8,304,293	9,228,572	4,991,107	8,688,224	5,531,455
Wisconsin	75,916	1,616,757,000	20,380,000	12,472,560	7,907,440	7,785,160	12,594,840	12,166,860	8,213,140	11,453,560	8,926,440
Wyoming	944	77,039,000	1,256,407	772,690	483,717	483,717	772,690	755,101	501,306	709,870	546,537
United States	1,065,790	73,314,410,000	841,075,753	565,484,381	275,591,372	353,513,504	487,562,249	552,217,249	288,858,504	515,891,820	325,183,933

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1940*

State	Estimated sales data for 1940			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	292,332	1,703,844,000	$23,574,647	$15,828,416	$7,746,231	$11,705,416	$8,754,245	$16,037,452	$7,537,195	$14,152,633	$9,422,014
Arizona	100,293	526,528,000	8,748,086	4,004,175	4,743,911	2,921,466	4,999,675	4,059,446	4,688,640	3,621,294	5,126,792
Arkansas	182,158	593,077,000	13,053,810	6,547,067	6,506,743	4,908,172	6,989,336	6,658,036	6,395,774	5,863,898	7,189,912
California	2,275,920	10,235,143,000	167,414,555	126,721,066	40,693,489	93,629,443	49,700,758	128,646,750	38,767,805	114,603,063	52,811,492
Colorado	258,604	725,869,000	19,614,003	10,278,138	9,335,865	7,924,799	10,223,767	10,526,442	9,087,561	9,148,051	10,465,952
Connecticut	516,211	1,595,155,000	42,954,245	22,470,183	20,484,062	17,638,624	22,313,547	22,988,983	19,965,262	19,625,883	23,328,362
Delaware	55,125	236,722,000	4,900,833	2,599,970	2,300,863	2,001,323	2,503,852	2,654,192	2,246,641	2,293,073	2,607,760
District of Columbia	83,846	886,488,000	14,269,043	10,605,715	3,663,328	7,485,521	5,456,627	10,914,977	3,354,066	9,458,948	4,810,095
Florida	384,096	1,017,436,000	31,344,182	13,597,189	17,746,993	10,885,485	19,089,682	14,010,009	17,334,173	11,932,640	19,411,542
Georgia	359,894	1,898,105,000	31,056,462	18,596,288	12,460,174	14,227,430	13,955,086	19,003,400	12,053,062	16,561,299	14,495,163
Idaho	124,106	734,113,000	9,302,077	5,732,785	3,569,292	4,246,693	3,939,497	5,795,513	3,506,564	5,099,709	4,202,368
Illinois	2,101,770	8,680,245,000	177,405,087	95,910,449	81,494,638	74,541,439	89,475,693	98,236,999	79,168,088	84,796,748	92,608,339
Indiana	884,150	3,093,999,000	64,507,736	36,504,380	28,003,356	27,921,955	30,926,714	37,298,905	27,208,831	32,500,695	32,007,041
Iowa	583,850	1,511,626,000	36,032,330	19,703,839	16,328,491	15,354,832	18,108,045	20,223,182	15,809,148	17,489,923	18,542,407
Kansas	397,871	1,187,470,000	27,207,064	14,811,293	12,395,771	11,454,207	13,638,454	15,158,064	12,049,000	13,129,572	14,077,492
Kentucky	374,010	1,169,097,000	24,796,252	14,379,365	10,416,887	10,838,064	11,478,194	14,622,552	10,173,700	12,836,117	11,960,135
Louisiana	313,731	1,181,741,000	22,771,263	11,994,732	10,776,531	8,989,288	11,597,777	12,154,735	10,616,528	10,630,041	12,141,222
Maine	224,006	1,031,376,000	15,429,352	8,170,518	7,258,834	6,166,346	7,879,773	8,305,104	7,124,248	7,276,050	8,153,302
Maryland	504,101	1,957,746,000	35,190,042	20,442,512	14,747,530	15,639,424	16,390,942	20,903,152	14,286,890	18,207,153	16,982,889
Massachusetts	1,326,406	3,394,517,000	97,198,887	45,426,318	51,772,569	36,117,952	56,127,108	46,747,026	50,451,861	39,993,925	57,204,962
Michigan	1,449,499	5,391,354,000	108,456,214	60,743,657	47,712,557	48,308,332	53,234,419	62,456,428	45,999,786	53,298,969	55,157,245
Minnesota	598,812	1,832,966,000	43,280,643	23,867,633	19,413,010	18,684,290	21,507,931	24,465,371	18,815,272	20,787,273	22,493,370
Mississippi	162,965	458,126,000	10,975,637	5,821,187	5,154,450	4,410,567	5,602,218	5,924,623	5,051,014	5,188,474	5,787,163
Missouri	801,832	3,057,299,000	59,826,642	35,430,547	24,396,095	27,486,427	27,424,318	36,343,171	23,483,471	31,472,969	28,353,673
Montana	122,020	1,629,650,000	13,574,627	8,947,401	4,627,226	6,376,985	5,103,903	8,990,519	4,584,108	8,073,057	5,501,570
Nebraska	290,197	751,751,000	18,674,070	10,617,672	8,056,398	8,286,066	9,013,493	10,916,213	7,757,857	9,455,086	9,218,984
Nevada	26,745	125,217,000	2,618,105	1,510,533	1,107,572	1,109,739	1,215,097	1,535,415	1,082,690	1,372,047	1,246,058
New Hampshire	148,902	353,537,000	10,386,435	5,303,339	5,083,096	4,062,500	5,504,335	5,413,758	4,972,677	4,705,464	5,680,971
New Jersey	1,290,204	3,598,136,000	103,504,820	48,189,830	55,314,990	38,181,851	59,701,332	49,539,383	53,965,437	42,386,383	61,118,437
New Mexico	49,499	106,061,000	4,110,197	1,676,676	2,433,521	1,351,970	2,622,533	1,742,144	2,368,053	1,502,173	2,608,024
New York	4,065,902	15,613,493,000	348,872,269	165,676,163	183,196,106	131,546,180	199,761,313	171,070,412	177,801,857	147,355,209	201,517,060
North Carolina	440,491	2,434,530,000	35,955,358	23,408,378	12,546,980	16,823,332	13,845,422	23,572,884	12,382,474	21,097,699	14,857,659
North Dakota	90,569	162,844,000	5,914,602	2,699,243	3,215,359	2,209,697	3,522,341	2,807,463	3,107,139	2,388,003	3,526,599
Ohio	1,890,110	7,544,469,000	143,981,047	86,804,824	57,176,223	66,516,902	63,654,082	88,518,763	55,462,284	76,580,973	67,400,074
Oklahoma	348,742	1,164,094,000	26,462,962	13,119,888	13,343,074	10,149,450	14,532,878	13,470,935	12,992,027	11,757,509	14,705,453
Oregon	314,336	1,280,624,000	22,130,904	14,958,013	7,172,891	11,438,619	8,361,145	15,253,364	6,877,540	13,278,472	8,852,432
Pennsylvania	2,471,091	12,187,075,000	216,110,577	134,866,611	81,243,966	94,635,130	86,471,859	134,716,398	81,394,179	120,951,629	95,158,948
Rhode Island	210,875	662,986,000	17,102,401	8,604,112	8,498,289	6,487,291	9,069,621	8,709,098	8,393,303	7,552,870	9,549,531
South Carolina	182,978	1,311,642,000	17,581,735	11,671,261	5,910,474	8,324,340	6,505,464	11,719,493	5,862,242	10,518,957	7,062,778
South Dakota	102,580	193,507,000	6,992,766	3,122,730	3,870,036	2,507,107	4,211,441	3,233,138	3,759,628	2,773,477	4,219,289
Tennessee	376,771	1,620,654,000	28,294,402	23,235,790	5,058,612	17,630,303	6,849,395	23,688,532	4,605,870	16,768,333	11,526,069
Texas	997,723	3,603,919,000	76,374,234	40,800,541	35,573,693	31,606,447	39,156,731	41,850,829	34,523,405	36,424,281	39,949,953
Utah	131,838	857,735,000	12,767,906	7,761,630	5,006,276	5,689,787	5,449,160	7,824,440	4,943,466	6,897,712	5,870,194
Vermont	92,469	240,261,000	7,046,061	3,950,273	3,095,788	2,898,890	3,318,493	3,981,018	3,065,043	3,498,809	3,547,252
Virginia	426,588	1,490,822,000	30,604,644	17,380,243	13,224,401	13,402,335	14,590,667	17,747,775	12,856,869	15,347,081	15,257,563
Washington	535,124	2,921,929,000	37,525,214	26,110,886	11,414,328	20,321,004	13,618,822	26,738,438	10,786,776	23,038,474	14,486,740
West Virginia	202,886	1,815,481,000	28,306,059	16,792,510	11,513,549	12,257,643	12,507,715	16,955,930	11,350,129	15,059,427	13,246,632
Wisconsin	789,384	2,657,082,000	54,413,957	30,815,418	23,598,539	23,672,830	26,053,727	31,449,675	22,964,282	27,303,897	27,110,060
Wyoming	47,876	133,471,000	4,034,949	1,936,111	2,098,838	1,480,839	2,265,137	1,982,287	2,052,662	1,736,043	2,298,906
United States	30,091,488	118,569,992,000	2,362,649,393	1,340,147,498	1,022,501,895	1,022,454,752	1,128,223,764	1,367,562,816	995,086,577	1,187,791,465	1,174,857,928

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some tables I have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is only fair that the Members of the House know about some of the pending legislation concerning a situation which the construction of buildings on the other side of the Potomac may tend to aggravate. Before our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds we have a bill, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], which would authorize the expenditure of money by the Federal Treasury to survey the need and make recommendations for bridges across the Potomac. In our hearings some people testified that due to heavy traffic they had to wait as long as three-quarters of an hour before they could cross the river. If we were to construct Government buildings on the other side of the Potomac, that would only tend to congest traffic a little more and would form perhaps a little stronger argument for the proposal of the gentleman from Virginia that the Federal Government assume

responsibility for the construction of bridges across the Potomac—a project which, in my opinion, is strictly a Virginia and District proposition.

Today in Washington, due to the many declared and never undeclared emergencies, we have housing, traffic, hospitalization, and sanitation problems. As thousands of workers are coming to the District each month, this problem grows worse and worse. It seems to me a little sensible decentralization of Government would go a long way toward solving this problem.

I do not see why our citizens in the Middle West—in Indiana, for instance—paying a 4-cent tax on gasoline, having no bonded road or bridge indebtedness, should be charged with the building of bridges between the District of Columbia and Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that we solve this problem by moving the Department of Agriculture to Indiana. Indiana is the center of population of the United States—the center of the Farm Belt—has and is able to finance plenty of roads, bridges, and building sites for such a department.

MISSOURI RIVER POWER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This rush action to appropriate funds to construct additional power plants in the Tennessee Valley should result in directing the attention of the authorities to the possibilities that exist on the Missouri River, in an area where there are large deposits of aluminum-bearing clays and the largest manganese deposits in the United States, if not in the entire world, and where there are thousands of loyal Americans who want to work.

At least 5 good sites are known to exist—sites that are feasible from an engineering standpoint. One of them, I am told, would develop at least 180,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power for 8 months in the year, plus 36,000 kilowatt-hours of firm power for the full 12 months of the year, at a cost of less than $40,000,000, which is the amount of the appropriation in this bill. Another site offers unusual possibilities, in that a bend of the river, a mile across at the neck, shows a fall of 21 feet, that could be utilized by a canal and develop a large head by a relatively low dam above the bend.

Under a resolution adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee at my request a little over a year ago, an engineering study of the power possibilities has been made and is now available in the office of the division engineer, United States Army. Another study was undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation to determine the possibilities of using power to pump water onto adjacent lands needing supplemental irrigation. The Bureau of Mines is exploring the manganese beds. Hundreds of tons of the manganese have now been processed at Knoxville by T. V. A. power, proving the feasibility of that process for these ores.

The time has come when action should be taken on power development on the Missouri River. For that reason I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to make an early determination on the subject. And, in view of the urgent reasons which led to the resolution and appropriation now before us, I bespeak your favorable consideration for the Missouri River power development when it comes before you.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am and have been heartily in favor of this and all appropriations for T. V. A. I have been, and am now, an ardent supporter of T. V. A., but I rise primarily at this time to point to the record as made in these hearings. On page 31 of the hearing before the committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], a member of the committee, asked this question:

What is the present situation at Grand Coulee?

Colonel Weaver, of the Army engineers, answered thus:

At Grand Coulee they have only two house units, two 10,000-kilowatt generators.

Now, that is the fact, as far as it goes, but it should have been stated that a great volume of electricity will soon come from Grand Coulee. There are three units to be installed within the next 10 months, and they are such giants in the generating field as have never been built anywhere in the world before. One comes in in September of this year with 108,000 kilowatts, another in January with 108,000 kilowatts, and another next July or August with 108,000 kilowatts, or 325,000 kilowatts of electricity is coming in at Grand Coulee within the next 10 months, and then there is provision made for 15 additional generators of that type and kind. These generators will be in production by the time new aluminum or magnesium plants could be built.

I want the record to be clear here that the two small house units that are now in production are not even calculated in the amount of energy that will be produced at Grand Coulee, which will be in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 kilowatts; and, added to that, is Bonneville, 232 miles away, on the same river, with 560,000 kilowatts. These two projects complement and supplement each other, because Grand Coulee is a high-water dam; and when the river is at flood there is the greatest volume of electrical energy generated; and at the same time at Bonneville electrical energy production is reduced. We have tied these two together. We need no steam plants to level off our production, as the combination of these two giant plants cares for that problem.

What I want to make clear is, first, out in the Northwest, by reason of the foresight of this administration, coupled with T. V. A., we have the electrical energy, if it is utilized, to meet this great crisis; and I am pleased to note that serious consideration is now being given to constructing aluminum and magnesium plants in the vicinity of the Northwest power plants. This should be coupled with the construction of fabricating plants also and thus save for other purposes the long haul of vast tonnage across the country that now takes place. Metal produced in the Pacific Northwest should not be hauled across the continent to be made into plane parts and then hauled back to Seattle to the Boeing plant to be made into planes. It is cheering news to be advised that matters such as I have mentioned are receiving consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] a few minutes ago make the statement that the Tennessee Valley Authority had not filed its regular annual report. I want to call his attention to the fact that that report was filed a good many months ago and is available to anyone who may ask for a copy of it.

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish my statement, please.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has not failed to file its report. Of course, the report for this fiscal year is not due until after June 30, but the report has been filed every single year. The gentleman also made reference——

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very briefly; yes.

Mr. MCLEAN. I inquired at the House document room for a copy of the Tennessee Valley report that was due on January 1 no longer than 10 days ago, and I was told it was not available and had not been received.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will be very glad to give the gentleman a copy, because I have some copies in my office.

Mr. MCLEAN. But when was it filed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They have been available——

Mr. MCLEAN. When the gentleman accuses me of making a statement that is not true, I say the report should be printed for the use of the Members of Congress, and they should be able to get it where it is supposed to be available. Has the report been printed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

The gentleman also made reference to the fact that an airplane carrier was about to be used at Mobile to generate power. He did not tell the House that if used it will be not for the Tennessee Valley Authority, but for the Alabama Power Co., a private utility furnishing power to the greater part of the State of Alabama and a private company that has used exactly the same means as the Tennessee Valley Authority to generate power; that is, by hydroelectric dams, with steam plants supplementing the supply.

As to the gentleman's statement about navigation on the Tennessee River when he went down there and made a thorough survey, I am going to see that some facts that are in my file and actually have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are made available to the gentleman from New Jersey, showing that navigation on the Tennessee River, even before the work has been completed, has far exceeded anything that the Army engineers ever predicted, hauling automobiles from Evansville, Ind., every week of the year, hauling grain from up in Iowa and Missouri, and hauling petroleum products and many other commodities. There is a constant flow of navigation on that river.

As to the power supp'y in the Tennessee Valley—yes; there is a shortage. There is a shortage pretty well all over the country; but let me say this to you: The Tennessee Valley Authority has a sufficient supply of power to fill every single commitment it has made, and the only reason the shortage is there is because it is supplying to the Aluminum Co. of America some 200,000 kilowatts that the Aluminum Co. of America has never contracted for, while the Aluminum Co. of America is sitting upon the Fontana dam site, the best site east of the Rocky Mountains, and has failed and refused to build a dam there to generate its own power. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4756, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. HARE, Mr. POWERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana.

REFUSAL OF VISAS TO ALIENS

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any American diplomatic or consular officer knows or has reason to believe that any alien seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States, he shall refuse to issue to such alien any immigration visa, passport visa, transit certificate, or other document entitling such alien to present himself for admission into the United States; but in any case in which a diplomatic or consular officer denies a visa or other travel document under the provisions of this act, he shall promptly refer the case to the Secretary of State for such further action as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I am in favor of this legislation, but what I reserve the right to object for is to ask the necessity for such legislation. It is hard for me to comprehend that a consular officer of the United States does not have the authority now to refuse a visa to someone who might come here and endanger the public safety.

Mr. SCHULTE. And I say to the gentleman that the consular officers do not have the power at this particular time. This bill has been requested by the Secretary of State and by the Department of State and by Mr. Hull himself.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not mean to tell the House that when a man who is known as a "red" or as one whose coming to the United States might endanger the public safety of the United States goes to an American consular officer and requests a visa that he must be given a visa, notwithstanding the facts that I have stated?

Mr. SCHULTE. That is the law at the present time, and that is the reason that the consular officers abroad and the Department of State and the immigration officials have asked for this authority.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It might be the way that they are carrying out their duties now, but I should think that it is always within the discretion of an official as to whether he shall grant a visa to an individual or not. If what the gentleman says is true, of course, this legislation is necessary.

Mr. SCHULTE. I have a copy of a letter here from the Attorney General, Mr. Jackson, who states that the purpose of the legislation is to provide means not now afforded by law for keeping out of this country certain aliens otherwise admissible whose presence in the United States would be a danger to the public safety. This bill was asked for by former Attorney General Frank Murphy, who stated they did not have sufficient power at that time. This legislation grants them that power that they have requested. I know my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] feels the same as I do about this. When this bill was first introduced in the Senate, I was surprised that they did not have authority at that time to bar those that they felt might become a detriment or menace to the United States, but it is very evident that they did not have that power, so this bill was introduced at the request, as I stated before, by those different consular officers who must deal with this situation. I do believe that this bill, when passed, will have the effect of keeping out those undesirables.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question. Has this matter been before the Committee on Immigration of the House?

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes; and it came out of the committee by a unanimous vote. This bill, however, has been passed by the Senate, and I am taking this course to expedite the matter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What is the reason that the Immigration Committee of the House has not had this bill up for consideration by the House?

Mr. SCHULTE. This is to expedite the matter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Who sponsored the bill before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], at the request of the various departments, who drafted the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I assured the Chair that this would not take any time, and, as there is other business urgently before the House, I am quite willing to withdraw the bill, if there is any controversy about it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for a short time further.

Mr. SCHULTE. If the gentleman from Ohio is going to object, I shall withdraw the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Oh, I don't want to object. I have read the bill through, and it seems to be all right if it has the cooperation of the Secretary of State. When a foreign consul authorizes an immigrant to come to these shores, there has been a tendency in the Committee on Immigration to give to that alien some rights to which he is not entitled, but this bill, as I read it, refers the matter to the Secretary of State. If the Secretary of State is in favor of this and is willing to take this added responsibility, then I think it is a good thing. Otherwise, if you are trying to impose additional duty on the Secretary of State that he does not want, I would not be in favor of it.

Mr. SCHULTE. I say to the gentleman that he has nothing to fear from me so far as loosening the immigration laws is concerned. This has been requested by the Secretary of State and by the Attorney General and by the Immigration Authority, so as to give them the power to deny the right of entry of certain aliens to the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman quoted the Attorney General. The Attorney General is not charged with as much responsibility as the Secretary of State. In my activities with reference to immigration, I have stood by the Secretary of State, regardless of whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. I stand by Cordell Hull, if he says this is all right, and I will withdraw my opposition.

Mr. SCHULTE. Let me read from the letter of the Secretary of State:

The Department is in full accord with the purposes of the proposed legislation. There is a need for such a bill to implement existing laws governing the admission of aliens, and the prompt enactment of H. R. 4817 is urged.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4817, was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, House Resolution 203 (Rept. No. 769), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3537, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a speech I made before the Georgia Manufacturers Association a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio speech I made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects, and in one of them to include a statement by J. Albert Woll, United States district attorney, Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a dispatch recently published in the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. GEYER of California, and Mr. KEFAUVER were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain remarks I made before the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette under date of June 11.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia be allowed to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by William T. Knudsen with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway appearing in the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement as to the program for next week, and ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday there will be a call of the Consent Calendar. There will be one suspension, on the bill H. R. 4, the pension bill relating to widows and orphans of World War veterans.

Then there is the temporary promotion bill, relating to retired warrant, petty, and other officers called back into service.

Tuesday we will consider the bill H. R. 1473, the Classification Act. There will also be another bill out of the Civil Service Committee relating to postmasters in some limited capacity.

Wednesday there will be the memorial services.

Thursday we will call up the bill H. R. 3537, the so-called blimp bill.

Friday we expect to take up the Whittington bill, H. R. 4911, the flood-control authorization bill.

All this is subject, of course, to the fact there are several conference reports that will probably be acted upon next week. The conference report on the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor bill has been filed, but when it will be called up I am unable to state. The report on the Agricultural appropriation bill will be called up some day next week. The conference report on the Interior bill will be filed Monday according to information I have received. The legislative appropriation bill goes to conference today. What action will be taken on that next week I am unable to state, but if filed it will of course have right of way over the other program. Then there will be a conference report on a legislative bill that came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not know its exact status, but if that conference report is filed it will of course be called up if it is the desire of the House conferees to call it up.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TABER. Can the majority leader advise us whether it is expected that conference reports on the Interior and Agricultural bills will be brought up next week? These are the ones that will be most apt to take time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that the conference report on the Interior bill will be filed Monday. That is the best information I have been able to get to date.

Mr. TABER. That would not be called up until Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not sooner than Tuesday. When it will be called up I am unable to state except that if the House conferees want it called up naturally the program I have announced would have to give way. This program is subject to the call of the conference reports.

As to the conference report on the Agricultural bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is in better position to answer that question than I. He informs me it may be called up Monday. Personally I should prefer for the benefit of Members who are interested if my friend from Missouri would agree with the House that it would not be called up before Tuesday. This would enable Members to govern themselves accordingly. I doubt very much from my talk with the gentleman if it will be called up Monday, but if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will agree that it will not be called up before Tuesday, this might be interesting news to some of the Members and they could govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, of course, we hope to call up the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill at the earliest possible moment. We will, however, be governed entirely by the wishes of the majority leader, and any assurances he gives the House in this matter will be entirely acceptable to us.

Mr. McCORMACK. The wishes of the majority leader are governed in greater part by the wishes of the chairman of the House conferees, and that in turn is dependent upon an uncertain element, the arrival back of a Member of the other body who is also a member of the committee of conference. In view of the fact so many Members are interested, and in view of the fact that action will be dependent upon some Member's arriving back in another body, I say there ought

to be some definite notice to the membership of the House that it will not be called up on Monday, that it will not be called up before Tuesday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say that so far as the committee of conference is concerned we shall be glad to follow implicitly the directions of the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances I will announce to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural conference report will not be called up before Tuesday.

EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, for work relief and relief, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee rose yesterday, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] had offered an amendment. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 12, line 3, after the word "agencies", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds of this act shall be expended for any project sponsored by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government unless justification for the sponsor's contribution for such project is specifically included in the appropriation for such department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a relatively simple one to get at a certain evil. We make appropriations for the different bureaus and independent establishments of the Government. It is presumed by myself—and I suppose by the rest of the Members of the House—that when we make an appropriation for a specific bureau that is the end of it—that it will cover its needs entirely for the following fiscal year. That is not always the case because the W. P. A. can supplement or add to the appropriations for that particular agency and establishment with W. P. A. funds if that agency or establishment of the Government sponsors a W. P. A. project. Without this amendment, the W. P. A. can supplement and give more money to the agency than Congress intended for a particular function.

It seems to me, if the Congress is going to be the holder of the purse strings, as is required by the Constitution of the United States, we should know ahead of time whether the supply bills for the various agencies are final and complete their needs, or is the money going to be used to sponsor a W. P. A. project without our consent. It seems to me every Member of the House wants to know how much money is being spent. We want to know whether we are finishing a job or whether we are half completing it. Are the funds going to be used to pay for the complete job or whether it just represents the sponsorship of the W. P. A. project.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman's amendment go far enough to prevent the use of this money in certain cases? I remember an instance where we beat an appropriation of $40,000,000, but in the summer after Congress adjourned the persons who were interested in that came to the W. P. A. and got the $40,000,000.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman is correct. That is the precise evil I want to get away from.

Yesterday I pointed out that Congress had said we would not spend any more Federal funds for the Jefferson Expansion Memorial. Later the Park Service used the city of St. Louis funds to sponsor a W. P. A. project, and the W. P. A., with the blank check we gave it, did the very thing that Congress did not want done. I know of other instances of kindred nature with reference to other independent establishments of the Government.

Let me point out further that the W. P. A. has always contended, when they make an allocation of W. P. A. funds to the States, it is no more the business of the Federal Government to see how that money is expended. When that money is allocated to the States the General Accounting Office never audits the account of that fund. I think it is an unwarranted abuse of the spending of Federal money never to get an accounting of the money that is spent by the State W. P. A. through its allocation process. This amendment will give us some control over this type of project sponsored by agencies of the Federal Government.

You gentlemen who want to raise the W. P. A. appropriation should support this amendment. It does not raise the entire amount of the appropriation one bit or lower it one bit, but it would vouchsafe that the money would be spent in accordance with the will of Congress. These agencies, bureaus, and independent establishments would have to explain before they get their appropriation in their supply bills whether they are going to carry out the appropriation by contract or whether they are going to sponsor a W. P. A. project.

Another thing would happen. We would know how much we were going to complete. Unless we have the proposition presented by the different bureaus and independent establishments to the Appropriations Committee ahead of time, unless we know ahead of time that the W. P. A. is going to do the work, we are never sure that any project will ever be completed. The evil goes on and on, as in the case of the St. Louis memorial expansion, where $15,000,000 have been spent and nothing is completed today God knows where it will end up.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I am very much interested in the Forest Service. About half of my district is in the national forest. They figure on a certain amount of W. P. A.—in fact, all the people depend on it to work in that forest, building trails and even planting trees.

Mr. JONES. This amendment will not affect such a case.

I have no objection to the W. P. A. taking care of Federal Government-sponsored contracts when they have Congress' permission, but I think the Congress ought to know ahead of time so we can have some share of control in accordance with our constitutional duty to know their plans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will consider very carefully the effect of this amendment. With possibly one exception, it is the most destructive amendment that has yet been offered to the bill. It sabotages directly the principal objective of the W. P. A. program. It cuts down the amount of money available under the bill. It cuts down the amount of money available for labor. It cuts down the number of men we can employ under the funds provided by this bill. It completely paralyzes one of the most important branches of the activities serviced by the appropriations carried in the bill.

If this amendment were agreed to, Mr. Chairman, all of the signally important work which the W. P. A. is now doing, and which it is now preparing to undertake for the Army and the Navy, for the military and naval departments and for the Department of Agriculture would have to be immediately summarily and permanently abandoned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that during the testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department, the adjutants general of the National Guard of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin all testified to the importance of W. P. A. funds for the construction of warehouses and storage facilities for National Guard equipment. They testified that last year, with the $3,000,000,000 the Congress appropriated for that type of work, they sponsored projects of a total value of $12,000,000. I am sure this amendment would interfere with the use of these funds for sponsoring projects of that nature, and it would be unfortunate to adopt it in its present form.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman refer to that significant testimony. It indicates the destructive effect which would be exerted by the provisions of this amendment both

upon projects now in operation and those which should be put in operation, not to mention the still more disastrous results it would effect through the reduction of the amount available for wages of labor. The purpose of this bill is to provide funds for the largest possible number of man-hours of labor, to provide employment. This amendment would interfere with that purpose by diverting the funds appropriated by the bill from wages to the purchase of materials.

Under the present plan the departments which are cosponsors supply the material, and the W. P. A. is left free to apply its funds to the employment of labor. That is why we are reporting the bill, that is what we are driving at, and that is the objective of the W. P. A. program—to provide employment. This amendment, by cutting off the sponsorship of the departments which supply the material, leaving it to the W. P. A. to supply the labor, would now compel the W. P. A. to supply both material and labor; and, of course, every dollar that goes into material is a dollar out of the funds that would otherwise be spent for labor.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. To what extent does the Army or Navy supply sponsorship by furnishing materials only?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All Government departments as cosponsors supply the funds for materials. A certain amount of material is required for even the cheapest forms of construction. Each project has a schedule specifying the amount per man on the job. If it is not supplied by the sponsors, it must be supplied by W. P. A.

The effect of this amendment would be to cut off the sponsors' contributions from any "department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government," which necessarily includes at this time some of the most pressing projects connected with the defense program, and compel the W. P. A. to take out of its already too meager funds money for both the material and the labor. The sentiment of the House, as indicated rather conclusively yesterday, opposes any further reduction of funds for jobs. We have already reduced the amount provided for labor to the minimum. Certainly it would be in contravention of the attitude taken by the House on yesterday if we should further reduce the already meager amount provided for labor by adopting this amendment and compelling the W. P. A. to pay for material out of the small amount appropriated for labor.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Could the adoption of this amendment in any wise affect the program of road construction that is now being carried on by the W. P. A. at the military establishment at Indiantown Gap in Pennsylvania? I ask this question because I have been informed that the W. P. A. is doing all that work at the military establishment, and it ought not to be interfered with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct in his assumption. This amendment would interfere with that project by preventing Federal sponsors supplying materials and would correspondingly reduce the amount for labor and the amount of road which could be built.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. This amendment would not affect any of the Army and Navy projects that have been presented to the Appropriations Committee where they know they are going to sponsor W. P. A. projects. I do not believe it is a fair statement to say that they would cut them all off, because the Army and the Navy have been very fair in presenting what they are sponsoring W. P. A. projects for.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In the fast-moving program upon which we are engaged it is practically impossible to foresee from day to day the needs to be supplied. The limitation could have no practical effect in protecting the scanty funds provided by the bill from unnecessary depletion by burdening it with the expense of supplying materials which otherwise would be furnished by the Federal departments.

I trust the Committee will reject this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to oppose this amendment. I call the attention of the author of the amendment and the members of the Committee to the fact that we are facing an emergency today and to the part that is being played by the W. P. A. in meeting that emergency.

I also call the attention of the author of the amendment to the mechanics of the operation of this program in connection with appropriations made to the departments. For instance, in the construction of Federal-aid roads, the States have to contribute 55 percent against the Government's 45 percent. How are you going to meet that situation when new roads must be constructed to serve defense industries in congested areas, and constructed in a hurry to relieve congestion and put our defense program into operation when the States are short of funds necessary to meet the cooperative requirements? When this condition exists, who is called on to do the job? The W. P. A.; and it is done by 100-percent Government contribution. The States and counties cannot go through the complicated machinery of contributing that money. The emergency must be met, and we are engaged today in building access roads. I am told that the complete program would take $240,000,000. We are building Army air bases and landing fields all over the country. I also know that we must build strategic roads. The W. P. A. is doing that work and is doing a splendid job. This amendment would block all that work and raise a barrier that could not be overcome.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I cannot imagine that the Bureau of Roads or any agency having to do with defense would not have its plans made up far enough ahead of time so that it could tell the Congress where it was going to sponsor a W. P. A. project.

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman something that is happening in the great State of California around San Diego and Los Angeles; and Boston, Norfolk, and many other eastern centers. An acute situation has developed. The reason is congestion. There are insufficient roads. They cannot get material and they cannot get employees into the locations of the new defense-industry plants. They must build roads in a hurry. We cannot go through the complicated, slow routine of the Federal-aid channel to get these roads built.

I am simply opposing the gentleman's amendment that would block and impair the development of our defense industries by preventing the construction of necessary access roads, as well as necessary strategic roads, landing fields, and other vitally important facilities.

Let me tell the gentleman that out in the State of Idaho, which I represent, the W. P. A. is building a strategic road designated by the War Department of first military priority, to relieve a bottleneck existing there, through the main range of the Rocky Mountains, and also building many access roads across the country, and doing a fine job.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds $100,000, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of a non-Federal building, exceeds $100,000, unless the building is one (a) for which the project has been approved by the President on or prior to May 15, 1940, or for which an issue of bonds has been approved at an election held on or prior to such date, or for which a State legislature has made an appropriation on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any projects which have been certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time simply to seek some information with regard to the unemployed in Puerto Rico. Am I correct in stating that Puerto Rico comes under the general appropriation for the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We have a budget estimate for about $75,000 of re-

appropriated funds pending in the deficiency subcommittee, and that is all that has been sent up by the Budget.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I understand that, but Puerto Rico today receives from the lump sum we have appropriated for the entire country funds for W. P. A. employment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 13, line 13, after the word "acts", insert "*Provided further*, That no part of any funds appropriated under this act shall be used in the purchase of any building materials for the specific purpose of storing same in a warehouse or surplus supply yard from which place such materials could be delivered to and used in the construction of a W. P. A. project in any locality or municipality where such building materials are readily available in sufficient quantities and at prevailing competitive prices from reputable and recognized building-material dealers in the respective localities where the W. P. A. projects are to be, or are being constructed: *Provided further*, That all materials so purchased and not used but in a returnable condition shall be returned and credited to the project account, said materials to be returned to building-material dealer from whom original purchase had been made."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to meet a condition which exists now and a practice which is being employed in many States by the W. P. A. wherein they buy carloads of building materials, lumber, and so forth, from large operators or wholesalers and have it shipped direct from the mills and then they store it in warehouses or supply yards from which places they haul this material around to the smaller towns without giving the recognized material dealers in those towns an opportunity to bid on such materials.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, this procedure has cost the taxpayers of this Nation a lot of money. It is just impossible to maintain a warehouse and from that warehouse haul materials from 20 to 60 miles or more without it being an expense to the taxpayers. There is also a great loss in the waste of materials because the material is improperly piled and not taken care of properly and in this way a lot of lumber gets crooked and is not then fit to use.

The purpose of the second section of my amendment, where I provide that unused material shall be returned to the original seller for a credit, is because of the fact that under the present system no material can be returned for credit. That may be hard for you gentlemen to understand, but that is a fact.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any evidence to give the House that the price of the material purchased under the present custom, delivered on the job, is more than the cost of the material from the local dealer?

Mr. JENSEN. I could not say positively that that is a fact; but knowing as we do that building-material dealers sell on such close margins, especially by carloads or in large quantities lots, possibly at a profit of 10 percent or less, it is just out of the question that any money is being saved under the present set-up. I am sure the Government is losing from 5 to 10 percent on all this warehoused stock.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEAL. What does the gentleman have in mind by "locally"? Does the gentleman mean in a town or city, or just what geographical division does the gentleman contemplate when he states it must be purchased locally?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, for instance, there may be only one material dealer in a town where a W. P. A. project is being built——

Mr. O'NEAL. I was just asking for a definition of what the gentleman means by "locally."

Mr. JENSEN. I mean in the trade vicinity.

Mr. O'NEAL. What does the gentleman mean by "trade vicinity"?

Mr. JENSEN. I was just going to explain that to the gentleman. For instance, in a town where there is only one dealer it is customary to take a bill to another dealer in another town to get competitive bids, and by so doing you do get the competitive prevailing price.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does not the gentleman think it would cause a great deal of confusion unless he had some sort of definition of what "locally" means? W. P. A. would not know whether it meant within 1 mile or 10 miles or 100 miles.

Mr. JENSEN. No; I do not think so, because the term "local vicinity" is well established by common knowledge and also by the Government's definition of same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, of course, goods ought to be purchased locally wherever that is possible, but I doubt if the amendment offered, with no more oportunity for consideration than we can give to it now, would be very helpful. The characteristics of these projects are rapidly changing. The markets where the W. P. A. material is bought are an uncertain proposition at the present time. The matter is further complicated by the defense program, where the other agencies of the Government are in the market for the purchase of large quantities of material, very much in advance. I am frank to say there are some things about the amendment that I think are entitled to consideration and should have careful thought by the committee, but I believe we should not put an amendment like that into the bill at the present time without having a chance to go into it more carefully. I would dislike to see it adopted unless the committee or someone had an oportunity to go over it with the W. P. A., and the Procurement Division.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. To make this observation. This question has been gone over very thoroughly by Members of Congress from Iowa, with the W. P. A. authorities. They gave us a very sympathetic hearing, and we felt that this amendment would be in order, and I am sure that by making this amendment a law it would save the taxpayers money.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But the W. P. A. has never said that to the committee, and the gentleman did not bring it to the committee. This is the first time that I ever heard of it.

Mr. JENSEN. It is quite natural that they would not, but this program started some time ago and the way the matter is going now, unless we adopt an amendment like this one the Government will continue to lose money. I call to the gentleman's attention the matter of the purchase of cement. It costs 3¾ cents a sack more in the paper sacks than in cloth sacks, because paper sacks cannot be returned for credit, and that is a matter that is costing the taxpayers millions of dollars and is depriving the poor folks of this Nation that money they so sorely need for relief.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman knows, of course, that the W. P. A. does not buy this stuff at all, but it is bought by the Procurement Division.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And I feel sure that with their experience they would know where to get the material at the best prices.

Mr. JENSEN. I contend that this amendment will not only save the taxpayers money but will give more dollars for relief labor and also give the small, independent building material dealers an opportunity to bid and furnish this material. They are big taxpayers and deserve the business.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman says and I am sorry that he did not come before our committee when we were wrestling with this problem and give us the benefit of his advice. I think we ought to go very carefully before we would inaugurate into this program any drastic revolutionary change in the proceedings. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 81, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 13, line 4, after the amount "$100,000", insert "from Federal funds."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of minutes ago I was somewhat surprised to read a statement made yesterday on the floor by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I hope that my colleague the Republican Congressman at Large from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is on the floor, although I do not see him at the moment. I observed him here a few minutes ago.

I was somewhat surprised when the gentleman said we find ourselves with an income approaching $90,000,000,000. We find our people facing starvation. He said:

Back in 1929—

He did not say back in 1932, but he said:

Back in 1929 the national income was somewhere around $85,000,000,000. It is now $90,000,000,000. In spite of that, we are called upon to increase the amount of the appropriation for W. P. A.

I read his statement thoroughly. I assume the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is opposed to this bill. I, as Representative at Large from Ohio, am in favor of the bill and I voted yesterday in favor of the Casey amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. In just a moment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I just wondered on what the gentleman bases the assumption that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is opposed to this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Maybe that is not a fair assumption. If it is not, I will withdraw it, but I just read his statement and I could not figure out what his position is on the bill.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. Not at this moment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said:

I do not know of a greater failure as a President than we have in the present occupant of the White House.

In March 1932 there were soup kitchens and bread lines in Cleveland. The gentleman and I come from the same city in Ohio. Soup kitchens, bread lines, and private charities must not be the answer of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problem of unemployment and of poverty. American citizenship should carry with it the right to be gainfully employed.

The gentleman further said:

The record of the New Deal performance is amazing.

Mr. Chairman, the record of the New Deal performance is amazing. We have gone a long way and under a great leadership since those dark days of 1932. In Ohio in 1932, in the month of March, transportation was paralyzed, thousands and thousands of jobless walked the streets of Cleveland and other cities in my State. They were unemployed, and their children were inadequately fed. The farmers of my State were bankrupt. They were not making enough money to pay the interest on their mortgages and to pay their taxes. The distinguished gentleman from the Thirteenth Ohio District [Mr. BAUMHART] knows that in his district, where I was born and reared, farmers were gathering at the crossroads and they were on the courthouse steps. They were threatening judges. They were interfering with the orderly foreclosure processes of the law. Mr. Chairman, farmers are not radicals. They are the bone and sinew of this country, and when the farmers of Ohio and other States gather at the crossroads and on the courthouse steps and threaten to hang judges it is because they feel they have no other remedy to feed their children.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And their Government at that time failed them.

Mr. YOUNG. The President of the United States——

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. In a moment. The then President of the United States at that time pulled the covers over his head, did nothing, and muttered to himself that "prosperity is just around the corner." Of course, we have made mistakes in 8 years, but the present administration has not made the mistake of doing nothing. Instead of 13,000,000 unemployed in this country there are now comparatively few.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 7 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will revise that to 10 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. I simply wanted to arrange to have the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], to whom reference has been made, properly safeguarded that he may have an opportunity to answer.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] always safeguards himself. The gentleman need not worry about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is seeking recognition at this time?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. And does the gentleman from Virginia seek recognition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I had better protect myself and take a little time after the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the apprehension of my friend from Virginia is entirely unnecessary. I assume he is fearful lest I might attempt at this time to answer the unsportsmanlike attack that was just made on my distinguished friend from Ohio. My only purpose in asking for time was to enable my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] to get to the floor. And then I wanted the RECORD to show that our friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] was called off the floor for a moment and was engaged at the time on matters of public business and of importance to his constituents. The inference which was left as the result of the remarks just made might have been such as to reflect unfavorably upon my colleague's attention to public business.

Mr. YOUNG. No such inference was intended, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield at this time.

I know of no man in the Congress who is more painstaking, industrious, and conscientious in his application to the public duty and to the interest of his constituents than my friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I do feel that it is an unfair reflection upon him simply to make the bald statement that he may be absent at a moment when all of us know that committee business and other matters of importance may detain him at the time from the floor.

Then, I should like the RECORD also to show, subject to the correction of anyone who might have the voting record at hand, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] voted for the last work-relief program, the last bill that was before the House for that purpose. To leave the impression that he would oppose this bill is manifestly unfair and reflects upon him in a way that I feel the RECORD cannot support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot reserve time. He may yield if he desires.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot do that. He may yield for a question if he desires or remain standing if he wants to retain his time.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall lead myself very willingly to the altar, and yield for a question to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entirely in order.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very kindly interest.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order. This is the regular order.

Mr. BENDER. I expect to read the gentleman's remarks shortly, and I will answer them fully.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman's best answer will be that he intends to support the present bill for the work-relief program now before the House. Am I correct in that, sir?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Who is asking the question? That is a trick question.

Mr. BENDER. Yes. To my friend the gentleman from Virginia I say that I need no prompting. I can speak for myself, but I want to read what the gentleman had to say before I speak on the subject. I was called off the floor for a moment. Of course, I would expect the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would make his observations when I was not on the floor. I will take care of the matter in my own way presently. I am for economy in all regular nondefense governmental functions, but I am opposed to any reduction in W. P. A. at this time. Labor under the New Deal has watched its hopes and aspirations turning into gall and wormwood. Labor has learned that the administration's protestations are meaningless so long as work for labor's hands is nowhere in sight. Men need work. No man or woman can look forward under the New Deal program to a wholesome development of a complete life. We all know that relief for the unemployed is necessary. We do not propose to let our people hunger. But reemployment of our unemployed is even more necessary. Until the Nation gets rid of the New Deal we must continue relief appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think that clears it up. I ask that the Clerk read.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, shall fix a monthly earning schedule for persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by section 1 which shall not substantially affect the current national average labor cost per person of the Work Projects Administration. Such monthly earning schedule shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living. The Commissioner shall require that the hours of work for all persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by section 1 shall (1) be 130 hours per month except that the Commissioner, in his discretion, may require a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of relief workers with no dependents and the earnings of such workers shall be correspondingly reduced, and, (2) not exceed 8 hours in any day, and (3) not exceed 40 hours in any week.

(b) The Commissioner may authorize exemptions from the above limitations of monthly earnings and hours of work on projects certified as hereinbefore provided as being important for military or naval purposes; to protect work already done on a project; to permit making up lost time; in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare; and in the case of supervisory personnel employed on work projects.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 14, line 16, after "section 1", in line 16, strike out down through the word "Administration", in line 18, and insert the following: "*Provided*, That in no instance shall the basic rate of wage be less than $60 per month."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday I addressed the House informing the Members that at the proper time I would offer an amendment to the work relief and relief appropriation bill for 1942 to establish a basic wage for the W. P. A. worker.

Fellow Members, for a long time speaker after speaker has declared for shorter hours and increased wages. That is all very good, but why should the Government itself advocate higher wages and then pass laws which result in starvation wages?

I have previously on many occasions endeavored to improve the lot of the unfortunate W. P. A. worker by attempting to have a prevailing-wage rate established for the man and woman on relief.

Today I am only asking that a basic wage rate be established to preclude any further discrimination and injustice, as has been practiced by the W. P. A. since it put into effect a wage cut in September of 1939, both in violation of the letter and spirit of the law.

In my district that cut amounted to 27 percent, or a decrease in wages of from $60 to $42.50 a month. In a few other districts the cut has been greater.

Today, Mr. Chairman, in proposing this amendment to the work relief and relief appropriation bill to establish a basic wage rate, I am asking that a rate be established that will be a basic, uniform rate throughout the United States.

Living costs have increased; wages have increased, but the W. P. A. worker is still the victim of a discriminatory wage cut. The Government, up until the present, has not restored a wage cut; that is not only an injustice but is discriminatory. We do not want to continue to be responsible for such a situation.

The W. P. A. worker is not even asking for an increase. What he wants is simply a restoration of the previous basic rate of pay.

Members, if we are to preserve civilization and the better things of life, we must not only be concerned with the problems of foreign nations, but must first put our own house in order by taking care of our domestic problems and our own people.

I plead with you to vote for my amendment, which, again I remind you, is not an increase for the W. P. A. worker but merely a restoration of a wage cut which was made by the Work Projects Administration in September of 1939.

Let us show the men and women of America who, through no fault of their own, still find themselves among our millions of unemployed, that we consider them Americans—as you and I—and that we are interested in providing at least a living wage until they can return to jobs in private business and industry, and that they are not the forgotten men and women of America.

We cannot hope to preserve democracy abroad by appropriating billions of dollars to aid foreign nations, if we do not preserve democracy at home. Domestic peace and contentment is a real requisite for national unity and the perpetuation of democracy.

Let us first appropriate for our own people. Our first line of defense for our own democracy is the welfare of our own people. If we are sincere in trying to establish national unity, I ask you to support my amendment, which provides that in no instance shall the basic rate of wage be less than $60 per month.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman, of course, understands that a basic wage of $60 per month will cut down the number of W. P. A. workers who can be employed by the appropriation provided for in this bill. I assume the gentleman expects a deficiency bill to be brought in later to take care of any lack of W. P. A. funds resulting from his amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Personally, I do not believe it will cut down the number of employees or the number of W. P. A. workers. I have given this matter a lot of consideration. I do not see how it will cut down the number of employees.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. If it increases the amount of pay, certainly the same number of men cannot be employed who were formerly employed at a lesser rate, can they?

Mr. FENTON. In my estimates I have multiplied a million by the average wage rate people in my district are getting. Even if you multiply 1,000,000 by $60, you get $60,000,000 per month, or $720,000,000 per pear.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman think that answers the question?

Mr. FENTON. I certainly do.

Mr. PATRICK. I have no further questions.

Mr. FENTON. Taking into consideration the words of Mr. Hunter and the Administration's figures, I do not see how it will decrease the number of men to be benefited.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with this amendment, and I am certainly pleased to know that a Member from the other side of the aisle—a Republican, if you please—has offered it. I observed when the Casey amendment was up for consideration, however, that there was practically a solid Republican vote against it. If that amendment had carried, there is no doubt that the W. P. A. could have adopted this policy. I am pleased to note that, as I said, a Member from the other side of the aisle has offered this amendment. It shows that at least one of them has a feeling for the common man.

I believe that you will be able to pay a $60-a-month basic pay to the W. P. A. worker provided the administrators of W. P. A. will cut down on some of their overpaid supervisory personnel. We

should be interested in the man with the pick and shovel and not interested so much in those who are looking for supervisory positions only to wax fat on the W. P. A. rolls to the detriment of the man with the pick and shovel. Not all the supervisory personnel are in this class but a goodly number of them are. I think the condition existing in some of the district offices is such that the W. P. A. would be better without them, and some of that money could be used to help the poor fellow in the ditch.

A rather peculiar situation exists in my district. In one county men receive $48 a month. In another county right adjoining the men receive $39 a month. That to me is the height of foolishness. Men right across the highway, one man living on one side of the road, the other man living on the other side of the road, those two men working in the same ditch, one man receiving $48 a month and the other $39 a month.

In Wayne County and in certain counties in Ohio your wage rate runs to $60 a month. Is there any reason that the people of my district or some other Member's district should work on W. P. A. for $39 a month and others receive $60 a month?

I believe this is a worthy amendment, and if we say to the administrators of W. P. A.: "You pay the laboring man who wields the pick and shovel, the man who actually does the work, $60 a month and cut down on some of your supervisory personnel," there will not be any need for having one single, solitary man taken off the W. P. A. rolls.

I hope that this amendment will be agreed to, thereby establishing basic rates for this program.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman will concede that those in supervisory positions are so much fewer in number that even if the theory of the gentleman is brought into the picture, you could not take just 1 or 2 men and readjust a scale for 30 or 40.

Mr. HOOK. That may be true probably in the gentleman's district, and I hope it is, but not true in many other instances, especially in the big cities such as New York, Chicago, and Detroit. The supervisory personnel is top-heavy. Let us give the real laborer with a big family a break for once.

Mr. PATRICK. You cannot take a man on one side and balance it off even by a change. You cannot take a man who falls on one side of the proposition and change the plan by 20 or 30 or even 50 or 60 on the other side.

Mr. HOOK. If we do not have sufficient funds to take care of the present situation, or if not enough to take care of the situation at all, we will remain in Congress, anyhow; therefore, we will be able to have a deficiency appropriation passed to care for it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Are we to understand from the gentleman's remarks that he is of the opinion that the present administration of W. P. A. has overloaded the organization with supervisory personnel?

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman certainly understands me. Not probably in your district or mine, but the abuse is in the big cities.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is attempting to say, then, that the administration of W. P. A. is bad under its present auspices; is that so?

Mr. HOOK. I am saying it is overloaded with supervisory personnel, and the money should be given to the common laborer instead of to supervisors. More worthy persons would benefit thereby.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment where the purpose no doubt is good, and where the intention is proper, but where lack of consideration of the entire problem probably would result in a bad situation if the amendment were agreed to. This proposition was not presented to the committee. It was not considered in the hearings and proper consideration has not been given to the administration of the law in this connection.

If this amendment were agreed to at the present time, and the amount of money was not changed in the bill, you would reduce the number of recipients of W. P. A. pay by many, many thousands. Already we have taken the limit off the pay as far as defense work is concerned, and that is almost 50 percent of those who will be employed in 1942. Approximately 450,000 will be working on defense projects and the prevailing wage requirement is not in this bill with reference to those workers. They will draw on an average of $74.30 per month. With the amount of money in the bill at the present time, and with half the workers drawing $14 a month more than the amount mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it means that the average of those who are not on defense work of the W. P. A. workers must receive a corresponding decrease in their monthly wage. That monthly wage today for the whole country is $56 per month. If the amount were reduced by the amount that 74 is over 60, and the 450,000 men are working on defense projects, the cut would be a very appreciable cut in the amount of money available for the rest of the workers. If the prevailing rate of pay were made a minimum of $60 the number of people taken care of, not on defense work, would go down by a large amount.

If the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] with reference to taking it out of the supervisory and administrative personnel were applied, we would have practically the entire amount given to labor and practically nothing for the administrative personnel.

The amendment is not sound, it is not good business, and it changes something that has been thoroughly debated in this House for a long time. The committee is of the opinion that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Does the gentleman from Kentucky think that the average wage paid throughout the country, of $852, as suggested by Mr. Hunter, the commissioner of W. P. A., is at all fair when the average worker in my district gets $532 per month?

Mr. O'NEAL. Has the gentleman read the hearings on page 12?

Mr. FENTON. I have certainly read the whole thing.

Mr. O'NEAL. The average cost was $74.30 on exempted projects, and all other projects $56. I say that if the average laborer were put upon what has been suggested, it would mean a corresponding decrease in the number of the recipients of W. P. A. pay.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is it not perfectly obvious and inescapable that if you establish a minimum rate which has the effect of raising the average rate, you must decrease the number of people who can be employed, unless you put more money in the bill?

Mr. O'NEAL. Just as much so as 2 plus 2 equals 4.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. You cannot escape that at all. As it is now, in certain sections of the country, under the law as we have written it, they pay a smaller rate of wage in order that in other sections where the cost of living is more the wage may be increased.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. As I understand, the committee does not expect to call up a deficiency bill this year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not on this.

Mr. O'NEAL. The committee has no such idea, as far as this year's deficiency bill is concerned.

Mr. FENTON. That is what I understand by reading the hearings.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the civilian rate of wage varies in different communities?

Mr. O'NEAL. It is.

Mr. TABER. Is it not also a fact that if we provide a minimum rate of wage that is higher than this in certain localities, we are encouraging people to stay on W. P. A. instead of going into private employment?

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct. Further, it is well known that the cost of

living is different in different sections of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FENTON) there were—ayes 27, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection) and unmarried widows of such veterans and the wives of such veterans as are unemployable who are in need and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owning allegiance to the United States who are in need

(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting blind persons, veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans, and wives of such veterans as are unemployable, who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (a) the expiration of 30 days after the date of his removal, and (b) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects.

(c) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution, the Work Projects Administration shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

(d) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by and except as provided in section 11 (b), no relief worker shall be employed on such projects until after his need for employment has been certified by (a) a local public certifying agency or (b) the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

(e) No blind person receiving aid under the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be prohibited from temporarily relinquishing such aid to accept employment on a Work Projects Administration project.

(f) No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi bund organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship, and that he is not a Communist, and not a member of any Nazi bund organization.

(g) The Commissioner shall cause a periodic investigation to be made of the rolls of certified employees on work projects and shall eliminate from the rolls those not in actual need, such investigation to be made so that each case is investigated at least once in every 12 months.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGRANERY: On page 16, at the end of line 3, insert the following: "*Provided*, That veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purpose of this subsection) need not be certified in order to be eligible for work under the provisions of this act."

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment follows section 10 (a) and would be a part of section 10 (a). I have not deleted or stricken any of the language the committee has in this section. The language the committee has used here is, in my opinion, something that covers a situation that is worthy in that the retention of veterans who are now engaged on W. P. A. shall be determined, in case of lay-offs, on the basis of need. However, this provision does not go far enough.

In order to get on W. P. A., veterans must be certified presently from the relief rolls. Hence, veterans who have service-connected disability and receive $12, $15, $20, $25, or $30 a month compensation would not be eligible for relief. A veteran who owns his own little home is not eligible for relief unless he first disposes of the home and the proceeds from the sale.

My amendment would permit a veteran, notwithstanding his compensation, of whatever degree it may be, to be first placed on the W. P. A. rolls for employment without having to go through the relief set-up.

I understand the committee has given some thought to this, and it is quite a problem. You cannot get down to language that will take care of the veteran who may perhaps be getting $50 a month, but there are a large number of veterans who get $6, $8, $10, $12, and $15 a month. These men presently cannot get on W. P. A. Although a shortage of labor is coming along, many of them cannot be absorbed in private industry. W. P. A. will perhaps need them and want them before the fiscal year closes, and there is no way they can be employed by W. P. A. presently without this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that in many States there are veterans who are receiving disability allowances which are less than they would be entitled to receive on relief, and because of that they are unable to get relief and are thereby prevented from being certified, and so are denied W. P. A. employment?

Mr. McGRANERY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the defense program will not absorb any of these unemployed veterans because of their age, the average age being 48 years and, therefore, they have no chance of getting private employment?

Mr. McGRANERY. That is true. There is the added reason that many of these veterans have only one arm or one leg, and perhaps there is no place in private industry where they could be used.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Under the present program, is not the assignment to W. P. A. on the basis of relative need?

Mr. McGRANERY. No; not the assignment to W. P. A. Under the present program the assignment is from the relief rolls.

Mr. HOOK. Of course, all those on the relief rolls are not assigned to W. P. A., so when an assignment to W. P. A. is available and there is a veteran and a nonveteran in relatively the same needy circumstances, with the exception that the veteran is disabled and is getting a pension of about $6 a month, the disabled veteran is discriminated against because he gets that $6 a month, and the other person, who is not a veteran, gets the preference in the employment. The gentleman's amendment will take care of that situation?

Mr. McGRANERY. It will take care of that situation; yes. The language now takes care of the veteran after he is on W. P. A., but it does not take care of the veteran who is seeking to get on W. P. A.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRANERY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I listened to the reading of the gentleman's amendment but did not notice that the gentleman had fixed any limit on the amount the veteran might receive, in order that, if the bill is enacted, any veteran receiving less than that amount might get preference.

Mr. McGRANERY. That is what has troubled the committee, trying to fix some minimum.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are several similar amendments pending at the desk to this section, and I would like, if possible, to agree on time.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 45 minutes. I think this will give ample time for everybody to be heard.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am agreeable to the proposal to close debate on the section in 45 minutes, but if we are going to do that I do not believe more than one speech on each side should be permitted on any amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Chair could control that.

Mr. TABER. Because there are 10 amendments at the desk and while I presume not more than half of them will be offered, it would not be fair to have a lot of discussion on one amendment and no debate available on the others.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. A number of them relate to the same thing, I may say to the gentleman, and the Chair can control that.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is not now on the desk.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I also have an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Committee will indulge the Chair a moment, the Chair may be able to throw some light on this matter. The Clerk advises the Chair there are 10 amendments to this section, that 4 of the 10 amendments are on the same subject, while the other 6 are on different subjects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think 45 minutes will give us reasonable time for debate.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, even though there are 10 amendments pending and some of them are identical, it would seem to me nothing more than fair that the Members who have introduced amendments be entitled to be heard on their particular amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure the Chair will recognize every one, and I believe that the debate on one or two of the amendments will cover everything.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman has asked to limit debate to 45 minutes?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the very serious consideration of the Committee, because what I have to say here I think will relate itself somewhat to a number of these amendments which are on the Clerk's desk.

Let me say in the first place, the Appropriations Committee is most sympathetic with the suggestions that veterans should be given preference, and the Congress has tried to write that into the relief law. Therefore you will find on page 10 of the committee report a special paragraph:

> The committee takes this opportunity of impressing upon administrative officials the duty of following closely the requirements of the law with respect to eligibility of veterans—

And so forth. Under the present law, all question of need being equal, the veteran has a preference. I believe we should not go further than this. I believe if there is one job to be given and there are two people applying for it, if the needs of the two people are equal, the veteran should have the job; but I believe if the nonveteran is a man with a wife and dependent children, and the veteran is a man, as my friend says, who may happen to own his farm or a little home, that man should not be given the job and turn the nonveteran, destitute person off.

This is the sort of preference we presently have in the law. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not accomplish what he says he seeks to accomplish. What he does is to take away the necessity for certification. Our relief program heretofore has always centered around the fact, as a practical matter, that the recipient must be certified as a person worthy of relief by a responsible certifying agency. Now, if you want to turn loose confusion and chaos and open the door for all sorts of maneuvering and intriguing and preferences of various kinds, take away the necessity for certification by somebody that the veteran or the applicant must be a person who is in need.

What my friend from Pennsylvania says and what other gentlemen will say about inequalities and injustices is true. For instance, you may find a veteran who is getting $10-a-month pension or social-security benefits of $6 a month, and he is precluded from a W. P. A. job. There is now on the Clerk's desk—and I have read it, because I have looked at all the amendments there—an amendment which will will presently be offered, in these words, which will remedy that situation:

> *Provided*, That if the monthly income of any such employable veteran from all sources is less than the earnings such veteran would receive if employed as a project worker of the W. P. A., then such veteran shall be certified as in need of work projects employment, but shall not be permitted to earn in any month an amount in excess of the difference between his other income and the W. P. A. income.

In my judgment this amendment will meet the injustice which all of us have recognized in this law. If the veteran gets $10 a month from Social Security or from the Veterans' Administration and is in need, he may have a W. P. A. job and earn the rest of what he would be entitled to on W. P. A., and I hope it will be the pleasure of the committee—I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] and many of the Members who are veterans, have been very industrious and very insistent in trying to protect the veterans, and the committee wishes to do that, but we do not want to open wide the door and I believe it would not be for the best interests of the American veteran to say that you are going to pick him out as a class, regardless of his relief needs, and set him off in a preferred group.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman accept the amendment which he has just read?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; I think so. That is the amendment, as I understand, that is going to be offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if that is agreeable, would it not be wise to substitute that amendment right now and dispose of it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] who has an amendment pending, is willing to have the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia considered as a substitute for his.

Mr. EDMISTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. EDMISTON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. McGRANERY: In lieu of the matter contained in the McGranery amendment on page 16, at the end of line 3, insert "*Provided*, That if the monthly income of any such employable veteran from all sources is less than the monthly earnings such veteran would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran shall be certified as in need of Work Projects Administration employment, but shall not be permitted to earn in any month an amount in excess of the difference between the amount of his other monthly income and the W. P. A. monthly earnings as a project worker."

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, while not going as far as the amendment which I offer as a substitute, I believe, does eliminate an injustice which has been done disabled American veterans of all wars seeking employment on W. P. A. The disabled veteran has been discriminated against, not by the Work Projects Administration but by the certifying agencies in the various States that must certify him to the W. P. A. before he can secure work. If he had a compensable disability, for which he was drawing an amount, for example, of $30 a month, and his next-door neighbor was in an identical situation and had no other income, he could be certified to the W. P. A. and could secure an income of $60 a month from the W. P. A., while the disabled American veteran could not be certified but must get along as best he can on whatever his compensation may be, $20 or $30 a month; and, as I say, his neighbor, in an identical situation, could work for the W. P. A. and get $60. Therefore, there has been a discrimination in the past against the disabled veteran. This amendment that I have offered as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] will eliminate that discrimination and allow him to be employed by the W. P. A. and be entitled to earn any difference between what he is receiving and the rate of pay in the W. P. A. of the position which he is qualified to fill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Could the adoption of this amendment result in a veteran receiving less for his work than the amount that would be received by another relief worker? I have in mind a situation, for example, where a veteran is receiving $10 a month compensation, and the monthly rate of pay of the W. P. A. would be $60 a month. Would the veteran have to work as long as the other certified employee in order to earn the $60?

Mr. EDMISTON. Under the language of my amendment I do not think so, and it is certainly not so intended. In the case cited, he would work the necessary time at the rate of pay to make up the difference between what he receives as disability compensation and the $60.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, in the hypothetical case that I have cited, he would work long enough to earn $50.

Mr. EDMISTON. I think $60 is the limit of pay by the W. P. A. in most areas and if he were receiving $30 for his disability compensation he would work one half a month or $30 worth for the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee says that he will accept the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia which has been offered as a substitute for my amendment, while it does not go as far as my amendment, it is a step in the right direction, therefore I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be withdrawn, and the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia will be considered as an original amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the Edmiston amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for this action on the part of the House, and on behalf of the Disabled Veterans of America, of which I am a member, I wish to thank you.

You have corrected a long-existing injustice to veterans of all wars, and in these trying times for America an act such as this contributes to the national defense by showing our new Army that America always has and always will give her veterans justice.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: On page 16, line 4, strike out all of subsection (b), beginning on line 4, page 16, and ending in line 13, page 16.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to remove the so-called 18-month clause—eliminate it entirely.

I know you are all familiar with the harsh and severe way this section of the law has operated. You all have personal knowledge of many cases of privation and destitution that have resulted from the operation of this section of the law.

When the committee first presented its reasons for this particular clause, it stated that the principal purpose was to create rotation in W. P. A. employment. Now, by its own statement that fewer people will be applying for W. P. A. work, the committee admits that such rotation is no longer needed. As a matter of fact, the turn-over from W. P. A. to defense work and private industry is now greater than the turn-over caused by this particular provision. The 18-month clause does not necessarily mean that persons affected are separated from W. P. A. rolls for only 30 days. Relatively few persons terminated under the provision are reinstated promptly on the expiration of the 30-day period. They are separated from 30 to 90 or 120 days, in many instances, because, in order to be restored to the program, they must have recertification of eligibility, which requires another investigaton, and, after recertification, must wait for openings to which they can be assigned. These people who are dependent on W. P. A. and cannot get jobs elsewhere are unable to build up any reserves for periods of unemployment and immediately feel the hardship of any interruption in wages. Throughout the compulsory furlough predict they suffer great privation and, in many cases, even utter destitution.

The President of the United States himself has requested that this restrictive section be eliminated. The W. P. A. Administrator favors its removal, and I hope that the Committee will see fit to abolish it.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the number of reemployables after this period has elapsed?

Mr. HEALEY. I do not have figures immediately available. I think the situation has changed a great deal now, but I know that when the matter was under consideration last year the figures demonstrated that only a very small percentage of those who had been separated from the W. P. A. rolls under this provision were absorbed by private industry.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. I would like to make the observation that as a result of this practice in the last year every time these layoffs have occurred the relief rolls in the State of Pennsylvania have not decreased but have increased.

Mr. HEALEY. I think the imposition of this clause has proven to be cruel and harsh and ruthless in its effects, and I think it should be removed without further delay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like briefly to answer the gentleman.

The 18 months' provision in this bill was put in the law after the matter had been gone into carefully with Colonel Harrington, who was then relief Administrator. Colonel Harrington, who I think all of us feel and believe was one of the best Administrators that W. P. A. has ever had, felt definitely that there should be some time limit or some period of turn-over in the relief program; some period whereby the relief worker would know that at that time he had to canvass the situation and see whether his own condition or condition of employment generally would permit him to get off of W. P. A.

Now, when the program has been cut down as much as it has and you are putting 700,000 men off the rolls, it is all the more reason why there should be some time when a person who has had 18 months of the benefit of this relief work should at least look around for 30 days and canvass the situation as to whether or not he can find employment elsewhere. It seems to me that is not a hardship when, according to the evidence, there are thousands of people who have been certified who cannot receive employment. Every Congressman here has in his district people eligible for W. P. A. who cannot get on W. P. A. because the rolls are full. When you write to the W. P. A. administrator in your district he tells you he is sorry, but there is nothing he can do, since the quota is full. Why? Because people are there and, except for this provision, would stay there. All this provides is that they must get off for a month. If the surveying agency finds they are still in need, then after 30 days they are eligible for reemployment. If the surveying agencies are alert and attend to their jobs, the most that can happen is a 30-day period in which the person will not be on W. P. A.

Mr. SACKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. That has not been the experience in our city. Generally when they have been on for 18 months and waiting for a 30-day period, it lapses into 2 or 3 months.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the fault of the surveying agency and not of the law. But there is little justification for a Federal program that takes one needy person and puts him on relief perpetually and shuts the door in the face of others who are equally as needy, equally as worthy, and to whom they say, "You cannot have any part of this relief program."

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Of course they cannot all get back in a month's time, because these workers have been supplanted with other workers and the vacancies are not there. Then they are required to wait much longer than a month.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But they are not waiting then as long as that person who has stood in line for 3 or 4 years trying to get on W. P. A. when there is no place for him.

A gentleman the other day in the committee said he had an experience in his district where some man came down to him and said, "I see you are going to do away with the 18-month provision." He said, "I do not know about it." He said, a W. P. A. worker went down to headquarters after he got notice he was to be laid off for 18 months and he asked if that was true. The administrator said "Yes." The fellow said, "That is a fine way to treat a citizen. I reckon I will have to go and look for a job now."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in this Federal-relief program, where we are not putting up enough money for everybody to have a job, it is just ordinary decency and justice to divide the work up a little and give everybody a chance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment and I believe I was recognized under the distribution of time that was made a moment ago. I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. WALTER. I desire to withdraw the amendment I offered, Mr. Chairman, because it is identical with the one offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts which is now under consideration, and I rise to speak in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe our distinguished friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] meant it when he said that men were today making careers of the W. P. A. I can imagine the incident occurring that he has spoken about. I can imagine a man saying, "Now, I shall have to look for a job"; but that, I daresay, is a very isolated case. I could not imagine a person, when the opportunity presented itself to earn a decent wage, continuing to work at the niggardly pay of W. P. A.

May I call the attention of the House to the fact that at the time this section was written into the law it was done because there were literally millions of people who could not find a place in the work-relief program, and that we had appropriated as much money as we felt we could safely appropriate at that time? It was intended, through the enactment of this particular section of the work-relief law, that there be a rotation of employment. The moment this section became effective 783,000 people were dropped from the work-relief rolls. Certainly that very drastic reduction in the rolls should have eliminated therefrom all the unworthy people who had secured employment in this program. There is, however, a large number of our citizens who, through no fault of their own, have no place to turn to for work except to the W. P. A.

May I call attention to the fact—and I say this because our distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] said yesterday that the committee was guided by the recommendations of the President—that the President of the United States in his message transmitting the appropriation for administrative expenses said this:

> The Work Projects Administration now requires the removal from employment of those persons who have been continuously employed for 18 months, and to make investigations at least once in 12 months to determine the continuing need of each project worker. I believe any such requirement works a great hardship on many people.

Let me call attention to the age of the workers who have been dropped. The average age of those who found private employment was 36.2 years. The average age of those not so fortunate as to find work was over 43 years. The investigation made in 1939 disclosed that but a little over 12 percent of the men who were dropped because of the 18 months' rule were able to secure employment in private industry, and nearly 55 percent were reassigned to W. P. A. Those of us who represent districts in which there is much work being done in connection with our defense program know full well that it is not until every young man in the community is placed in private industry that private industry takes a chance on an older man; and I respectfully suggest that it would be a wise thing to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I offered, because it is identical with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, on January 31, 1941, I introduced on the floor of this House the bill H. R. 2789, which would strike out the 18-month layoff clause covering W. P. A. workers, which is identical with the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. On Wednesday, June 11, I made a statement, which will be found in the RECORD at page 5027, to the effect that when the relief bill, House Joint Resolution No. 193, came up for consideration I intended to offer an amendment to strike out the 18-month clause. I laid on the Clerk's desk yesterday this amendment, and owing to the fact the chairman has recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has introduced an amendment identical to mine, and to my bill H. R. 2789, I am happy to rise in support of this particular amendment.

I am wondering if we fully realize how many we have on W. P. A.? We have 1,440,000 men and women on W. P. A. Thirty-two percent, or approximately 460,000, are under 35 years of age. Twenty-four percent, or approximately 345,000, are between the ages of 35 and 44. Twenty-four percent plus, or 345,000, are between the ages of 45 and 55. From 19 to 20 percent, or 273,600, are 55 years of age and over.

Mr. Chairman, what is going to be done with these 618,600 unemployables who were over 50 years of age as of June 1? You will agree with me, I believe, that industry will not absorb this group. Defense or nondefense industry does not want anyone over 45. We are arguing back and forth that we want local control. Under the mandatory provisions of the present W. P. A. law the local enforcement officer or W. P. A. director has no authority whatsoever. We gentlemen in Washington, we Members of Congress, have issued a mandatory order that regardless of needs, regardless of whether or not they need work, when a man or woman has worked 18 months on W. P. A. they shall be laid off. The gentleman from Virginia stated he had talked to Colonel Harrington. I raise the question whether or not Colonel Harrington knows conditions in your district and my district as well as the local agency. The local agency should have jurisdiction to determine the need or lack of need of the local individuals who are on W. P. A. The minute we lay them off W. P. A. they are going on relief. They have no place else to go. W. P. A. is playing an important part in our defense program, and this program must be carried through. W. P. A. workers become familiar with their duties, and then they are laid off—to do what? To go on relief. Is that the American way of life? Are we going to force the people who possibly are not as fortunate as you and I to bend their heads and ask for relief? The people of America do not want relief—they want jobs. They want a chance to support their families and be given the privilege to earn a few dollars so they can look their fellowman in the face and say, "I work for my keep, the true American way."

I do not agree with all things of the W. P. A., but, my friends, the people do not agree with all things Congress does. Do you realize that 74,000 unfortunate people were laid off W. P. A. in March 1941, right in the dead of winter, because the law said, "They have worked 18 months"? Let us be fair, let us do unto others as if we were the others, and adopt this amendment and let the world know that we are going to take care of our people regardless of race, color, or creed.

I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this House will think about the real situation of the W. P. A. and the necessity for trying to keep it as clean as possible. If we go ahead and permit the abolition of the 18-months rule, what happens? We will have a group who will insist on perpetuating themselves forever upon that roll, and it will be absolutely impossible to separate them from the roll. The damage to the poor people of this country by the creation of that kind of a class and the damage to those people themselves as a result far outweighs any inconvenience to a few people who happen to be displaced.

Lots and lots of people every year hunt up jobs and get jobs because they have

been thrown off the W. P. A. under this 18-month rule. Many more of them are in that group every year, and they are better off because of the loss temporarily of their positions.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman made a statement that it would be impossible to remove them from the roll.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. That is not true.

Mr. TABER. Why, of course, it is true.

Mr. HEALEY. There are many reasons why persons may be removed from W. P. A.

Mr. TABER. Now, the gentleman knows there is no way of removing those people who insist on hanging on to that situation, who will not get themselves in a position where they will take private employment. Everyone knows that. There is no use trying to create some hysteria here this afternoon on that subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I congratulate the committee on retaining the 18-month provision. May I say that I think we would be wise if we would reduce this to 12 months in line with the reduction in the appropriation which is being made. To save my life I cannot see how anyone can argue that we should confer the right on these people to be perpetuated in these jobs when others are waiting.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEALEY) there were—ayes 63, noes 72.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. HEALEY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 84, noes 79.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: Page 15, line 16, after the word "needs", insert: "*Provided, however,* That the fact a person has an insurance or benefit policy which he or she has carried 12 years or more, or which has a cash-loan value of $500 or less, shall not be considered in determining the actual need of such employment."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is nothing more nor less than to save the burial policies for the old people. The situation is today that we have in many cases an old couple who have a policy they have been paying on for a number of years for the purpose of providing money for their burial at the time of their death.

If my amendment is agreed to they will be allowed to retain this policy in order that there will be money enough to bury them when they die. In other words, it will save them from the potter's field, and I think we should at least furnish the opportunity for them to be saved from the potter's field after their death. The present law is such that if they die destitute, the relief has to take care of them and the potter's field is their lot; but if we adopt this amendment the certifying agency must certify an old person who is destitute other than one of these burial policies. The only purpose of this is to allow relief agencies to take into consideration the fact that they will allow these old people to retain this burial policy to keep them out of potter's field.

I respectfully submit it is a worthy amendment and should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman offers is purely an administrative matter. It mentions one condition which he would like to have corrected. I could stand up here and probably mention 150 kinds of assets that some unemployed person might have, and just as logically argue that they should be inserted in the bill by way of an exemption to the regulations in the bill. For instance, if some person happened to have a horse they needed for certain work or if they had some parlor furniture or if they had this or that, we might say that should not be held against them as far as being certified for work is concerned.

This is purely an administrative matter which has no place in the bill. You have to leave a little bit to the discretion and to the good judgment of the certifying agency. The W. P. A. agencies and management are composed of men and women who are sympathetic with these things, and will try to do justice to the people trying to get on W. P. A. But for us to attempt to write in here a definition of just what assets should be considered and what assets should not be considered is, it seems to me, a very poor way to write legislation. This interferes with the administration of an agency and should be defeated.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. The present certifying agencies claim they do not have discretion to take care of the situation.

Mr. O'NEAL. I can mention a hundred and fifty things which might be considered assets which by law we could take out, just as we could the insurance policy the gentleman mentioned, but that is an administrative matter that should be handled in a different way.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 15, line 13, strike out all of section 10 (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 10. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs, except that preference shall in all cases be given to veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection) and unmarried widows of such veterans and the wives of such veterans as are unemployable who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer at this time concerns the question of veterans' preference on W. P. A.

For the past several years Congress in considering the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act has included a preference for veterans. I am sorry to say that the preferences have not proven as effective as I am sure Congress intended. In other words, the language in the various relief appropriation acts provides a legal loophole which subjects the preferences intended for veterans to the various rules and regulations of the certifying agencies of the respective States, so that there is absolutely no uniformity whatsoever as to the application of such preferences.

There is hardly a Member of Congress, I dare say, who has not received numerous complaints from the manner in which veterans' preference has been extended. This is borne out by the statement appearing in the report of the Committee on Appropriations, page 10, in which the committee makes the following exhortation:

> The committee also calls attention to the provisions of the law insofar as they affect veterans, so that State and local administrators may use the utmost care in determining that veterans' preferences are scrupulously observed.

While it is admitted that there has been unequal application of these preferences by the various local W. P. A. administrators, the principal reason for the ineffectiveness of intended preferences is due to the legal loophole in the law itself.

The question before us at this moment is whether or not this Congress really wants to give the veteran a true preference or wants to make it appear to the public that such preference is being given when, in truth, such is actually not the case.

Let me at this point remind you that the three great veteran organizations in the country—the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, take the position that either a real veterans' preference be extended or none at all.

The present so-called preference has no effectiveness because it is subject to the so-called relative-needs clause. In fact, it results in actual discrimination against those citizens who gave their

youth and a part of their blood or their health in defense of this country and who now receive small amounts of compensation by reason of their service-incurred disabilities.

As an illustration, it is the policy of the W. P. A. to divide all certified eligibles into two classes—class A covering those with no income or assets, and class B where there is some income or some assets. All of those in class A must receive assignment before consideration is given those in class B.

Veterans who receive as little as $10, $20, or $30 monthly—and, by the way, 45 percent of all service-connected disabled veterans receive less than $30 monthly compensation—are placed in class B. Therefore, a veteran for example receiving $20 monthly compensation with a family and really in need is denied W. P. A. employment, whereas his needy nonveteran neighbor gets a W. P. A. job, earning an average of $55 monthly, thus having a net income of $35 more monthly than the battle-scarred veteran. In short, the disabled American veteran, in lieu of compensation, would be far better off on W. P. A.

I have cited the case of the disabled veteran receiving $20 monthly to show the vicious effect of the relative-needs clause, and many more instances could be enumerated.

Unemployed veterans generally are subject to the varying standards set up by public-relief agencies in the different communities and States. The relative-needs clause permits local W. P. A. administrators to make their own interpretations to the detriment of needy veterans as pointed out in the committee's report.

My amendment is designed to exempt veterans, their widows, and wives of those veterans unemployable from the effect of the relative-needs clause, and would give authority to the W. P. A. itself to determine their need for and entitlement to employment. In other words, my amendment establishes uniformity in determining eligibility for employment as far as veterans are concerned on a Federal basis and not according to varying rules and regulations of local and State relief agencies as heretofore.

I think my colleagues will agree with me and approve of my proposal to establish a standard basis for determining veteran eligibility for W. P. A. employment which will apply equally in all States.

Let me point out that the average age of the World War veteran is nearly 49 years and his opportunity for employment is limited. These unemployed employable veterans are anxious to become employed and would much rather have employment than to have to ask for a pension.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that at the present time in Pennsylvania—at least I am so informed by Colonel Matthews—one out of seven now on W. P. A. is a veteran.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

There are some who maintain that the relative-needs clause should be applied to veterans as well as to nonveterans. But Congress has long recognized that those men and women willing to give their lives in defense of their country are in a special class and entitled to preference. To those who persist in applying the relative-needs clause to the defenders of this Nation let me quote from a letter received from Philip A. Mathews, State administrator of W. P. A. in Pennsylvania:

> May I suggest that in the new W. P. A. Act provision be made that veterans who are unemployed be entitled to assignment on W. P. A. work without having first been relief cases.
>
> At the present time 1 man out of every 7 working on the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania is a veteran, and it seems to me that these men who have fought for their country should be entitled to a job on W. P. A. without first having to beg for relief. In addition, let me point out that disabled veterans, men who have lost an arm or a leg, or have been so maimed as to be granted a disability award, in a very large number of cases because of the disability award granted by the Federal Government, are rejected for relief by the department of public assistance, and that, of course, bars them from employment by the W. P. A.
>
> The disability award granted these men is small, amounting to just about the same grant that the department of public assistance would give them for relief, and yet, because it comes from the Federal Government and not from the department of public assistance, these men are denied the opportunity of a Federal job.
>
> I believe that if proper provision is made to care for our unemployed veterans it will have a very decided effect in raising the morale of the young men who are now being inducted into the Army and Navy. If the veterans of the last war are not taken care of, the possible veterans of the next war may think our country an ungrateful master.

Since Administrator Mathews points out effective veteran preference is a national-defense necessity, my amendment will accomplish such an objective.

In asking your support for this amendment, let me leave this thought with you—America need never fear for its future so long as it provides adequate security for its defenders.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is asking you by this amendment to take away any question of relative need and to give every veteran, irrespective of need, precedence over every person in the United States, many of whom may be in a very sad and deplorable condition financially. The gentleman, by this amendment, would wipe out the Edmiston amendment, as well as that which is in the bill, and would state that a veteran who has no dependents, or who has no great financial responsibility, as far as his family is concerned, should take precedence over a widow with two or three children who may be in the direst of need.

I believe I know something of the veteran. I do not believe the veterans of this country would ask that this relative need clause as now written and as changed by the Edmiston amendment be done away with and the language of this amendment be substituted. I do not believe the able-bodied veteran of the World War who is better off than the widow with children, or than some man who has greater responsibilities, is the type who would say, "Put me ahead of him." The veteran is not selfish. The real soldier is not seeking to get all that he can from the Government. If one is such an individual, he should not be. I say that my association with the veterans leads me to believe that they would repudiate any action designed to give them an unfair benefit and unfair preference over those who are weaker and worse off than they are.

This amendment should be defeated, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I agree with what the gentleman has said about the veterans asking for a special preference for veterans; but may I point out that my amendment simply removes the relative-need test and substitutes the need-of-employment test.

Mr. O'NEAL. The representative of the veterans' organizations stated, as I understood his testimony, that the law today did not need very much changing, that it was a question of administration, and that the veterans' organizations felt that in many places they were taken care of properly but that some administrators did not take care of them properly.

I say now for the Committee as we said in the hearings, that if any administrator is not following the provisions of the law as to veterans' preference, we condemn such action and certainly hope that he will be required to do so in the future.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken had a very fine World War record. He was a member of our own New England Division, the Yankee Division, and I know his interest in the veterans is great. I also know his sincerity of purpose. Doubtless veterans in his section of the country have not had the great difficulty that veterans in other sections of the country have had in securing W. P. A. work. I feel the Congress should take some action to help the veterans secure W. P. A. employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the members of this committee were asked to increase the appropriation under this joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 193, by $364,000,000 under an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Like many other Members of the House, I received telegrams and communications urging that the appropriation of $886,000,000, carried in this bill, be increased by the amount I have indicated.

This increase was asked in the face of the fact that every agency of the Government and the Appropriations Com-

mittee of this House, having charge and jurisdiction of this bill, recommended the amount carried in the bill as being sufficient and adequate to provide for the needs under W. P. A. for the next fiscal year.

It was my best judgment that the recommendations of the committee, the administrative agencies of the Government, and the Bureau of the Budget should be sustained, and I accordingly voted to uphold the committee's recommendation. Such an increase in the proposed appropriation was actuated and based not so much upon actual need, but upon the premise that it would maintain the morale of our people in the present emergency. The trend of each succeeding year of late has been ever increasing appropriations to meet added demands and ever-increasing requests for more money in nearly every activity of the Government. It is refreshing that at least this appropriation represents a substantial reduction in the amount appropriated in the last preceding year. Let us remember that one of the foundations on which the stability of the Government rests is a sound economic structure. If the present trend continues, no person with sound reasoning and good judgment can come to any other conclusion than that the inevitable fate of this Republic will be the complete economic collapse of our way of life. There is a limit to the credit of the United States and that limit is approaching with unparalleled speed.

The people of this country will soon come to a full realization that they cannot look to the Federal Government for support in all and every activity in American life.

Today persistent efforts are being made on the floor of this House; first, to provide minimum wages for W. P. A. workers below which no State administrative board under W. P. A. could go regardless of whether it is just, sound, or reasonable. Other amendments have been offered to change or eliminate reasonable restrictions now contained in the basic law governing the W. P. A. Administration. I believe that it is not only unwise but it is unsound to make it easier and to encourage that segment of our population who will make no effort to obtain employment in private enterprise, business, or industry in order to relieve the Government of the burden of maintaining them.

The keystone on which W. P. A. began was need and need should be the only basis of our concern in the hearing on this measure before the House as pertinent to this issue and bearing directly upon our discussion and debate on this bill and these so-called liberalizing amendments offered to weaken the administration under the W. P. A. And as some evidence of what the people in the Nation think about this particular relief function of the Government, I call to your attention a short editorial which appeared in the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city, in the issue of June 11, 1941, on this very subject and I will include it in my remarks in order that the Members of this House may know at least the conclusions arrived at by a very prominent daily paper which reflects the views and opinions of the people in the area of its circulation, and this is what they have to say about it:

W. P. A. LABOR SHORTAGE

Widely separated sections of the Nation report the possibility that W. P. A. activities may have to be dropped because of a shortage of men who can qualify for relief employment. Opportunities for work have increased so rapidly that able-bodied men are getting jobs at higher pay than the W. P. A. schedule.

In some localities the only employees still certified for W. P. A. projects are men who are advanced in age or who lack the physical strength to compete on even terms in the swifter pace of private industry.

The W. P. A. was started originally to provide a small income for millions who were out of work. The entire program was built on an emergency basis, with repeated assurance that whenever industry called for more men, Federal activities would be reduced in a corresponding degree.

Various persons who get higher pay in the W. P. A. ranks because they have administrative assignments may be loath to see the emergency end because this will mean that they, too, must quit the Government pay roll. But there is no excuse for continuing a relief program in any community where those who have charge of it must beat the bushes in an attempt to find unemployed indigents.

In such cases new unemployment should be created—by putting the relief executives back in circulation. The great trouble with all temporary Government projects is their inherent tendency to become permanent. Those who find soft berths in them always have political connections powerful enough to blanket the interests of the taxpayers.

I believe it is the duty of every Member of Congress in the consideration of this appropriation bill, to do everything that is possible in behalf of those who are in need, and I believe we can best serve the needy people of our country by doing everything possible to encourage them to seek employment and gainful occupation in private pursuit, enterprise, business, and industry and thereby lighten the burden on the Federal Government.

This is particularly true at this time in the face of a threatened war and in the further fact that we are appropriating and expending billions of dollars to provide a national defense to protect home and country.

I say it is the patriotic duty of every person to assist his Government by assisting himself. The time calls not only for patriotism but it calls for economy, thrift, prudence, and individual sacrifice on the part of all of us if the Nation is to be sustained, the Government upheld, and our economic structure preserved, and the American way of life maintained for ourselves and those who will come after us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOSER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOSER: Page 16, line 5, after the word "workers", insert "any person refusing to pay taxes to counties, parishes, or subdivisions or advising and/or counseling against payment of such taxes."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think that section has been stricken out of the bill, and therefore I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair is advised, the gentleman from Virginia is correct. That paragraph has been stricken out by an amendment already adopted, and the point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOSER: Page 16, line 14, after "projects", in line 13, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all employees and/or workers who refuse to pay taxes to counties, parishes, or subdivisions, or advising and/or counseling against payment of such taxes."

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this subsection was rendered necessary because people employed on W. P. A. were counseled, especially in rural communities, not to pay taxes, advancing as a ground for their argument that their salaries were paid by Federal Government check and therefore are exempt. This prompted appeals, first, to the W. P. A. administrative officers, and Mr. Nels Anderson, who had charge of their public-relations section, put before me regulations absolutely inconsistent with the rights in civilian life with respect to garnishment of wages for taxes, as contrasted with the policies that have sprung into existence in labor organizations as a result of the National Labor Relations Act, where check-offs for dues occur against the wages of those who may leave W. P. A. and be placed in industrial employment, pay high initiation fees where membership in a union is necessary. I appealed to different groups and to the head of the W. P. A. and Mr. WHITE and Mr. HOLMES came to my office, as well as Mr. ROLPH, and we went over the situation. It was passed back to the State administrator to try to effect an amicable arrangement, but they flatly refused. The situation that now exists is that a local community or a township may sponsor a school-grading project and the man employed on that project refuses to pay nominal taxes to the school district, and inures to his benefit as a laborer on that project. It may be the very school his children are attending, and the balance of the citizens of the township may be paying the taxes that sponsors the project that gives him employment. The same thing applies to a road project sponsored by a board of supervisors. This has brought about such chaotic condition that the State administrator has been unable to stem, and the cooperation received by me, I am sorry to say, has been wholly ineffective because of too much buck passing by a number of people, as I have indicated. A situation developed where a man went down to see the tax collector in his township and threatens to thrash him on his own premises because the tax collector was pressing a W. P. A. worker to pay his taxes for a school that was sponsoring the project on which he was employed. In one township or district they had a record of certain people employed there whose gross earnings for continuous employment exceeded the salary received during that period of the year comprising the school term by a school teacher in the same community, paying taxes into the

sponsor's fund. It is absolutely wrong and there must be some method of approach, and I hope the Committee sees fit to adopt the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how we could establish a rule on this bill that people had to pay taxes before they could get on relief. I am entirely in sympathy with what the gentleman says that people who can pay taxes and who can support their schools and who can take care of their local commitments ought to do so, but it seems to me it certainly would be illogical to establish by legislation that a man could not be on relief unless he paid taxes.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MOSER. I do not believe the gentleman from Virginia wishes to state in the way he has stated that it would be necessary for a man to pay taxes before he can get on relief.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Or on a W. P. A. job.

Mr. MOSER. The amendment would specifically put him off if he refused to pay taxes on the ground that his check comes from the Federal Government.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not see how we could force a man to take money that he has said he needs to support his family and give it to the tax collector.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Would not the Government forfeit the man's property if he did not pay his taxes?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would think so.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the request made a moment ago to include the right to revise and extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachussets. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately after the remarks of the distinguished gentleman and great World War hero, EMMET O'NEAL, of Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACIORA: Page 17, strike out lines 12 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) No Communist and no member of any Nazi Bund organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution, and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi Bund organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi Bund organization."

Mr. MACIORA. Mr. Chairman, we have criminal statutes and immigration laws to deal with subversive aliens and persons who illegally enter or illegally remain in the United States.

Those laws, and not an administrative provision such as is contained in the appropriation bill now up for consideration, should be invoked to deal with the question of aliens of the classifications I have mentioned.

The way to deal with the alien problem is not to starve human beings to death by refusing them employment. To them the United States is the land of opportunity. They have sacrificed the comfort of home and family association to come to this promised land—to this country that came into existence because people sought opportunity or were persecuted and oppressed elsewhere. They have come into the midst of customs and a language that is strange to them. Denied educational opportunity at home, their problem aggravated by difficulties of assimilation here, many of them have been slow—understandably slow—to qualify for admission to United States citizenship.

I have in my files scores of pitiful letters. They are professions of faith and of hope for the future, pleadings, and self-censuring messages, but all adding up to the circumstance of inability to master promptly the language, the script, the history of the United States. But they reflect honest effort, sincerity, and an abiding faith in the American way of life. They are messages of hope. But if all of this is to be dashed to earth by what I regard an unthinking restriction, such as this bill proposes to perpetrate, I can visualize the heartache that must follow.

Connecticut was one of the Original Colonies. The early settlers built a strong foundation in agriculture, in industry, and, most important of all, in true Americanism. Those elements were nurtured by those who came after them—men and women who, as were the original colonists, were people from foreign shores. I do not have statistics available, but I know I am safe in saying that a very large majority of the residents of my State are of foreign birth or extraction—originally aliens or children of aliens. But they have helped build and develop the finest State in the United States.

The alien, as he is collectively known, has been an important contributor to the history and welfare of the United States. He is a potential citizen. Certainly we can do no less than reassert the assurance that brought every race, color, and creed to our shores in the past 200 years—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is all this amendment does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACIORA) there were—ayes 15, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. (a) The appropriations contained in sections 1 and 2 of this joint resolution, and any administrative allocations thereof shall not be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the agencies receiving appropriations under sections 1 and 2 hereof or allocations under such appropriations are authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, such officers and employees, and utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State such State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the head of the agency involved, as may be necessary, and prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

(c) Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriations in this joint resolution in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk. I am offering two amendments, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia, that the two amendments be considered together?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 21, line 24, strike out the word "sections", and insert the word "section."

On page 22, line 1, strike out the word "and" and the figure "2."

On page 22, line 6, strike out "sections 1 and", and insert "section 1."

On page 22, line 7, strike out the figure "2."

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed these amendments with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], members of the subcommittee. All this amendment does is to proscribe the limitation as to civil service so that it limits only the W. P. A. employee and does not affect a few others in the Treasury Department and a few other offices.

Mr. TABER. This would simply place the employees in the Bureau of Accounts in the Treasury Department and Division of Disbursements and General Accounting Office under civil service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. That have to do with this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it does not undertake to do anything with W. P. A. employees.

Mr. TABER. They are administrative employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the amendments.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 26. No part of any appropriation in this joint resolution shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general, or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

Mr. BENNETT Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr BENNETT: Page 28, line 3, after the figures "26" and before the word "no", insert "In selecting timekeepers, foremen, project supervisors, and other administrative personnel, preference shall be given to qualified persons who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify, and."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane to this paragraph.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot agree, Mr. Chairman, with the distinguished Member from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that the amendment is out of order or that it is not germane to the section to which it is offered. However, if he insists on that, we may find another place to offer it.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would think the gentleman might offer it as a separate section.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

With the permission of the Chair, I will offer it as a separate section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to withdraw the pending amendment?

Mr. BENNETT. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 28, after line 10, insert a new section, as follows:

"In selecting timekeepers, foremen, project supervisors, and other administrative personnel preference shall be given to qualified persons who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane because there are other sections in the bill. Section 1 deals with administrative expenses; section 15 deals with administrative employees. If offered at all, it should have been offered to one of those two sections.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, section 26 has to do with the matter of employment, persons to whom salaries shall be paid, and it appears to me that the amendment is germane.

I am really surprised that any Member of this House would object to the adoption of an amendment of this kind. I have had occasion to observe many instances where qualified folk on the relief rolls have been supervised by folk who are very incompetent and who are in no way in need of the help that they receive. I have in mind one woman whose education was limited to the second grade, supervising a job on which there was a woman who was a graduate of the University of Kansas, a widow with three children. The supervisor was less competent possibly than any woman she was supervising. She owned a very fine farm. She owned considerable city property which was rented, and was holding her position through political pull.

I have in mind a woman who has a monthly income for life of $161.50; who is 77 years of age but who draws $200 a month. She performs no duties, because her health does not permit it. She has been drawing that $200 per month for several years.

I insist, Mr. Chairman, that these timekeepers, foremen, and project supervisors ought to be taken from the lists certified as in need of help. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will prevail.

There is no need to take the time of the House to discuss the merits of the amendment. I believe that every person who will put the needs of the people above political consideration will support this amendment. We ought to quit playing politics with human misery.

Every Member of the House knows that there are plenty of men and women on the relief rolls who are capable of serving in all minor administrative positions.

I agree with the President that as a result of the greatly increased employment under the defense program, the relief rolls have greatly decreased and should continue to decrease. Certainly the cost of administration of W. P. A. should be very much less than heretofore. It is high time that the Congress make a sincere effort to reduce nondefense expenditures and quit playing politics with human misery. I am greatly disappointed by the evident disposition of the majority Members to place patronage above the welfare of qualified persons on the relief rolls.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENNETT) there were—ayes 73 and noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 28. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval stores products) in competition with existing industries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 29, at the end of line 3, insert the following: "This section shall not apply to municipal water plants and distribution systems."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I submitted this amendment to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and to the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I do not know whether they object to it or not. My impression was that they did not. The language has been prepared by the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, I am sorry that I cannot agree with the amendment. This section undertakes to keep W. P. A. out of private business. We have had great difficulty in getting it in and then keeping it in. I would dislike to see it relaxed in any respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say that I am in entire accord with section 28. The difficulty, however, lies in the interpretation. In interpreting that language so as to prevent competition between mills, mines, factories, and plants that may be created or expanded by W. P. A. labor and W. P. A. funds, the W. P. A. has so interpreted "plants processing some commodity for sale" as to apply to municipal water plants.

The W. P. A. has so interpreted the language "plants processing some commodity for sale," interpreted it to apply to municipal water plants. The net result is that several situations have arisen in the country where a municipal plant cannot now expand its lines if it sells to a consumer who is directly receiving water from a privately owned plant. We have a situation in Illinois at the present time where the Illinois Commerce Commission has permitted a municipal water plant to sell in excess of 1,000,000 gallons of water a day to a large brewing company. They have been buying from a plant in the adjoining city which is divided from the municipally owned plant by only a street. Heretofore the municipal plant has not had water available in sufficient quantities to supply such industrial need.

I took the matter up with W. P. A., but they took the position that section 28 applied to municipally owned water plants and distribution systems. I think exceptions should be made in the case of such facilities, and this amendment merely provides a remedy for that situation.

Since I have made mention of a condition which exists in my own immediate area, this would be an appropriate time to interpose a word of praise for those who have been directing the affairs of W. P. A. in that part of central Illinois which embraces my congressional district.

A year ago and also 2 years ago, I had occasion to deliver on this floor a lengthy and documented speech on the abuses in W. P. A. in Pennsylvania, Louisiana, and elsewhere, and at that time I took occasion to praise the conduct of W. P. A. in my own area.

I can with a sense of pride reaffirm that statement now and pay tribute to Mr. James F. McElwee, the district director, and to Mr. Joseph Braunagel, the assistant district director, and the members of their staff for the careful and efficient way in which they have administered Work Projects affairs.

Both of them had long business experience and applied that experience and training when they were called into the Federal service. They have ever sought to make the W. P. A. an efficient and economical operation, and provide to the taxpayers a dollar's worth of service for every dollar expended.

Other colleagues of mine whose districts are a part of that W. P. A. district can corroborate this estimate of their work and I deem it a duty and a pleasure to throw a bouquet to these gentlemen and their coworkers for the service which they have rendered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman from New York wishes to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. The Congress put this limitation in. I feel that if we start pulling at it we may break it down and they will get to doing the vicious things they did before, practices this language was designed to stop. I should like to help the gentleman from Illinois but I am afraid we are in the situation where we must support the language of this section as reported by the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I feel it would be very, very bad to relax the rule provided in section 28 which, as I stated in the beginning, was put in there with the purpose of trying to keep W. P. A. out of direct competition with private enterprise. I believe every Member of the House is sympathetic with this viewpoint and I hope very much we will not make any relaxation of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 193 making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amedments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to make his point of order before action is taken on ordering the previous question?

Mr. ARENDS. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Healey amendment striking out the paragraph relating to the 18 months' provision.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I request a separate vote on the so-called Lasser amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment striking out the food-stamp provision.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: On page 16, line 4, strike out all of subsection (b) beginning in line 4, page 16, and ending in line 13, page 16.

Mr. HEALEY: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEALEY. The language struck out, I understand, is the 18 months' provision.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEALEY and Mr. SACK) there were—ayes 82, noes 114.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted a quorum.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 165, answered "present" 2, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—169

Allen, La.	Geyer, Calif.	Patrick
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gillie	Peterson, Fla.
Angell	Granger	Pittenger
Arnold	Guyer, Kans.	Plauché
Baumhart	Haines	Powers
Beam	Harrington	Ramsay
Bender	Harris, Ark.	Ramspeck
Bishop	Harris, Va.	Randolph
Blackney	Hart	Rankin, Mont.
Bland	Harter	Rees, Kans.
Boggs	Healey	Robinson, Utah
Boland	Hébert	Rogers, Mass.
Bolles	Hendricks	Rogers, Okla.
Bradley, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Rolph
Brooks	Hook	Sabath
Brown, Ga.	Houston	Sacks
Bryson	Hull	Sanders
Buckler, Minn.	Hunter	Sasscer
Bulwinkle	Imhoff	Satterfield
Burdick	Izac	Sauthoff
Byrne	Jackson	Scanlon
Byron	Jacobsen	Schulte
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	Secrest
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer, Mich.
Capozzoli	Kee	Shanley
Cartwright	Kelley, Pa.	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Kramer	Sikes
Cochran	Kunkel	Smith, Conn.
Connery	Landis	Smith, Maine
Crosser	Larrabee	Smith, Ohio
Cullen	Leavy	Smith, Pa.
D'Alesandro	Lesinski	Smith, Wash.
Day	Ludlow	Spence
Dingell	Lynch	Springer
Domengeaux	McArdle	Sullivan
Downs	McGehee	Sutphin
Doxey	McGranery	Sweeney
Dworshak	McGregor	Tenerowicz
Eaton	McKeough	Tibbott
Eberharter	McMillan	Traynor
Elliot, Mass.	Maas	Van Zandt
Ellis	Maciora	Vincent, Ky.
Fenton	Marcantonio	Walter
Fitzgerald	Meyer, Md.	Weaver
Fitzpatrick	Mills, La.	Welch
Flaherty	Mundt	Wene
Flannery	Myers, Pa.	Wheat
Fogarty	Nichols	White
Forand	Norrell	Wickersham
Ford, Miss.	Norton	Wilson
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Gale	O'Connor	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavagan	O'Leary	Worley
Gehrmann	Oliver	Wright
Gerlach	Patman	Young
		Zimmerman

NAYS—165

Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio
Andersen, H. Carl	Disney	Jensen
Anderson, Calif.	Ditter	Johns
Andresen, August H.	Dondero	Johnson, Calif.
Arends	Doughton	Johnson, Ill.
Baldwin	Duncan	Johnson, Luther A.
Barnes	Durham	Johnson, W. Va.
Bates, Ky.	Edmiston	Jones
Beckworth	Elliott, Calif.	Jonkman
Bell	Elston	Kean
Bennett	Englebright	Keefe
Boehne	Faddis	Kefauver
Bolton	Fellows	Kerr
Bonner	Flannagan	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Leland M.	Kinzer
Buck	Fulmer	Knutson
Burch	Gamble	Kocialkowski
Burgin	Gathings	Lambertson
Butler	Gearhart	Lanham
Carlson	Gibson	Lea
Carter	Gilchrist	LeCompte
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Lewis
Chapman	Gossett	McLaughlin
Clark	Graham	McLean
Claypool	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Coffee, Nebr.	Gregory	Mansfield
Cole, Md.	Gwynne	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Colmer	Hall, Leonard W.	Michener
Cooley	Halleck	Mills, Ark.
Cooper	Hancock	Mitchell
Courtney	Heidinger	Monroney
Cox	Hess	Moser
Crawford	Hoffman	Mott
Creal	Holbrock	Murray
Crowther	Holmes	Nelson
Cunningham	Howell	O'Hara
Curtis	Jarman	O'Neal
Davis, Ohio	Jarrett	Pace
Dewey		Paddock
		Patton

Peterson, Ga.	Russell	Thomas, Tex.
Pheiffer, William T.	Rutherford	Thomason
Poage	Short	Tinkham
Priest	Simpson	Vorys, Ohio
Rankin, Miss.	Smith, Va.	Ward
Reece, Tenn.	Snyder	Wasielewski
Reed, N. Y.	South	West
Rich	Sparkman	Whelchel
Rizley	Stearns, N. H.	Whittington
Robertson, N. Dak.	Stefan	Wigglesworth
Robertson, Va.	Stevenson	Williams
Robsion, Ky.	Sumners, Tex.	Winter
Rockefeller	Taber	Woodruff, Mich.
Rodgers, Pa.	Talle	Woodrum, Va.
	Taylor	
	Terry	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Harness Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—95

Andrews	Hartley	Ploeser
Barden	Heffernan	Plumley
Barry	Hill, Colo.	Rabaut
Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Beiter	Hobbs	Richards
Bloom	Hope	Rivers
Boren	Jenks, N. H.	Romjue
Boykin	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Scott
Camp	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scrugham
Cannon, Fla.	Keogh	Sheridan
Celler	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Clason	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Clevenger	Kopplemann	Steagall
Cluett	McCormack	Stratton
Coffee, Wash.	McIntyre	Sumner, Ill.
Collins	Maciejewski	Tarver
Copeland	Magnuson	Thill
Costello	Mason	Thom
Cravens	May	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Merritt	Tolan
Davis, Tenn.	Murdock	Treadway
Delaney	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
Dickstein	O'Day	Voorhis, Calif.
Dies	Osmers	Vreeland
Douglas	O'Toole	Wadsworth
Drewry	Pearson	Weiss
Fish	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gifford	Pierce	
Grant, Ind.		
Green		
Hare		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Youngdahl for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Coffee of Washington for, with Mr. Hill of Colorado against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Cluett against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Harness for, with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Hope against.

General pairs:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Beiter with Mr. Thill.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. May with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Costello with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Green with Mr. Romjue.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Koppleman with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Murdock.

Mr. Celler with Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Pierce.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Thom.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Kelly of Illinois.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Steagall.

Mr. Tolan with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BATES. I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GIFFORD. On this roll call I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2, line 24, after the colon insert "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 114, answered "present" 1, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—214

Allen, Ill.	Cox	Gwynne
Allen, La.	Crawford	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andersen, H. Carl	Creal	Hall, Leonard W.
Anderson, Calif.	Crowther	Halleck
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Hancock
Angell	Curtis	Harness
Arends	D'Alesandro	Harris, Ark.
Baumhart	Day	Harris, Va.
Beckworth	Dirksen	Hartley
Bell	Disney	Heidinger
Bender	Ditter	Hendricks
Bennett	Dondero	Hess
Bishop	Doughton	Holmes
Blackney	Doxey	Howell
Bland	Duncan	Hunter
Boehne	Dworshak	Jarman
Boggs	Eaton	Jarrett
Bolles	Edmiston	Jenkins, Ohio
Bolton	Elliott, Calif.	Jensen
Boren	Ellis	Johns
Bradley, Mich.	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Englebright	Johnson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Faddis	Johnson, Ind.
Bryson	Fellows	Johnson, Luther A.
Buck	Fenton	Johnson, Okla.
Bulwinkle	Ford, Leland M.	Jones
Butler	Ford, Miss.	Jonkman
Byron	Fulmer	Keefe
Carlson	Gamble	Kilday
Carter	Gathings	Kinzer
Cartwright	Gearhart	Knutson
Case, S. Dak.	Gerlach	Kocialkowski
Chapman	Gibson	Kramer
Chiperfield	Gilchrist	Kunkel
Coffee, Nebr.	Gillie	Lambertson
Cole, Md.	Gossett	Landis
Cole, N. Y.	Graham	Lanham
Colmer	Grant, Ala.	Larrabee
Cooley	Gregory	Lea
	Guyer, Kans.	LeCompte
		Ludlow
		McGehee
		McGregor
		McLaughlin
		McMillan
		Maas
		Mahon
		Mansfield
		Martin, Iowa
		Martin, Mass.
		Meyer, Md.
		Michener
		Mills, Ark.
		Mills, La.
		Monroney
		Moser
		Mott
		Mundt
		Murray
		Nelson
		Nichols
		Norrell
		O'Hara
		O'Neal
		Pace
		Paddock
		Patman
		Patton
		Peterson, Fla.
		Peterson, Ga.
		Pheiffer, William T.
		Pittenger
		Plauché
		Poage
		Randolph
		Rankin, Miss.
		Reece, Tenn.
		Reed, N. Y.
		Rees, Kans.
		Rich
		Rizley
		Robertson, N. Dak.
		Robertson, Va.
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rockefeller
		Rodgers, Pa.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rogers, Okla.
		Russell
		Rutherford
		Sasscer
		Satterfield
		Secrest
		Shafer, Mich.
		Short
		Sikes
		Simpson
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, W. Va.
		South
		Sparkman
		Spence
		Springer
		Stefan
		Sumners, Tex.
		Taber
		Talle
		Taylor
		Thomas, N. J.
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thomason
		Tibbott
		Tinkham
		Van Zandt
		Vincent, Ky.
		Vorys, Ohio
		Weaver
		West
		Wheat
		Whelchel
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Wigglesworth
		Williams
		Wilson
		Winter
		Wolcott
		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Woodrum, Va.
		Youngdahl
		Zimmerman

NAYS—114

Arnold	Gore	O'Leary
Baldwin	Granger	Oliver
Bates, Ky.	Haines	Patrick
Beam	Hart	Powers
Boland	Harter	Priest
Bradley, Pa.	Healey	Ramsay
Brooks	Hébert	Ramspeck
Burdick	Heffernan	Rankin, Mont.
Burgin	Hill, Wash.	Robinson, Utah
Canfield	Holbrock	Sabath
Cannon, Mo.	Hook	Sacks
Capozzoli	Houston	Sanders
Clark	Hull	Sauthoff
Claypool	Imhoff	Scanlon
Cochran	Izac	Schulte
Connery	Jackson	Shanley
Cooper	Jacobsen	Smith, Conn.
Courtney	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Maine
Crosser	Kean	Smith, Pa.
Cullen	Kee	Smith, Wash.
Davis, Ohio	Kefauver	Snyder
Dickstein	Kelley, Pa.	Stearns, N. H.
Dingell	Kennedy, Michael J.	Stevenson
Domengeaux	Kerr	Sullivan
Downs	Leavy	Sutphin
Durham	Lesinski	Sweeney
Eberharter	Lewis	Tenerowicz
Elliot, Mass.	Lynch	Terry
Fitzgerald	McArdle	Traynor
Fitzpatrick	McGranery	Walter
Flannagan	McKeough	Ward
Flannery	McLean	Wasielewski
Fogarty	Maciora	Wene
Forand	Marcantonio	White
Ford, Thomas F.	Myers, Pa.	Worley
Gale	Norton	Wright
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Young
Gehrmann	O'Connor	
Geyer, Calif.		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Shannon

NOT VOTING—102

Anderson, N. Mex.	Collins	Jennings
Andrews	Copeland	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Barden	Costello	Kelly, Ill.
Barnes	Cravens	Kennedy, Martin J.
Barry	Culkin	Keogh
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn
Beiter	Delaney	Kirwan
Bloom	Dies	Kleberg
Bonner	Douglas	Kopplemann
Boykin	Drewry	McCormack
Buckler, Minn.	Engel	McIntyre
Buckley, N. Y.	Fish	Maciejewski
Burch	Flaherty	Magnuson
Byrne	Gifford	Mason
Camp	Grant, Ind.	May
Cannon, Fla.	Green	Merritt
Casey, Mass.	Hare	Mitchell
Celler	Harrington	Murdock
Chenoweth	Hill, Colo.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Clason	Hinshaw	O'Day
Clevenger	Hobbs	Osmers
Cluett	Hoffman	O'Toole
Coffee, Wash.	Hope	Pearson
	Jenks, N. H.	

Pearson	Schaefer, Ill.	Thill
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Schuetz	Thom
Pierce	Scott	Tolan
Ploeser	Scrugham	Treadway
Plumley	Sheppard	Vinson, Ga.
Rabaut	Sheridan	Voorhis, Calif.
Reed, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.	Vreeland
Richards	Starnes, Ala.	Wadsworth
Rivers	Steagall	Weiss
Rolph	Stratton	Welch
Romjue	Sumner, Ill.	
	Tarver	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hill of Colorado for, with Mr. Coffee of Washington against.

Mr. Hope for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

General pairs:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Osmers.

Mr Starnes of Alabama with Mr Fish.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr Culkin.

Mr. Joseph L Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Beiter with Mr Thill.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. May with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Costello with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Barnes with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Bonner with Mr Clason.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Drewry with Mr Stratton.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Green with Mr. Romjue.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. Celler with Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Pierce.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Thom.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Kelly of Illinois.

Mr. Tolan with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Harrington with Mr Steagall.

Mr. LUDLOW changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 2, commencing in line 24, after the word "appropriation", strike out all of the remainder of the page, and on page 3 strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is this the amendment striking out the provision for food stamps?

The SPEAKER. It is.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 148, noes 120.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. BOLAND and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 168, noes 122.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 193 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following changes in those parts of the joint resolution relating to relief and its administration by the Work Projects Administration; provide for allocation of funds to States, Territories, municipalities, and the District of Columbia by grants-in-aid to enable them to carry out the relief programs determined and administered by them, and in which they participate through reasonable financial and other contributions.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE TO POSTMASTERS OF THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CLASSES

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 235), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1618, a bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes. That, after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 236), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1073, a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923 as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 234), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent speech of Hon. James A. Farley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article on the St. Lawrence project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a poem relative to Chief Justice Hughes, and in the second to include a telegram from our national committeeman from Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission of the House to sit during sessions of the House next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could shout loud enough promptly to bring to the attention of the people of Oakland, Calif., the brilliant and heart-rending speech of the late Honorable George G. Vest, of Missouri, in behalf of the dog, which appears in the RECORD under date of October 16, 1914.

Today Rowdy, a fox terrier, is doomed to die by the dead-hand action of his mistress, who in her will ordered his execution upon her demise.

Dog lovers and sportsmen, boys and girls all over the land are hoping and praying that this inhuman and unwarranted action will be arrested and the life of a dog, man's greatest friend, be spared.

There are thousands of homes that will welcome Rowdy and acknowledge him as their own. Rowdy is not a criminal or a menace to public health or safety, and he has a right to live. It would be a sin and a crime if he were killed to carry out the unsound and inhuman provisions contained in the will of a thoughtless eccentric. If the situation was reversed and Rowdy, the dog, having died first, left a will, I am sure it would not condemn to death the selfish and heartless mistress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the speech referred to may be reprinted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

EULOGY ON THE DOG

(By Senator Vest, of Missouri)

"Gentlemen of the jury, the best friend a man has in this world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter whom he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us—those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name—may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him, perhaps when he needs it most. A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees to do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolute, unselfish friend that man can have in this selfish world—the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous—is his dog.

"Gentlemen of the jury, a man's dog stands by him in prosperity and in poverty, in health and in sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground, where the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he can be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer; he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince. When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens. If fortune drives the master forth an outcast in the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him to guard against danger, to fight against his enemies. And when the last scene of all comes, and death takes the master in its embrace, and his body is laid away in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by his graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws, his eyes sad but open in alert watchfulness, faithful and true even to death."

Judge John F. Philips, United States judge of the western district of Missouri (retired), and a former law partner of Senator Vest, gives the following account of the circumstances that occasioned this famous tribute to the dog:

"In the early seventies a Kentuckian residing in Johnson County, Mo., owned a noted hound named Old Drum, imported from Kentucky. He was always reliable; when he made outcry on the hunt, it was an assurance that the trail of the fox or deer was scented hot, and he led the pack in the chase. The owner had for the faithful dog a devotion akin to affection. One morning Old Drum was found shot to death near a neighbor's house. Circumstances of small evidential import pointed to that neighbor as the assassin of Old Drum, which induced a suit in justice of the peace court to recover $150 damages, the maximum sum recoverable in that jurisdiction. After one or more hung juries, there was a verdict for the defendant. The plaintiff appealed the case to the higher court. The costs had piled up enormously, and the hot blood of the litigants was up. Eminent counsel were employed on either side. Among those for the plaintiff was Col. Wells H. Blodgett, for many years the general solicitor of the Wabash Railroad Co. When the case was up for the second trial Vest chanced to be in attendance upon the court. Blodgett persuaded his client to employ Vest, who was waiting to try some important case. His fondness for the good dog obtained his assent.

"The trial had already begun; Vest merely sat by as if a spectator during the examination of the multitude of witnesses. The discussion before the jury by the other counsel had consumed the short winter day; and the court, insisting that the case should be given to the jury that evening, took a recess until after supper. 'The dog case' had attracted the attention of all Warrensburg; and the fact that George Vest was to speak that night 'in a dog case' filled the courtroom almost to suffocation with men, women, and boys.

"One of the counsel for the defendant had derided such a lawsuit about a hound dog of little value if not a neighborhood nuisance. Vest paid little attention to the evidence or law of the case, but leveled the whole artillery of his genius to a vindication of the dog's invaluable traits. So vibrant with pathos was his voice that men and women wept, and the jury was swept from deliberation, and returned a verdict at once for the plaintiff for $500, when the sum sued for was only $150. The excess was remitted and 'the dog case' was closed; but Vest's tribute to the dog is immortal."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL—1942

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it was intended that the District of Columbia appropriation bill be taken up today. The fiscal year is drawing to a close, and it is essential we pass the bill as soon as possible and get it over to the Senate. It is my understanding, after a conference with the leadership, that the bill will be called up Monday, and I ask unanimous consent that when the bill is called up on Monday we limit general debate to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill and I think 1 hour of debate is not enough. I would agree if an additional half hour were requested, providing 1½ hours of general debate.

Mr. MAHON. I think that is a proper request. We would like to have more time on the bill, but I think we should pass it as soon as possible and send it to the Senate.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will agree to 1½ hours of general debate, I shall not object.

Mr. MAHON. I so request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] asks unanimous consent that when the District appropriation bill is taken up for consideration that general debate be limited to 1½ hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to be heard on the bill and I do not want to be foreclosed by a short limitation of time in general debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho 5 minutes under general debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman when he is going to call up the bill and just how it comes on the program for Monday. I presume the calendar will be called, and if there are any suspensions they will be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be one suspension. After this it is the intention of the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Texas to call up the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on House Resolution 193.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I have just addressed to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a certain newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include various editorials and news comments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain statements made today concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there was transmitted to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I am the chairman, a letter, signed by Secretary Ickes, addressed to the Speaker of this House, notifying the Congress that the provisions of the Boulder Dam bill have been put into operation. I assumed that was a matter to be printed in the RECORD. I have submitted the matter to the Public Printer, which has been returned. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as stated in requesting permission to insert the following letter in the RECORD, I assumed on receipt of this report from the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress in the form of a letter addressed to the Speaker reporting that certain provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (act of July 19, 1940, 54 Stat. 774) had been complied with, which was transmitted to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I am chairman, that as this report conformed to a provision of law it was proper material for inclusion in the proceedings of the House printed in the RECORD.

It now develops that, conforming to the interpretation of the Public Printer, this report cannot be inserted in the RECORD without special permission, as stated in the attached letter from Superintendent of Planning R. A Ritter:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1941.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: We find it necessary to return herewith copy submitted by you for insertion in the RECORD This, you will recall, was returned to you previously on June 5, but you felt that we had made a mistake and you returned it to us for our review.

In connection with matter to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I must refer you to several sources, which I feel sure will explain the procedure pretty thoroughly. First, I can refer you to pages 200 and 201 of Cannon's Procedures in the House of Representatives. Next I refer you to the regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing adopted by that body in the control of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as authorized by title 44, section 181, of the Code of Laws of the United States. I am including a copy of this for your review. Under the House Rules, section 929, "Leave to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," the following may be found:

"The practice of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speeches not actually delivered on the floor has grown up by consent of the House as the membership has increased, and it has become difficult at times for every Member to express at length on the floor his reasons for his attitude on public questions. * * *

"Leave to extend remarks does not permit a Member to insert in the RECORD statements and letters of others unless the leave granted specifies such matter, whether the extension be under general leave for all Members or individually."

I am sure you appreciate that this Office has no desire toward assuming, nor personal interest in performing, editorial responsibilities in connection with Federal printing and binding. The inclusion of this material would be a routine matter with us; however, we must operate according to the effective statutes concerning printing and binding and the regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Very truly yours,

PUBLIC PRINTER,
By R. A. RITTER,
Superintendent of Planning.

As it is obvious that this important report would be out of place in the Appendix of the RECORD, I have requested and received permission that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior addressed to the Speaker appear at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 29, 1941.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: The Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (act of July 19, 1940, 54 Stat. 774) provides in section 10 thereof as follows:

"* * * This act shall take effect for all purposes when, but not before, the Secretary shall have found that provision has been made for the termination of the existing lease of the Boulder power plant and for the operation thereof as authorized by section 9 hereof, and that allottees obligated under contracts in force on the date of enactment of this act to pay for at least 90 percent of the firm energy shall have entered into contracts (1) consenting to such operation, and (2) containing such other provisions as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper for carrying out the purposes of this act."

In view of contracts entered into in this month of May 1941 between the United States and lessees of Boulder power plant and allottees of electrical energy, I hereby find that provision has been made for the termination of the existing lease of the Boulder power plant and for the operation thereof as authorized by section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and that allottees obligated under contracts in force on July 19, 1940, to pay for at least 90 percent of the firm energy have entered into contracts (1) consenting to such operation and (2) containing such other provisions as I deem necessary and proper for carrying out the purposes of said act.

Pursuant to said section 10, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act today has taken effect for all purposes.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Under special order the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] for 20 minutes.

LABOR COMMITTEE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the hour is so late, but I believe that my message is of great importance and that it is quite necessary for me to deliver it.

I have asked for this time today to discuss what seems to me to be either a misunderstanding or an unfair attitude on the part of certain Members toward the committee of which I have the honor

of being chairman. I am doing this, not so much because of myself, but rather in justice to the fine, loyal members of my committee and the many Members of the House who have been my friends through our years of service.

I do not believe anyone can accuse me of shirking a responsibility. The facts are these: The Labor Committee was set up for the purpose of dealing with all matters concerning labor. Since its inception, its purpose has been to deal fairly with legislation designed to benefit labor, at least that is our conception of the job. In the last several years, it has not been an easy job and our difficulty has been increased by the fact that, not only have we had a responsibility to our constituents, but also, where formerly we had one great labor organization to consider when bills affecting labor were introduced, we now have two, each trying to gain the advantage of the other with the committee caught in between while trying to do an honest job for all labor whether organized or unorganized. Current world conditions have increased our difficulties and we find ourselves in a very unhappy position. As a result of these conditions, we have, on the one hand, labor making some foolish mistakes at a time when, for the benefit of all labor they should be working together, regardless of personal conflict in this time of great emergency; and on the other hand, we have those whom I shall designate as "labor baiters" watching their opportunities to take advantage of this condition and in the confusion of emotional stress, commit crimes against labor which, instead of punishing the few who are responsible for much that is taking place, would, in effect, destroy much of the really necessary laws enacted through the years to benefit the honest, God fearing, loyal and patriotic men and women of America who through the sweat of their brow and their sacrifice have built this Nation and made it the envy of all the world.

Considering these facts, your committee has been obliged to move slowly. We could not and would not rush legislation to the floor of the House at a time when emotion might rule over common sense. I do not believe there are many Members of the House who would not protect the rights and priviliges of the working men and women of America in normal times and under normal conditions, but these are not normal times. Judging from the mail coming to our offices every day, it would seem that many people are suffering from the jitters. Everything seems to be overemphasized—radio, newspapers, and conversation. We are tending to extremes in whatever way our personal thoughts and desires lead us. In this atmosphere, which I am sure you will agree exists, it would seem the better part of wisdom to stop, look, and listen before we commit ourselves to anything we may live to regret bitterly. I believe that this is the time to give serious and deliberate thought to the tremendous problem which will be ours when the emergency is over and our industry is seeking to readjust itself. Toward this end, the committee is giving serious consideration to the solving of the problem. We consider this our most important duty at this time and feel that labor and industry are fearful about what the post-war conditions in this country will be. The committee is concerning itself with a long-range program that will attempt to rebuild a normal economic structure when the crisis is passed. To this end, the committee has taken definite action in the appointment of a subcommittee to consider a bill to set up a post-defense advisory commission to make studies of how best to attack the problem. With regard to employment, both at the present time and also in the future, a second subcommittee has been appointed to consider a bill to regulate private employment agencies engaged in interstate commerce. This bill is aimed directly at the exploitation of innocent workers looking for employment in interstate commerce. A third subcommittee is ready to report a bill to the full committee to extend the provisions of the Randolph-Sheppard Act allowing blind persons to operate stands in Federal buildings throughout the country. I present these facts to the Members of the House so that they may have a concrete idea of just what the Committee on Labor is doing and how we are approaching the problems confronting the country dealing with labor.

We protest writing labor legislation on the floor of the House without any consideration whatsoever, without clearly understanding or even a knowledge of the full significance of amendments offered. We are supposed to give full and deliberate consideration to all bills in committee before they are even reported to the House. How, then, can any Member defend the position of passing legislation affecting the lives of millions of people without even knowing an hour before it is passed what it means? If this House intends to continue the practice of acting on amendments offered in the heat of debate which completely change the purpose and intent of the reported bills, at least we should be notified by printing in the RECORD, at least 24 hours in advance, the amendments we shall be called upon to debate. If legislative riders are to be attached to appropriation bills, there should seem to be little necessity for legislative committees. I regret that I find it necessary to say this. However, since there have been direct and indirect attacks made upon the Labor Committee and criticisms indulged in by certain Members who themselves have the privilege of at least trying to correct the things complained of, I consider it my duty as chairman of the Labor Committee to state our position.

The Labor Committee has been criticized by Members for doing nothing about the strike situation. Let us examine the record. Every Member of the House knows that so-called antistrike bills and all bills concerned with labor should be referred to the Labor Committee. Were they? Certainly not. They were written, and by design, to contain certain provisions so that it would be in order to refer them to another committee. This cannot be denied. However, the Labor Committee has been under fire for not acting on bills which never have come to it. Another committee expects to bring up a bill in a short time which clearly should have been referred to the Labor Committee As originally introduced and considered, it contained the words "naval defense," and as such was referred to the Naval Affairs Committee. Later the words "naval defense" were stricken out and the words "national defense" were inserted throughout. When the words "naval defense" were stricken out, it was no longer a Naval Affairs Committee bill. I want it clearly understood that this is not a criticism of that committee. I am submitting facts which the House should know. I have always had a great respect for the responsibilities of committees, as has been evidenced throughout my service in Congress. Invariably I have followed the position of a committee when bills were reported to the House. I understand the difficulties of committees and believe the Members of the House are honest in attempting to solve the many complex problems presented. In loyally supporting other committees, I expect them to support our committee. We have honorably fought for legislation we considered to be for the best interests of the country and we have to our credit some of the finest laws on the statute books. We shall continue to fight for the things we believe are right, and no amount of unjust criticism will interfere with our purpose.

So, in a spirit, not of concession, but of fair play, I ask the Membership of the House to deal with the Labor Committee as they would with any other committee of the House. If you have suggestions or advice to impart, we shall be glad to receive them. We do not feel that we are always right, but we do know we are honest and sincere in our service and we ask your cooperation in a very difficult task, keeping faith with our country and insisting that no unfair advantage is being taken of the men and women who constitute the workshop of America.

To me, one of the greatest tragedies of the current labor situation is the fact that a small, but very active, minority within the ranks of labor can cause so serious a situation in defense industries as to almost alienate the affection of the American people from the cause of labor. The great labor organizations have always held the respect and confidence of the fair-minded citizenry of the country. It required many years of courage and education to establish the rights and privileges of the workingmen and women of America. They have enjoyed their long-disputed rights not too many years, but were making definite headway over a rough road until recently when subversive elements found their way into a few labor unions, and used these unions to betray innocent workers. While I rejoice that some of the responsible labor leaders have at last recognized the menace they have to contend with and I feel sure they will take steps to eradicate this threat to the freedom and liberty of American workers, it seems a pity they were not recognized sooner before so much damage was done. There never has been a greater friend to the laboring

people of this country than President Roosevelt, and we deplore the necessity which prompted him to commandeer the aviation plant at Inglewood, Calif. I am sure he did so with great reluctance and only because he felt that the safety of American defense was at stake. It takes a high degree of courage to deal with situations of this kind and the President has proved that he is equal to the task. It is to be hoped that it will not be necessary for him to do this again. Strikes in industry are usually justified. However, since subversive influence has made itself felt, the problem is much more difficult to solve. I believe now that labor realizes the challenge it must meet, it will rise to the situation and solve its own problem in the truly American way.

Since our problem and responsibility as Members of Congress is to endeavor to pass just laws to govern the people we represent, it would seem our duty to consider the consequences before we rush into legislation which, in the final analysis, is unnecessary and which, instead of helping a bad situation, will probably lead to bitterness and even violence. As I have said many times before, I deplore strikes in defense industries, particularly at a time when perhaps the freedom of our beloved country hangs in the balance, but I do not think repealing or destroying hard-won labor laws will solve the problem. Courage, patience, and an honest effort by all concerned, industry, labor, and Government will win the battle and bring the hundreds of thousands of workingmen and women throughout the country to a realization of their responsibility and duty at the time of crisis in our democratic way of life. I have absolute faith in the great majority and know they will not fail to measure up to what is expected of them.

Last, but by no means least, I am asking the workingmen and women, whose battle we are waging, to cooperate with us even to the point of sacrifice if necessary, in order that their hard-won victories may not be destroyed through the brutal betrayal by a few so-called labor leaders whose ambition is to break the ranks of labor and destroy every advantage we have secured through years of devotion to the cause of labor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. First, permit me to compliment the gentlewoman from New Jersey upon the splendid statement she has just made, and the sane and patriotic attitude she has taken in the statement.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentlewoman, a moment ago, indicated that mediation was the proper process. Does the gentlewoman not think that the Mediation Board which has been established to settle labor disputes is the agency to which we should turn first?

Mrs. NORTON. Undoubtedly, there is no question about it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentlewoman not also believe that instead of appealing immediately to force, as the Government might do concerning strikes in defense industries in this very critical situation, if maximum production of war material is our aim, we are more apt to attain it and thus a greater degree of safety through mediation rather than force?

Mrs. NORTON. I believe it should be accomplished by mediation, but unfortunately a crisis as the gentleman knows arose in California, which made it necessary for the President to act as he did. I deplore such a situation. I would like to see mediation and mediation only between labor and industry take care of the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK. That, of course, is one instance but there may be other instances where perhaps mediation instead of force can be used. If mediation fails, justice and national safety require us to deal sternly with the subversive element.

Mrs. NORTON. I am inclined to think that there will perhaps not be any more instances where it will be necessary to use force. At least, I hope so.

Mr. MURDOCK. And I hope so, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the chairman of the Labor Committee favor legislation which would protect an employee from coercion from any source, in trying to bargain collectively?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I would favor such legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be allowed to extend his remarks and insert an article from the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror on juvenile delinquency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHEESE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 10 minutes, because the hour is late. However, I do want to call your attention to some releases from the Department of Agriculture by the Secretary with reference to cutting down the consumption of cheese in this country.

I think it is unfortunate, after what we have gone through during the last 10 years, that when the American farmers especially those who are producing dairy products, are getting a fair price for their products, people are now asked to cut down consumption so that some foreign nation may be privileged to have the products themselves.

I have taken it upon myself to write a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which I call his attention to this fact. We have several large dairy States in the United States, like Wisconsin, which produces over 50 percent of the American cheese consumed in the United States, and like Minnesota, where a great deal of butter is produced. Texas has become a great dairy State in the last few years. I think the Secretary of Agriculture should take notice of this.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of this letter to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 12, 1941.

HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called to a release of yours under date of June 6, in which you appeal to the people of the United States to reduce their consumption of cheese in order that more of this cheese might be available for Great Britain and other nations. I would be very derelict in my duty if I did not call your attention to the fact that Wisconsin produces slightly over 50 percent of the American cheese consumed in the United States. I have very large dairy interests in my district, and other Congressmen from Wisconsin are similarly situated. After they have gone through 10 years of a struggle to exist, to say that we should cut down the consumption of cheese in the United States at a time when they are getting a fairly reasonable price for it, is beyond my comprehension.

Under present laws, your Department has almost complete control over all of the agricultural markets, through the use of Federal funds, both for the purchase of farm products and loans to the farmer. Wisconsin, through its Governor and other agencies, has been advertising cheese and other dairy products for the State of Wisconsin, and also for the benefit of all other producers of dairy products throughout the United States, and to issue a release which would offset what has been done in the way of advertising dairy products in the last few years is certainly not fair to the dairy interests of this country which, of course, you represent. The per capita consumption has increased in the last few years from 3.5 pounds per capita to 5.3 pounds per capita.

Your statement is liable to develop a situation where the patrons of cooperative creameries, in response to your appeal, will sell their milk to cheese factories and condensing factories and cause the collapse or bankruptcy of cooperative creameries. This would be a situation that I am sure you would not want to assume the responsibility for creating. Certainly the patrons of cheese factories who are patriotic will increase the production of cheese, and with a reduced consumption demand, due to your appeal, we may again see a very much lower price for cheese.

In your release you say that certain consumers can use substitutes for cheese. Just what do you consider a substitute for cheese? I admit, of course, that there is something else that almost everybody could eat instead of cheese that would still keep them alive, but I doubt very much whether there is any substitute for cheese.

The present administration has twice already lowered the tariff on cheese after it assured the farmers before the first election of the President that no farm tariffs were too high. This resulted in 14 times as much cheese being imported in 1936 as in 1935, when the first reduction of the tariff was made, and 3 times as much in 1939 as in 1938, after the second tariff reduction was made. It is now proposed, in the negotiation of trade treaties with foreign countries, to reduce the tariff on cheese again. You certainly must realize that, according to your own Bureau of Economics, cheese has averaged only 13.4 cents per pound for the 8 years of the present administration, while it averaged 18.1 cents per pound for the 8 years preceding the present administration. During the 4 years of the Hoover administration it averaged 14.7 cents, and this includes the whole of his administration.

The President has asked the United States to become the arsenal of the world, but I have seen nothing in his message or his public utterances where he has asked the people of the United States to cut down the use of any of our dairy products so that we may ship them to Great Britain or any other nation.

Personally, I am very much interested in knowing whether you favor the proposed reduction in the tariff on Argentine cheese. I am sure that the good dairymen of Wisconsin—and of all the States producing cheese and butter—would be glad to know your position on the further reduction of the tariff on dairy products, and especially on cheese. You are probably aware of the fact that the importation of cheese from Argentina in 1935 was about 1,000,000 pounds, while in 1940 it had reached 7,000,000 pounds. Just what will the importation be if the tariff is again reduced? Just what will the domestic price of cheese be if the administration again reduces the tariff on dairy products and at the same time you ask for a reduced domestic consumption and an increased domestic production?

You perhaps are also aware of the fact that due to the low dairy prices during the present administration in the year 1939 the largest percentage and the largest number of farms were foreclosed by the Federal land bank that have ever been foreclosed in the history of the Federal land bank in Wisconsin.

In your release you ask the dairy farmer to feed grain to increase his milk production. I am perfectly willing to admit that the Government does own a large amount of grain and has mortgages on a large number of bushels of different commodities, and if this could be disposed of it would be a good thing for the Government. For instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation, on April 30, 1941, had mortgages on 224,414,143 bushels of wheat and also mortgages on 299,109,424 bushels of corn, besides owning outright 221,485,811 bushels of corn. I am just wondering whether you feel that the dairy farmer would buy 80 or 85 cents a bushel corn and produce butter for a price of 31 cents in Chicago, or about 27 or 28 cents net to him on his farm. The parity price would be about 37.1 cents per pound. It would be a fine thing, of course, if the farmer could get the cost of production, plus 10 percent, the same program that is being used in the building of cantonments for the Government, but he cannot do this.

At a recent nutrition conference it was reported that 45,000,000 Americans are underfed. I am wondering if you still feel justified in asking for a reduction in the consumption of dairy products when most nutrition experts say that 25 percent of the family food budget should be spent for dairy products.

Your press release states that the British colonies' supply of dairy products is exhausted, yet your Department says that on June 4, 1941, New Zealand had 35,000,000 pounds of cheese and Canada 15,000,000 pounds of cheese; that New Zealand had 68,000,000 pounds of butter, and Canada 9,000,000 pounds of butter in storage. June 4 was only a few days ago.

The Wisconsin farmers have taken you at your word when you wanted them to produce more dairy products. The State of Wisconsin produces 10 percent of the Nation's milk, and you will be interested in knowing that the production of milk, during the first 6 months of this year, increased 9 percent over the production during the same period last year, and last month there was an 11-percent increase in milk production over production during the same month a year ago. This would indicate that the Wisconsin farmer has been willing to cooperate with you, and that is one more reason why you should not do anything to discourage or hurt him.

As a final suggestion, in order to obtain more dairy products, I suggest that you furnish vats and equipment to the cooperative creameries so that they may make cheese as well as butter, if cheese is what is so greatly needed. The administration has found millions of dollars to buy bins to store corn and wheat throughout the country and it should be able to provide a small amount of equipment for creameries and cheese factories. If these creameries should take up the production of cheese, after the emergency is over that you speak about, they can again return to their normal production of butter.

I trust that you will take this letter in the spirit in which it is written, because I have in mind only the very best interests of the dairymen of this country.

Sincerely yours.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I made a statement which I think proper to retract. Therefore I have taken this privilege at this late hour.

I said that the report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the period ending July 30, 1940, had not been filed. What I should have said was that the report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for that period was not available, and therefore it appeared to me that it had not been filed.

It is the practice when various boards and bodies present their reports, that copies are made available in the document room of the House and the Senate. That was not the case in this instance. The report was presented to Congress. It was presented to the Vice President, who referred it to the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate. No copies have been available in the document room since that time. The statement of the gentleman from Alabama excited my curiosity and looking into the matter I found that copies could be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents upon the payment of 75 cents. So, Mr. Speaker, I have obtained a copy of the annual report of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the Superintendent of Documents at a cost of 75 cents. I am anxious to direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the report is available to Members of Congress through the Superintendent of Documents at a cost of 75 cents. Of course, if you are in a hurry you must add the cost of taxicab fare for the messenger, as I was required to do this afternoon. I would advise those who desire copies to hurry because the supply must be limited, else they would be available in the document room. It is an illustrated report and contains some very valuable information. I hope to find time to look into it more carefully.

I have looked it over hurriedly, and I find that roughly there are 4,500 people on the pay roll of the Tennessee Valley Authority at upward of $1,500 per annum. Of course, that does not include the entire personnel of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I regret my error, but it does seem to me that there is an inference to be placed upon the fact that although the Tennessee Valley Authority did, in strict conformity with the law, file its annual report with the Congress through the Vice President and by reference to committee, it should have been made available to Members of Congress in the place where such documents are usually to be had. Failure in this regard is responsible for my dereliction of this morning, and I apologize for having made the statement. But I feel I was justified, in view of the efforts I had made to obtain a copy of it. My failure to do so was because copies of the report were not available except by purchase from the Superintendent of Documents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It seems to me the gentleman should not feel too grievously over this matter because the gentleman will recall that the Attorney General's department, I think it was a Federal court in Texas, convicted a man of violation of a Federal law, supposedly a violation of a Federal law, and it was not until the case came to the United States Supreme Court on appeal that it was discovered there was no such law in existence.

It came out that the man was not guilty. So when the Government itself will prosecute a man and carry him through the courts clear to the Supreme Court when there is no law punishing the acts with which he was charged, I do not think the gentleman should feel badly at all. I hope the gentleman does not presume that he knows or can learn all that this administration is doing.

Mr. McLEAN. No; I find it difficult enough to find out what the Tennessee Valley Authority itself is doing, let alone the rest of the New Deal agencies. My recollection is that the conviction was under a regulation made by an administrative agency pursuant to a statute conferring legislative power, which regulation has been changed pending the appeal. The incident was responsible for the Federal Register, suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I repeat for emphasis that anyone who desires a copy of the report of the Tennessee Valley Authority may secure the same from the Superintendent of Documents at the price of 75 cents per copy. None are available in the document rooms for the use of Senators or Members of Congress.

THE THREATENED GASOLINE SHORTAGE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a very fine telegram from the Boston American, which is waging a very aggressive campaign to try to prevent the shortage of gasoline; also an illuminating editorial from the Washington Post of today entitled "Whose Tankers?"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out to the House on numerous occasions before that it would have been very much wiser had the Neutrality Act been in force, so far as Japan was concerned. I pointed out that we were shipping commodities of war, such as oil, scrap iron, and so forth, to Japan all the time the United States was saying how sorry it was we felt for China. I also pointed out that some of the oil, scrap iron, and cotton might later on be used in an attack against the United States, as well as against China. Today, Mr. Speaker, some 800,000 barrels of oil are going to Japan every month. In whose tankers? It is difficult to find out. It is adding insult to injury to allow this situation to continue. With a shortage of oil, for one reason or another, it is incredible that this country should be allowed to suffer to aid a possible enemy. New England will suffer especially under these conditions.

I have been doing everything in my power to have the situation remedied. If the tankers that have been given to foreign nations are being used to ship to Japan oil we need in this country, certainly something should be done if possible to repossess these tankers; at any rate, the matter should be thoroughly investigated. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the entire Congress should take action that this threatened shortage of gasoline be stopped. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we act properly and promptly, possessing as we do such a large supply of oil, action can be hastened and the situation can be improved. I realize it is somewhat a matter of shortage of facilities that brings this situation about, but I believe if we all work together the threatened gasless Sundays, which will mean such tremendous deprivation to people of moderate means who have no opportunity to leave their homes except on Sunday to get fresh air, can be avoided. We must make sure also that heatless days do not follow gasless Sundays.

Another thing that must be considered is the matter of passenger transportation in railroad trains, for if there is a shortage of carrying facilities people will not be able to travel. Instead of passenger cars, the trains will be made up of tank cars. That will be only a step toward curtailment of travel by air. So transportation of all sorts for persons will be curtailed.

I earnestly hope, Mr. Speaker, the appropriate committees of the House will take action on this matter.

The telegram from the Boston Advertiser follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 13, 1941.*

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Washington, D. C.:

Threatened gasoline shortage disturbs all New Englanders, entire recreation industry, thousands of filling-station owners and workers, home owners, highway bondholders, and innumerable small businessmen. Can we repossess tankers previously transferred to foreign registry? Or can we by some other practical method avert the calamity that impends? Please use your influence in Congress and, so far as possible, rally all New England Congressmen.

JOHN NOONAN,
Executive City Editor, Boston Sunday Advertiser.

The editorial from the Washington Post of June 13 follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 13, 1941]

WHOSE TANKERS?

The transfer of American ships to Panamanian registry will permit the shipment of American goods to ports in the United Kingdom without violating the neutrality law. But it also permits shipments to the Axis nations, and these are now being made to Japan. Oil tankers which formerly flew the American flag and which, presumably, are still American-owned, have reportedly been transferred to Panamanian registry, and have been promptly chartered by Japan to haul oil across the Pacific. This state of affairs, if true, is rendered doubly absurd by the oil shortage facing the East.

The Maritime Commission has not seen fit to clear up the fog of apprehension, and perhaps misinformation, surrounding this subject. Movements of American shipping are now rightly regarded as a military secret, not to be divulged. The Commission, to be sure, has gone so far as to say, as have executives of oil companies, that no tankers flying the American flag are supplying Japan with oil, but this is begging the question. And the American people will not be satisfied by the subterfuge. Clearly, if members of our transport fleet, still largely owned by citizens of this country, are in Japan's service, every effort should be made to requisition them for American use. This would not be easy, since they have doubtless been chartered for a specific period, and are technically beyond American jurisdiction. But something should be done to rectify a situation which enables Japan to get some 800,000 barrels of American oil each month in bottoms that were once American. Oil rationing of any kind, considering the fact that we possess 60 percent of the world's supply, is bad enough. When it is due in part to the requirements of a nation which is our potential enemy in the Pacific, the spectacle becomes galling.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARRIS, for Monday, June 16, on account of official business.

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BOEHNE, for 1 week, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MACIORA, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, and Mr. McLEAN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1524. An act to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 158. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3782. An act establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Monday, June 16, 1941, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to continue hearing Assistant Attorney General Littel in the case of the United States against Northern Pacific Railway.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (ALLEN of Louisiana).

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents has tentatively scheduled a further hearing on the subject of royalty payments, as covered in House Joint Resolutions 32,

73, and 123, on Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 1015, House Office Building. Interested parties are requested to contact the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

645. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

646. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with the construction of certain public works in connection with the War Department in the District of Columbia," approved June 15, 1938; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

647. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, and which require an appropriation for their payment amounting to $27,191.69 (H. Doc. No. 264); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

648. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools deposited in a warehouse and shop building maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation at Parker Dam, Ariz., destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Claims.

649. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $28.57 (H. Doc. No. 265); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

650. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $254,685.36 (H. Doc. No. 266); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

651. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department in the sum of $2,465.39 to pay for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy (H. Doc. No. 267); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

652. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $26 (H. Doc. No. 268); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

653. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Crooks Terminal Warehouses, Inc., Chicago, Ill., in the amount of $688.35 (H. Doc. No. 269); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

654. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the amount of $133.95 to pay claims for damages to or loss of privately owned property caused by employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (H. Doc. No. 270); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

655. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages due to military operations, amounting to $4,551.02 (H. Doc. No. 271); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

656. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Treasury Department to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard in the sum of $600 (H. Doc. No. 272); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

657. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to $257,527.56 allowed by the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

658. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of $25,583.27 (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

659. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury and require an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $198,775.96 (H. Doc. No. 275); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

660. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $1.93 (H. Doc. No. 276); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

661. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to persons employed at military, air naval bases acquired by the United States from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5049. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 194. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3537, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4911, a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 235. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1618, a bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 236. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1073, a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2186) for the relief of the estate of John B. Brack; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4940) for the relief of Charles P. Engelhardt; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5050. A bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5051. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5052. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administretion expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5053. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Novato Creek, Marin County, Calif., and its tributaries for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 5054. A bill directing the recall of certain vessels to United States registry; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 237. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Federal employees affiliated with or engaged in alien philosophies or activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to legislation of the cane-sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution 19, relative to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Resolution 31 and Join Resolution 18, relative to appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Resolution 8 and Joint Resolution 17, relative to appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their concurrent resolution relative to the flood-control project at Sugar Hill; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5056. A bill for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5057. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Starling; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 5058. A bill granting a pension to May Jewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5059. A bill to grant the status of quota immigrants to William B. Fawkner and his wife, Mrs. Ida Fawkner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Holden; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of Anthony Robert DeStafano; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Jozef Kvartek; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1403. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., supporting Senate bill 860 and House bill 2475, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1404. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, endorsing the Geyer-Pepper anti-poll-tax bill and urging that it be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for action at the earliest possible moment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1405. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Nevada, Iowa, and surrounding towns, opposing enactment of Senate bill 933 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1406. By Mr. HESS: Petition of the United States Selectee-Parents Legion, of Cincinnati, Ohio, pleading that their sons be kept out of Europe; also a statement of the principles and purposes of the legion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1407. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Dave Rodney and others, regarding Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1408. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., advocating the securing of wholesome recreational facilities in the areas ercund the camps in conjunction with other agencies for the best interests of the camps and the communities in matters dealing with health, recreational and social life; to the Committee on Military Affairs

1409. Also, resolution adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., approving of further congressional study of the problems facing the broadcasting system in order to preserve the freedom of the radio for the best interests of democracy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1410. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the continual production of crops and services of foreign lands, to relieve poverty in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1411. Also, petition of the Port of New York Authority, favoring present sugar quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1412. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, representing 51,000 members in the State of New York, while prayerfully hoping that the President and Congress will use their good offices as effective means of keeping America out of war and in assisting the world to come to a just and lasting peace based on principles of Christian charity and justice, pledge fullest support for the defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1413. By Mr. MARCANTONIO: Petition of 14,805 names in support of labor's right to strike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Long Island Association, New York City, opposing the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1415. Also, petition of the Knights of Columbus, New York State Council, New Rochelle, N. Y., urging world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1416. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition signed by Mrs. E. G. Bjorneby, of Kalispell, Mont., and 294 others, urging you to vote for Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1941 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1417. Also, resolution of the South Valley County Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Montana Division, Glasgow, Mont., signed by Ben Rice, secretary, in convention assembled, June 3, 1941, urging our President, Senators, and Representatives to stick by their campaign pledges to keep America out of war by opposing convoys and other acts which might put the United States into the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1418. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, opposing proposed legislation curtailing the cane sugar refining industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1419. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Mine Workers of America, District 50, Local No. 12151, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1420. Also, petition of the Delta Council of Stoneville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the instruments which are being used to slow up industries holding defense contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1421. Also, petition of the city of Seattle, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4929, relating to railroads and passenger service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1422. Also, petition of the Kansas City Joint Board Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antistrike legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1423. Also, petition of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the program for national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1424. Also, petition of the Polish Democratic Club of Greater New York, Inc., New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of the late Hon. M. Michael Edelstein; to the Committee on Memorials.

1425. Also, petition of the American Russian Slavonic Democratic Club, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of the late Hon. M. Michael Edelstein; to the Committee on Memorials.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Lord and giver of life: As we bow before Thee, bestow upon us Thy blessing, to the illumination of our minds, that we may find the secret of life and of wisdom in looking afresh at the common things of life that they lose not for us their mystery and their message.

Make tender our hearts, tender from aught of hardness which may have been acquired during the contacts of the days, beneath the wear and tear of life. We ask not for what may make us comfortable, but for greater strength to keep Thy laws and to be of gracious service to God and fellow-men wherever we may be.

Sanctify to us alike the hours of joy and the hours of pain, the trivial round, the uninspiring task. For those in our midst who have so recently walked with sorrow, we beseech Thy heavenly com-

fort; for him beloved of us all, who now lies upon a bed of pain and suffering, we pray that he may be speedily restored to health and strength, to renewed and consecrated service to his country, and for those whom Thou hast brought back into our midst we give Thee unfeigned thanks, which we add to our petitions in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 12, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 12, 1941:

S. 529. An act for the relief of Harry J. Williams;

S. 681. An act for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin;

S. 991. An act for the relief of the widow of the late Artis J. Chitty;

S. 1022. An act for the relief of Richard Gammon;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of Claude W. LaSalle, and the Dauterive Hospital; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize the postponement of payment of amounts payable to the United States by the Republic of Finland on its indebtedness under agreements between that Republic and the United States dated May 1, 1923, May 23, 1932, and May 1, 1941.

On June 13, 1941:

S 583. An act for the relief of Maj. Harold Sorenson;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Lt. J. B. Edgar, Jr.;

S. 657. An act for the relief of certain United States Commissioners; and

S. 931. An act for the relief of Robert B. Ayers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2844) to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. HARE, Mr. POWERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4158. An act to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; and

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 158. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; and

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Murdock
Aiken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Glass	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Rosier
Bilbo	Gurney	Russell
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Bulow	Holman	Stewart
Bunker	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Capper	Kilgore	Tydings
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lodge	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Walsh
Connally	McKellar	Wheeler
Danaher	McNary	White
Davis	Maloney	Wiley
Downey	Mead	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HARLAN F. STONE TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice, under the rule of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask that it be read, so that it will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Harlan F. Stone, of New York, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

As chairman of the subcommittee considering this nomination, and as required by rule 1 of the committee, I announce that Saturday, June 21, at 10 a. m., has been set as the time for the public hearing on this nomination in the Judiciary Committee room, at which all interested parties will be heard.

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman of Subcommittee.

HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT H. JACKSON TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which was appointed to consider the nomination of Hon. Robert H. Jackson, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Under the provisions of rule 1 of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, announcement is made that on Saturday, June 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., a public hearing will be held upon this nomination in the room of the Committee on the Judiciary, and all interested persons may at that time be heard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLAIMS OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools deposited in a warehouse and shop building maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation at Parker Dam, Ariz., destroyed by fire (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

IMPORTATIONS OF RED-CEDAR SHINGLES FROM CANADA

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, stating that, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 79, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Commission has instituted an investigation under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, of the effect upon the red-cedar shingle industry in the United States of importations of red-cedar shingles from Canada (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Tennessee Valley Authority, signed by the chairman of the Board, the vice chairman, and director, relative to the accountability of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the relationship between the Office of the Comptroller General and that Authority (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the construction of a highway from Hilo through the saddle between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa to Kona, county of Hawaii

"Whereas a highway from Hilo through the saddle between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa to the district of Kona, county of Hawaii, would be of the utmost value to the Federal Government as a national-defense measure, thus enabling the rapid movement of troops and artillery directly across the island of Hawaii, and obviating the hazard of the interruption of such movements in the event of damage to bridges on the presently existing highways; and

"Whereas the construction of such a highway would open up several thousand acres of tillable land and ranching area, thus assisting the Territory to become self-subsisting in time of blockade or interruption of transportation from the mainland during time of strikes; and

"Whereas the proposed highway would open unlimited sites for airports, air and artillery bases strategically located toward the center of the island of Hawaii; and

"Whereas such highway would open up vast national-park possibilities, as well as recreational activities for tourists and the residents of the Territory; and

"Whereas such highway would almost entirely traverse land owned by the Government, thus obviating practically all expense in obtaining the necessary rights-of-way: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to appropriate funds necessary to construct a highway from Hilo through the saddle between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa to the district of Kona, county of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. That this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior of the United States, the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department, and the commandant of the Fourteenth Naval District.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1941.

"J. B. POINDEXTER,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution endorsing the recommendations contained in Investigational Report No. 42, made in 1939 by representatives of the Bureau of Fisheries of the United States Department of Commerce

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in 1939, by House Concurrent Resolution No. 59, requested the United States Bureau of Fisheries to make a survey of Hawaiian fish and fisheries as a source of food supply; and

"Whereas, in the same year the said Bureau sent two of its staff members, Frank T. Bell and Elmer Higgins, to Hawaii to study existing fishing conditions 'to determine whether the Federal Government should assist the Territory of Hawaii in developing its fisheries, and if so, in what ways and to what extent'; and

"Whereas in said year the said staff members, after an investigation, submitted to the Bureau their report, entitled, 'A Plan for the Development of the Hawaiian Fisheries', which report has been published by the United States Department of Commerce Bureau of Fisheries as Investigational Report No. 42; and

"Whereas, the said report recommended, among other things, that a well-balanced program of research should be undertaken jointly by the Federal and Territorial Governments, to provide a sound basis for future developments, this research to be in two fields, (1) biology, including offshore fisheries, inshore fisheries, and pond culture; and (2) technology and economics of the fisheries, including chemical and engineering studies of methods of canning, refrigeration, or other means of preservation of fishery products, the development of new products, the utilization of byproducts, and improved methods of shipment and general distribution; a study of improved methods of capture and of the economics of the entire fishing industry and its organization, including the possibilities of cooperative production and marketing, and increase of employment in the industry; and

"Whereas the said report recommends that the Congress appropriate to the Bureau of Fisheries substantial sums each year for use in carrying out, in cooperation with the Territory, the recommendations of said report, and that the Legislature of Hawaii appropriate the sum of $10,000 per year for the employment of skilled, technical personnel in the division of fish and game of the board of agriculture and forestry of the Territory, and for the purpose of assisting the division to cooperate with the Bureau of Fisheries in fishery investigations: Now therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii hereby accepts and adopts the recommendations contained in the aforesaid Investigational Report No. 42, pledges the full cooperation of the Territory with the Federal Government in carrying out the recommendations contained in said report, and respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation, including the necessary appropriation to enable the carrying out of the full program recommended in said report.

"SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution be transmitted to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1941.

"J. B. POINDEXTER,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the coinage of memorial 50-cent pieces in honor of the late Will Rogers, the proceeds of the sale of such coins to go to the Will Rogers Memorial Fund

"Whereas the late Will Rogers was a national figure and an outstanding citizen of this Republic; and

"Whereas he exemplified the American way of life in that he was of humble birth and yet by a striving hand he reached the very heights of success in his chosen field; and

"Whereas Will Rogers was known as the ambassador of good will of this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Eighteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in honor of Will Rogers, and to permit the sale of the coins by the Will Rogers Memorial Commission of Oklahoma for the purpose of raising funds to operate, maintain, extend, and improve the Will Rogers Memorial at Claremore, Okla., where the body of Will Rogers is to be finally interred; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Representative of Oklahoma in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law the National Recovery Act of 1941

"That whereas a bill (H. Res. No. 1036, 77th Cong., 1st sess.) to provide for national recovery by raising revenue and retiring citizens past 60 years of age from gainful employment and provide for the general welfare of all the people of the United States, and for other purposes, has been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the enactment into law of the National Recovery Act of 1941 will provide for and promote the general welfare of the United States by supplying to the people a more liberal distribution and increase of purchasing power, retire certain citizens from gainful employment, improve and stabilize gainful employment for other citizens, stimulate agricultural and industrial production and general business, and alleviate the hazards and insecurity of old age and unemployment; and

"Whereas thousands of the citizens of New Hampshire desire the immediate enactment into law of the said National Recovery Act of 1941: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, in General Court convened, do hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact into law the beforementioned National Recovery Act of 1941; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislative branches of the Federal Government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to United States Senator H. STYLES BRIDGES United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, Congressman ARTHUR B. JENKS, and Congressman FOSTER STEARNS, requesting them to do all in their power to secure the passage of the said National Recovery Act of 1941."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the table:

"Resolution memorializing Congress in opposition to proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry

"Whereas it is the established policy of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to preserve the domestic sugar-refining industry in Massachusetts, as evidenced by Massachusetts House Document No. 1296 of 1934, favoring Federal legislation for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry, which legislation the Congress subsequently enacted in 1934, thereby protecting consumers in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the United States on the supply and price of sugar; and

"Whereas existing Federal law provides a readily accessible supply of raw cane sugar from Central and South American countries, which, as our Government experts on defense and consumers' needs have stated, is ample for United States consumption; and

"Whereas legislation by the Congress is being considered and which, if enacted, would deprive this sound Massachusetts industry of much of its raw material, would deprive our good neighbors of Latin-American countries of the market for their product, and would add millions of dollars to the huge subsidy now given to the beet-sugar industry, thereby increasing the burden upon the American consumer: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges upon the Congress of the United States to oppose any change in existing Federal law that would create unemployment in this Commonwealth, further overburden the consumer, and detract from existing good will between the United States and the Latin-American countries so necessary in this time of national emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend sections 203 (3) and 207 (1) (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested, through the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, to make certain amendments to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, as more particularly set forth in the proposed form of the bill hereinafter set out; and to that end the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged, through said Delegate to Congress, to enact and adopt a bill amendatory of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, in substantially the following words and figures, to wit:

"'A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands now in use as an airplane landing field.

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*, That so much of section 203 of title 2 of the act entitled "Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, "approved July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 108), as designates the land hereinafter described as "available lands" within the meaning of that act, is hereby repealed and the land restored to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii. On the island of Molokai: Those portions of Hoolehua, Apana 2, and Palaau, Apana 2, being additions to the Molokai airplane landing field, comprising two parcels of land, as follows:

"'1. Parcel 1: As set aside for public purposes by the Executive Order No. 809 of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, dated July 15, 1938, and consisting of 20.784 acres, more or less, and particularly described as follows:

"'Beginning at the northwest corner of this parcel of land and the present southwest corner of the Molokai Airport (Executive Order No. 307, dated December 16, 1927), the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Middle Hill, being 243.12 feet north and 16,124.03 feet west, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2821 and 2903 and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"'1. 265°10'30", 1,380.00 feet along the north side of Mahana Avenue along Molokai Airport (Executive Order No. 307) and along United States Army Reservation (Executive Order No. 665, dated October 28, 1935);

"'2. 41°30'30", 1,247.39 feet along the proposed northwest side of Pipika Avenue extension;

"'3. Thence along the proposed northwest side of Pipika extension on a curve to the right with a radius of 548.14 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being 63°16'30", 406.53 feet;

"'4. 85°02'30", 136.30 feet along the proposed north side of Pipika Avenue extension;

"'5. Thence on a curve to the right with a radius of 60.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being 132°59'30", 89.11 feet;

"'6. 180°56'30", 952.00 feet along the east side of a 50-foot road to the point of beginning.

"'Parcel 2: As returned to the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii by Resolution No. 68 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, dated March 3, 1941, and consisting of 13.527 acres, more or less, and particularly described as follows:

"'Beginning at the southeast corner of this piece of land, on the west boundary of the present Molokai Airport, the true azimuth and distance from the northwest corner of Executive Order No. 809 being 00°56'30", 242.00 feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Middle Hill being 1.15 feet north and 16,128.01 feet west, thence running by true azimuths measured clockwise from south:

"'1. 60°25', 841.74 feet along the remainders of 50-foot road and lot 170 of the Hawaiian homes land;

"'2. 180°56'30", 812.62 feet along the remainder of lot 170 of the Hawaiian homes land;

"'3. 240°25', 841.74 feet along the remainders of lot 170, Pine Avenue, lot 158 and 50-foot road of the Hawaiian homes land, to the west side of the present Molokai Airport;

"'4. 00°56'30", 812.62 feet along the west side of the present Molokai Airport to the point of beginning.

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend section 207 (1) (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 so that it will read as follows:

"'SEC. 207 (1) (a). The commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to the use and occupancy of a tract or tracts of Hawaiian home lands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) Not less than 1 nor more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; or (2) not less than 100 nor more than 500 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands; or (4) not more than 1 acre of any class of land to be used as a residence lot; *Provided, however*, That in the case of any existing lease of a farm lot in the Kalanianaole Settlement on Molokai, a residence lot may exceed 1 acre but shall not exceed 4 acres in area, the location of such area to be selected by the lessee concerned: *And provided further*, That a lease granted to any lessee may include both a residence and an agricultural or pastoral lot, the gross acreage of both lots not to exceed the maximum acreage of either the agricultural or pastoral lot, as the case may be, and as provided for in this section: *And provided further*, That any such detached residence lot shall be located on the same island as the agricultural or pastoral lot concerned, and within a reasonable distance thereof.'

"SEC. 3. The secretary of Hawaii is hereby requested and directed to forward certified copies of this joint resolution to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1941.

"J. B. POINDEXTER,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing Congress to provide Federal funds to States providing assistance to blind persons; to the Committee on Finance. (See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. DAVIS.)

A resolution of the Council of the City of Seattle, Wash., favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 4929, relating to and prohibiting railroads from entering into agreements to restrict passenger service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A petition of sundry citizens of Middleboro, Mass., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 1) providing for an excise tax on retail stores, known as the anti-chain-store bill; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Mass., favoring appropriations for the W. P. A. as originally proposed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of White Water, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill

(S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial to Congress to pass an act for the relief of citizens of the United States physically incapacitated from earning a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease

"*To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida, in legislative session assembled, do most respectfully memorialize and petition your honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of citizens of the United States who have contributed, according to their means, to the operation of our National Government and the welfare of society are now because of physical handicaps spending their days in poverty and misery, dependent upon public or private charity, or their relatives; and

"Whereas social security has become the dominant question before the American people; the aged, the blind, and dependent children have been included in the social-security program of the United States and therefore justice and the public welfare demand that ample provisions be now made for the health and support of that class of people not otherwise provided for, who are unable to earn a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida, do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, in order to accomplish the foregoing purpose, to immediately enact such legislation as may be necessary to include in the present social-security program of the United States the crippled and those citizens who are unable to earn a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease, to the end that these unfortunates may be given the same security as is now provided for the aged, the blind, and dependent children; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor June 9, 1941."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 94

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to clear the name of Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell

"Whereas the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell enlisted in 1898 at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War as a private in the First Wisconsin Infantry and saw active service in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; then served on the Mexican border in 1912; and was repeatedly decorated during the World War by Congress and by several of our allies for repeated gallantry and giving exceptional example to his fellow soldiers, and

"Whereas he rose from the ranks during 28 years of spectacular achievement, having been the first American officer to fly over the trenches during the World War, the first American to scout troop movements by plane, commanded the largest concentration of airplanes in the history of aviation; and

"Whereas he continued to pioneer aviation progress by proving the feasibility of transcontinental flight, as a result of which our air-mail system was instituted; and

"Whereas from 1920 to 1924 he served as assistant to the chief of the Army air service, in charge of operations and technical development, in which position he contributed invaluably to the development of military and civil aeronautics; and

"Whereas he strove to impress his superior officers with the shortcomings and deficiencies in the Army and Navy flying units, only to be rebuffed and demoted; and thereafter the crash of the dirigible *Shenandoah* and failure of Navy's flight by plane to Hawaii prompted him to charge incompetency on the part of his superiors and criminal neglect of national defense; and

"Whereas, although a separate inquiry substiantiated the truth of his accusations, he was tried by a court martial for violating the Ninety-sixth Article of War, found guilty of a breach of discipline and suspended from the service for 5 years without pay, but still subject to call; and

"Whereas the practical effect of this decision was that the pride and dignity of military officials must be protected at all costs, even at the risk of jeopardizing the effectiveness of national defense; and

"Whereas General Mitchell's fearless adherence to principle resulted in his sacrificing his personal ambitions in an effort to arouse the Nation to a knowledge of its military helplessness; and

"Whereas developments arising from the present European conflict demonstrate incontrovertibly that General Mitchell was possessed of prescience which placed him many years ahead of his colleagues; and

"Whereas the stigma upon his memory should be officially eradicated: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such official action as may be necessary to clear the name of this soldier and patriot to the end that he who stood his ground, though persecuted, may be completely and forever cleared; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 58

"Relative to memorializing Congress concerning the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products

"Whereas negotiations have been undertaken by the Department of State of the United States Government for the purpose of making a reciprocal trade treaty with the Republic of Argentina; and

"Whereas the proposed reciprocal trade treaty with the Republic of Argentina intends to reduce the tariff upon tungsten and tungsten products; and

"Whereas the mining industry of California is in an orderly manner developing tungsten properties in this State; and

"Whereas the development of these properties will place the United States in a better position to furnish tungsten and tungsten products so vitally necessary for national defense; and

"Whereas the development of these properties and other mining properties in connection therewith will employ citizens of this State now being supported by public relief at the expense of the taxpayers; and

"Whereas industrial plants for the processing, smelting, and refining of tungsten ores are hesitant to continue their rapid production and expansion, due to the proposed reciprocal trade treaty: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to permit no reduction in the existing tariff rates on tungsten and tungsten products in this proposed reciprocal trade treaty with the Republic of Argentina; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the State of California is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee for Reciprocity Information and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that such Senators and Members from California are hereby respectfully urged to support such legislation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12

"Relative to discrimination in steamship service and freight rates between New York and California ports to the Panama Canal Zone

"Whereas Congress has authorized the construction of additional locks at the Panama Canal at an eventual total cost of approximately $277,000,000, as well as an additional expenditure of approximately $35,000,000 for the construction of barracks, airports, etc.; and

"Whereas large quantities of foodstuffs, materials, and supplies are imported annually into the Republic of Panama, amounting in the year 1937 to $21,828,000, of which imports from the United States amounted to $11,377,000, principally from the Atlantic seaboard; and

"Whereas materials and supplies will be imported into the Panama Canal Zone in large quantities as additional protection for national defense by the United States Government and for the Republic of Panama, including alfalfa, groceries, cold-storage products, dry goods, dairy products, raw materials, housewares, candies, and tobacco, milk and cream, shoes, cattle and hogs, soaps, meats, lard, vegetables, lumber, petroleum products, cement, iron and steel, automobiles, chemicals, medicines, reinforced concrete frames and floor slabs, hollow-tile filler walls, stucco exterior, tile and composition roofing, miscellaneous iron and steel, hollow metal work, metal lath and plaster, steel shelving, automatic refrigeration systems, waterproofing, cold-storage rooms, slate toilet partitions, glazed tile wainscoting, ceramic, cement, and other quarry products, tile floors, paint, plumbing, electric fixtures, and various other types of materials and supplies grown, produced, and manufactured on the Pacific Coast; and

"Whereas the United States Government owns and operates the Panama Railroad Steamship Co., which is operated under the direction of the President of the United States and the War Department, which operates steamship service between New York and the Panama Canal Zone, and railway service between Atlantic and Pacific ports of the Canal Zone; and

"Whereas freight rates upon said Government-owned line between the Atlantic seaboard and the Panama Canal Zone are materially less than freight rates on private lines operated between Pacific coast ports and the Canal Zone, in some cases being as much as 50 percent less; and

"Whereas if similar service and the same freight rate basis were provided by the United States Government between Pacific coast ports and the Panama Canal Zone, California growers, producers, and manufacturers of supplies and materials to be used in said construction work, including the necessities of life, to be imported into the Republic of Panama as hereinabove set forth, would be in a position to compete with growers, producers, and manufacturers on the Atlantic seaboard; and

"Whereas due to the withdrawal of ships under the jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission from export trade due to the war, there are now numerous vessels available for this service; and

"Whereas private steamship lines operating between the Pacific coast ports and the Panama Canal Zone will not meet the New York-Panama rates of the Government-owned Panama Railroad Steamship Co., resulting in a practical monopoly in favor of shippers from the Atlantic seaboard to said Panama Canal Zone: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of War are hereby respectfully requested to take such action as will be necessary to provide similar steamship service between Pacific coast ports and the Panama Canal Zone and at the same freight rate basis in order that Pacific coast growers, producers, and manufacturers may be enabled to compete with growers, producers, and manufacturers on the Atlantic seaboard in supplying agricultural and manufactured materials and supplies to the Panama Canal Zone; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Governor of the State of California to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House, to the Secretary of War, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF PENNSYLVANIA—ASSISTANCE TO THE BLIND

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania State Legislature memorializing Congress to provide Federal funds to States providing assistance to blind persons. The resolution has been transmitted to me by Mr. George F. Holmes, secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania and has come to the Senate of the United States only after its adoption by both the Senate and House of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I ask that it be published in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide Federal funds to States providing assistance to blind persons

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recognizing the duty of the Commonwealth to provide for its unfortunate blind citizens has provided for the payment to them of a pension; and

Whereas the Federal Government contributes toward the care of blind persons but insists that moneys apportioned to any State for such purpose must and can only be contributed on a basis of the actual need of the blind; and

Whereas this Commonwealth receives no part of Federal funds apportioned for blind persons because its system of assistance for the blind is on a liberal pension basis instead of the basis of actual need as required by the Federal Social Security Act: Therefore be it

Resolved (*if the house concur*), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the social security law of the Federal Government by providing for the contribution of Federal funds for assistance to blind persons to States which provide for such assistance either on a basis of actual need or on a pension basis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the Senate, May 27, 1941.

Concurred in by the House, June 11, 1941.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND PREVENTION OF VICE CONDITIONS NEAR MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without all the names attached, a petition signed by numerous citizens of Idaho Falls, Idaho, and vicinity, praying for the passage of Senate bill 860.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *June 9, 1941.*

To our delegation in Congress: Hon. JOHN THOMAS, Senator; Hon. D. WORTH CLARK, Senator; Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, Representative; Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK, Representative:

We, women resident in south Idaho, earnestly beg our representatives in the Congress of the United States to vote protection of our sons from vice and liquor by voting for and supporting with your strong influence Senate bill 860, which would prohibit the sale of liquor to our sons in camp, and create a zone around camps where prostitution and sale of liquor is prohibited, as was done in the World War in 1917.

SIXTH DISTRICT IDAHO WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
LENA K. SLAYTON,
President, District 6, Idaho.
MRS. ELSIE E. BAILEY,
Secretary, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
(And sundry other citizens.)

IMPORTATION OF BEEF FROM SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from a number of Kansas City businessmen expressing their opposition to trade treaties which would allow increased importation of beef from South American countries. I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed.

This is a matter in which I am deeply interested, for the reason that my State of Kansas is one of the leading beef-producing States. I believe the adoption of treaties permitting South American nations to send more beef and other products into this country would be extremely harmful to the western section of the United States. Such treaties would serve to destroy the market the cattlemen of the West have for their cattle. Lowering the purchasing power of the cattle growers—and subsequently that of persons engaged in industries allied with the cattle industry, such as the grain industry—would have a serious effect on our entire economy.

I am opposed to these treaties. I am against any program which brings the products of foreign countries into competition with the products of our own citizens. I believe in giving our own people the first and best opportunity to market their products.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 11, 1941.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Located in the Middle West and being well informed not only as to the cattle population of our surrounding territory, but the financial condition of the cattlemen as well, let us urge upon you active and energetic opposition to trade treaty with South American countries looking toward increased importation of beef.

Furthermore, an arrangement of this kind would set a precedent, and, if granted, the South American countries would undoubtedly demand even more trade concessions after the war is over.

Cattlemen have hundreds of thousands of cattle being prepared for market bought on the prevailing restricted South American importation basis who would in many cases be severely harmed financially if it were made possible for South American countries to export a large increased amount of beef to this country. In addition to severe financial setbacks to the cattlemen, it would probably prove ruinous to the growers of grain and feed, vast amounts of which are used annually by the cattlemen.

COMMERCE TRUST CO.
FIRST NATIONAL BANK.
INTERSTATE NATIONAL BANK.
CITY NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO.
UNION NATIONAL BANK.
STOCKYARDS NATIONAL BANK.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R 4926. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 441).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1586. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept for the United States Naval Academy such gifts and bequests as he may see fit; without amendment (Rept. No. 442); and

H. R. 3536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 443).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4973. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); with amendments (Rept. No. 444).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, June 16, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 158) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1633. A bill to enable certain legislative employees to obtain transfer to a position in the classified civil service within 1 year after separation from active duty with the armed forces of the United States; and

S. 1634 (by request). A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1635, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1636. A bill for the relief of Charles N. J. Miller; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1637. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1638. A bill to provide for the imposition of indeterminate sentences in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1639. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oklahoma of certain lands in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1640. A bill providing for the return of certain moneys to the Treasury of the United States;

S. 1641. A bill relating to compensation and conditions of employment of contractors' employees on the Canal Zone;

S. 1642. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to persons employed at military, air, and naval bases acquired by the United States from foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1643. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with the construction of certain public works in connection with the War Department in the District of Columbia," approved June 15, 1938; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INDEPENDENT AIR CORPS—DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, events in the world abroad must have convinced us that the nation which controls the air in the years to come will be the nation which will control the world. The time has passed when control of the waves was control of the world. Events in Crete, events in Greece, events in France, and events throughout the world generally have demonstrated the fact that the nation having the strongest air force is the strongest nation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the past we have very much neglected that which has been emphasized by events during the past year. With that thought in mind, I have tried to work out a plan, which I am submitting to the Senate by a bill which I am about to introduce, under which there will be for national defense in America a great and powerful triumvirate—a force by land, a force by water, and a force by air. To that end I believe, and I say now after a long study, that there should be established in this country and in this Government a secretary of military aviation to have charge of the part of the national defense known as national-defense aviation, and under such a secretary sitting at the Cabinet table there should be worked out a program so that national defense from the air will have behind it a united force and a united effort.

Mr. President, I realize that this proposal may not meet with approbation from certain elements of those in charge of the military and naval defense of our Nation; but after a study is made I am convinced that eventually this country will come to the realization that the mistakes which have been made in the past should not be continued, and that we should have for national defense a department of national aviation in military affairs separate and distinct from the Navy and the Army to sit at the council table, to advise the President, so that this Nation will go forward to lead the world in control of the air.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator, I understand, is introducing a bill to provide for an independent air corps.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. In the interest of national defense?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased that the Senator is introducing the bill, because I think this is a subject which, in view of the public interest, should be thoroughly studied. Personally, I have not yet reached the conclusion, as the Senator knows from private conversation with me, that what he proposes is a desirable step to take. I have felt, after conferring with naval experts, that a better national-defense program would result by maintaining the present policy, namely, with each service having its own air corps. However, I think there is so much interest in the question, and so much agitation about it, that it might well be studied.

It is not a new proposal, and I am sure the naval experts of the Government have decided views in opposition to the proposed change.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's remarks suggest a thought I wish to express, and I am grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts. Involved in this matter is the question of what committee will consider the subject. I have tried to give to that consideration the best thought of which I was capable, and I am asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I realize that the Committee on Naval Affairs is also very much interested, and it may be that during the course of the study the combined efforts of these two great committees might be applied to the bill.

I send the bill to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 1635) to establish a Department of Aviation, to consolidate therein the activities of the Government relating to military aviation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PAY AND EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS ON THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 1641, introduced by me today and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, relating to compensation and conditions of employment of contractors' employees on the Canal Zone, I wish to state that within the next several years we will have spent approximately $600,000,000 on the Canal Zone, most of it by contract. The Army, Navy, Panama Canal Administration, Panama Railroad, and Panama Railroad Steamship Co., are going along satisfactorily in regard to rates of pay and working conditions, but some of the contractors are not paying prevailing rates, or observing working conditions set up by the Government of the United States. The labor turn-over of the contractors on this defense work in the Canal Zone has reached an appalling percentage, more than 51 percent. I shall hope to bring about some improvement in conditions there.

The employees of the contractors have remained at work despite the bad working conditions, as observed and reported by Mr. W. C. Cushing, a special representative of the American Federation of Labor, who visited the Canal Zone last December and spent a great deal of time in making observations there.

I wish to say in that connection that the employees are complaining about the working conditions, and that they are receiving less than the prevailing rates of pay specified by the Government, and for Sundays and Saturdays, and all holidays, they are receiving merely straight-time pay, though the Government employees are receiving overtime pay.

I hope this matter may receive immediate action in the Military Affairs Committee so as to make the conditions comply with Government requirements.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4158. An act to amend sections 3341, 3351, and 3361 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 309 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal section 2907 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; and

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establish-

ment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 57, line 5, to strike out "$5,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,215,317."

On page 57, line 18, to strike out "mounted."

On page 57, line 19, beginning with the word "January", to strike out all down to and including line 5 on page 58 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the date of enactment of this act."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BILBO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the end of the resolution, to insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1942, the sum of $100,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, such sum to be in addition to any funds appropriated by such section 32 and to be subject to all the provisions of law relating to the expenditure of such funds."

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place to insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. No part of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended for undertaking or prosecuting, in whole or in part, any non-Federal project if all or a substantial part of the funds contributed by the sponsor of such project for the purpose of financing its share of the cost thereof have been or are to be paid to such sponsor, or are to be reimbursed to such sponsor, by or on behalf of any person who owns or was the former owner of any part of the real property included within such project, or of any real property adjacent thereto, or who, in the opinion of the Administrator, would receive a direct and substantial financial benefit as a result of the prosecution of such project."

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON HOUSING AND THE NATION'S DEFENSE

[Mr. BYRNES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Housing and the Nation's Defense, Present and Future," delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before the National Committee on the Housing Emergency, Inc., at Washington, D. C., on June 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR NORRIS AT WOOSTER COLLEGE, OHIO

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator NORRIS on the occasion of the commencement exercises at Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER ON SUPPLYING FOOD TO PEOPLE OF BELGIUM AND OTHER EUROPEAN NATIONS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 8, 1941, urging the State Department to arrange for the shipment of food to the people of Belgium and other European nations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE ON FRAUDULENT FREEDOMS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator NYE on June 12, 1941, on the subject of fraudulent freedoms, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON CITIZENSHIP AS A LIVING LEGACY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Racine, Wis., on June 8, 1941, on the topic Citizenship as a Living Legacy, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR MEAD ON AMERICA'S PLACE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Switchmen's Union of North America, at Buffalo, N. Y., on June 9, 1941, and an address delivered by him at the post-office employees' communion breakfast in Buffalo, N. Y., on Sunday morning, June 8, 1941, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA UNITES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator BREWSTER on June 10, 1941, on the subject America Unites, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HULL REGARDING ACTION OF DARLAN-LAVAL GROUP

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Secretary of State on June 13, 1941, relative to the action of the Darlan-Laval group of the Vichy Government of France, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY STATE DEPARTMENT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the State Department on March 21, 1941, relative to the St. Lawrence seaway, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION OF FRENCH POSSESSIONS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, correspondence between himself and the Secretary of State regarding the acquisition by the United States of French possessions in the Western Hemisphere, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTION BY OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT ON STRIKES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release from the Office of Production Management, Division of Labor, giving the attitude of the O. P. M. on strikes; which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. THURMAN W. ARNOLD BEFORE AMERICAN BUSINESS CONGRESS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Thurman W. Arnold, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the meeting of the American Business Congress in New York City, on June 13, 1941.]

REPORT BY JOHN J. PELLEY ON RAILROADS IN DEFENSE OF THE NATION

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address delivered by Mr. J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, at Washington, D. C., June 13, 1941, entitled "A Report on Railroads in the Defense of the Nation," which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA, AWAKE!—SERMON BY DR. GEORGE HAMILTON COMBS

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon by Dr. George Hamilton Combs, of Kansas City, Mo., entitled "America, Awake!" which appears in the Appendix.]

A TOAST TO THE FLAG—BY JOHN J. DALY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, A Toast to the Flag, by John J. Daly, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS NEEDED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of the bill made the unfinished business last Thursday.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I wish to make a statement.

As all Senators know, I have been absent, and I did not take part in the consideration of the bill when it was before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which I am chairman. I have gone over the bill since I returned to the Senate, and I find that two very important amendments should be made.

This is a national-defense bill, a measure providing for the construction of roads for national defense. The first important amendment I would suggest would be on line 18, page 2, and line 20, on the same page, where it is provided that two-thirds of the cost shall be borne by the Government and one-third by the States. I think "two-thirds" should be stricken out and "three-fourths" inserted. I do not think we should burden the States unduly in connection with the tremendous cost of building these roads for national-defense purposes.

I have conferred with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in charge of the bill, and have asked whether he would accept an amendment, striking out "two-thirds" and inserting "three-fourths." I am not able to proceed with the argument in support of the amendment. This is an important bill, and I think it should be passed as soon as possible; yet I think it would be very improper for us to burden the States with this enormous program of extra road building, since we now have a road program which is quite burdensome on them.

For this reason, unless the Senator is willing to accept the amendment I have suggested—and I hope he will do so—I think the bill should go over until I am strong enough to present the matter on the floor of the Senate. I hope the Senator will agree to that, unless he is willing to accept the amendment I have just suggested.

The second amendment I wish to suggest is after the word "highways," in line 10, page 2, and at other places where it may occur, there should be added the words "and bridges," because the bridges should be strong enough, when they are built on these highways, to carry the tanks of the Army, and I am afraid they will not be unless they are specifically mentioned. I know they are taken care of, in a way, in a measure formerly passed, but I think the words should be specifically inserted in this bill.

I am asking that these two amendments be agreed to, and if the Senator is willing to accept them, I am willing to have the consideration of the bill proceed. Otherwise, I will ask the Senate to permit the bill to go over until I may be able to argue the amendments. I am sure I can convince the Senate that three-fourths of the cost should be borne by the Government.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement made by the able Senator from Tennessee. I think the Senator in charge of the bill will recall that 2 weeks ago I objected to the amount suggested as payment by the States. I think at that time the bill provided for 50–50 payments, 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the States. I said that 75 and 25 should be substituted for the ratio of 50–50, the States paying 25 percent and the National Government 75 percent, because, as suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, these roads are to be constructed for national defense.

The bill has been made the unfinished business by unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it has, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending request is that committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. As chairman of the committee which has charge of the bill, I am asking that its consideration be postponed unless the amendments I have suggested be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was taken up by motion last Thursday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand that. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. McNARY. I have stated that the bill has a fixed status before the Senate. It is the unfinished business at this moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. And it cannot be postponed by objection. The amendments could not be written into the bill by the mere acceptance of the Senator from Arizona. It is out of his charge. It has to be done by action of the Senate. That is what I want to make clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me, there is no doubt about that, but I am quite sure that the Senator from Arizona will be willing to accept the amendment. He introduced the bill as prepared by the Department, and it was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The Senator from Arizona, being the second ranking member of the committee, introduced the bill. I think it would expedite the matter if he would accept the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is now appealing to the graciousness of the Senator from Arizona. I wanted to correct the thought in the mind of the Senator.

I share the view of the Senator from Tennessee, and should like to hear the Senator in charge of the bill state that he would consent to the amendment, provided it was accepted by the Senate. I think the ratio of payment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee is proper, and I have thought so all the while. The roads are to be constructed for national defense, and in matters of national defense the Government always pays 100 percent, and I think we should not expect any more from the States than 25 percent, which they would pay in order to identify themselves as partners.

I also agree with the Senator from Tennessee that bridges should be included in the measure. I do not think there are many bridges in the country which are sufficiently strong to carry the heavy trucks which are now being manufactured. Bridges are certainly as much a part of a road as any other unit of it. I hope the Senator from Arizona will comply with the request of the Senator from Tennessee, and, so far as he can, accept the amendments suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, subject, of course, to the approval of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am inclined to give expression to the same sentiment which has just been expressed so ably by the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and I think the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], would certainly be rendering a service if he himself should favor the two amendments suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Of course, these roads will be in the several States, but of necessity certain of the highway construction contemplated under this bill will fall very heavily on certain States which will find it rather difficult even to match the proposed 25 percent, and certainly they will find it very much more difficult to go beyond 25 percent.

Mr. President, anyone who has had the opportunity of observing where these strategic highways are under continuous use by the Federal Government at this time, knows that they are practically confined to the use of the Government. Recently I had the opportunity to see the use being made of roadways of the regular highway system by the Government at one of the large Army posts in my State, and I observed that the public finds it very difficult to use the road at all, and that the roads are worn out with very great rapidity, particularly by the heavier machines now being used in training.

I express the hope that the amendments suggested by the Senator from Tennessee may at least be regarded in a favorable light by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Since the Senator from Tennessee suggested his amendments, I have conferred with various members of the committee that considered the bill, and I can assure the Senator from Arizona that he will not have any trouble with any members of the committee in respect to the proposed amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the announcement, I myself, was going to make, Mr. President, in response to the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee. For example, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] thought that the ratio ought to be——

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighty percent Federal share and 20 percent State share.

Mr. HAYDEN. Eighty and twenty percent. Other proposals were suggested. On the other hand we do have a basis for getting away from the 50–50 arrangement, and that appeared in a formal report, made as the result of long study, which was submitted to the Congress by the President. I wish to read a provision of that report:

> Strategic network: To provide for the replacement of substandard bridges and the correction of other critical deficiencies of the strategic network at a desirable rate, a supplementary appropriation of not less than $100,000,000 is required. This appropriation should be prorated to the States on the existing Federal-aid basis, and used solely for designated defense projects. It should be available to pay all legitimate costs of the projects on a somewhat higher basis of Federal participation than the existing 50–50 basis, but otherwise should be expended under the provisions of the Federal highway legislation.

The question was what constitutes a fair ratio. The suggestion at first generally made was 60–40. The committee decided upon a ratio of one-third to two-thirds, which would be 66⅔ and 33⅓ percent.

Mr. President, we all have the greatest faith and confidence in the sound judgment of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He has sponsored highway legislation in this body for many years. As one of the authors of the original highway act of July 11, 1916, he rendered a service to his country that, as the years go on, redounds increasingly to his credit. Those of us who have stepped into the picture much later and with much less background of experience, are always inclined

to yield to his views on highway legislation. If it is the judgment of the senior Senator from Tennessee that this bill can be enacted into law on the basis of a ratio of one-fourth to three-fourths, the others of us are only too willing to accept the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before that is done may I find out what the final extent of the obligation is which we are now definitely relieving the States of to a substantial degree? I notice the committee report says that in the committee's opinion $250,000,000 will not be sufficient to accomplish all that will have to be done during the continuance of the emergency. How much will be necessary?

Mr. HAYDEN. The President in his message to Congress said:

> It has been estimated by the Federal Works Agency that $458,000,000 will be required as a minimum for strengthening the entire strategic network of highways of more than 75,000 miles.

A part of that money would be Federal grants-in-aid and a part would be State funds, as the case may be. In addition to that considerable Federal-aid money heretofore appropriated in the ordinary way has been used and will continue to be used on the strategic network.

It was testified before our committee that of the regular appropriations made by Congress heretofore, 60 percent has been spent on the strategic network within the past year. The total Federal-aid mileage is approximately 225,000 miles. The strategic network is about 78,000 miles of this total. Yet the States, recognizing the need for national defense, have voluntarily devoted 60 percent of their money to the 78,000 miles out of the 225,000 miles, and that will continue. But our judgment was that there are certain things which ought to be done, and which must be done right away, and for that reason we put a ceiling of $250,000,000 on this bill. The Budget estimates can be sent up here for the various purposes outlined in the bill. What estimates will come I do not know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand that the figure $400,000,000 is the estimate for the total operation the Senator has in mind?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the figure stated in the report made after an intensive study of the entire situation in all the States, participated in by the Army, by the Public Roads Administration, and by the State highway departments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator, what does the language mean "during the continuance of the emergency"? Does that mean that this arrangement is required in connection with the existing war-defense effort, or will it be required in connection with the announced general national-defense program upon which we are launched, probably permanently? Is this a permanent thing or is it a war emergency?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. We say that these authorizations, that is, authority to make the appropriations, so that Budget estimates can be submitted, or so that the matter can be submitted to Congress under proper authority of law, will be limited to the emergency. Whenever the emergency is over this entire proposal lapses.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator does not think, does he, that this is the beginning of a break-down of the general contributory system in respect to Federal road aid?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I do not. That is a sound system, and a fair and equitable system, and it has worked very well, but, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, the States have even now difficulty in matching Federal funds. That was one reason which induced the committee to depart from the 50–50 arrangement, for there was a showing that the State legislatures have already adjourned, they have levied their taxes for the next biennium, and they would have great difficulty in matching funds on the old basis.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the difficulty of the States in matching Federal funds on occasion; but I have not much sympathy with the complacent notion that the Federal Government never seems to have difficulty in matching funds or paying bills that may be run up under the matching system. It seems to me that it is time to begin thinking about the difficulty the Federal Government has in meeting its financial obligations. I know of nothing automatic about the ability of the Federal Government to pay even the accounts involved in this bill. I think that before it gets through the Federal Government will have just as much difficulty as have the States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator will remember that during the previous war one of our greatest handicaps was the bottleneck in transportation. The railroads broke down. We did not have an adequate highway system. Manufactured products could not be transported from the interior of the country to the ports, and we could not move our troops. The highway system which we have built up in the intervening 20 years makes it possible for us to carry on even though the railroads should break down, except in certain places where the roads are not wide enough and the bridges are not sufficiently strong. What we now propose to do is to widen roads and strengthen bridges in places where such improvement is needed. A strain is being placed upon the system by reason of increased troop movements and the establishment of powder plants and of other factories throughout the United States where men are congregated in extraordinary numbers, and from which products must be hauled away. That is a burden which arises solely because of national defense.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not complaining about the objective. I do not want any transportation bottleneck. I am merely discussing the fact that we cannot automatically transfer expenditures to the Federal Treasury indefinitely on the theory that that is an easy way to get the money.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is nothing indefinite about this proposal. It is a definite proposal, to do certain necessary things.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am trying to find out whether it is definite or indefinite.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is definite.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The report discusses the continuance of the emergency. Is that definite or indefinite?

Mr. HAYDEN. We could have made the terms of the bill unlimited. I think it ought to please the Senator when I say that when the emergency is over the legislation lapses.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator from Michigan that of the 75,000 miles of strategic roads most of them have already been built. They are now in use. They are of sufficient strength for ordinary use. It is proposed to strengthen them so as to meet the heavier burdens that have been imposed upon them because of the present emergency. According to the testimony, as I recall the figure, 96 percent of the 75,000 miles of strategic roads is now in use; and as I have just indicated the proposed authorization is to be used to strengthen them and also to enlarge them where found necessary. There is no reason why the amount paid by the Federal Government should not be almost 100 percent, rather than the proposed 75 percent. As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I suggested that the Federal Government's share should be at least 80 percent of the cost, but the committee compromised the matter by providing for a two-thirds Federal and one-third State contribution, respectively. I am, of course, heartily in favor of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In connection with the point suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, it was testified before the committee that between 2,000 and 3,000 bridges do not meet the specifications of the War Department. That condition constitutes an emergency which must be taken care of; and I believe the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would be in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The emergency of which the Senator speaks is one which the Federal Government is creating by reason of its activities. The proposed improvements are not necessary for civilian use in normal times. Therefore, the Government should contribute a

larger percentage than normal, because the Federal Government knows that the bridges must be strengthened. The Federal Government uses the roadways, which are sufficient for civilian use in time of peace. It is now necessary that they be strengthened. That is a complete justification for the larger contribution of the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bridges now constructed meet the requirements of the civilian population of the various communities, but they do not meet the requirements of the War Department under the present emergency.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to be practically unanimously agreed that the 75–25 ratio should be adopted. I wonder if we cannot act on that amendment now, and discuss the other amendments later?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's amendment is an amendment to the second committee amendment. I ask that the first committee amendment be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, in section 1, on page 2, line 3, after the words "routes as", to strike out "main"; and in the same line, after the word "lines" where it first occurs, to strike out "and auxiliary lines", so as to make the section read:

That as used in this act the term "strategic network of highways" means all existing or proposed highways which conform to routes designated on the map of the strategic network of highway routes dated October 25, 1940, revised to May 15, 1941, and approved by the Secretary of War. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to designate existing or proposed highways conforming to such approved routes as lines of the strategic network of highways.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in section 2, on page 2, line 10, after the word "highways" and before the period, to insert "and bridges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, in section 2, on page 2, line 14, after the word "supplemented", to strike out "and shall be matched with State funds on the pro rata basis heretofore required by law" and insert "except that, in any case in which the Federal share payable under existing law on account of any such project is less than two-thirds of the total cost thereof, the Federal share payable on account of such project may be increased to any amount not in excess of two-thirds of such cost.", which, with the amendment previously adopted, would make the section read:

SEC. 2. Strategic highway network: Such sums as may be necessary during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out projects to correct critical deficiencies in the main lines of the strategic network of highways and bridges. Such sums shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of such act, as amended and supplemented, except that, in any case in which the Federal share payable under existing law on account of any such project is less than two-thirds of the total cost thereof the Federal share payable on account of such project may be increased to any amount not in excess of two-thirds of such cost.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment now pending. In line 18, after the word "than", I propose to strike out "two-thirds" and insert "three-fourths"; and in line 20, after the words "in excess of", to strike out "two-thirds" and insert "three-fourths."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question. Was this issue raised in the House while the bill was under consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill has never been considered by the House. The House committee has completed consideration in committee, and expects to report the bill promptly to that body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator know what the House committee has done?

Mr. HAYDEN. The House committee has not yet formally acted, and I have no knowledge on the subject.

I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 14, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, in section 2, page 2, line 18, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "three-fourths", and in line 20, after the words "not in excess of", to strike out "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "three-fourths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 14.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 14, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, in section 3, on page 2, line 24, after the word "naval", to strike out "reservations and defense-industry sites" and insert "reservations, to defense-industry sites, and to the sources of raw materials"; on page 3, after line 6, to insert "The acquisition of new or additional rights-of-way necessary for such projects may, to the extent determined by the Federal Works Administrator, be included as part of the construction of such projects and Federal funds shall be available to pay the cost of such acquisition"; and in line 14, after the word "appropriated" to insert "and shall be available, without regard to apportionment among the several States, for paying all or any part of the cost thereof", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Access roads: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to provide, by contract or otherwise, for the construction and improvement of access roads to military and naval reservations, to defense-industry sites, and to the sources of raw materials when such roads are certified to the Federal Works Administrator as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for replacing existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary closures or restrictions at military and naval reservations and defense-industry sites. The acquisition of new or additional rights-of-way necessary for such projects may, to the extent determined by the Federal Works Administrator, be included as part of the construction of such projects and Federal funds shall be available to pay the cost of such acquisition. Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this section during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, are authorized to be appropriated, and shall be available, without regard to apportionment among the several States, for paying all or any part of the cost thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill for a little light on section 3, covering access roads. I can see nothing in that section which describes exactly what an access road is. I believe there was some conversation in the committee covering that item. Perhaps this is a hypothetical question; but I should like to ask the Senator if the term covers not only a road leading from a new plant or war industry to a present strategic highway, but also improvements to the strategic highways which are required from that point on to some main terminal or center.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the term clearly would cover such a situation. A main line, Federal-aid highway may now be entirely adequate to carry the normal traffic for which it was constructed, partly from State funds and partly from Federal funds. However, when an Army camp is located along the highway the traffic becomes multiplied many times. Instead of an ordinary two-lane highway, it is necessary to make it a four-lane highway to handle the traffic. It is necessary to use that road to have access to the camp. Clearly an improvement may be made to such a road as an access road. I think there is no doubt of it. The President so indicated in his message, when he said:

It is clearly evident that the financial requirements for community facilities and access roads are greatly in excess of local resources and present available Federal funds and that additional funds will be required immediately to relieve the existing traffic congestion in important areas.

I invite the Senator's attention to the words "existing traffic congestion in important areas." I think it is clearly contemplated that funds appropriated for access roads may be utilized for the purpose the Senator has indicated.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me also ask the Senator whether the amount of Federal contribution toward the construction of the so-called access roads is limited to the division that has already been agreed to, 75 to 25?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no. In his message to Congress the President indicates that the entire cost of access roads should be borne by the Federal Government, and that, in addition, the cost of securing rights-of-way should be borne by the Federal Government. The provisions of the bill completely and accurately carry out the recommendations made by the President in that respect.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 4, line 10, after the word "purposes", to insert "of sections 2, 3, and 4"; in line 11, after the word "paying", to insert "the Federal share of"; in line 12, before the word "surveys", to strike out "such" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "plans", to insert "required for such purposes, respectively"; in line 13, after the word "such", to strike out "other"; and in line 19, after the word "State", to strike out "and any funds available for the purposes of this section may be used to reimburse such State for all or any part of the expenditures made by such State on account of such project", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. Surveys and plans: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to make such surveys and plans as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, including advance engineering surveys and plans for future development of the strategic network of highways and bypasses around and extensions into and through municipalities and metropolitan areas. Any funds available for carrying out any of the purposes of sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act may be used for paying the Federal share of the cost of the surveys and plans required for such purposes, respectively, and for paying such administrative expenses as the Commissioner of Public Roads deems it necessary to incur for carrying out the purposes of this act. By agreement with the State highway department of any State, any project carried out in such State under the provisions of this section may be carried out through or in cooperation with the highway department of such State. Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out advance engineering surveys during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, are authorized to be appropriated for apportionment among the States in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented. Such sums shall be matched with State funds on the pro rata basis heretofore required by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 5, line 20, before the word "lines", to strike out "auxiliary", so as to read:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. Extension of Federal-aid system: Notwithstanding the limitations in section 6 of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, respecting the mileage of the system of Federal-aid highways, such system of highways in any State may be extended to include, and there may be approved as a part of such system of highways in such State, any of the main lines of the strategic network of highways.

SEC. 7. Extension of secondary road system: Funds heretofore or hereafter made available for expenditure under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, for secondary or feeder roads are hereby also made available for expenditure on the same basis on any roads (including bridges thereon) which are lines of the strategic network of highways and are not on the system of Federal-aid highways.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 6, line 1, after the words "authorized to", to strike out "provide, by contract or otherwise, for" and insert "cooperate with the States in", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. Off-street parking: In order to facilitate the flow of traffic on sections of the strategic network of highways forming bypasses around and connections into and through municipalities and metropolitan areas, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to cooperate with the States in the location, development, and construction of off-street facilities for the parking of vehicles, and projects for providing such facilities shall be considered to be highway projects. Where, by appropriate law, ordinance, or regulation of any State or any governmental subdivision thereof, provision is made for the permanent prohibition of parking of vehicles within the roadway or street portion of any such section of the strategic network of highways, funds heretofore or hereafter made available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, for construction and reconstruction on the system of Federal-aid highways, are hereby also made available for expenditure on the same basis for the location, development, and construction of such off-street vehicle parking facilities as may be required, including the cost of acquiring the lands necessary for such facilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 7, after the words "Acquisition of rights-of-way", to strike out:

By agreement with the State highway department of any State, such new or additional rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands in such State as may be required for any project on the strategic network of highways, or for any project authorized by this act, may be acquired by such highway department or by any political subdivision of such State, and the Commissioner of Public Roads may advance or reimburse the share of the cost of such acquisition payable by the Federal Government: *Provided, however,* That if the Commissioner of Public Roads finds that the laws of any State, or the procedure which must be followed therein, are such that the highway department or political subdivisions of such State cannot obtain possesesion and the right to enter upon and use the required rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands with sufficient promptness, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to acquire in the name of the United States such rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands as may be required in such State for such projects, by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931, 46 Stat. 1421) and may enter upon and take possession thereof, and expend public funds for projects thereon, without regard to the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The costs incurred by the Commissioner of Public Roads in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds available for paying the cost, or the Federal share of the cost, of the project for which such lands or interests are acquired. The Commissioner of Public Roads is further authorized, by proper deed executed in the name of the United States, to convey any lands or interest in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section to the highway department of such State, or to such political subdivisions thereof as its laws may provide, upon condition that such highway department or political subdivisions will accept the same and will maintain the project constructed thereon.

And insert:

By agreement with the State highway department of any State, such new or additional rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands in such State as may be required for any project authorized by this act, may be acquired by such highway department or by any political subdivision of such State, and the Commissioner of Public Roads may advance or reimburse the share of the cost of such acquisition payable by the Federal Government: *Provided, however,* That if the Federal Works Administrator, in his discretion, shall determine that the highway department of any State is unable or unwilling to obtain possession and the right to enter upon and use the required rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands, improved or unimproved, with sufficient promptness, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, in the name of the United States, such rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands as may be required in such State for such projects, by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931, 46 Stat. 1421) and may enter upon and take possession thereof, and expend public funds for projects thereon, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General (without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and without regard to State, municipal, or local laws, ordinances, or regulations). The costs incurred by the Federal Works Administrator in acquiring any such rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds available for paying the cost, or the Federal share of the cost, of the project for which such rights-of-way, lands, or interests in lands are acquired. The Federal Works Administrator is further authorized and directed, by proper deed executed in the name of the United States, to convey any lands or interest in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section to the highway department of such State, or to such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon condition that such highway department or political subdivisions will accept the same and will maintain the project constructed thereon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have the able Senator in charge of the bill discuss and analyze the amendment. Wherein does it differ from the language which has been stricken from the section?

Mr. HAYDEN. The differences are minor in character; but, inasmuch as this text was approved by the Bureau of the Budget——

Mr. McNARY. Which text?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amended text which the committee seeks to have adopted.

Let me explain to the Senator that what I had to work on in preparing the bill was not what subsequently came up

from the Bureau of the Budget, but what was contained in the report prepared cooperatively by the War Department, the Public Roads Administration, and the various State highway departments. They made a general recommendation of this kind; and in preparing the bill which I introduced I had a section along this line. Then, subsequently, the President, sent up a message and stated that Mr. Carmody would submit to Congress the draft of proposed legislation. When that draft came up, his text differed from what I had prepared in some particulars.

Mr. McNARY. Pardon me; I cannot follow what the Senator is stating. Is the text of which the Senator is speaking, the Carmody text, stricken from the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the text I originally wrote is stricken out, and the text submitted by Mr. Carmody and approved by the Bureau of the Budget is inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. McNARY. That is the matter which is in italics?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the matter which is in italics in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, it is my purpose in due time to offer an amendment to this section, on page 10, line 2, after the word "and", to insert a comma and the phrase "during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941."

Mr. HAYDEN. I should have no objection to that, because the whole bill is predicated upon that idea.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, I offer that amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let us take one thing at a time. I desire to have the Senator from Arizona, in answer to my inquiry, explain the reasons for this amendment, why it is here, and what it means. Then I shall be glad to go back to the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut in order at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee amendment is before the Senate, and the Senator from Connecticut has a right to offer an amendment to it.

By way of explanation, let me say that heretofore the States have been required to pay every cent of the cost of rights-of-way. The Federal Government purchased no rights-of-way at all at any time. Here, inasmuch as we have included both the improvement of the strategic network and the building of access roads, the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Carmody, the Public Roads Administration, and all the other agencies concerned said that, this being a Federal matter, and these roads being primarily for the benefit of the Federal Government in promoting the national defense, money should be made available to acquire rights-of-way.

That does not mean necessarily that the Federal payment will be 100 percent in any case. The bill says, "to the extent that the Administrator may agree with the State highway department."

There may be some right-of-way that it is highly desirable for a State to secure for a long-time purpose, and the State should contribute to the acquisition thereof. On the other hand, it might be a matter in which the State would have no interest, such as a road leading into a military camp, and the Federal Government should pay the whole cost. That is the primary thing; and the change made from existing law is that a contribution may be made up to 100 percent by the Federal Government for the acquisition of rights-of-way. That is point No. 1.

As I had the bill written I referred in every case to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and this bill refers to the Federal Works Administrator. The Federal Works Administrator is like the head of a department, and the Commissioner of Public Roads is under him. I think it is immaterial which way it is, but we adopted that language in committee.

I referred to one section of the statutes, and they referred to three or four sections from which they make exemptions. We specifically refer to the law now permitting the quick condemnation of post-office sites, and things of that kind. As Senators know, we passed a statute for that purpose. The same procedure will be available under this bill whenever the laws of a State do not permit quick condemnation; and, again, it is understood that there will be cooperation and collaboration and understanding between the State highway department concerned and the Public Roads Administration in these matters.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the major difference between the language stricken out and the language inserted involves the question of rights-of-way, does it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they both provide for acquisition of rights-of-way.

Mr. McNARY. But the proportion the Government should pay and the proportion the State should pay are changed?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there is no change in that respect.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator said that was the main difference between the language in italics, that which is proposed to be inserted, and that which was in the original text.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I said that the main difference between existing law, which permits no contribution, and what we now propose is that the Federal Government may purchase rights-of-way.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator was speaking about the difference between the language proposed to be inserted and the original language.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the method of approach is the same in both cases. The minor changes recommended in Federal Works Administrator Carmody's draft would have involved making amendments in half a dozen places in the language I had drawn; and I thought it better to strike it all out and adopt the language recommended by Mr. Carmody and the Bureau of the Budget. The effect is the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 11, page 10, line 2, after the word "and", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether his amendment would permit the completion of a project that was half-way finished when the emergency ended?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CONNALLY. How would it do that?

Mr. DANAHER. In fact, all the amendment would do, as the Senator from Arizona obviously will recognize, is to provide a limitation upon the period of time within which sections 355, 1136, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall stand suspended.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Arizona if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut would hinder the completion of a project that might be halfway finished when the emergency comes to an end?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the amendment satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am satisfied there can be no harm in it, and I think we should limit this legislation to the period of the emergency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Turning back to page 9, line 16, of the committee amendment, I move to strike out the words "in his discretion." The reason for the amendment is that the clause purports to have the authority in question rest upon an agreement by the Federal Works Administrator with the State highway departments. In point of fact, the proviso goes on to say that if the Federal Works Administrator "shall determine that the highway department of any State is unable or unwilling to obtain possession and the right to enter upon the required "rights-of-way," or property to be acquired, the Federal Works Administrator is none the less empowered to go in and acquire the right-of-way or the property, as the case may be. Consequently, if there is to be a determination, we should, it seems to me, abide by the legal definition of the action of an administrative officer in making a determination as to which rules of law, with which we are all familiar, now definitely apply. Therefore, Mr. President, we should not suspend the existing rule determining what is a determination by an administrative officer by adding thereto the phrase "in his discretion."

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry that I am unable to follow the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. There is a very real difference, let me say to the Senator from Arizona, between a determination by an executive or administrative officer, a determination pursuant to a duty imposed upon him by statute, and an authorization for him to act in his discretion. There is a very real and a legal difference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill now reads that the Federal Works Administrator may determine "in his discretion."

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. He may determine it or not, and he could do that whether in or out of his discretion. All I know is that this is the way the provision came up, and this is the way it is. I cannot see any advantage in taking the words out. If the Bureau of the Budget likes it this way, why not adopt it?

Mr. DANAHER. Because it enlarges a legal definition. That is why it should come out. I move in the amendment, in line 16, page 9, that there be stricken out the words "in his discretion."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of the committee on page 9, line 16, after the word "Administrator", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "in his discretion."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Now, Mr. President, on page 9, in line 17, I move to strike out the words "or unwilling." There again, Mr. President, we have the vice of the language which has been "sent up," as the Senator from Arizona puts it, to the effect that the Federal Works Administrator, under this proposed language, is empowered to go in and take lands in a given State whenever he determines that the highway department of a State is unwilling to obtain possession of the lands. When we undertake to superimpose the will or the decision of th Federal Works Administrator upon the attitude and action of the State in question we are going far beyond the needs of the exigencies of the situation this legislation is designed to meet. If it be a legitimate case of the highway department in a State being unable to acquire the land either because limitation of its own law or otherwise, then we are, under this legislation, empowering the Federal Works Administrator to go into that State and acquire the land. Under such circumstances, Mr. President, we are giving him all the authority he ought to have in the premises.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 9, line 17, after the word "unable", it is proposed to strike out the words "are unwilling."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The next amendment was, in section 12, page 11, line 17, after the word "based", to insert "except that in case of damage caused by maneuvers such notice shall be filed within 30 days after completion of such maneuvers", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 12. Emergency repairs: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of roads and highways substantially damaged by the Army or the Navy or both. The Commissioner is authorized on behalf of the United States to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine any claim accruing subsequent to the passage of this act, submitted by the State highway department of any State, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, for reimbursement of the cost of such rehabilitation or repair. Such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant shall be certified to Congress for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by the Commissioner unless notice of intention to file such claim has been presented to him within 30 days after the occurrence of the damage, upon which the claim is based, except that in case of damage caused by maneuvers such notice shall be filed within 30 days after completion of such maneuvers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 14, on page 12, line 13, after the word "on", to strike out "September 8, 1939, or any extension or modification thereof", and insert "May 27, 1941", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 14. Recall of retired employees: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), and section 204 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 404), any person heretofore or hereafter retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, may be employed in the service of the Public Roads Administration during continuance of the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of such person and credited to his account as provided in section 12 (a) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the regular deductions prescribed by the said act: *Provided further*, That upon separation from the service for any cause such person may elect to receive a refund of the total deductions so withheld together with interest at 4 percent compounded on June 30 of each year, or receive credit for the additional service in the computation of any annuity awarded thereafter: *Provided further*, That payment of the annuity of such person shall be suspended during the period of such employment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 15, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 16. The total of all appropriations made for carrying out the purposes of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act shall not exceed $250,000,000.

M. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the Senator from Arizona. The total amount is $250,000,000. Of that sum what approximately would be available for network construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. According to statements made by Members of the other House, there would be $100,000,000 for strategic network improvement and development and from $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 for construction of access roads. That is what is indicated in the report so far as immediate needs are concerned.

Mr. McNARY. I can only observe that is a very niggardly sum for network defense road construction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question on the subject of estimates? My recollection is that the Senator told me that this total program would amount in the neighborhood of $400,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The estimate submitted as the result of a review of all the projects desirable to June amounted to $458,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That does not include the $150,000,000 for access roads, and it does not include the $25,000,000 for tactical roads, does it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the tactical roads are out; the Army was not interested in that type of road, and the committee came to the conclusion that anything necessary of that kind could be handled in connection with the access roads.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The grand total contemplated by the report is $600,000,000 instead of $400,000,000, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. It is nearer to $600,000,000 than $400,000,000 over a long period of time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator is a little more accurate in his prophecy that this is not breaking down of the general matching formula on roads than he was on his estimate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I still insist that I gave the Senator the correct figure. The Senator from Michigan confuses administration estimates with the actualities of this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the report, on page 3, under the heading "Strategic highway network," is this statement:

The bill defines a "strategic network of highways" as consisting of all existing or proposed highways which conform to routes designated on the map dated October 25, 1940, revised to May 15, 1941, and approved by the Secretary of War. Copies of this map are not available.

Mr. HAYDEN. They are now available; they were not available at that time.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have not seen a copy. My interest was aroused because of a certain road called the Jordan Valley Road in Malheur County, Oreg., which I understood was of some strategic importance. I do not know whether that road is included in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the day the report was filed the map was not available, but it became available on the following day.

If the Senator will telephone the War Department or Public Roads Administration, he may obtain a copy of the map.

Mr. HOLMAN. I previously asked one of the pages to get me a copy of the map, and was advised by someone that it was a confidential map and not available.

Mr. HAYDEN. The one who made that statement did not talk to Mr. MacDonald. I am sure the Senator will have no trouble about getting the map now.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the road to which I have referred was supposed to be in the bill, and perhaps it is, though I do not know.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no particular road named in the bill. What was done was to indicate routes between two termini. The details as between two places can be worked out in the most practicable manner.

Mr. HOLMAN. This road would be particularly between Boise, Idaho, and San Francisco, on the Pacific coast.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will secure a copy of the map, I am sure he can obtain from it the information he desires.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand the bill as now amended, the participation of the Federal Government with the States is on a 75–25-percent basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I also understand that under the present basis of Federal aid my State of Utah, because of the vast area of public lands in Utah, gets approximately 76 percent of Federal funds.

Mr. HAYDEN. Seventy-five and twenty-two one-hundredths percent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Utah will continue to get 75.22 percent?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. But if a State under the present basis is getting only 50 percent, the amount will be raised to 75 percent?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, this bill means very little to the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Utah. On the question of rights-of-way, as I understand the bill, even those three States which do not participate much in this additional benefit will receive a considerable benefit as a result of the purchase of rights-of-way by the Federal Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. Where that is necessary. As a matter of fact, in our State most of the rights-of-way are across public domain; so it is not much of a problem there, as it is in the East where highways are constructed through congested areas. Nevertheless, whatever right-of-way trouble we have will be ameliorated to the extent the bill provides. Heretofore, we could get no help at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 13, lines 16 to 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is also proposed to renumber the sections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the sections will be renumbered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. In its ultimate effect, does the program as now contemplated differ greatly from the matter which was submitted 2 years ago, when the self-liquidating projects bill was before us?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it differs very, very materially. Conditions are now entirely different. This bill is the result of a study undertaken nearly a year ago at the direction of the President. This study required nearly 7 months, and a report was submitted in February.

Before the bill is passed I should like to make a statement to explain the differences between the measure we now have before us and the recommendations which came to us from the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended that the money appropriated for the improvement of the strategic network be not apportioned among the States in the usual manner, but rather be distributed by the War Department here in Washington to meet needs as discovered throughout the country. That is the reason why this entire program has been delayed as long as it has been. These recommendations took 7 months to make. They were filed on the 1st of February. February passed, March passed, and most of April passed with nothing done; and finally I took it upon myself to find out what was the matter. I made inquiry at the War Department, and was told that they would like to have the money, but that they did not want the headache that came along with it. They had been under terrific pressure from all parts of the country with respect to the location of cantonments and Army camps. Every chamber of commerce in the United States that thought it wanted one of these cantonments had the same idea, which was to send somebody on a plane to Washington, get some Senators and some Representatives to go down and see the Chief of Staff or some general, or somebody else, and have an Army camp located in its particular county.

The information given me at the War Department was that they simply could not do any business because of the terrific pressure about locating the camps. They said, "If you hand to the War Department a sum of money to improve roads, there will be the same thing to do over again. It will be a question of who can get here first, who can bring enough Senators and Representatives down here and put enough pressure on us to get a particular road approved; and long experience has demonstrated that that is not the way to do it."

The Army is right. Neither Senators nor Representatives want to be taken away from their duties—as they would have to be, at the request of their constituents—to go down and find the officer in the War Department who distributes this money; but if the allocation is made in the normal way and the money is distributed to the States, there will be no trouble about it. The work can be done. There will not be enough money appropriated to do all of it. Whatever needs to be done in the various States can be arranged by an understanding between the Public Roads Administration, the corps area commander, and the State highway department.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the distribution under this bill will be on the basis of 75 percent by the Federal Government and 25 percent by the States.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there are two things involved. The distribution of the lump sum of money is made in the normal way; but within a particular State the amount of money that goes to such State is matched on a different basis than heretofore.

Mr. BYRD. What about the regular appropriation, which heretofore has been disbursed on a 50-50 basis?

Mr. HAYDEN. If $100,000,000 were appropriated in the regular way, and $100,000,000 were appropriated in this way, the amount that would go to the State of Virginia would be exactly the same; but when the money apportioned to the State of Virginia arrived in the State, or when it became available to Virginia, the State would then have to put up 25 percent of the amount rather than 50 percent, as is now the case. That is the idea.

Mr. BYRD. Does the bill change the apportionment of the regular appropriation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if he would mind inserting, after the words "The Commissioner of Public Roads", which appear on page 2, lines 21 and 22, and in sections 4 and 5, the words "acting through or in cooperation with the State highway department of any State."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with respect to access roads I can only say that there might be such a situation that a provision of that character might not be desirable from the State's point of view; and, if such were the case, I think the Senator's suggestion would tie down the provision so tight that it would not work, whereas the Senator well knows that there is the closest kind of cooperation between the Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is in my State.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is all over the United States. I think that is a matter which had better be left as it is, rather than tying it down too tightly.

Mr. ANDREWS. That has been the custom in Florida all along. I have a letter from the chairman of the State Road Department of my State in which he expresses the view that he thought that the clause I have suggested should be included in the bill, so that they would feel they had a part in it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think they will not only feel that they have a part in it, but they will find that they have a part in it, because there is no other suitable agency to undertake the work in 99 cases out of 100. I do not want to lock the door and throw away the key, in case there should be a navy yard or an Army post or some strategic center that had to be fixed right away, and should the State not be in a position to do it, the Public Roads Administration or the respective department concerned should have the right to get the necessary work done as promptly as possible. That is all there is to it. I do not think the highway department of Florida has any occasion for worry, and I should not care to accept an amendment of that kind under those circumstances.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Senator's argument applies to the strategic highway network just as it does to the access roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question in regard to the strategic highway network, because it is directed that the sums be apportioned among the States according to the Federal Highway Act and be expended in accordance with the Highway Act, and that is through the State highway department.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know the custom in other States, but in Florida the State road department has to furnish the rights-of-way.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is cared for in section 11 of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think probably it will work out as the Senator suggests; but I should like to place in the RECORD the letter of the State highway department of Florida on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE ROAD DEPARTMENT OF FLORIDA,
Tallahassee, June 14, 1941.

Hon. C. O. ANDREWS, *United States Senator,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your telegram of the 11th instant inviting the Governor's comments on Committee Report No. 21, Senate Bill 1580 authorizing appropriations during the national emergency for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, etc.

Governor Holland has requested that I convey his thanks to you for keeping us posted on this proposed legislation and has also asked me to analyze the bill for comments as you requested as he has been busily engaged since adjournment of the Legislature handling matters acted on at their session.

I desire to call your attention to the following:

Section 3, access roads provides that "The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to provide, by contract or otherwise, for the construction and improvement of access roads, etc." This section does not mention "acting through or in cooperation with State Highway Department." The authority as now stated in the Act "by contract or otherwise" permits agreement with the State Highway Departments of the various States but, on the other hand, authority is also given to handle these access roads directly without consulting or using existing organizations of State Highway Departments.

The above remarks on section 3 also apply to section 4, flight strips.

Section 5, survey and plans gives permissive authority to enter into agreements with State Highway Department but the Commissioner of Public Roads may handle these matters direct without consultation with State Highway Departments.

My suggestion would be to insert in Sections 3, 4, and 5 after the words "The Commissioner of Public Roads" add the following "acting through or in cooperation with the State Highway Department of any State."

I trust you will be able to secure Senator Hayden's consent to adopt this suggestion.

Sincerely yours,
THOS. A. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before concluding the discussion on the bill I desire to dwell for a moment on a matter covered in the bill which is entirely new to any highway construction program we have ever had in the United States, that is, that part of the bill which refers to flight strips, so-called.

For years the countries abroad which have made the greatest strides in aviation have found great difficulty in finding landing places and landing fields. Today Great Britain is looking over her entire island for ways and means of landing additional aircraft. Germany solved the problem to some extent in the early years of her activity, and is going forward now, so that in occupied France today Germany is constructing that which we take a step toward constructing by the provision of the bill before us, that is, flight strips. If there be a sector of, say, 5 or 6 or 7 miles of straight road, the highway department, acting in cooperation with and under the direction of the War Department, and particularly of the air branch of the War Department, may in its contract set out provisions for a flight strip by the side of the road, so that the contractor constructing the road will establish a landing field, at much less expense than could otherwise be done, which will be only for emergency service. It will be a widening of the road, so to speak, so that a runway of, say, 150 feet wide and 6,000 or 7,000 feet long will be available, and an Army pilot, or any pilot, finding himself in distress, looking for a place to come down, will know that on the highway system there is likely to be an emergency landing strip, and he will find his way down to it in safety.

On some occasions, up to the present time, pilots finding themselves in trouble have sought to avail themselves of the surfaced roads. The result has been loss of life, loss of property, and general damage. By establishing landing strips on the highways, at places to be selected by the military department of the Government, we will take a great stride forward in aviation.

Mr. DAVIS. What will be the probable cost of the additional strips for airplane landings?

Mr. McCARRAN. The probable cost is not a matter on which I have any figures, nor have any figures been submitted to us. Suffice it to say, it will not be great, and this is the most inexpensive way of creating an emergency landing field.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I am very much impressed with the remarks made by the Senator from Nevada, which pertain to other States as well as to Florida. The practice in Florida has been to build along the highways parkways 200 feet wide, and there are many hundreds of miles of such parkways along the highways throughout the State. Those parkways are constructed on the sides opposite the electric wires and telephone wires, and it would not cost much to convert them into landing strips.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Florida that during the course of the hearings on the bill it was recited to the committee that in Great Britain, wherever they have opportunity to establish so-called flight strips, they use in some instances what is known as the turf. In other words, if the base underneath the grass turf is of sufficient strength to carry heavy craft, they use the turf; otherwise, they have to put in a heavier base, and perhaps a hard base.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the striking machinists in the west-coast shipyards last night rejected President Roosevelt's urgent plea for their return to work, and contracts aggregating $500,000,000 are still being held up. This strike began March 3, and has been in existence now for over 3 months. The machinists working on this job are only a small percentage of the total labor, and the members of other labor unions are anxious to return to work, and are being prevented from doing so because of the threats and violence of the machinists who are striking.

Not long ago, Admiral Land, in testifying before the Truman committee, suggested that some way must be devised to control the minority of workmen from preventing the large majority from going to work on such an essential defense operation as the construction of merchant ships.

I am advised by the War Department that on June 13 there were 35 strikes still in existence, and 24 strikes threatened. I am advised by the Navy Department that on June 14 there were 43 strikes, making a total of 68 actual strikes, and 24 strikes threatened.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a report made to me by the War Department, and a report made by the Navy Department.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
LABOR SECTION,
June 13, 1941.

Subject: Strikes and labor disputes affecting War Department procurement.

Memorandum for the Under Secretary of War.

New strikes reported June 12, 1941: Bass Foundry & Machine Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.;

Douglas & Lomason, Detroit, Mich.; Mills Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Cases where men have returned to work: Aluminum Co. of America, Cleveland, Ohio; Bohn Aluminum Co., Detroit, Mich.; Detroit Steel Products, Detroit, Mich.; Republic Stamping & Enameling, Canton, Ohio.

American Potash & Chemical, Trona, Calif.:

Strike: March 19, 1941, of 1,000 mine, mill, and smelter workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Malcolm conducting negotiations. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board, April 23, 1941.

Interest: Borax and boric acid for Kimball Glass Co. and Corning Glass Works. Medical Corps contracts far behind schedule.

American Thread Co., Fall River, Mass:

Strike: June 9, 1941, of 2,500 C. I. O. and A. F. of L. workers.

Issues: Jurisdictional.

Status: Commissioner on case and conducting negotiations.

Interest: Thread for Quartermaster Corps prime and subcontracts. Also thread for Suncook Mills, which make 80 percent of the cotton fabric used by Air Corps.

Antrim Iron Co., Mancelona, Mich.:

Strike: May 29, 1941, of 450 United Mine Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Alleged discriminatory discharge of one employee.

Status: Commissioner Connor reports deadlock in negotiations.

Interests: Charcoal, pig iron, and methanol for various defense projects.

Apollo Steel Corporation, Apollo, Pa.:

Strike: May 19, 1941, of 950 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Ward and Office of Production Management labor consultant conducting conferences. Company has rejected union proposals. Strike continues.

Interest: Sheet steel for ABC Steel for Quartermaster Corps; hot-rolled steel for motor generator for ordnance contracts. Motor generator will have to cut production 50 percent on July 15, 1941, if Apollo steel not shipped by June 30, 1941.

Bass Foundry & Machine Co., Fort Wayne, Ind

Strike: June 11, 1941, of 72 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.) in foundry.

Issues: Unascertained.

Status: A. F of L. workers in machine shop will be forced to stop in 2 days.

Interest: Company is considerably vital to machine-tool industry. Manufactures castings.

Canister Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.:

Strike: June 6, 1941, of 300 F. L. U. (A. F. of L.).

Issues: Closed shop and wage increases.

Status: Commissioner Hurley on case. Joint conference held June 10, 1941.

Interest: Mouth and annealing machines for .50 caliber guns (A-1-a priority) for Western Cartridge—delay in receiving machines will seriously retard operations of .50-caliber cartridge line. Eight million dollar order for fiber canisters for Ordnance.

Clay City Products Co., Uhrichsville, Ohio:

Strike: May 31, 1941, of brick and clay workers.

Issues: Wage increases and contract terms.

Status: Commissioner Fuller held conference June 10, 1941, and reported some progress.

Interest: Clay pipes for use at island air bases.

Cleveland Brass Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Strike: About May 7, 1941, of 150 die-casters (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Harris on case. National Labor Relations Board election to be held as soon as possible.

Interest: Indirect source of supply for Ordnance.

Douglas & Lomason, Detroit, Mich.

Strike: June 11, 1941, of 550 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.) and (A. F. of L.). Called by C. I. O.

Issues: Union recognition.

Status: A. F. of L. has closed-shop contract. C. I. O. called strike.

Interest: Subcontractors for Chevrolet division of General Motors on Quartermaster Corps contracts.

Ethyl gas plant, Baton Rouge, La.:

Strike: Building trades (A. F. of L.) on June 3, 1941, on construction of plant addition.

Issues: Closed shop.

Status: Commissioner held conference June 11, 1941.

Interest: Plant partly owned by Standard Oil. One of largest aviation-gasoline plants in the country.

Fuld & Hatch Knitting Co., Cohoes, N. Y.:

Strike: June 2, 1941, of 240 United Textile Workers of America (A. F. of L.) in knitting and spinning departments.

Issue: Wage increases.

Status: Union willing to have conciliator arbitrate wage question.

Interest: Undershirts and drawers for Quartermaster Corps.

Gager Lime Manufacturing Co., Sherwood, Tenn.:

Strike: June 5, 1941, of 185 cement, lime, and gypsum workers (A. F. of L.).

Issue: New contract terms.

Status: Meetings being held.

Interests: Lime for Aluminum Co. of America, Tennessee Corporation, Reynolds Metal, Republic Steel, Atlantic Steel, Southern Chemical & Cotton. Alternate source of supply available but not yet obtained.

Gerschwin Feather Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: May 27, 1941, of unascertained number of C. I. O. workers.

Issue: Unascertained.

Status: No details.

Interest: Pillows for Quartermaster Corps.

Karp Metal Products Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: June 5, 1941, of 35 U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.).

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Post reports deadlock in negotiations.

Interest: Boxes and containers for Ordinance, Signal Corps, and Air Corps.

Lamson & Sessions Co., Plant No. 2, Cleveland, Ohio:

Strike: June 10, 1941, of 480 U. A. W. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and vacations with pay.

Status: Commissioner assigned June 11, 1941. Possibility of No. 1 plant going out too.

Interest: Carriage bolts for Picatinny & Ravenna; $1,500,000 bolts for Air Corps.

Louisville Tin & Stove Co., Louisville, Ky.:

Strike: May 21, 1941, of 225 American Federation of Labor workers.

Issues: Closed shop and check-off.

Status: Commissioner Robertson holding meeting in Washington June 12, 1941.

Interest: Only source of copper-lined powder boxes for Du Pont shipments to Charleston powder plant; manufacture miscellaneous cooking equipment for Quartermaster Corps.

Lumber Industry in the Pacific Northwest area, State of Washington:

Strike: May 10, 1941, of about 16,000 woodworkers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and contract terms.

Status: Twin District Council, Seattle, Wash. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board May 9, 1941. Union rejected Board's proposal on June 9, 1941, and drafted their own five-point program.

Willapa Harbor Lumber Mills, Raymond, Wash.:

It is believed that the union here is awaiting the outcome of the National Defense Mediation Board negotiations in the Twin District Council case.

Interest: Lumber for construction projects and for airplane production.

Maisel Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Strike: May 9, 1941, of 33 textile workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner conducting negotiations.

Interest: 650,000 pillows for Quartermaster Corps.

Mills Co., Cleveland, Ohio:

Strike of 150 A. F. of L. machinists, date not ascertained.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Report of strike received June 12, 1941.

Interest: Manufactures metal partitions for offices and is now engaged on construction work for Ravenna ordnance plant, Frankford Arsenal, Rock Island Arsenal, and Du Pont, and other defense projects.

New Jersey Galvanizing Co., Newark, N. J.:

Strike May 23, 1941, of 35 S. W. O. C. (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages and union shop.

Status: Commissioner conducting negotiations.

Interest: Holding up iron frames necessary to complete Fort Monmouth project.

Ohio Brass Co., Barberton, Ohio:

Strike: Exact date unknown—Quartermaster Corps reported June 7. Number of men involved likewise unascertained—U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.) Local 474.

Issue: Unascertained.

Status: Report just received. Commissioner McCoy assigned on the 10th of June.

Interest: Supplies the contractor on the Kingsbury ordnance project with 5,000 pin-type insulators.

Pittsburgh truckers, Pittsburgh, Pa. (176 companies involved):

Strike June 2, 1941, of 1,500 A. F. of L. teamsters, chauffeurs, and warehousemen.

Issue: Wages.

Status: Commissioner on the case. Conferences in Washington adjourned without settlement being reached.

Interest: Tying up deliveries from freight terminals and between mills in the Pittsburgh area. Many Air Corps contracts are affected. Slowing down delivery of Curtiss-Wright propellor blades and also deliveries to Frankford Arsenal.

Reliance Manufacturing Co., Michigan City, Columbus, and Washington, Ind.:

Strike April 28, 1941, of 1,200 A. C. W. (C. I. O.) and U. G. W. (A. F. of L.).

Issue: Union recognition.

Status: Commissioner Cofer reports case deadlocked.

Interest: 100,000 pairs cotton drawers for Quartermaster Corps at Michigan City plant, 90,000 cotton duck trousers at Columbus, Ind., plant.

St. Louis Steel Fabricating Cos., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: Approximately 200 ironworkers (A. F. of L.) between May 19 and 24, involving 13 companies.

Issues: Closed shop and signed agreement.

Status: Office of Production Management labor consultant on the case and also Commissioner White. Negotiations continuing with two of the companies having already settled.

Interest: Delaying 41 tons of structural steel for oil-storage building at Curtiss-Wright, St. Louis, Mo.; 10 tons of structural steel for boiler building at Weldon Springs ordnance plant. Subcontractor for Navy gun mounts; also manifold piping for Weldon Springs. Delaying Venice, Ill., generating plant which furnishes power for St. Louis ordnance plant and Weldon Springs.

Shampaine Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

Strike: May 20, 1941, of 131 Steel Workers Organization Committee (C. I. O.).

Issues: New contract terms.

Status: Commissioner on the case. Negotiations still in progress.

Interest: Hospital equipment for Medical Corps.

Sivyer Steel Castings Co., Chicago, Ill.:

Strike: May 23, 1941, of 250 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issues: Wages, closed shop, and vacations with pay.

Status: Commissioner on the case. Meeting held June 11, 1941. Semifinished materials and patterns for 155-millimeter carriages removed June 12, 1941, to the Milwaukee plant.

Interest: Castings for International Harvester for limber and gun carriages for 155-millimeter high-speed adapters. Carriage production at International Harvester was suspended because of failure to get axles out of Sivyer. Castings for Allis-Chalmers, who make crawler tractors for Ordnance. Important subcontractors for Navy. Delaying production of trailers at Athey Truss Wheel Co.

Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.:

Strike: May 28, 1941, of 2,800 International Ladies' Garment Workers (A. F. of L).

Issues: Wages and improved working conditions.

Status: Commissioner Deal on the case. Conferences June 11, 1941, in Washington between union officials and president without results.

Interest: Undershirts and drawers for Quartermaster Corps. All but one contract up to schedule.

Wilson-Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.:

Strike: May 15, 1941, of 1,200 bookbinders at the two plants (C. I. O.).

Issue: Wages.

Status: Commissioner Scheck reports he is unable to get parties together for meeting since June 7.

Interest: Posting trays, stands, and guides for Quartermaster Corps for laundries in 37 camps, posts, and stations; also supplies American Sales Book Co., with cards and paper for Remington Arms.

Wire Cloth Products, Forest Park, Ill.:

Strike: May 6, 1941, of an unascertained number of United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.).

Issue: Terms of new contract.

Status: Commissioner Holmes on the case. Joint meetings in progress.

Interest: Reported to be manufacturing parts for bomb sights; known to be subcontractor for White Motor Co., who has contracts for Ordnance.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Indiana Harbor, Ind.:

Strike: June 9, 1941, of 750 Steel Workers Organizing Committee (C. I. O.).

Issue: Seniority.

Status: Report just received. Strike centers in the Merchants Mill and a strike vote is now being taken which threatens to call out 7,500 more workers. Commissioner on the case.

Interest: Basic steel.

OTHER STRIKES NOT INCLUDED IN FIGURES

Auburn Rubber Works, Auburn, Ind.: Strike reported June 4, 1941, of United Rubber Workers because of a cut in wages. No further reports and no War Department interest ascertained as yet.

Bignall Co., Medina, N. Y.: Strike June 9, 1941, of 1,100 United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.). Company manufactures plumbers' brass and iron goods. No War Department interest ascertained.

Kennedy Valve Co., Elmira, N. Y.: Strike May 23, 1941, of 500 molders and machinists (A. F. of L.) for closed shop and wages. Union willing to ship defense work. Commissioner MacDonald on case. War Department interest unascertained.

Marathon Electric Manufacturing Co., Wausau, Wis.: Strike May 26, 1941, of 506 U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.), because of discharge of employees. Company manufactures small motors and generators for machine tools. Industrial relations counsel entering case for management June 9, 1941.

THREATENED STRIKES

Most immediate danger

American Brass, Waterbury, Conn.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts amounting to $7,000,000; manufactures brass for Frankford Arsenal for small arms ammunition; also major suppliers of raw and finished brass products. Negotiations deadlocked on wages. Joint conference June 13, 1941. Union threatens dead line. O. P. M. labor consultant on case.

Budd Wheel Co., Detroit, Mich.: Fifty prime contracts with Ordnance for millions of shells, wheels, etc., for artillery equipment; subcontracts with Quartemaster Corps for Fargo division of Chrysler for steel forgings and drum brake assemblies; total value $25,000,000. Notice of strike filed with State board on June 10, 1941. Joint conferences yesterday with O. P. M. labor consultant sitting in.

Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, San Diego, Calif.: Large and important contractor for Air Corps, Navy, England, Netherlands, and Canada. Negotiating new contract and terms run parallel with those being asked at North American Aviation. Strike vote completed. Tentative agreement reached was submitted to membership May 12, 1941.

Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co., Neville Island, Pittsburgh, Pa.: Propellers for Air Corps. Certified to N. D. M. B., May 12, 1941. Acceding to the request of the N. D. M. B. the union called off yesterday a strike set for midnight. Hearings will be held next Monday in Washington.

Detroit Tool & Die Shops (61), Detroit, Mich.: Approximately 6,000 men involved. Numerous Ordnance and Air Corps sub and subcontracts. Union asking for 5-cent wage increase. Meeting was held yesterday including conciliator and representatives of the State mediation board. Thirty shops have already signed agreement.

Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.: Manufactures magnesium; leading plant in country of this critical item; strike threatens on issue of union recognition. N. L. R. B. started hearings May 26, 1941; hearings completed but no decision rendered. Election to be held sometime in June. Attempts being made to adjust discharge cases.

Packard Motor Car Corporation, Detroit Mich.: Manufactures 3,000 engines for Air Corps. Strike threat averted by agreement reached as a result of negotiations yesterday.

OTHER SERIOUS THREATS

American Aluminum Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Aluminum metal for Air Corps. N. L. R. B. election held Neither A. F. of L. nor C. I. O. having obtained majority, a runoff election will be held in the near future. It is probable that A. F. of L. will win it.

American Bobbinet Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: Manufacturing mosquito netting for Quartermaster Corps. Wage controversy—Commissioner Post on case. Agreement reached on wages; remaining issue involves three-shift basis now in operation. Union desires two shifts of 40 hours. (Late report just in indicates settlement was reached June 10, 1941.)

E. W. Bliss Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Prime contractor for ordnance for press and small arms ammunitions machinery ($10,000,000) for Lake City, Denver, and St. Louis ordnance plants; Navy and British also have contracts. Certified to N. D. M. B. May 22, 1941. Strike threatened for May 28, 1941, postponed indefinitely. Negotiations to continue before the Board in an effort to settle new minimum wage rate dispute. Board is preparing findings and recommendations.

Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.: Manufactures tractors and graders for ordnance and Air Corps. Strike threatening again. Commissioner Hoskins assigned June 7. Company not bargaining in good faith. Commissioner arranging conferences for this week.

Curtiss-Wright propeller division, Caldwell and Clifton, N. J.: Manufactures propellers for Air Corps. Strike threat rescinded June 10, 1941, and union is awaiting results of N. L. R. B. hearing.

Electro Metallurgical Co., Alloy, W. Va.: Supplies steel companies with ferro-manganese; manufactures 75 percent of total tonnage of alloys for the entire country. C. I. O. and company negotiating contract.

Empire Finished Steel Corporation, Newark, N. J.: This company is subcontractor for ordnance for Frankford Arsenal and Picatinny Arsenal. Union is threatening strike vote June 14, 1941. Company feels they are only large source of material in East. Shut-down would be serious.

Hospital Supply Co., New York City: Large Medical Corps contracts for hospital supplies; Commissioner Post assigned; situation looks serious.

Omaha Steel Works, Omaha, Nebr.: Manufactures 350,000 M102 155 mm. shells for ordnance; priority A-1-h. Union asking wage increase for machine operators. Strike would stop production recently started. Now 3 months behind schedule.

Pennsylvania Forge Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: Ordnance prime and subcontracts for machine-gun forgings and tubes. Wage controversy; Commissioner Spencer reentering case. This plant is one of the very few plants in the country equipped to make ordnance-gun forgings.

Motor Products Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: Manufactures 50,700 bushings for Ordnance; also airplane motor parts for Packard. On June 11, 1941, notice of intention to strike was filed with State mediation board. Commissioner Dewey and O. P. M. labor consultant on case.

Reynolds Metal Products Co., Louisville, Ky.: Supplying $4,000,000 worth of aluminum on Army and Navy contracts. Strike was called off. Agreement was reached May 12, 1941, providing for wage increase.

Scullen Steel Co., St. Louis, Mo.: British order for 50,000 bombs through Ordnance, also 100 steel bodies. Joint conference of 2 union groups which was begun on Saturday continuing on June 11, 1941. Situation still remains unchanged.

Sealed Power Corporation, Muskegon, Mich.: Manufactures pistons and rings for Air, Ordnance, and Q. M. C. Strike vote taken; no date set. Thirty-day notice period expired June 5, 1941. Parties to be in Washington on June 16 for conference. President of company is to attend and does not think men will strike meanwhile.

Toledo Machine Tool Co., Toledo, Ohio: Machine tools for Frankford Arsenal. Strike vote was taken June 11, 1941, but no deadline has been set.

U. S. Rubber Co., Detroit, Mich.: Prime and subcontractor for Ordnance, manufacturing tires and tubes. A strike here would interfere with manufacturing of tanks and cause delays in deliveries for tires and tubes; numerous prime contracts with Q. M. C. for raincoats and boots. Wage controversy. Strike vote taken June 4, 1941. Commissioner Rye on case. Company has agreed to joint negotiations for all plants.

CASES REPORTED SETTLED

Packard Motor Car Corporation, Detroit, Mich.

Reynolds Metal Products Co., Louisville, Ky.

American Bobbinet Co., Newburgh, N. Y.

JOSEPH F. BATTLEY,
Major, United States Army,
Chief, Labor Section.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, June 14, 1941.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Strikes on Naval Defense Contracts.

There are listed below strikes which were in effect during the week ending June 14, 1941, in plants having naval defense contracts. More complete information may be obtained from the shore establishments division, room 2026, branch 812, where information as to discrepancies noticed, or as to urgency of contracts in the plants listed, should be sent.

Man-days lost on national defense work in plants at which naval defense contracts have been involved, have accumulated in the first 5 months of 1941 to a total of between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000. This lost time is equivalent to the time necessary to build at least eight submarines, or at least six destroyers, or two cruisers, or nearly 1,000 fighter planes, of 500 patrol planes. The total number of lost man-days in plants at which naval defense contracts have been involved has been increased during the past week by approximately 105,000, which is a total of 157,000 so far during the month of June.

The following cases have been settled during the week:

Aluminum Co. of America, Cleveland, Ohio: Began June 9; ended June 12. Status: 5,000 involved. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board June 4. Production resumed June 12, 1941.

American Thread Co., Fall River, Mass.: Began June 6; ended June 11. Status: 1,700 involved.

Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, Detroit, Mich.: Began June 10; ended June 12. Status: 5,000 involved. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board June 9. Men returned to work June 12, 1941.

Detroit Steel Products Co., Detroit, Mich.: Began May 7; ended June 12. Status: 750 men involved. Operations resumed on June 12 pending National Labor Relations Board election.

Fedders Manufacturing Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: Began May 22; ended May 25.

General Ceramic Corporation, Keasby, N. J.: Began May 31; ended June 10. Status: 460 employees involved.

North American Aviation, Inc., Inglewood, Calif.: Began June 5; ended June 11. Status: 9,000 employees involved.

Plymouth Rubber Co., Canton, Mass.: Began June 2; ended June 5.

Thorsen, P. S., & Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Began June 6; ended June 10. Status: 200 involved.

Truckers' strike, Philadelphia, Pa.: Began May 21; ended June 14.

The following cases are still open:

American Potash & Chemical Co., Trona, Calif.: Began March 19. Status: 1,000 workers involved. Certified to National Defense Mediation Board April 23, 1941. Delivery arranged for potash covered by only Navy Department contract involved. No further report will be made.

Apollo Steel Co., Apollo, Pa.: Began May 19. Status: 1,600 men involved. Strike is not seriously interfering with naval defense material as yet. Negotiations continuing. No settlement in sight.

Atlantic Metal Products Co., Long Island City, N. Y.: Began May 13. Status: 165 men involved. Jurisdictional dispute. Release and loading of defense material promised.

Boston & Lockport Block Co., Boston, Mass.: Began June 10. Status: Walkout of employees.

Busch-Sulzer Diesel Engine Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began April 21. Status: 75 men involved. Plant extensions practically completed. Company is proceeding with own arrangement to finish the job.

Canister Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.: Began June 7. Status: 300 involved. Being negotiated but settlement not in sight.

Crescent Tool Co., Jamestown, N. Y.: Began May 12. Status: 500 machinists involved. No change in status.

Karp Metal Box Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.: Began June 5. Status: 35 involved. Strike for union recognition. Present negotiations deadlocked.

Kennedy Valve Co., Elmira, N. Y.: Began May 15. Status: 500 involved. Situation deadlocked. Company is subcontractor and has suggested that concerns holding Navy defense contracts secure material from other sources. It is understood that the Kennedy Valve Co. is not accepting any further commitments from naval activities or contractors for the duration of the strike. Negotiations continuing.

Lamson & Sessions Co., Cleveland, Ohio: Began June 10. Status: 480 involved. Walkout not sanctioned by union officials. Issue: Dissolvement of alleged company union. Negotiating.

Lone Star Cement Co., Birmingham, Ala. Began May 29. Status: No change in status.

Lumber Mills, Tacoma, Wash.: Began May 10. Status: About 16,000 woodcutters involved. Complicated situation. Settlement will probably be based on negotiations affecting Twin District Council, Seattle. Under consideration by National Defense Mediation Board since May 9.

Marathon Electric Manufacturing Corporation, Wausau, Wis: Began May 26. Status: 500 employees involved. Row over discharge of 8 female workers engaged in slow-down. No settlement in sight.

San Francisco Shipyards, San Francisco: Began March 3. Status: 2,000 machinists union members. It is understood that machinists have voted to return to work and that possible review may be made by National Defense Mediation Board.

Sawyer Foundry & Machine Co., Oswego, N. Y.: Began May 8. Status: 11 men involved out of total number of 22 employees. Strike will not delay delivery on Navy contract.

Schurk Iron Co., St. Louis, Mo.: Began May 22. Status: 30 involved. Case before National Labor Relations Board. Joint conferences being held.

Sivyer Steel Castings Co., Chicago, Ill.: Began May 23. Status: 254 workers involved. Conciliation commissioner made defense proposal to company and union which may lead to early settlement.

Superior Lime & Hydrate Co., Pelham, Ala.: Began April 9. Status: 37 men involved. One source of supply of lime and limestone for steel manufacture. Plant closed indefinitely. Case will be dropped.

Trenton Spring Products Co., Trenton, N. J.: Began May 28. Status: 120 involved. Plant is closed. Situation being handled by Office of Production Management.

Washington Motor Coach Co., Seattle, Wash.: Began May 29. Status 212 involved. Strike affects to some extent transportation of employees to plants engaged in national-defense work. No direct Navy contracts involved. Negotiations unsuccessful.

Wilson Jones Co., Chicago, Ill., and Elizabeth, N. J.: Began May 15. Status: 1,200 bookbinders involved. Negotiations continuing.

Wire Cloth Products Co., Forest Park, Ill.: Began May 6. Status: 44 involved. Settlement expected soon.

Woodstock Flag Co., Birmingham, Ala.: Began May 2. Status: 50 employees involved. No change in status.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Indiana Harbor, Ind.: Began June 9. Status: 750 employees of Merchants Mill involved. Under negotiation, but possibly 7,500 men may go on strike. Report of last week of strike of June 2 involved grievances settled the same day.

Listed below are companies in which strikes are pending, but information relative to naval defense contracts not yet available:

Albuquerque & Cerrillos Coal Co., Madrid, N. Mex., May 15, 1941.

American Coach & Body Co., Cleveland, Ohio, June 11, 1941.

Auburn Rubber Co., Auburn, Ind., June 3, 1941.

Bass Foundry & Machine Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., June 11, 1941.

Clay City Products Co., Uhrichville, Ohio, May 31, 1941.

Mills Co., Cleveland, Ohio, June 12, 1941.

Ohio Brass Co., Barberton, Ohio, June 10, 1941.

Tri-Boro Transit Co., Binghamton, N. Y., June 2, 1941.

United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., Fairbanks, Alaska, June 5, 1941.

C. W. FISHER,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Shore Establishments.
L. M. ATKINS,
Captain, United States Navy,
by direction.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration, was announced as first in order.

Mr. DAVIS. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

TRANSFUSION OF BLOOD

The bill (S. 1290), to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment," was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that Senate bill 1290 is the same as Order of Business 374, House bill 4293.

Mr. McNARY. Over.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have twice previously objected to this particular bill being considered on the call of the calendar. I have conferred with the clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs, to point out the ground for my objection, which is simply this: As the proviso at the very end of the bill now reads, it would authorize retroactive payment for blood transfusions, no matter how or when the blood was furnished. There is no limit of time, and no limit as to the purpose for which it was provided.

The existing law contains a proviso which is ample for all purposes, and I am making this statement to the end that the members of the committee may be advised of the reason for my objection, and to the further end that, upon the bill being appropriately amended, I shall have no objection to its passage. For the present I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, Senate bill 1290 and House bill 4293 will be passed over.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to Calendar No. 374, House bill 4293.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, upon the call of the calendar I objected to the consideration of Senate bill 1290, which is identical with the House bill just referred to by the Senator from Connecticut, bearing in mind that objection had been made by an absent Senator a few days ago. That is why I objected again today. Personally I have no objection to the bill. I want the Senate to act fairly to a Senator who is absent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the attitude and the cooperation of the Senator from Oregon, which I personally have found helpful on more than one occasion. I realize fully the spirit in which he has voiced objection to the bill in behalf of an absent Senator.

It was not my purpose to ask that the Senate pass the bill at this time, but I wanted the Senate to know that I had conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], in in an effort to work out remedial language, which I think will make a stronger and a more logical bill than the measure now before us.

It seems to me that on page 2, line 6, after the word "purposes" and before the comma, the following language should be inserted, "in connection with the care of any person entitled to treatment at Government expenses." Then, strike out the proviso from line 14 to and including line 19.

Mr. President, for many years there has been on the books an act which would authorize any person in the Military Establishment to receive transfusions of blood at Government expense. There is provision also for taking care of patients who are Government wards in Government hospitals. However, the pending bill would extend to other wards of the Government, whether they are in a Federal hospital or institution or not, the benefits which existing law provides for veterans. It thus would apply to civilian hospitals and civilian institutions, and that is a perfectly correct result. It also would extend the matter of Government procurement to the acquisition of blood for blood banks and for scientific and research purposes.

There is a limit somewhere, it seems to me, to the purposes for which Federal funds should be devoted, and I therefore had in mind that we should limit the extension to treatment or care of persons entitled to treatment at Government expense. If we do not do that, and if we add the "provided further" clause, which I think should be eliminated, we will find that the Government, as a matter of retroactivity, will be authorizing payment to persons, whether in the employ of the Government or not, for blood furnished whether for a blood bank or for scientific purposes, or for Government wards, or for any other purpose, without limitation in any way.

As the matter stands, it could even affect incidents dating back to 1914. It provides so informal an exercise of access to the Treasury for people who have furnished blood for any purpose whatever that it seems to me the bill is open to objection as being too broad.

With these thoughts in mind, I have notified the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs how I felt, and he, too, knows that there is sufficient ground for the objections to justify the matter being taken up with the departments, to the end that we may ascertain whether or not acceptable language can be written. It would be my purpose, if amendments were to be proposed at this time, to offer amendments such as I have outlined. I do not, however, ask that the bill be amended until the Senator from North Carolina shall have taken the matter up with the departments. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, prior to the remarks just made by the Senator from Connecticut, we had discussed this matter, and I am very glad the Senator saw fit to make the observations pertaining to the proposed changes in the bill which he has brought to our attention. It was understood between us that after he had made these suggestions I would be provided an opportunity to take the matter up with the War Department, to ascertain whether the proposed changes would be agreeable to them. I thank the Senator very much for his suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 96) making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRNES. In behalf of two Senators who are absent, I ask that that bill and the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 2475, Calendar No. 340, be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The two bills referred to will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1358) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 357) to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 374) providing for the better administration of justice in the Navy, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons serving in confinement pursuant to a duly approved sentence of a naval court martial shall, until discharged from confinement, remain subject in all respects to the articles for the government of the Navy and all other laws for the administration of justice in the Navy, and shall be liable to trial by court martial under said articles and laws for offenses committed while under any sentence imposed pursuant to the first or any subsequent trial by court martial.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when the bill was reached on the occasion of the last calling of the calendar I was not present. A request for an explanation of the bill was made at that time. I am now prepared to make the explanation. I will be very brief.

Under existing law the Army has authority to court martial Army personnel who are serving court-martial sentences that extend beyond the time of their enlistment. The Navy has no such authority. The Navy has no authority to court martial any officer who is imprisoned in a naval prison for an offense committed in prison during the time he is serving the term of imprisonment. This bill would put the Navy in the same position as the Army, with the same authority the Army has, and would permit court-martialing of enlisted men in the Navy for offenses committed while in prison, though the term of their enlistment had expired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF NAVAL OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1529) to amend the act approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 383), relative to retirement of officers of the United States Navy after 30 years' service, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the second proviso of the second paragraph of the Act approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 383), under the heading "Pay of the Navy" is hereby amended to read as follows: "Hereafter, when an officer of the Navy has been 30 years in the service he may, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list with 75 percent of the active-duty pay provided by law for the permanent grade or rank held by him at the time of his retirement."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, an explanation of that bill was also requested when the calendar was last called. Under the existing law an officer who retires voluntarily after 30 years of service is entitled to three-quarters of the highest pay of his grade, whereas an officer who has retired upon reaching the

retirement age of 64 years, though he may have served more than 30 years, is entitled to three-quarters of the pay of the rank which he then holds. In some cases the pay of the latter would be less than the pay of the former. In other words, a man voluntarily retiring after 30 years' service would get more retirement pay than an officer or man who remained in the service until he retired by reason of reaching the age of 64, long after he had had 30 years of service. The purpose of the bill is to equalize that situation and to remove that disparity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1467) to amend section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, approved September 16, 1940 (Public Law No. 783, 76th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting, after the words "enlisted men" in line 7, the words "of the seventh grade", so that the exception contained in said sentence shall read as follows: "except that the monthly base pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade with less than 4 months' service during their first enlistment period and of enlisted men of the seventh grade whose inefficiency or other unfitness has been determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall be $21."

SEC. 2. That no back pay or allowances shall accrue prior to the date of approval of this Act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to limit the payment of the $21 monthly rate as provided in section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to men of the seventh pay grade—that is, the lowest pay grade—and to grant increases of pay in all cases where enlisted men are promoted to a rating higher than the seventh pay grade, regardless of the period of time they have served in their first enlistment prior to the date of promotion.

That can be illustrated and understood by a very brief statement. Under existing law, if a Reserve man in the enlisted service of the Navy is called to active duty he can be promoted from the seventh grade at once and receive some additional pay. The law does not permit this in the case of an enlisted man in the Regular Navy service. So that of two men coming to the service at the same time, one, having voluntarily enlisted, must wait 4 months, though he may be promoted before he will receive the additional pay that goes with his promotion, while the one who comes from the Reserve does not have to wait 4 months. This bill would equalize the situation and remove that inequality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION FOR NAVAL SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS—BILL RECOMMITTED

The bill (H. R. 4671) to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that that bill be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for consideration of some amendments which have been proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 799) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval property, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ENLISTMENT OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF FELONY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1110) to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That section 1118, Revised Statutes, be, and the same is hereby, amended by omitting the period at the end thereof, by substituting therefor a colon, and by adding after the colon the following: "*Provided, however*, That with relation to deserters and persons convicted of felonies the Secretary of War may, by regulations or otherwise, authorize exceptions in special meritorious cases."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY OF BANDMASTERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1568) for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. The title of the bill does not at all indicate its objective.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this is an Army bill, not a Navy bill. Therefore, I am not in a position to explain it. However, there are bills pending before the Naval Affairs Committee for increase in the pay of the three Navy bandmasters. Evidently, a similar effort is being made to increase the pay of Army bandmasters. The Naval Affairs Committee has been reluctant to consider favorably increasing the pay of bandmasters. While our bandmasters are excellent men and doing excellent service, and we all entertain the very highest personal regard for them and think they are most efficient, the committee does not feel justified in increasing the pay of bandmasters in view of the fact that there are a million or more young men who have made tremendous sacrifices and are serving the country in the present emergency for $21 a month.

I have no doubt that efforts will be made to readjust or change the base pay of enlisted men. It seems to me that whatever position we may take in that connection would be embarrassing if we should increase the pay of the bandmasters of either the Army or the Navy. Of course, if the Army bandmasters are given increased pay, there will be additional pressure upon the Naval Affairs Committee to give additional pay to the Navy bandmasters. I think I express the sentiment of my committee when I say that the committee has felt that it would be very unwise at this time to readjust salaries in the higher brackets in the Navy, and that we should be subjected to a good deal of criticism for doing so, and would be very much embarrassed if efforts should be made substantially to increase the pay of the thousands who are serving our country in this emergency at a tremendous financial sacrifice.

I think it is timely to make this statement, in view of the bill being on the calendar at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1568?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, following the statement of the able Senator from Massachusetts, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JACK Y. UPHAM

The bill (H. R. 2739) for the relief of Jack Y. Upham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILLIP CHRISTIAN HOLT

The bill (H. R. 2742) for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY GARD

The bill (H. R. 2891) for the relief of Roy Gard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER DISBURSING OFFICERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The bill (H. R. 3846) for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALOHA MOTORS, LIMITED

The bill (H. R. 735) for the relief of Aloha Motors, Limited, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLLS OF SENTIMENT FOR INTERVENTION IN WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the fact that in the issue of Life magazine for May 26, 1941, appears an article on interventionist sentiment in Neosho, Mo., a typical county-seat town in the Middle West.

The publishers of the Springfield Newspapers, Inc., in Springfield, Mo., polled every adult whose name appeared in the 1940 Neosho city directory, to ascertain by written ballots the true sentiments of the residents of Neosho. The poll was announced on May 29, and closed with the ballots received on June 7.

From approximately 3,100 ballots mailed, 994 were returned within the time limit. Of this number, only 276, or approximately 27.7 percent, voted for intervention in the European war, and many who thus voted gave qualifying answers. Those who voted against intervention totaled 692, or 69.6 percent, while approximately 3 percent were uncertain.

Mr. President, I have before me the accounts from the Springfield Leader-Press-News, in which the record of the poll is given. I ask unanimous consent that the clippings be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of May 29, 1941]

"AMERICA FIRST" CHALLENGES LIFE'S REPORT THAT NEOSHO FAVORS WAR—NEWSPAPERS TO POLL ENTIRE CITY ON QUESTION OF INTERVENTION

(By Docia Karell)

Do most of the folk at Neosho favor intervention in the European War?

Life magazine in its current May 26 issue says they do.

In an entertaining 10-page story, lavishly illustrated with fine pictures—some of which are reprinted herewith—a Life reporter reports, "In talking to businessmen, shopkeepers, lawyers, factory workers, and farmers in Neosho I found a unanimity of interventionist sentiments that surprised me—" and he offers such statements as these to show what he means:

A. C. McGinty, banker, "We're got to keep England from going under * * * If we are going to send them aid we had better see that it gets there."

C. W. Crawford, miller, "We better take it over ourselves I would hate to see our boys sent over there * * * but if England can't win without it we've got to send 'em."

Alfred Briggs, hardware merchant, "We got to get into it if we can't help England win any other way."

Philip Graves, lawyer, "The question seems to be whether we should get in or stay out. Which? I think we should go in with everything we've got."

Glen Woods, grocer and mayor, "It's a practical necessity as well as a moral one * * * I can't see how we can help getting in it actively, and I can't see how we could live with ourselves if we didn't.

Those statements not only express the interventionist sentiment, but they define it—"intervention" means "getting in" to the war to help England win and to defeat Germany.

There are other statements in the Life story, too, and some strong anti-interventionist statements from Lawyer Charles Prettyman, identified as "Neosho's richest citizen," and three or four others.

But the author's conclusion was plainly stated: "I found a unanimity of interventionist sentiment."

THE OTHER SIDE

O. K. Armstrong, of the America First Committee and a strong anti-interventionist, immediately visited Neosho and came back with a series of equally strong statements from Neosho citizens opposing intervention—statements such as these:

Walter Bussell, merchant and Legionnaire: "I am positive that 75 percent of Neosho citizens are in favor of keeping out of this war."

Mrs. F. P. Zbranek, cafe operator: "We have a boy who is ready to go into the Navy. I would gladly give him, if necessary, to the defense of our country, but my people left Europe to get away from these continuous wars, and I think we should stay completely out of them. We have nothing to gain to play Europe's war games. I am against our country mixing in it."

H. M. Ritchey, son of a first settler: "No foreign war for me. * * * Look what the President promised. He said he would keep us out. Now he wants to take us in. It will be a sad mistake if we get in."

Moses Speaks, taxi driver: "For any aid we give Britain we should do what they would do—demand enough security to see that they don't welch on us, as they did on their last war debts. We ought to defend this country and let them fight their own wars."

George W. Dahnke, former county collector, now in farming and insurance, "I think the majority of Neosho citizens are just where Willkie and Roosevelt both told us we should be during the last campaign: They were for keeping out of war. So are we."

WHO'S IN MAJORITY?

There you have two sides of it.

Mr. Armstrong, pointing out Life's policy of all-out American aid to Britain and support of Roosevelt's war policy, suggested the Life writer had sought to support that point of view. "He wanted to show that the Middle West is not as opposed to intervention as has been reported," Mr. Armstrong said.

But Mr. Armstrong himself is as strongly anti-intervention as Life is interventionist—and he did the same thing as he said the Life reporter did: Found the sentiment he was looking for and hoped to find.

Naturally, both sides are represented in Neosho—as in any American town.

But what do the majority of Neosho citizens think about it?

To get a complete, fair, and impartial report, the Springfield newspapers are going to poll the entire city—everybody, regardless of opinion; every man and woman listed in the Neosho city directory. Letters explaining the situation, and ballot cards, will be mailed to every adult listed in Neosho city directory by Friday evening, with requests to mark and return them immediately.

"STUFFING" IS OUT

About 2,100 letters will be mailed, enclosing about 3,500 ballot cards—that is, separate cards for each husband and wife in letters addressed to Mr. and Mrs.

No extra cards will be printed, and all will be distributed by direct mail to Neosho citizens only, one each—so that any "stuffing" of the ballot box will be impossible.

The ballots will contain just one simple and direct question: Do you favor United States entry into the European war?

No signatures will be asked.

Most "opinion" polls are representative—they're just samples, carefully selected to be typical. But this one will be different—not a "sample" of opinion but a complete record, insofar as we can get it, of what everybody in the whole community thinks about this country going to war against Hitler.

No question whatever has been raised as to the authenticity and sincerity of statements on both sides—they are all accepted as honest and bona fide. What the Springfield newspapers hope to establish with this unusual poll is, Which is the opinion of the majority—and of how big a majority?

This will be especially interesting, because no doubt Neosho itself is a "sample"—anyhow, Life selected it as such—and what the people of Neosho think may be taken as an indication of opinion in this section of the country.

The poll will be conducted by the Springfield newspapers, to assure its comprehensiveness and complete impartiality; it will be paid for by the America First Committee, which challenged the Life conclusion and proposed the poll as a test.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of June 3, 1941]

FIRST NEOSHO RETURNS: FOR GOING INTO THE WAR, 44; AGAINST INTERVENTION, 112—CITIZENS SPEAK OUT STRONGLY ON BOTH SIDES OF QUESTION

Do you favor United States entry into the European war?

Ballots asking that question were mailed to 3,153 Neosho citizens—all who are listed in the city directory, on Sunday.

First returns came in today—159 ballots in the morning mail.

They showed Neosho to be 70 percent against this country entering the European war.

The first returns: Against intervention, 112; for intervention, 44; undecided, 3.

More than half the ballots, 80, simply voted "No" and made no comment. Of both the "Yes" and "No" voters, quite a large number signed their names, though no signature had been requested.

Comments on both sides varied considerably, from thoughtful uncertainty to downright belligerence.

NO!

"No" voters made such comments as these: "Absolutely no," and "Definitely not." "Keep our boys at home."

"European war—absolutely no; American side of the Atlantic, yes. I have two sons in the armed forces. They were not drafted," said J. C. Suits.

"Be prepared to protect our shores against invasion. Keep out of Europe and the Far East. From an ex-sailor who was in the Sino-Jap affray. Jack Clanton."

"No—not even send Britain help. If we must help Britain—go all the way."

"I think we should stay at home and make our own country the best place in the world and be ready to help others when their troubles are over," wrote Mrs. A. S. Donnelly.

"I think we should get our own house in order first. We have no trouble with Germany. Why pick a fuss?" said Mr. Donnelly.

"We favor every means short of war, but. * * * Even if it causes England's defeat we must stay out of this war until directly attacked."

YES!

"Yes" voters commented thus:

"Anything to beat the Huns."

"Down with Hitler."

"If necessary."

"We are convinced we as a Nation help in full the Nation we think is for the betterment of the whole earth, and we should have been helping fight the war long ago."

LIFE CRITICIZED

"No" voters commented:

"I believe it is true that the reporter from Life found only what he was looking for. He talked to me 1 hour and did not express in his article the sentiment which I represented," wrote Prosecuting Attorney Herbert A. Douglas.

"Life would like to increase its circulation with war pictures of our own soldiers in action."

"It seems to me that all America is to be found as the Life reporter and Mr. Armstrong did find Neosho—the interviewer asks his

own questions and gets answers to more or less justify his own leaning. I do not believe the European war will settle anything one way or the other. The last one did not 'save democracy.'"

WE'RE CRITICIZED

"Yes," voters wrote:

"How much is Hitler paying you for this poll? Your slogan should read 'American First Committee for Germany.' I'm an American and rooting for F. D. R."

"I'm a 100-percent American and in favor of everything our President has done or may do. You are spreading disunity by this propaganda poll."

But the big majority just voted and said nothing—and they voted "No" on our getting into the European war.

A number of the Neosho ballots are reproduced on page 7 in the same proportion as indicated by the first tally.

LIFE MAN PUZZLES NEOSHO MINISTER

To the EDITOR:

Regarding the poll which your paper is taking of the attitude of Neosho citizens as to intervention in the present war. I will not get to vote on this proposition on your official ballot as we moved to town after the last directory was issued. My wife and I would like to cast two votes for nonintervention.

Some of us are at a loss to account for Mr. McKelway's conclusions. I happen to be the minister who was interviewed by him, I am quoted in the article and my church is pictured in connection with the story.

Now Mr. McKelway told me that he had found quite a strong noninterventionist sentiment here and asked me why it was not better organized. Then in the article he makes the point that Neosho is strong interventionist. He must have interviewed, by accident, the noninterventionists first and then come across an overwhelming interventionist sentiment.

Faithfully yours,

JAMES W. MCMILLAN,
First Presbyterian Church, Neosho, Mo.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of June 4, 1941]

NEOSHO 440 TO 167 AGAINST FIGHTING, CITIZENS' REMARKS BECOME MORE CAUSTIC—SOME QUALIFY THEIR VIEWS—THEY WANT HITLER WHIPPED BUT DON'T WANT TO DO IT—BUT MOST SAY "STAY OUT"

(By Docia Karell)

Neosha citizens today were still voting more than 2 to 1 against this country's entrance into war.

In reply to the question, "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" 458 more ballots were received this morning.

They were: No, 326. Yes, 121. Unanswered, 11.

Added to 159 ballots received yesterday morning and 4 last night, already reported, the total today is 621 ballots received—no, 440; yes, 167; uncertain, 14.

Of all the votes so far received, the direct "noes" total 71 percent.

Of 3,153 ballots distributed, almost exactly a fifth have now been returned and tabulated.

The ballots were mailed Sunday to all citizens of Neosho listed in the city directory—mailed by the Springfield newspapers to get a definite answer to the question of how Neosho feels about America entering the present war. Life magazine recently reported most Neosho citizens favor it. O. K. Armstrong, of the America First Committee, estimated, on the contrary, that 80 percent of them would oppose it. The poll is an effort to find the true answer.

SOME "HEDGE"

By far a great majority of the ballots come in plainly checked "no", some "yes." Many voters on both sides add personal comments. In some cases, these indicate that the "yes" and the "no" voters are not so far apart. As an example, one person votes "no", but comments, "Whatever it takes to whip Hitler," which leaves his opinion somewhat equivocal.

One votes "yes," but adds, "With everything but boys at this time"; and quite a lot of the "no" voters, too, are willing to help England with practically everything except boys.

QUESTION "UNFAIR"?

Some of the "Yes" voters, too, qualify their votes with such statements as, "If necessary," or "If England can't win over Hitler alone," or "When we know it is for defense."

And most of the "No" voters who make any comment, are for home defense and aid to England, short of war.

Among those who favor this country's going into the war, there are a few—perhaps 8 or 10 out of the whole 169—which criticize the poll and question its good faith, with such comments as these:

"Your question is too unfair to be worthy of any answer, but a large "Yes" rather than a Hitler victory. If you men of the America First Committee are too namby-pamby to defend right and honor and justice, 'give us the tools,' and we, the women, will do it for you. Mrs. Charles A. North."

"Your question is unfair and you know it. You are trying to mislead the people by not stating a fair question. We have already entered the war—you know that. I am in favor of carrying out the mandate of the Congress in aid to Britain. Whatever it takes to carry that out."

MOST VOTE SILENTLY

"This is a World War, not a European war. We are at war and have been since 1933. Mr. Armstrong, your poll is very amateurish. You dodge facts Just as your so-called America First Committee does."

"Yes—If this world can be controlled by Anglo-Saxons—I am definitely with the Anglo-Saxons—as against German 'kultur'—Italian oil—Japanese incense."

But the majority of the Neosho men and women who have checked and returned their ballots apparently have done so in the same spirit of frank and honest inquiry and fact-finding that motivated the poll.

There also are a few voters who complain of the Life story. Says one, "Our people are aroused and mad." Wrote Robert R. Roberts, "I think that article in the Life magazine was a lot of uncalled for adverse advertisement for our little city"; and someone else commented, "Writer for Life stated very few facts, mostly untrue."

But again, the big majority of hundreds stuck to the question, and just voted "yes" or "no" on whether or not they think this country ought to enter the war.

Other "Yes" comments from Neosho:

"Not in favor of any war, but think it high time we step in."—E. J. Price.

"The only sane thing to do."—J. M. Kimbell, Route 2.

"If we had used our Navy in the beginning, Hitler wouldn't have the advantage he now enjoys. Beat Hitler, and all he stands for."—Mrs. Herbert Pace.

"STAY OUT"

Other "No" comments from Neosho:

"We saved democracy once. See what we have now—So."

"We don't want war, we don't need war, we have all we can do to take care of our own country. * * * I think we ought to enjoy our own freedom."

"The war is not ours. No need for second blunder."

"Did we make the world safe for democracy in 1917? No."

"Let them fight their own battles. Let us mind our own business."—L. E. Denbler.

"As a member of the United States Marine forces in the Nicaraguan expedition (1926–30) I had a taste of what war and being under fire is like. I am certainly not in favor of jumping into this war at all. Our men are not prepared to meet the German forces."—D. C. Francis.

"I am not in favor of sending our boys over, or sending material to agitate in war. I am in favor of peace at all times."—Emma Pate.

"We have resources aplenty for ourselves. * * * Why risk our necks in a vain attempt to save all continental Europe and thereby lose our own freedom?"—Mrs. Lucille Oliver, 317 South Hamilton.

"We'd better 'fall to' and get our own country straightened up."—Dr. Gertrude Ferguson.

"We would like for our little city to continue to grow, but not by wars."—Mrs. Roberts.

"We lost in the World War. Why try it again?"—J. H. Miller.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press of June 5, 1941]

LATEST FROM NEOSHO: 616 TO 227 AGAINST WAR—"NO" VOTES STILL FAR IN LEAD IN NEOSHO POLL ON INTERVENTION

Today's return of 241 more ballots in the Springfield newspapers' poll of Neosho, Mo., war sentiment, maintained the same percentage of votes against this country entering the war as each day's return has shown—71 percent.

The question: "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?"

This morning's count was—No, 176; yes, 60; uncertain, 5.

That makes the present total—No, 616; yes, 227; uncertain, 19.

So far, 862 ballots have been returned, of 3,153 mailed out; and between 40 and 50 have been returned undelivered—presumably to persons who have moved away since the Neosho directory was published, or who for some reason failed to get their mail.

THEY DON'T COUNT

Besides these legitimate ballots, 198 "phony" cards were received today, but not included in the count. When the ballots were mailed by Springfield newspapers, they were carefully identified as a guard against "stuffing" the poll, and only those officially mailed out are counted on return. The 198 "phony" ballots have been printed in imitation of the original. All of the 198 were "no" votes.

In this case, however, the America First Committee is innocent. Paying the expenses of the legitimate poll, it is not stuffing its own vote.

Comments written onto the ballots today were similar to those previously received, with the appearance also of a few cracks at organized labor—such as "No war for United States until the dues-collecting racketeers have been placed under control in this country"; and "I strongly oppose entry into the war. I say clean up our country of John L. Lewis and his henchemen, including 'Ma' Perkins."

On both sides are many moderating statements. The "Yes" voters add "if necessary," or some such qualification; and the "No" voters add, "unless"—"unless we are invaded" or "unless we are attacked."

Here are some more typical comments:

NO

"America for Americans, Europe for Europeans."

"There has always been war in Europe, yet the world still stands."

"I am not interested in 'pulling chestnuts out of the fire' for any country.—Mildred Hastings."

"I don't feel that this is our fight. However, we want to see the allies on the winning side—but death is very permanent.—Roy Angspurger."

"No average citizen would advocate sending troops to Europe to fight for democracy

again—we did that once—and what did we gain—nothing but unpaid war debts. However, if and when the Americas are included in the war, I'd say fight with all we possess."

"I am not in favor of Hitler running the world. But I don't want the United States to undertake it, either."

"Most positively not. Stay as far away from it as possible."

YES

"If necessary to beat Hitler and Lindbergh."

"The sooner we declare war with the Axis Powers the sooner we can deal with the America First organization and all other Nazi sympathizers."

SATURDAY DEADLINE ON NEOSHO POLL—RESULTS SUNDAY

The final count and results of the Springfield newspapers poll of sentiment of Neosho citizens on the question "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" will be reported in the Sunday News and Leader.

This means that all ballots, to be counted, must be received by the Springfield newspapers in the Saturday morning mail, or, in other words, they must be mailed in Neosho not later than Friday.

The ballots were mailed last Sunday, delivered Monday. That has given all this week as time to reply.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) News and Leader of June 8, 1941]

NEOSHO 69.6 PERCENT OPPOSED TO AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN WAR

(By Docia Karell)

By a vote of 69.6 percent "no" on the question, "Do you favor United States entry into the European war?" the Springfield newspapers' poll of Neosho has disproved Life magazine's conclusion that there is "a unanimity of interventionist sentiment" in that typical Ozarks city.

The poll ended yesterday with a return of 994 ballots marked as follows:

No, 692; yes, 276; uncertain, 26.

Of 3,153 ballots mailed out to every Neosho citizen listed in the latest city directory, 99 were returned undelivered, apparently because the addressees had moved from the community. That leaves 3,054 ballots for which to account, and 994 is practically one-third of that many. A one-third return on any such poll is considered average and satisfactory.

BALLOTS TO EVERYBODY

Most polls, to begin with, pick only a limited number of "typical" persons to question, and consider the result representative. This one was all-inclusive; ballots were mailed to all, regardless of status or vocation.

Of the results of the poll, Mr. Armstrong said yesterday, "I am gratified. I believe it represents fairly accurately not only the sentiment of Neosho but also the sentiment of Missouri citizens as a whole throughout the State. Taking the entire Middle West, and including States like Wisconsin, where anti-interventionist feeling is very strong, I believe the same sentiment would run 5 to 10 percent higher.

"Life did select a typical small city in the Midwest," conceded Mr. Armstrong. "But Life started out with a purpose—it intended to show a majority in favor of intervention. We have presented accurate results (through the poll) correcting the misleading impression which Life gave."

FEW DISTURBED SOULS

Most of the approximately 1,000 Neosho citizens who marked and returned their ballots understood perfectly well what they were about and were able to give a straightforward "Yes" or "No" answer. They knew what they thought. The biggest majority of both "Yes" and "No" voters thought a "Yes" or "No" sufficient answer. A good many, however, added explanatory comments, and those were extremely interesting and enlightening. A great many of them have been printed in the Springfield newspapers during the past week.

But there were a few disturbed souls in Neosho who thought the question unfair—apparently because they dislike the word "war." Their point of view is set forth at some length by Phil H. Graves in a letter to the editor, which appears on our readers' editorials page today.

Of Mr. Graves' letter, Mr. Armstrong said: "If there was any attempt to mislead anybody, it was on the part of Life magazine. It is true that Life used the word 'intervention' and did not define it. But in the popular mind, 'intervention' today means our taking part in the war.

"Any straightforward question such as was asked on the ballot is a fair question.

"The fact that the Springfield newspapers conducted the poll insured that it would be fair and impartial in every way."

The Springfield newspapers also considered the question on the ballot perfectly fair.

Their only purpose in taking it was to find what the real facts are—no effort was made to influence it; and, on the contrary, every effort was made to be impartial and fair to both sides. From the newspapers' point of view, it was strictly a news project—to report as accurately and completely as possible what the sentiment is; not to promote either side.

Life itself defined "intervention" by implication in quoting from Neosho interventionists such statements as: "I would hate to see our boys sent over there * * * but if England can't win without it we've got to send 'em." "We got to get into it if we can't help England win any other way." "The question seems to be whether we should get in or stay out. Which? I think we should go in with everything we've got." "I can't see how we can help getting in it."

SO ENDS THE POLL

It is all clear enough from Life's own story. What they are talking about is "getting in it"—and you can't "get in it" and have anything but war, no matter if you just call it "intervention" instead. To criticize the wording of the question is merely quibbling and a deliberate refusal to face a fact squarely.

It is probable that a few late, straggling ballots may still come in, but officially the count was completed yesterday. A few votes more or less would not change the result anyhow, since the percentage—about 70 percent "noes"—has been running the same each day since the first returns began to be received.

The ballots are all available for scrutiny and count by anyone who wishes to see or examine them.

This ends the poll. Life's conclusion of a unanimous interventionist sentiment has been disproved—but the poll also showed the sentiment is there and strong, though it is a minority sentiment. Mr. Armstrong's estimate likewise was overoptimistic. He anticipated at least 80 percent or more of "no" votes and the actual result showed about 70.

Perhaps the most hopeful and interesting thing about the poll was the moderation of most of the voters and their thoughtful understanding of the situation—a fine symbol of democracy.

We hope the poll leaves no hard feelings.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate because of the fact that the story in Life magazine stated that practically all those consulted voted in favor of intervention. The heading of one of the clippings to which I have referred is " 'America First' challenges Life's report that Neosho favors war. Newspapers to poll entire city on question of intervention." Life magazine, in its issue of May 26, says that the residents of Neosho are overwhelmingly in favor of going to war.

A complete list of the vote taken in Neosho is given. This shows the inaccuracy of the poll taken by Life magazine in this particular community. The story in Life magazine indicated that the overwhelming majority wanted to go to war. Because of that fact the publishers of the Springfield Newspapers, Inc., took a poll of all the persons registered in that community.

Mr. President, a letter came to me the other day from one of the men who takes the Gallup poll in my State. He stated that some of the questions which were asked were trick questions. He said that he asked certain questions of a group of persons who he knew were anti-interventionists, isolationists, or whatever one chooses to call them. He said that when he asked the questions sent out by the Gallup poll, and explained to the persons whom he had selected, and who he knew were isolationists, that the questions were trick questions, although he called attention to the fact that they were trick questions, each of the 15 persons who believed in isolation answered each of the questions as the Gallup poll indicated it wanted them answered, to the effect that he wanted to go to war under certain conditions.

Afterward when he went back and explained to them in detail exactly what the answers meant, all but one of the 15 persons reversed themselves and said that under no circumstances did they want to go to war.

That is exactly what I contended was taking place in the Gallup polls. When a person is asked, "Are you in favor of Mr. Willkie or Mr. Roosevelt?" we get a correct picture. When a person is asked, "Are you in favor of intervening in this war or against it?" we get a correct picture. But when some other question is asked, which every lawyer knows may elicit a certain answer if it is asked in a certain way, it is impossible to obtain a correct picture. That is the reason why we seem to get contradictory answers from the same persons in the Gallup polls. The young man who wrote to me happens to be a college graduate and a very brilliant young man. When he wrote to me I knew nothing about the matter to which he referred. He said he thought I ought to have the information explaining how the polls were being taken and why there were seeming contradictions in the Gallup polls on certain questions.

I call this matter to the notice of the Senate to direct attention to the inaccuracy of the Life magazine poll in the little town of Neosho, where Life magazine stated that the people of the community, which was a typical country town, wanted to go to war. When the local newspaper took the poll it showed just the contrary.

CASCADE INVESTMENT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 2861) for the relief of Cascade Investment Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN KLASEK

The bill (H. R. 3243) for the relief of John Klasek was considered, ordered to a

third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VERNON ATKISON

The bill (H. R. 1649) for the relief of Vernon Atkison was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OTIS THOMPSON

The bill (S. 1426) for the relief of Otis Thompson was announced as next in order.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to Calendar No. 420, Senate bill 1426, introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill. I have looked into the matter, and I find that I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1426) for the relief of Otis Thompson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 10, after the word "injuries", to insert the words "alleged to have been", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Otis Thompson, Belington, W. Va., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from injuries alleged to have been received during May 1938 while employed by the Works Progress Administration at Philippi, W. Va., is authorized to be heard under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, as if he had filed notice of injury and claim for disability compensation within the time prescribed by such sections 17 and 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOMER J. SWOPE AND JOHN W. WHITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Homer J. Swope and John W. White, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, lines 5 and 6, to strike out the words "and John W. White, postmaster and assistant postmaster, respectively," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Homer J. Swope at Quincy, Ill., with the sum of $985.79, representing the amount of postal funds and money-order funds lost in the burglary of the post office at Quincy, Ill., on December 3, 1939.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Homer J. Swope."

MAGGIE LOU MORSE

The bill (H. R. 1753) for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES C. DYSON

The bill (S. 334) for the relief of James C. Dyson, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 334 in behalf of a constituent of mine, a resident of my State, who was very seriously injured by an enrollee in a C. C. C. camp. I do not see on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], who is chairman of the subcommittee to which the bill was referred. Perhaps I should ask that the bill go over temporarily until the Senator from Delaware returns.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Calendar No. 423, Senate bill 334.

Mr. President, my bill called for relief in the amount of $10,000. The matter was referred to the Department of Agriculture, which recommended $5,500 as being a reasonable amount. Taking into consideration the fact that Mr. Dyson, the injured person, had received hospitalization in a Federal hospital, the representatives of the Department of Agriculture thought that the amount should be reduced to $5,500. Now the committee has reduced the amount below the Department's recommendation, to $3,000, which I think is very unreasonable. I desire to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill as to why that amount was inserted in the bill instead of the $5,500.

The injured person is sick. He is permanently injured. His left leg is in very bad shape, and never will be any better. He is unemployed. He is destitute. He needs the money. If there ever was a case where the amount should not be reduced, this is the case.

I desired to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he would let me offer an amendment increasing the amount from $3,000 to $5,500, as was recommended by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Paul H. Appleby. The Department went into the matter very fully and completely, and made that recommendation.

I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

ORGANIZATION OF MILITARY UNITS IN UNITED STATES POSSESSIONS

The bill (S. 173) to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of extending to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone the permission to organize military units not a part of the National Guard, which was granted to the States by the amendment made to such section by the act of October 21, 1940, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. I do not know that I shall have any objection. I do not know its real purpose. May it go over for the present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

EXEMPTION FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The bill (S. 1397), to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I certainly desire to have some explanation of the bill. I think the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] probably can explain it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to Senate bill 1397, let me say that the original law provided for the exemption from military service of certain aliens.

The Committee on Military Affairs had this matter under consideration, and reported the bill favorably. I will read a short extract from the committee's report:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1397), to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that it do pass.

The measure provides that any male alien residing in the United States "who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, or who is registered, or who is or may become liable to registration under the Selective Training and Service Act" shall be relieved from liability to training and service thereunder "if he makes a declaration prior to becoming a member of the land or naval forces or, within a time fixed by the President, if he is already a member of the land or naval forces" in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, withdrawing his intention to become a citizen of the United States, which shall be held to cancel his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States and to forever bar him from becoming such a citizen.

If the alien withdraws his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, he will be exempt from military service.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, has objection been voiced to Senate bill 1397, Calendar No. 425?

Mr. McNARY. I requested an explanation. The statement made by the Senator from North Carolina does not exactly explain what I had in mind, and I ask that the bill go over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

REPRODUCTION OF ALIEN REGISTRATION RECEIPT CARDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1512) to amend the Alien Registration Act, 1940, by making it a criminal offense to reproduce alien registration receipt cards, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "who", to insert the words "with unlawful intent"; on page 2, line 4, to strike out "$1,000", and to insert "$5,000"; and in line 5, after the word "than", to strike out "6 months", and insert "5 years", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 36 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940 (act of June 28, 1940, title III, sec. 36, 54 Stat. 675; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 457), be, and the same is, hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection to be lettered (d), reading as follows:

"(d) Any person who with unlawful intent photographs, prints, or in any other manner makes, or executes, any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of an alien registration receipt card or any colorable imitation thereof, except when and as authorized under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $5,000 or be imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY OF RETIRED PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2279) to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in section 2, page 2, in line 14, before the words "per centum", to insert "or 3"; and in line 22, after the figures "2½", to insert "or 3."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHARLES H. WRIGHT AND WILLIAM FRANCIS AGARD

The bill (H. R. 3233) for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE NEAL STORAGE CO.

The bill (S. 1608) for the relief of the Neal Storage Co., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $24 to the Neal Storage Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages incurred as a result of the cancelation on June 27, 1940, by the Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior, 501 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio, of its order for three trucks to be furnished by the Neal Storage Co. for the purpose of moving and transporting certain office furniture and equipment of said Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REDEMPTION OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE BONDS

The bill (H. R. 3847) to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

COLLATERAL SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

The bill (S. 1471) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal notes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1941" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1943."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1602) to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 14), and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the purpose of that bill? Its title is not revealing at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed the bill was reported by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], who is not present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If there is no explanation of the bill, let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

HENRY KOTILA

The bill (S. 201) for the relief of Henry Kotila was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry Kotila, of Negaunee, Mich., the sum of $115.80, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred as the result of an accident involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on the Camp Escanaba-Gwinn Road, about 4½ miles northeast of Camp Escanaba, Mich., on November 26, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ROCHE, CONNELL AND LAUB CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Roche, Connell and Laub Construction Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUARDIAN OF HOWARD BURKETTE

The bill (H. R. 2709) for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. GEORGE H. KERLEY

The bill (H. R. 2710) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOM GENTRY

The bill (H. R. 3399) for the relief of Tom Gentry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUSTAV SCHMIDT

The bill (H. R. 3520) for the relief of Gustav Schmidt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELINOR LEUGERS

The bill (S. 1398) for the relief of Elinor Leugers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elinor Leugers, dependent mother of the late LeRoy Leugers, machinist's mate, second class, United States Coast Guard, who died aboard the *Pandora* on October 14, 1939, an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate said LeRoy Leugers was entitled to receive at the date of his death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JESSE W. PITTS

The bill (H. R. 241) for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RINZO TAKATA

The bill (H. R. 732) for the relief of Rinzo Takata was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEIRS OF GEORGE P. EDDY

The bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED T. JOHNSTON

The bill (H. R. 1674) for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KENNELLY FURNITURE CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Kennelly Furniture Co. which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$136.99" and insert "$135.66", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $135.66 to the Kennelly Furniture Co., of Mandan, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the unpaid balance of the funeral expenses borne by such company with respect to the burial of Redtomahawk, formerly an Indian scout, United States Army,

who died in 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. MILLS

The bill (H. R. 903) for the relief of James A. Mills was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD E. WAREHIME

The bill (H. R. 1532) for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY CLERK RAY BELLAMY VIERS, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

The bill (H. R. 4459) to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Viers, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. H. C. BIVINS AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,743.25" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LAWRENCE CHLEBECK

The bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF HOLDERS OF COTTON POOL PARTICIPATION TRUST CERTIFICATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1557) to provide for reimbursement to the holders of cotton pool participation trust certificates, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,320,000, or so much thereof as may be required by the Secretary of Agriculture to accomplish the purposes hereinafter declared and authorized. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to, or upon the order of, the Secretary of Agriculture, such a part or all of the sum hereby appropriated at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to draw from the Treasury of the United States any part or all of the sum hereby appropriated, and to deposit same to his credit with the Treasurer of the United States, under special symbol number, to be available for disbursement for the purposes hereinafter stated.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to pay the sum of $2.40 per bale, from the sum hereby authorized to be appropriated, to all holders of participation trust certificates of the cotton producers' pool, Form C–5–I, of record as of May 1, 1937.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, which purpose is hereby specifically stated to be to reimburse holders of Form C–5–I cotton producers' pool participation trust certificates for $2.40 per bale carrying charges deducted from the proceeds of the cotton producers' pool.

SEC. 5. All expenses incident to the accomplishment of the purposes of this act are authorized to be paid by the Secretary from the appropriation authorized hereunder, and any balance remaining after reimbursements have been made in accordance with this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma if this is the bill which was acted upon at the last session and passed by the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is the identical bill which passed the Senate at the last session of the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSAY OFFICE AT HELENA, MONT.

The bill (S. 296) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an assay office at Helena, Mont., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish, equip, and maintain an assay office at Helena, Mont., for the purpose of assaying ore and purchasing gold.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary in order to establish, equip, and maintain such assay office, and to acquire such land and construct or rent such buildings as may be necessary for the proper functioning of such assay office.

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC FARM COMMODITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 117), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on May 15, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out the preamble and also to strike out the body of the resolution and insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized and requested to hold hearings immediately on the question of parity prices for basic, necessary, and essential farm commodities and that at the conclusion of said hearings the committee is requested to consider the advisability of formulating and reporting to the Senate legislation defining such parity prices; and be it further

Resolved, That pending the holding of the hearings and the suggesting of legislation that no agency of the Government should assume to exercise implied power in undertaking to fix maximum prices on any of the said basic, necessary, and essential farm commodities below the tentative parity prices fixed by the Department of Agriculture as of May 15, 1941, and as follows: Wheat, $1.149 per bushel; cotton, 16.12 cents per pound; corn, 83.5 cents per bushel; rice, $1.057 per bushel; tobacco, fire-cured, 10.6 cents per pound; Maryland tobacco, 17.9 cents per pound; cigar leaf, 11 cents per pound; and cigar binder, 15.5 cents per pound.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to acting on the amendment, but I wish briefly to refer to the resolution itself.

I should like an explanation of the plan which is contemplated by this particular Senate resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this is a Senate resolution which, if adopted, would express the sense of the Senate on the question of parity prices. A few days ago the Congress passed a bill providing for a loan of 85 percent of parity prices on some basic farm commodities, if not all, especially wheat and cotton. The present law provides no definite formula for fixing or determining parity prices. In other words, the Agriculture Department is authorized to loan 85 percent of the parity price on wheat or on cotton. However, the law does not provide a definite formula for determining parity prices at the present time.

Under the present system the Bureau of Economics of the Department of Agriculture acts upon a formula based upon the years 1909–14. That was a good many years ago. It is the contention of some that the base period should be brought down nearer to date, because farm prices are less now than they were then, while the things the farmers have to buy are much higher than they were then.

So this resolution suggests two things: It, in effect, instructs the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a study of what should be the parity prices of basic farm commodities, and then to suggest to the Senate definite legislation by which parity prices may be arrived at. That is the first suggestion.

The second proposition is that, pending the suggesting and the recommending of this formula, no agency of the Government shall assume to use implied powers to say what parity prices are to the extent of fixing the price of such commodities below what may be determined as parity.

The resolution sets forth what the Agricultural Department holds to be parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and various brands of tobacco. I think no one will object to preventing any agency fixing a price on any of these commodities below the parity prices set forth in the resolution. All this is not legislation; it is simply a means of arriving at legislation at some future date.

That is the explanation of the resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator explain what he understands by the inhibition of the exercise by a Government

agency of an implied power to undertake to fix maximum prices?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In the preliminary hearing on the resolution the Committee on Agriculture had before it Mr. Leon Henderson, who contended that he has the implied power to fix the maximum price of any commodity upon which he sees proper to fix a price, including wheat, cotton, and any other product which might come to his knowledge. But it was the idea of the committee that if he has the power to do that it is an implied power and is in the nature of what I might term, in Western parlance, "a bluff." Of course, Mr. Henderson can use his position to say that no commodity shall sell for more than a certain amount, but if a person dealing in that commodity should see fit to sell the product for more than the amount fixed by Mr. Henderson, the latter could use further implied powers to embarrass the seller, or proposed seller, of such particular commodity. He could do that in various ways. Even though he has no authority to do it, he could accomplish the end. It was the intention of the committee, at least, to suggest to Mr. Henderson, pending the working out of a legal program for determining parity prices of basic farm commodities, that he should not undertake to set a price of any such commodities below what the Department of Agriculture holds to be the parity price under the formula under which it now acts.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. When we were considering the parity bill a few days ago, was it then explained to us, taking cotton as an illustration, that the parity price was 16.12 cents a pound?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I was present on that occasion, but I am not sure what representations were made. I know at that time I arrived at the rather definite conviction that there should be some law upon the statute books that would enable any person to arrive at what may be the parity price. The parity price changes from day to day. The parity prices as set forth in the resolution were arrived at as of date May 15, if I remember correctly.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. The effect of the precatory terms the Senator uses in his resolutions would be to put a floor under prices, and there would be no limitation upon their going up meanwhile, would there?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The preamble has been stricken from the resolution, as is customary when a resolution comes before the Senate proper, the whereases are stricken out, and only the resolution itself is acted upon by the Senate. The words are used as argument to put the purpose of the proposal before the Senate or before the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the resolution which is before him and address his attention to lines 4 to 9, inclusive, he will see that if we adopt this language it will have the effect of calling upon the agency of the Government in question to assume to exercise no power, whether implied or otherwise, to alter, by way of fixing a maximum price, the parity prices fixed by the Department of Agriculture as of May 15. Thus, we should in effect be asking the particular agency, Mr. Leon Henderson in charge, to put a floor under commodities at these prices, should we not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was the intent of the committee in recommending this substitute resolution to provide that, pending the passage of definite legislation, neither Mr. Henderson nor any other agent of the Government should assume to exercise any power, implied or otherwise, in fixing a lower price for wheat than $1.149 per bushel, a lower price for cotton than 16.12 cents per pound and so forth. That was the intent of the committee in authorizing the reporting of this resolution. These are the minimum prices to be considered, and neither Mr. Henderson nor anyone else shall assume to fix a lower price than the prices set forth in this resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator consent to an amendment striking out the word "fix" in line 6, striking out all of line 7, and so much of line 8 as ends with the word "tentative," and inserting the word "alter"?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like the Senator to indicate just what language he refers to.

Mr. DANAHER. It would then read:

Resolved, That pending the holding of the hearings and the suggesting of legislation—

Which, by the way, may never come—

no agency of the Government should assume to exercise implied power in undertaking to alter parity prices fixed by the Department of Agriculture as of May 15, 1941—

And so forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that is one of the purposes of the resolution; in effect, to serve notice on Mr. Henderson or anyone else who may assume to exercise implied power that they should not undertake, with the consent of the Senate, to fix the prices of these basic farm commodities—and those are the only ones under consideration—at prices lower than the prices fixed as parity by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, until they have revised their estimates. If they should revise their estimates and fix parity prices as of a later date than May 15, then, of course, those prices would govern.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator consent to an amendment to cause that particular clause to read as I have just indicated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as this resolution has no force and effect in law, and inasmuch as this discussion probably will serve the same purpose as the passage of the resolution might serve, I should have no objection to taking out that language if the Senator objects to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I respectfully move to strike out the word "fix" from line 6, to strike out all of line 7, to strike out so much of line 8 as will include the word "tentative", and to insert the word "alter."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment reported by the committee will be agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The amendment striking out the preamble was agreed to.

REFUND OF PROCESSING TAX ON HOGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "or", to strike out "his" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "representative", to insert "of such person"; in line 18, after the words "price of", to strike out "such"; in the same line, after the word "hogs", to insert "so marketed by such person"; on page 3, after line 11, to strike out "Any claim for payment under the provisions of this paragraph shall be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, and proof upon such claim must be submitted within 18 months from the date of such enactment", and insert: "All claims for payment under the provisions of this paragraph shall be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within 1 year from date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That any claim heretofore filed with a Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall be considered as filed hereunder, and may be amended within 1 year from date of enactment of this act. Proof upon any claim must be submitted within 18 months from date of such enactment: *Provided*, That proof heretofore furnished with a claim heretofore filed shall be made available for use as proof upon such claim"; on page 4, line 10, after the word "as", to strike out "proof of" and insert "evidence in proving"; and in line 16, after the word "payment", to insert "or in furthering the enactment of this legislation", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas that part of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which levied a processing tax has been held to be unlawful and unconstitutional and said processing tax as previously assessed on hogs marketed for slaughter was charged to the raisers and producers and was in fact deducted from the market price paid to such raisers and producers for such hogs; and

Whereas provisions were made under title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936 for refunding to processors that part of such tax which they in fact bore and did not shift to consumers or raisers or producers; but no provisions of law were ever made for refunding such processing tax to those raisers and producers of hogs who in fact bore the burden of such tax on hogs marketed for slaughter: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That any person who raised or produced and marketed hogs for slaughter on which there was levied, collected, or paid a processing tax under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act prior to the time that such act was held unconstitutional, or the legal representative of such person, may have such tax or part thereof refunded to him, if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Internal Revenue Commissioner, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, or to the satisfaction of the Processing Tax Board of Review, or to the trial court, as the case may be, under provisions of title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936 insofar as such title may be applicable that all or part of the burden of such processing tax was in fact charged to and borne by such person and was in fact deducted from the market price of hogs so marketed by such person. The amount of such tax borne by such person with respect to any particular quantity of hogs shall be deemed to be an amount equal to the processing tax payable upon an equal quantity of hogs at the time such particular quantity of hogs was marketed minus any amount by which the spread between the average hog product value at Chicago of such particular quantity of hogs during the month in which they were marketed and the average hog price at Chicago of such particular quantity of hogs during such month was less than the amount of such processing tax plus 65 cents for each hundredweight of such particular quantity of hogs. The rate of processing tax levied, collected, or paid with respect to any particular quantity of hogs marketed by a claimant under the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to be the rate prevailing on the day following the day upon which such hogs were marketed by such claimant. All claims for payment under the provisions of this paragraph shall be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within 1 year from date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That any claim heretofore filed with a Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall be considered as filed hereunder, and may be amended within 1 year from date of enactment of this act. Proof upon any claim must be submitted within 18 months from date of such enactment: *Provided*, That proof heretofore furnished with a claim heretofore filed shall be made available for use as proof upon such claim. The allowance or disallowance by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of any claim filed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be reviewable in the same manner and to the same extent that the allowance or disallowance of a claim is reviewable under the provisions of section 906 of title VII of the Revenue Act of 1936. Account sales kept by a vendor or a vendee, or by an agent of either, with respect to a particular quantity of hogs shall be accepted as evidence in proving a claim for payment under the provisions of this paragraph with respect to such quantity of hogs. No part of any payment made under this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with obtaining such payment or in furthering the enactment of this legislation, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding; and any person violating the provisions of this sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

JAMES C. DYSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a moment ago Senate bill 334 was temporarily passed over. I should like to revert to that bill at this time. As I stated while the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] was absent from the Chamber, this bill has to do with injuries which were incurred in Colorado by an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to returning to the consideration of Senate bill 334?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 334) for the relief of James C. Dyson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "is" and insert "be, and he is hereby", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James C. Dyson, of Parker, Colo.

And so forth. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to read:

The sum of $3,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of a collision which occurred when the motorcycle on which he was riding as a passenger was struck by a United States Forest Service truck near Castle Rock, Colo., on August 19, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,500", which is the amount the Under Secretary of Agriculture recommended. I should like to read to the Senate his exact language.

Mr. Paul H. Appleby, in his recommendation to the Senate on May 1, 1941, said:

It is believed that the sum of $5,500 will justly compensate Mr. Dyson, and it is recommended that S. 334 be given favorable consideration, and that this sum be appropriated for his relief

In accordance with Mr. Appleby's suggestion and recommendation I offer the amendment I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, in the amendment proposed by the committee wherein it is proposed to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000", it is now proposed to insert "$5,500".

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, this claim was referred to me as a subcommittee. The injury was done to Mr. Dyson while he was off duty from the Civilian Conservation camp where he was employed. While riding on a motorcycle—he was not driving the motorcycle—he approached a curve, as I remember, at about 25 miles an hour, and the motorcycle met a truck driving at about the same rate. The truck was too far over to the left, and the motorcycle was driving at a rate which was entirely out of keeping with the point it was approaching. Both the driver and the rider knew of the danger.

The left leg of Mr. Dyson was very seriously injured. I do not think there is any doubt about that. He has since been employed. The Senator from Colorado says he is not now employed. I understand that the injury which is now keeping him from being employed has no connection with the damage done in this accident.

I reported back to the committee that I thought $2,500 would be just compensation for the damage. That is merely my belief. I have no personal feeling in the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Mr. Dyson is not now employed. He is sick. He needs an operation, and will have to have another operation before he will be in physical condition to be employed. He has been employed since the injury; but Mr. Dyson is a man who would be employed if both legs were gone. He is an industrious man, a hard-working man; and the mere fact that he has been employed and received some little pay ought not to bar him from receiving the compensation to which the Under Secretary of Agriculture says he is entitled.

I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood by the Senator from Colorado. I am a member of the Claims Committee; but when a report is made after an investigation, and the full committee has acted on it, I always feel that the members of the committee should be bound by the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECTION BASES FOR THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3536, a bill authorizing certain public works, which was previously reported today from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think there should be some explanation before consent is given.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Congress has previously appropriated, March 17, 1941, $10,000,000 for constructing what is known as section bases for the Navy. At the time the $10,000,000 was appropriated it was known that the amount would not be sufficient to carry out the program of the Navy in regard to section bases for the national defense. The amount of money provided in the bill $50,000,000 would continue the program that has already been inaugurated, and would permit the construction of 29 more section bases.

Section bases are small bases located along the coast, for the purpose of relieving the navy yards. Section bases can take care of and repair smaller vessels, and can provide anchorage for destroyers and private yachts converted for naval uses and used in coastal and harbor patrol. It is a part of the general plan for section bases up and down the Atlantic and Pacific to relieve the major and larger yards. The average amount of money it is estimated each of these bases will cost is $877,000. Funds for approximately 30 section bases have already been appropriated for, and the work thereon has commenced.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the bill authorize the acquisition of locations outside the confines of the United States and its possessions?

Mr. WALSH. No. The exact locations on our coasts has not yet been determined—except the 30 already under construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3569) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, before moving to proceed to consideration of executive business, I wish to state to the Senate that at the conclusion of the executive session it is my intention to move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. I now ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Commerce, and the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to file reports.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may not all committees be included, without designating any particular committees?

Mr. BYRNES. I so amend the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice Alvin J. Wirtz, resigned;

Thomas F. Britt, of Arizona, to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz., vice Patrick J. Keohane; and

Frank E. DeKay to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Murdock
Aiken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Glass	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Guffey	Rosier
Bilbo	Gurney	Russell
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Herring	Smathers
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Bulow	Holman	Stewart
Bunker	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hughes	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Capper	Kilgore	Tydings
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lodge	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Walsh
Connally	McKellar	Wheeler
Danaher	McNary	White
Davis	Maloney	Wiley
Downey	Mead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—JOHN J. DEMPSEY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the nomination of Hon. John J. Dempsey, a former Member of Congress, and now a member of the Maritime Commission, to be Under Secretary of the Interior is not on the calendar. The nomination has been before the Public Lands Committee, but due to some unavoidable circumstances there was some delay in considering it. The committee has unanimously favorably reported the nomination.

The office of the Secretary of the Interior is understaffed. One of his assistants is leaving the city today, and he is very anxious to have his staff filled. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this nomination be considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John J. Dempsey to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado (Mr. Adams) asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations of the calendar.

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Luther Harr to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Luther Harr to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to make a statement before a vote is taken on the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Luther Harr, a very prominent citizen of Pennsylvania, to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

Mr. President, I have the very highest regard for Dr. Harr. Judged by his public-service record, I believe that he would be an excellent officer, and would serve well as Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. In fact, the appointment would be of the highest order. As an educator and as a public servant he has earned the respect of all who know him.

On that basis, when the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce referred his nomination to me I gave my consent. When I gave my approval to Dr. Harr's nomination I was aware of the great responsibility that would be his as Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel; and it was my belief that he would give his full time to the work and give up his public offices as treasurer of the city of Philadelphia and treasurer of the school board, which positions together pay him a compensation of $14,000 a year.

However, later a newspaper announcement informed me that Dr. Harr expected to assume the office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, and also retain his offices with the city and county of Philadelphia.

Immediately upon receipt of that notice I conferred with my colleague [Mr. GUFFEY], who informed me that Dr. Harr intended to hold both public positions in the city and county of Philadelphia until the end of the year, and begin work as Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel immediately, without compensation.

Mr. President, it strikes me that such action would constitute a sharp violation of Public Law No. 34, Seventy-seventh Congress, which extends the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, and specifically defines the duties of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. I ask that the act amending the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 and extending the life of that act be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Public Law 34—77th Cong.]

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 19 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (relating to termination of the act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. This act shall cease to be in effect (except as provided in section 13 of the Revised Statutes) and any agencies and offices established under, or to engage in the administration of, this act shall cease to exist at 12:01 a. m., April 26, 1943."

(b) Section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of the bituminous-coal taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3527. Termination of Tax.

"The taxes imposed by this chapter shall not apply to the sale or other disposal, after April 25, 1943, of bituminous coal."

SEC. 2. The Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 is amended by adding after section 21 a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive branch of the Government an office to be known as the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. The office shall be in charge of a counsel to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The counsel shall have no financial interest, direct or indirect, in the mining, transportation, or sale of, or the manufacture of equipment for, coal (whether or not bituminous coal), oil, or gas, or in the generation, transmission, or sale of hydroelectric power, or in the manufacture of equipment for the use thereof, and shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The counsel shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per year and necessary traveling expenses. With the exception of a clerk to the counsel, the attorneys, and such special agents and experts as the counsel may from time to time find necessary for the conduct of his work, all employees of the counsel shall be appointed and their compensation fixed in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(b) The counsel shall have and perform the functions conferred and imposed upon the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission by this act as in force upon its enactment. The functions of such office which were transferred, by Reorganization Plan No. II transmitted by the President to Congress on May 9, 1939, to the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior shall not be performed by such office of the Solicitor after the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel has taken office, and in no event after the expiration of 60 days after the date this section takes effect.

"(c) All records and property of such office of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission transferred by such reorganization plan to the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and all records and property of the office of such Solicitor used primarily in the administration of any function of the office of such Consumers' Counsel transferred by such reorganization plan, and all personnel so transferred (not heretofore retransferred or separated from the service under section 402 of such reorganization plan) and all personnel used in the administration of such functions are transferred to the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel established by subsection (a) of this section for use in the administration of the functions vested in such office by this section.

"(d) So much of the unexpended balances of the appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for the use of the office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior in the exercise of the functions of the Office of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission transferred by such reorganization plan, or for the use of the Secretary of the Interior in the exercise of any function so transferred, as the Director of the Budget with the approval of the President shall determine, shall be transferred to the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel for use in connection with the exercise of the functions vested in such office by this section. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer: *Provided*, That the use of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds transferred by this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) and section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

"(e) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of the Consumers' Counsel of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, or the office of such Consumers' Counsel, or the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, or the office of such Solicitor, in the administration of the functions vested in such office or officer by this act or such reorganization plan and in effect at the time this section takes effect, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if this section had not been enacted, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

"(f) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any of the officers or offices referred to in subsection (e) of this section in his or its official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his or its official duties, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this section, but the court or agency before which such suit, action, or proceeding is pending may (on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date this section takes effect showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved) allow the same to be maintained by or against the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel."

Approved April 11, 1941.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it will be noted that section 22 (a) of the law provides that—

the Counsel • • • shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

Let me repeat that. The law provides that the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel—

shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

While I am not a member of the legal profession, it should be apparent to anyone reading that provision of the law that the Coal Consumers' Counsel, who would be paid $10,000 a year, plus office help, and plus traveling expenses, may not hold any other position that would consume his time and energy.

Elaborating further on the positions in Philadelphia held by Dr. Harr, which he does not intend to resign, he is the treasurer of the city of Philadelphia, an elective office which involves stewardship of annual receipts amounting to approximately $81,000,000, and for which the people of Philadelphia pay Dr. Harr $10,000 annually. He is also charged with the responsibility of receiving moneys on account of the sale of new city loans, and acts as an agent for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the receipt of moneys paid on account of licenses.

Dr. Harr also is treasurer of the Philadelphia school board, under what is known as the Pennsylvania school code. The school board in Philadelphia is a separate taxing unit, and receives approximately $31,000,000 annually. For performing the duties of this office, Dr. Harr receives $4,000 annually.

It has been contended that there is a precedent for Dr. Harr's action, on the basis that the Director of Civilian Defense accepted that position while retaining his post as mayor of New York. The Office of Civilian Defense was created by Executive order. There are no restrictions about accepting that position, except those which the President himself imposes.

However, the position of Consumers' Counsel is created specifically by Congress. His duties are defined and his salary is specified. Congress specifically warns the Counsel against holding other places at the same time, when it says that the Consumers' Counsel—

shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

As I see it, there is no parallel between the Presidentially created office of Director of Civilian Defense and the office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, created by an act of Congress clearly pointing out that the person accepting the position of counsel shall not actively engage in other work.

Mr. President, acceptance of the office of Coal Consumers' Counsel without pay and retaining of the public positions in Philadelphia would not only violate, in my view of the matter, Public Law No. 34 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which explicitly states that the Counsel—

shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment—

but also would violate article 4, section 3, of the Philadelphia city charter, approved June 25, 1919, which states:

No person shall hold more than one office or position of profit under the city government, and no person shall hold any office or position of profit under the city or any department thereof while holding any other office or position of profit in or under the Government of the United States, of this Commonwealth, or any county, city, or other political subdivision thereof.

Here we are confronted with the city charter of Philadelphia, prohibiting the holding of more than one office or position of profit by anyone. In this instance it is obvious that the law of the city government is violated. Of course, we have no control over that matter, but surely we cannot and will not knowingly and willfully condone a further breach of the Federal statutes by conferring an-

other position or appointment for profit upon the nominee.

It seems to me impossible for Dr. Harr to accept the office of Consumers' Counsel without profit. Unless stated to the contrary in any particular law, the Government cannot accept voluntary services. Title 31, section 665, of the Code of Laws of the United States, in force January 3, 1935, states as follows:

> Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary services for the Government or employ personal services in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

On that basis we have the "dollar-a-year" men working for the Government. Dr. Harr would have to accept the job on a "dollar-a-year" basis; and technically, if not practically, that is profit. Therefore, Dr. Harr would violate the Philadelphia city charter by accepting another Government office for profit.

Again I state, that while I am not a lawyer, after reading the language of the Federal and municipal statutes, it would seem that both would be violated by the retention of the city offices and the acceptance of the Federal position.

Any person who accepts two or more positions at the same time must feel that he is able to discharge the obligations which they place upon him. The question is whether one person can discharge the obligations of not one but two jobs, both of which must be regarded as full-time obligations. The people of the city of Philadelphia elected Dr. Harr to perform a full-time job as treasurer of the funds of Philadelphia. The consumers of bituminous coal in this country, numbering more than 60,000,000, expect that the Consumers' Counsel shall apply all his time and energy in the protection of their interests.

Mr. President, it would seem unfair to the bituminous coal consumers in this country to permit anyone holding other offices to act as their counsel on a part-time basis when every pound of coal which today comes from the coal mines has a market. As Consumers' Counsel, his is the important responsibility of seeing that coal prices do not get out of hand; that is, to keep them from skyrocketing during these times of rising prices. He is the special representative of the coal-consuming public. Already the general price level of bituminous coal has risen 1 percent. Constant vigilance is necessary to safeguard against unwarranted or whimsical increases in the price of bituminous coal to the consumers. I submit that such vigilance cannot be maintained when placed in the hands of anyone, no matter how well qualified he may be, whose time and energies are divided.

Mr. President, I have reviewed the hearings and read the reports of the committees on the Bituminous Coal Act and I am impressed with the importance which is attached to the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel. An indication of this importance is the fact that Public Law 34, passed at the present session of Congress, extending the Coal Act of 1937, made the Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel an independent office in the executive department.

The work of the Consumers' Counsel as "watchdog" of the coal consumers' interests is enormous. This is clearly set forth in a letter from Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, under date of March 14, 1941, when the bill proposing a 2-year extension of the Bituminous Coal Act was under consideration. It was made clear in that act that the Coal Consumers' Counsel could have no other office or vocation. As the letter from Secretary Ickes to Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, is rather lengthy, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 14, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on
Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: At the hearings on March 11 and 12 on House Joint Resolution 101 for the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act, I was asked to furnish a statement of services rendered in behalf of consumers by the Consumers' Counsel Division.

I am the more eager to supply this information for the record because of the possibility that, as a result of a colloquy at the March 13 hearing, the committee may have been left with the impression that the Consumers' Counsel Division's activities ceased with the resignation of Mr. Frederic L. Kirgis as Director in January. The contrary is true. There has been no slackening in the pace of the Division. The Consumers' Counsel Division has never been more active than in the period since minimum prices became effective October 1, 1940. It has been particularly active during January, February, and to date.

Although the staff of the Consumers' Counsel Division is very small (consisting of 55 employees in all), the breadth of its activities is really about as wide as that of the Coal Division itself and of all the district boards, whose staffs and available funds are many times as great. Since the establishment of minimum mine prices, the Consumers' Counsel Division has analyzed every petition filed with the Bituminous Coal Division to determine the effects of the proposals upon the consuming public, and, in addition, has instituted 22 proceedings in its own name. Sometimes a petition affects a single consumer or a small group of consumers. Sometimes it affects thousands of consumers and annual tonnages running into the millions.

More than 700 petitions have been filed by producers, district boards, and others, and they are continuing at the rate of 100 per month. The Consumers' Counsel Division has followed all proceedings in these cases as the special representative of the coal-consuming public. In about 250 cases analysis and investigation disclosed substantial consumer interest requiring intervention by the Consumers' Counsel Division. Hearings or informal conferences have been held in 140 of these cases, and these were attended by one or more representatives of the Consumers' Counsel Division. The Division has filed 45 briefs, covering 71 cases. In addition, many pleadings and motions have been filed. In many of the seven-hundred-and-odd proceedings hearings have not yet been scheduled.

While representation of the consumers' interest in all these proceedings is the main task of the Consumers' Counsel Division, it has many subsidiary duties to perform. Among these are the receipt and answering of correspondence at the rate of about 700 or 800 items a month; the preparation of the Coal Consumers' Digest which is sent to approximately 5,000 persons and organizations who have requested it; the holding of conferences (at one of which 100 representatives of consumers who buy 80,000,000 tons of coal a year were present); the preparation of a weekly Calendar of Proceedings to advise consumers of matters of interest before the Bituminous Coal Division and other administrative agencies; the receipt and analysis of numerous consumer inquiries and formal and informal complaints filed with it by consumers (individual domestic users, large and small industrial concerns, retail dealers, and groups, school boards, municipalities, and State and Federal agencies).

Since October 1, 1940, the Consumers' Counsel Division has received 1,743 letters regarding minimum prices and related matters such as marketing rules and regulations, market area boundaries, distributors' discounts, and the like, as well as 239 letters relating to retail prices, transportation costs, and chemical analyses of coals. Smaller consumers, particularly, who have recently learned of the existence of machinery for the handling of complaints, have often been unable to couch legitimate complaints in formal language with supporting factual information, for effective presentation at a hearing. In each of these cases the Consumers' Counsel Division has assisted these consumers by explaining the price schedules and regulations to them, and, in proper cases, by petitioning for rectification of prices about which they have complained.

Even these 2,000 consumers who have corresponded with the Consumers' Counsel Division represent only a small fraction of the consuming public. The Consumers' Counsel Division's responsibility is not limited to articulate consumers. A householder may be harmed by an inequity in the price schedule which adds a few dollars to his annual fuel bill, but he is hardly in a position personally to seek administrative rectification. The Consumers' Counsel Division seeks out these inequities and takes steps to have them eliminated even in the absence of consumer complaints. Sometimes a single consumer directs attention to a situation which calls for general price revisions affecting thousands of other consumers. Such petitions are included in those filed by the Consumers' Counsel Division.

All this work has involved intense activity by economists, technicians, and lawyers on the staff. I think anyone will agree that such a broad program of work by a staff consisting of 55 people, including only 8 lawyers, 20 technical experts and special agents, and 27 clerical employees is a subject for praise and perhaps of wonder.

As a sample of the current activities of the Division, I attach hereto as exhibit A an excerpt from a report on the Division's work during February 1941.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, again I desire to say that I have no feeling whatever in the matter. Dr. Harr is competent in every way to fill the office of Coal Consumers' Counsel, in fact, he can handle it well, in my opinion, and can contribute greatly to the success of the office, but it is my belief that it is not fair to the coal consumers of this

country or to the people of Philadelphia to permit this position to be held by one who would hold other responsible positions at the same time.

We have before us the law from which I quote.

The Counsel—

Meaning the Bituminous Coal Counsel—

shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in behalf of Dr. Luther Harr, whom I recommend for the position of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

Dr. Harr was born in Philadelphia about 45 years ago. He was educated in the public schools, Penn Charter School, and the University of Pennsylvania, of which he is a graduate. Immediately on his graduation he was employed as instructor in economics, and later as a full-time professor in finance. While occupying the professorship of finance, Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, asked him to take the position of secretary of banking, which he did. He held that position from January 15, 1935, until he resigned on December 31, 1937, to become treasurer of the city and county of Philadelphia. Dr. Harr has filled, faithfully and honorably and with distinction, every position to which he has been called.

If my colleague is worried about the legal phase of the matter, I should like to say that all the facts were brought to the attention of the President of the United States when I recommended Dr. Harr for appointment, later to the attention of Secretary Ickes, who is in charge of the Bituminous Coal Division and, finally, to the attention of the Department of Justice. They all know the conditions and circumstances, and the Department of Justice has ruled that Dr. Harr would violate no law by accepting and filling the position to which he has been nominated. Furthermore, I am sure if my colleague would look up the record he would find that the positions of treasurer of the school board and city treasurer of Philadelphia have been filled by one and the same man for more than 30 years.

It is not Dr. Harr's intention to draw any salary from the Federal Government until he resigns from the position of treasurer of the city of Philadelphia.

In view of the fact that he is so well qualified for the position, and in view of the further fact that if there is any doubt as to his right to fill the position that question can be determined by legal proceedings in very short order, I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination of Dr. Harr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, did I understand my colleague to say he desired a yea-and-nay vote on this question?

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not. If my colleague desires one, he can have it.

Mr. DAVIS. I know that the hour is late, that several committees are meeting, and that a number of Senators are in attendance upon them. So I do not feel that I should call them back now, especially when many of the leaders have said that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote upon this nomination; but if my colleague desires such a vote, I shall ask for a quorum and then ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GUFFEY. I should like to say to my colleague I did not ask for a quorum call the other day, though I did not object to it. I do not ask for a quorum call now, though do not object to it; but I think my colleague would not secure a quorum now to vote on this question by the yeas and nays. So I should like to have the nomination voted on.

Mr. DAVIS. At the request of my colleague, then, I should like to have a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of Dr. Harr's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BYRNES. In accordance with the order previously agreed to, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 16 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph A. McNamara, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont. Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 22, 1941.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Al. W. Hosinski, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana. Mr. Hosinski is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 29, 1941.

Guy McNamara, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 22, 1941.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John H. Fahey, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 6 years from July 22, 1941 (reappointment).

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Williams, Edwin G., May 21, 1941.
Kunkel, Gerald M., July 1, 1941.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Johnwick, Edgar B., June 7, 1941.
Brown, Lawrence W., June 10, 1941.
Weber, Francis J., July 1, 1941.
Dawber, Thomas R., July 1, 1941.
Diseker, Thomas H., July 1, 1941.
Hilbish, Theodore F., July 1, 1941.
Furcolow, Michael L., July 5, 1941.
Tooley, George E., Jr., July 1, 1941.
Zobel, Robert L., July 16, 1941.
Crahan, Thomas F., July 1, 1941.
Kaiser, Raymond F., July 1, 1941.
Usher, Glenn S., July 1, 1941.
Smith, Charles C., July 1, 1941.
Preston, Wendell A., July 1, 1941.
Street, Murdo E., Jr., July 1, 1941.
Lowry, James V., July 1, 1941.
Graning, Harald M., July 15, 1941.
Habel, Karl, July 15, 1941.
Zinn, Francis T., July 9, 1941.
Wenzel, Ralph E., July 11, 1941.
Hewitt, Robert T., July 8, 1941.
Smith, Robert R., July 11, 1941.
Diamond, Murray A., July 19, 1941.
Kiesselbach, Max R., July 9, 1941.
Price, Frank L., July 7, 1941.
Williamson, Weldon A., July 11, 1941.
Wright, Robert D., July 25, 1941.
Christensen, Aaron W., July 8, 1941.
Guthrie, Nobel W., July 4, 1941.
Love, Albert G., Jr., July 7, 1941.
Turner, John P., July 1, 1941.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States to be captains (Engineering), to rank as such from June 1, 1941:

Commander (Engineering) Benjamin C. Thorn.

Commander (Engineering) Milton R. Daniels.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Maj. George Good Cressey, Air Corps.

NOTE.—The date of rank is omitted, as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the date of rank and necessitate the renomination of this officer.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Commander Harold J. Nelson to be a captain in the Navy to rank from the 1st day of May 1941.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Lucian A. Moebus, January 1, 1941.
Roy C. Hudson, January 1, 1941.
Oswald S. Colclough, January 1, 1941.
Lyman A. Thackrey, January 1, 1941.
Thomas L. Wattles, February 1, 1941.
Carroll L. Tyler, April 1, 1941.
Carleton C. Champion, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Mark H. Crouter, April 1, 1941.
Douglass P. Johnson, April 1, 1941.
Paul S. Slawson, April 1, 1941.
Joseph U. Lademan, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Valentine M. Davis, April 1, 1941.
John M. Thornton, April 1, 1941.
George D. Morrison, April 1, 1941.
Charles F. Grisham, April 1, 1941.
William M. McDade, April 1, 1941.
Joseph H. Seyfried, April 1, 1941.
Clarence F. Swanson, April 1, 1941.
Chester L. Walton, April 1, 1941.
James B. Donnelly, April 1, 1941.
Thomas B. Brittain, April 1, 1941.
Robert W. Bockius, April 1, 1941.
Winfield S. Cunningham, April 1, 1941.
Carroll T. Bonney, April 1, 1941.
George W. Mead, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Neill D. Brantly, April 1, 1941.
Charles D. Murphey, April 1, 1941.
Philip R. Kinney, April 1, 1941.
Jewett P. Moncure, April 1, 1941.
Richard P. Glass, May 1, 1941.
John V. McElduff, May 1, 1941.
Joseph J. Rochefort, May 1, 1941.
Herbert C. Behner, May 1, 1941.
Roland E. Krause, May 1, 1941.
Campbell Keene, May 1, 1941.
Nolan M. Kindell, May 1, 1941.
Edward E. Dolecek, May 1, 1941.
Delbert L. Conley, May 1, 1941.

Nathan W. Bard, May 1, 1941.
Harold J. McNulty, May 1, 1941.
Francis A. Packer, May 1, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Barron G. Lowrey, December 16, 1940.
Kenneth Craig, January 1, 1941.
Charles T. Singleton, Jr., January 1, 1941.
Laurence H. Frost, January 1, 1941.
Malcolm A. Hufty, March 1, 1941.
Louis M. LeHardy, April 1, 1941.
Louis E. Gunther, April 1, 1941.
Walter B. Davidson, April 1, 1941.
Thompson F. Fowler, April 1, 1941.
Clarence E. Gregerson, April 1, 1941.
Edward D. Crowley, April 1, 1941.
Paul B. Tuzo, Jr., April 1, 1941.
George P. Biggs, April 1, 1941.
Ernest J. Davis, April 1, 1941.
Frank L. Durnell, April 1, 1941.
Alfred J. Benz, April 1, 1941.
William K. Rhodes, April 1, 1941.
Winthrop E. Terry, April 1, 1941.
John C. Hammock, April 1, 1941.
Robert B. Goldman, April 1, 1941.
Walter J. Whipple, April 1, 1941.
Herald F. Stout, April 1, 1941.
Wesley A. Wright, April 1, 1941.
Frederick A. Davisson, April 1, 1941.
Allen M. Kemper, April 1, 1941.
Harper D. Scrymgeour, April 1, 1941.
Vilhelm K. Busck, April 1, 1941.
Justus R. Armstrong, April 1, 1941.
Nathaniel C. Barker, April 1, 1941.
Algernon S. Joyner, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Royal Lovell, April 1, 1941.
Ramond C. Ericson, April 1, 1941.
Harold A. Fravel, April 1, 1941.
Henry D. Rozendal, April 1, 1941.
Doir C. Johnson, April 1, 1941.
Edwin S. Schanze, May 1, 1941.
Douglas V. Gladding, May 1, 1941.
Henry E. Bernstein, May 1, 1941.
Theodore W. Rimer, May 1, 1941.
Earl K. Olsen, May 1, 1941.
John K. Wells, May 1, 1941.
Hubert E. Strange, May 1, 1941.
Daniel J. Sweeney, May 1, 1941.
Orville K. O'Daniel, May 1, 1941.
Morton K. Fleming, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Erasmus W. Armentrout, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Diggs Logan, May 1, 1941.
Frederick C. Stelter, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Louis Shane, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Otho P. Smoot, May 1, 1941.
Thomas F. Conley, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Thomas R. Langley, May 1, 1941.
James N. Shofner, May 1, 1941.
Guy B. Helmick, May 1, 1941.
Robert R. DeWolfe, May 1, 1941.
Wallace J. Miller, June 1, 1941.
August W. Lentz, June 3, 1941.
Clifford T. Corbin, June 3, 1941.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John Shannon, December 16, 1940.
Benjamin B. Cheatham, January 1, 1941.
Thomas H. Ward, February 1, 1941.
George O. Klinsmann, February 17, 1941.
Bernard M. Strean, April 1, 1941.
Paul Masterton, April 1, 1941.
Laurence H. Marks, April 1, 1941.
Robert A. Macpherson, April 1, 1941.
John A. Gamon, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Clayton L. Miller, April 1, 1941.
Francis J. Smedley, April 1, 1941.
Bertram J. Prueher, April 1, 1941.
George D. Roullard, April 1, 1941.
William W. R. Macdonald, April 1, 1941.
Thomas V. Peters, April 1, 1941.
Carlton B. Jones, April 1, 1941.
James J. Vaughan, April 1, 1941.
John J. McCormack, Jr., April 1, 1941.
Edward P. Jackson, May 1, 1941.
Herbert E. Fulmer, Jr., May 1, 1941.
Fitzhugh McMaster, May 1, 1941.
Robert S. Camera, June 3, 1941.

Medical Inspector Rolland R. Gasser to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1940.

Dental Surgeon Everett K. Patton to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of captain, to rank from the 1st day of July 1940.

The following-named paymasters to be pay inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1940:

Stephen E. Smith
Cornelius A. Brinkmann
Ellory F. Carr

Passed Assistant Paymaster Mark W. Clay to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 1st day of February 1941, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939:

Henry P. Adams
Samuel J. Major
George E. Moore 2d
John C. Pennell
Thomas H. Bell
Benhardt B. Fischer
John M. Gor
Daniel J. Carrison
Robert C. Dexter, Jr.
Jesse S. Claypoole, Jr.
Earl E. Carlsten
William H. Williams
William H. Seed
Francis B. Grubb
Nathaniel W. James 3d
George W. Netts
Herman Spector
Raphael A. Zoeller
Frederic W. Corle
Lawrence Lovig, Jr.
John G. Beard, Jr.
Rex W. Warner

Pay Clerk Edward J. Hagen to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 2d day of April 1941.

Carpenter Carl J. Kalb to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January 1941.

The following-named commanders to be commanders in the Navy, from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Raymond D. Tarbuck, January 1, 1941.
Carlton R. Todd, February 1, 1941.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 7th day of February 1941:

Victor A. Moitoret
Joseph F. Zawacki, Jr.
William D. Owen, Jr.
David S. Moore
Josiah B. Henneberger

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 16 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

John J. Dempsey to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Luther Harr to be Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious Heavenly Father, Thou hast brought us to the light of a new day, and as we face its challenging duties and demands, may we have a clear vision of Thy divine will and purpose.

May Thy special blessing rest upon our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress as they seek to direct the course of our Nation toward a fuller measure of happiness for all. We pray that we may be sane and practical idealists, steadfastly keeping our eyes on the stars and our feet upon the ground, never allowing the spiritual values to become eclipsed.

Grant that the clarion calls, to which we are supremely and courageously responding, may be those of an all out for God and His Kingdom, an all out for a more Christlike way of life, an all out for truth and righteousness, an all out for struggling and suffering humanity.

In the name of the Christ, our Saviour, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 13, 1941, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a pledge by college women and a letter from President John M. Wood, of Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON]?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM E. THOMAS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of William E. Thomas, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. McGEHEE, RAMSPECK, and THOMAS of New Jersey.

MARGARET M. CUTTS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. McGEHEE, RAMSPECK, and THOMAS of New Jersey.

BERT AND MARIE FREEMAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1933) for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman,

with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR GOSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 859) for the elief of Arthur Gose, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, these bills have all been passed by the House?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes; and the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what does the amendment do?

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps" and insert "not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman, what is the meaning of the amendment?

Mr. McGEHEE. The original bill provided that the money should be paid from the appropriation made for the C. C. C. This amendment makes it payable out of the Treasury.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, instead of taking it from the C. C. C. appropriation it is taken out of the General Treasury?

Mr. McGEHEE. Money for all claims is provided from the Treasury and not from the department affected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The mistake was made in the first place?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money is involved?

Mr. McGEHEE. Five hundred dollars.

Mr. RICH. What do you mean by the words "not otherwise appropriated"?

Mr. McGEHEE. That means from the Treasury.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean we are going to be able to get $500 out of the Treasury?

Mr. McGEHEE. Why, we are getting billions today, so I guess there is $500 there.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is going to run up against the greatest stone wall some of these days he has ever known when he thinks we are going to get even $1 out of the Treasury, because the Treasury will be busted.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. R. LEE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 188) for the relief of Maj. R. Lee, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$740.94" and insert "$790.44."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. R. LARKIN AND DORA LARKIN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4064) for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, after "authorized", insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall accord recognition to any valid assignment executed by W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin to the Fort Hall Water Users' Association of all or any part of the amount herein authorized for payment to them."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. AND ROBERT W. GILLESPIE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1976) for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Hon. Julian P. Alexander, of the State of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE LATE M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Committee on Patents with reference to our late colleague, Hon. M. Michael Edelstein, who passed away here in the House a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, a Representative from the State of New York and a member of this committee.

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents record its appreciation of the diligent and faithful services of the late Representative of the Fourteenth Congressional District of New York.

Resolved, That the Chairman of the Committee on Patents is hereby authorized to request that a copy of this resolution be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Resolved, That the clerk of the Committee on Patents is hereby directed to make this resolution a part of the committee records and to transmit a copy of it to the family of the deceased.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the reading of the Journal and such other business as has a prior right, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin entitled "U. S. O. Means Your Opportunity to Serve."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, every loyal American faces a responsibility in this present emergency. Each of us will have his or her chance to serve.

The United States Service Organizations for National Defense offer, such an opportunity.

Under the draft, young men have been moved from their homes to distant places. They find themselves among strange scenes and surrounded by strange faces.

They desire comradeship and companionship.

On June 7, 1941, an editorial on this subject appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin. I am extending this editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope the subscribers of the RECORD throughout the Nation will read this article and tell their friends about it, with the idea of cooperating in every way.

Let us dedicate ourselves wholeheartedly and unselfishly to helping our boys.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain correspondence between the Secretary of the Navy and myself with reference to the procurement of naval aircraft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST COLORED WORKERS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I note in this morning's paper that the President has made an appeal to industries engaged in filling defense orders to discontinue flagrant discriminating against colored people in employment on national defense.

In that connection, may I say that on March 24 of this year I introduced a bill, H. R. 4149, asking for just about that. When the draft was instituted we did not turn colored people away because of their color. I believe that the discrimination that has taken place in national-defense employment against colored people is probably the most un-American of the un-American activities that are going on in this country at the present time.

Such investigation as I have made convinces me that this discrimination is most flagrant in the airplane industry. It seems to me that there is no sound reason for this. Colored men, and colored women, for that matter, are, I believe, taken by and large possessed of sufficient mental capacity and manual skill and dexterity to qualify, after a reasonable period of training, for jobs in our defense industries.

The industries are constantly training young men and women. One big aircraft plant on the west coast is said to be taking into training 500 young people per week. Surely, a fair percentage of alert, well-educated young colored people should be given at least a chance to prove their capacity.

If our national morale is to be strengthened on all fronts, the sooner this discrimination against colored people is stopped, the better it will be for the unity of this great Nation in this hour of turmoil, peril, and uncertainty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during the present week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF STRIKERS AT NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION CO. PLANT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, chickens always come home to roost. In Friday morning's Washington Post we saw that the subversive strikers at the North American Aviation Co. plant in California were going to be able to collect their pay under the National Labor Relations Act for the time they were out on strike. This payment will come out of the Government of the United States. Is it not a tragic situation that we have so balled up our legislative procedure that such a thing is possible? Do you not think something ought to be done to stop this sort of thing and head it off before our Government is mulcted in that way?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects—in one extension to include an editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News with reference to strikes in California, and in the other to include a speech I made on the same subject on June 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEAVY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1942

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I am extending in the RECORD today my remarks on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1942 and make particular reference to the subject of reclamation. The conference report on this bill will be filed today. I urge every Member of the Congress, and particularly do I urge those from the 17 Western States, comprising one-half the area of this Nation, to give careful attention to the conference report. In my remarks I have stated certain current facts relative to the reclamation program that we all need to possess in order to wisely vote on the conference report.

I have tried to state concisely and clearly these facts that justify many of the changes that were made in this appropriation bill when it came from the other body and that will appear in the conference report. I only take this time to call the attention of the House to the more extended statement which I have placed in the RECORD, and I urge you to become familiar with the situation as I have stated it in my remarks. I am sure if this is done, the work of the House conferees will secure your speedy approval.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an argument which came to my attention with reference to an increase in the Federal tax on gasoline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I made last night over the Columbia network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OIL-SHORTAGE REMEDY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks and to include therein a suggestion by former Governor Landon as to how the so-called oil shortage may be remedied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 11, the Office of Production Management issued a release which reads as follows:

> William S. Knudsen, Director General, Office of Production Management, today announced that O. P. M. has formally approved the St. Lawrence waterway project as part of the all-out defense effort. The approval covered both waterway and electric-power phases of the project.

This approval was the result of considered deliberation and formal action taken by the council of the Office of Production Management, which is made up of Mr. Knudsen, Mr. Hillman, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of Navy Knox. It seems to me that this approval is the complete answer to

opponents of the project who say that building it would divert men, money, and materials from our defense effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief extract from a report filed by the St. Louis Bar Association with reference to an additional judge in the eastern district of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave a program on the radio last night in which I participated. I ask unanimous consent to insert the program of that meeting in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I asked unanimous consent to insert certain matter in the RECORD. I find that it is too long, and I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $120. I renew my request to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter received by me protesting about the shipment of oil to Japan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE MUHLENBERG FAMILY

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to place in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter I have received from the Reverend Paul H. Krauss, chairman of the executive board of the United Lutheran Church of America, concerning plans for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the arrival on American shores of the famous Muhlenberg family.

In connection with the observance of this celebration, to be held in 1942, the United Lutheran Church is anxious to obtain the issuance of a special Muhlenberg anniversary stamp.

This project deserves the loyal support of every Member of this body, particularly in view of the fact that the first Speaker of the House of Representatives was Frederick A. Muhlenberg, son of the distinguished Henry Muhlenberg whose statue occupies an honored place in Statuary Hall.

You can make your support effective by addressing letters to the President and the Postmaster General, recommending the immediate approval of this worthy and patriotic suggestion. I urge each of you to do so at once.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired, and the Chair suggests that the letter the gentleman referred to is improper to insert at this point in the RECORD and suggests that it be extended in the Appendix.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SURVIVORS OF STEAMSHIP "ROBIN MOOR"

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the New York Times there appeared an advertisement consisting of something like two-thirds of a page, signed by a group of people in the United States, taking the President of the United States to task for not plunging the United States into war over the sinking of the steamship *Robin Moor*. The President and the Secretary of State have been diligent in securing information on the sinking of this vessel. This morning there comes from London this report:

> The surviving 35 missing passengers and crew of the torpedoed merchant freighter *Robin Moor* were landed at Capetown today, according to a dispatch from the South African city.

That just shows that, in this day of hysteria, in this day of unrest, in this day of propaganda and confusion, how necessary it is to stop the effort of these pressure groups to intimidate the President of the United States or to intimidate the Congress of the United States into plunging this country into the European war. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

WOODEN SHIPS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a Flag Day address which I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

KEEP OUT OF WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and I agree, certainly not on Government ownership of public utilities, but we certainly do agree on the fact that we want to keep this country from getting into war. The first thing you hear when you waken in the morning is that Great Britain wants America to come in and help save them from defeat by sending materials and men. I do not want to see anything happen to Great Britain. I do not want to see anything happen that is wrong to any nation, certainly first of all to America. I want this country to do everything within its power to keep this country from becoming entangled in this war so that we will not have to send any boys abroad. It will wreck us if we do. America will have to carry the load and prosecute the war in Europe. This I am opposed to. Why? Because I love the United States more than any other country.

We must be very careful what is happening at the present moment that we are not drawn into this war. It is the end of American democracy; it is the end of American liberty if we permit any country to entice the people here to get us into this conflict.

I hope that Congress does everything to aid and assist in keeping out of war. It is your duty. It is your responsibility to keep America out of war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PLUMAS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 1595, to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF REGULAR ARMY AND PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2277, to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an enlisted man of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts who has had less than 20 years of service in the military forces of the United States and who has become permanently incapacitated for active service shall be discharged: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting the right of an enlisted man discharged hereunder to receive such pension and other benefits as may now or hereafter be accorded by law to disabled former soldiers of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts.

SEC. 2. An enlisted man of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts who has served 20 years or more in the military forces of the United States and who has become permanently incapacitated for active service due to physical disability incurred in line of duty shall be placed on the retired list.

SEC. 3. When an enlisted man is placed on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of the next preceding section he shall receive 75 percent of the pay he was receiving immediately prior to his retirement plus a money allowance of $9.50 per month in lieu of

rations and clothing and $6.25 per month in lieu of quarters, fuel, and light: *Provided*, That the money allowances of enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts placed on the retired list under this act shall be the same as those heretofore or from time to time hereafter prescribed by the Secretary of War under existing law for enlisted men of that organization retired after 30 years of service.

SEC. 4. Where an enlisted man placed on the retired list under this act or under any provision of law would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, if he were not receiving retired pay, he may waive receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving such pension or compensation; and thereafter such retired enlisted man may waive receipt of such pension or compensation for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances. To prevent concurrent payments, when waiver of receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation is filed in the War Department that Department shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver and the effective date of the stoppage of retired pay and allowances. Similar report to the War Department shall be rendered by the Veterans' Administration, when waiver of receipt of pension or compensation is filed in the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances.

SEC. 5. All periods of service which are now counted under provisions of existing law in computing the time necessary to enable an enlisted man to retire upon completion of 30 years of service shall be credited in the computation of the 20 years of service necessary to confer eligibility for retirement hereunder.

SEC. 6. The administration of this act shall be under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "the", insert the word "average", and in line 13, after the word "receiving", strike out the word "immediately" and insert "for 6 months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 239, a similar bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an enlisted man of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts who has had less than 20 years of service in the military forces of the United States, and who has become permanently incapacitated for active service shall be discharged: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting the right of an enlisted man discharged hereunder to receive such pension and other benefits as may now or hereafter be accorded by law to disabled former soldiers of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts.

SEC. 2. An enlisted man of the Regular Army or of the Philippine Scouts who has served 20 years or more in the military forces of the United States and who has become permanently incapacitated for active service due to physical disability incurred in line of duty shall be placed on the retired list.

SEC. 3. When an enlisted man is placed on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of the next preceding section he shall receive 75 percent of the pay he was receiving immediately prior to his retirement plus a money allowance of $9.50 per month in lieu of rations and clothing and $6.25 per month in lieu of quarters, fuel, and light: *Provided*, That the money allowances of enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts placed on the retired list under this act shall be the same as those heretofore or from time to time hereafter prescribed by the Secretary of War under existing law for enlisted men of that organization retired after 30 years of service.

SEC. 4. Where an enlisted man placed on the retired list under this act or under any provision of law would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, if he were not receiving retired pay, he may waive receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving such pension or compensation; and thereafter such retired enlisted man may waive receipt of such pension or compensation for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances. To prevent concurrent payments, when waiver of receipt of retired pay and allowances for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation is filed in the War Department that Department shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver and the effective date of the stoppage of retired pay and allowances. Similar report to the War Department shall be rendered by the Veterans' Administration, when waiver of receipt of pension or compensation is filed in the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of receiving retired pay and allowances.

SEC. 5. All periods of service which are now counted under provisions of existing law in computing the time necessary to enable an enlisted man to retire upon completion of 30 years of service shall be credited in the computation of the 20 years of service necessary to confer eligibility for retirement hereunder.

SEC. 6. The administration of this act shall be under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to make the Senate bill conform to the House bill?

Mr. GORE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 9, after the word "the", insert "average."

On page 2 of the Senate bill, after the word "receiving", strike out the word "immediately" and insert "for 6 months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2277) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS AND ELECTION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 145, to change the time of the appointment of Presidential electors and the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER NEAR DUBUQUE, IOWA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2811, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill., under authority of the act approved July 18, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC CORPORATE AUTHORITY TO UNDERTAKE SLUM CLEARANCE IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 93, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska may create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income within the Territory.

SEC. 2. The Legislature of the Territory of Alaska may provide for the appointment and terms of the commissioners of such authority and for the powers of such authority, except that such authority shall not be given any power of taxation, nor any power to pledge the faith of the people of the Territory for any loan whatever.

SEC. 3. The Legislature of the Territory of Alaska may authorize such authority to issue bonds or other obligations with such security and in such manner as the legislature may provide, except as provided in this act. Such bonds and other obligations shall not be a debt of the Territory of Alaska or any political or municipal corporation or other subdivision of the Territory other than such authority; and such bonds and other obligations shall not constitute a debt, indebtedness, or the borrowing of money within the meaning of any limitation or restriction on the issuance of bonds or other obligations contained in the laws of the United States applicable to the Territory of Alaska or any political or municipal corporation or other subdivision of the Territory.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "income", insert "and for persons (and their families) engaged in national-defense activities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NATIONAL MONUMENT IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2675, to permit mining within the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. ANGELL objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That does not mean that the bill is recommitted to the committee

The SPEAKER. No. The bill is stricken from this calendar only. The Clerk will call the next bill.

DISPOSITION OF TRUST OF INDIANS DYING INTESTATE WITHOUT HEIRS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4533, to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may state that I have an amendment at the desk which has been submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which I intend to offer if the bill is considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon final determination by the Secretary of the Interior that the Indian holder of a trust or restricted allotment of lands or an interest therein has died intestate without heirs, the lands or interest so owned, together with all accumulated rents, issues, and profits therefrom held in trust for the decedent, shall escheat to the tribe owning the land at the time of allotment.

If the tribe which owned the land at the time of allotment has been reorganized or reconstituted by reason of amalgamation with another tribe or group of Indians or of subdivision within the tribe or otherwise, the land shall escheat to the tribe or group which has succeeded to the jurisdiction of the original tribe over the area in question. If neither the tribe which owned the land at the time of allotment nor a successor tribe or group exists, the land or interest therein shall be held in trust for such Indians as the Secretary may designate within the State or States wherein the land is situated or, if the Secretary determines that the land cannot appropriately be used by or for such Indians, it shall be sold and the proceeds of such sale shall be held in trust for such Indians as the Secretary may designate, within the State or States wherein the land is situated.

SEC. 2. If an Indian found to have died intestate without heirs was the holder of a restricted allotment or homestead or interest therein on the public domain, the land or interest therein and all accumulated rents, issues, and profits therefrom shall escheat to the United States and the land shall become part of the public domain: *Provided*, That if the Secretary determines that the land involved lies within or adjacent to an Indian community and may be advantageously used for Indian purposes, the land or interest therein shall escheat to the United States to be held in trust for such needy Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, where the value of the estate does not exceed $2,000, and in case of estates exceeding said sum, such estates shall be held in trust by the United States for such Indians as the Congress may hereafter designate.

SEC. 3. The proviso in section 12 of an act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855, 858), is hereby repealed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 1, after line 9, and on page 2, line 20, after the word "domain", insert "subject to the payment of such creditors' claims as the Secretary of the Interior may find proper to be paid from the cash on hand or income accruing to such estate."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OIL AND GAS LEASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1817, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Utah inform us what this bill does?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This bill simply puts into operation a settlement that has been made between the various departments and the people interested in these oil lands. They have been attempting to make an agreement with reference to this matter for a number of years. This simply puts that agreement into operation.

Mr. RICH. Has the Secretary the power now? Does it give him greater power to lease Government land for oil?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It does not give the Secretary any additional general powers.

Mr. RICH. The reason I bring that to the attention of the gentleman from Utah is because of the fact that today the Secretary is permitting 42,000 barrels of oil, 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, and 3,500 barrels of machine oil to be shipped to Japan. It would seem to me if the Administration wanted to conserve our oil and gasoline they would stop shipping it out of the country to a place where it might eventually be used against us.

Let me express the hope also that the gentleman will recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that he stop this practice. I have already done so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be interested to know that this bill permits a settlement agreement to go into effect which will enable the United States Government to collect oil royalties on certain lands which it otherwise could not collect without litigation.

Mr. RICH. I want the Government to collect royalties wherever it can, but I want the Government also to conserve our oil resources. To ship this natural resource out of the country, particularly to Japan, is absolutely inconsistent; but it is the way the administration handles its affairs. It is simply ridiculous.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he cannot buy oil and gas in this country he go to Canada, because I understand we are shipping plenty of oil to Canada and the Canadians are advertising in their newspapers and in ours, too, for American tourists to come to Canada, that they will guarantee them all the oil and gas they want.

Mr. RICH. This administration talks about conservation. Why does it not act?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise me whether this bill grants the Secretary of the Interior powers that are continuing that would give him any arbitrary decisions in the making of settlements?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. My understanding is that it does not.

Mr. BOREN. Specifically, what is involved?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The only land involved in this bill is about 1,600 acres of land located in Wyoming.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from Utah that what seems to be worrying some of our friends on the other side is the memory of Teapot Dome. This is not a Teapot Dome affair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it certainly is not.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman from Mississippi wants to do what he said he did, keep out of war and protect this country's interest, does he not think we ought to stop sending gasoline and oil to Japan, by whom it may be used against us? That would be worse than Teapot Dome.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Nothing could be worse than Teapot Dome in the way of domestic scandal and the diversion of public resources.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue leases under the provisions of section 19 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, except as otherwise provided in this act, covering lands within the area in Niobrara County, Wyo., described as follows:

Southwest quarter section 25; south half section 26; southeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter section 27; east half section 34; north half and southeast quarter section 35, all the foregoing in township 36 north, range 65 west, of the sixth principal meridian, and west half northeast quarter section 28, township 36 north, range 64 west, of the sixth principal meridian.

Such leases shall be issued to the respective oil and gas operators in possession of lands within the area described above on and prior to January 1, 1940, under placer-mining claims initiated prior to October 16, 1918. Each lease shall be dated as of January 1, 1940, and shall be for a term of 10 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Each lease shall reserve as royalty to the United States 12½

percent of all the oil and gas produced except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost. No lease shall issue unless (1) an application for lease be made within 6 months from the effective date of this act; (2) the application covers all of the lands in the possession of the applicant within the area described above; (3) the applicant shows aggregate expenditures prior to January 1, 1940, by the applicant and his predecessors in interest of not less than $10,000 on or for the benefit of each claim upon which the application is based; and (4) the applicant shall pay to the United States as royalty 4 cents per barrel for all oil and one-fourth cent per 1,000 cubic feet for all gas produced from the claim prior to January 1, 1940, except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, insert a comma after the words "southeast quarter."

Page 2, line 8, after the figures "1918", strike out the period and insert the following: "and shall inure to the benefit of all parties having contracts with the lessees or operators under such placer-mining claims as their interests may appear."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ISSUE OIL AND GAS LEASE ON CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 178, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, No. 127 on the calendar is exactly the same as 126. Does the gentleman wish to substitute 127 for 126? There is no need of passing two bills.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The Senate bill is the one that we should pass. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 1817 was passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill S. 178?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue leases under the provisions of section 19 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, except as otherwise provided in this act, covering lands within the area in Niobrara County, Wyo., described as follows:

Southwest quarter section 25; south half section 26; southeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter section 27; east half section 34; north half and southeast quarter section 35, all the foregoing in township 36 north, range 65 west, of the sixth principal meridian, and west half northeast quarter section 28, township 36 north, range 64 west, of the sixth principal meridian.

Such leases shall be issued to the respective oil and gas operators in possession of lands within the area described above on and prior to January 1, 1940, under placer-mining claims initiated prior to October 16, 1918, and shall inure to the benefit of all parties having contracts with the lessees or operators under such placer-mining claims as their interests may appear. Each lease shall be dated as of January 1, 1940, and shall be for a term of 10 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. Each lease shall reserve as royalty to the United States 12½ percent of all the oil and gas produced except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost. No lease shall issue unless (1) an application for lease be made within 6 months from the effective date of this act; (2) the application covers all of the lands in the possession of the applicant within the area described above; (3) the applicant shows aggregate expenditures prior to January 1, 1940, by the applicant and his predecessors in interest of not less than $10,000 on or for the benefit of each claim upon which the application is based; and (4) the applicant shall pay to the United States as royalty 4 cents per barrel for all oil and one-fourth cent per thousand cubic feet for all gas produced from the claim prior to January 1, 1940, except oil or gas used for production purposes or unavoidably lost.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, strike out "month" and insert the word "months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1817) was laid on the table.

PREVENTING PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4784, to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important amendment to the law which has to do with keeping secret inventions primarily useful for national defense. It is strongly urged by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Justice. It was passed over without prejudice 2 weeks ago.

It is most important that this bill be enacted into law. It has been unanimously reported by the Patents Committee, or by every member who was present at the hearings. It has been unanimously recommended to us by the various departments concerned. The representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and Justice Department appeared before the committee.

It is important that these inventions that are primarily useful for national defense be not permitted to be sent to foreign countries in order that applications may be made in those countries for patents. It is a matter of such vital importance and so strongly recommended, from the angle of our national defense, that I hope there will be no further delay in the passage of this bill.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman says was true at the time this bill was introduced, but shortly thereafter the President of the United States issued a proclamation to set up an agency which did, far more efficiently and more practically, the very thing they are trying to do by this bill that it is my contention this bill is unnecessary at the present time. It will destroy an existing agency that is doing the work better than could be done under this bill; therefore I ask that until the gentleman and myself have a chance to thoroughly thrash this matter out that it be passed over. I will be glad to confer with the gentleman, and I believe we can, with a simple amendment, coordinate these two agencies to the end that we will have a stronger bill and a stronger agency than the agency which the gentleman now suggests.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman has reference to the Bureau of Import and Export Control?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. That is true.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman is incorrect in his statement that it was placed in operation after the committee gave consideration to this bill. I will say further that the chairman of the committee and myself, 3 or 4 weeks ago, had a conference with representatives from the Bureau of Import and Export Control, and we were satisfied, in view of the fact that that Bureau has to do with many things besides patents, and this bill concerns patents exclusively, that any possible kinks in administration could be ironed out through conferences. We requested that they confer with the War Department the Navy Department, and the Department of Justice, as well as the Patent Office in this regard. We have heard nothing further from them from that time until this. May I say further that in the Patent Office the Army and the Navy have a force of experts who go over these applications for patents to determine what ones are primarily useful for national defense in order that they may be kept secret. We have set up this machinery in established institutions of the Government that have been going on for 150 years and I think that is the place to repose the authority.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman spoke about eliminating a bureau. Would this bill do that?

Mr. LANHAM. No; it would not. Nor would it add one. The Bureau of Import and Export Control has charge, through Executive order, of many items that are considered for importation or exportation. This measure has to do solely with patents on inventions made in the United States.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman spoke about that, I cannot help but recall that in 1932 the President said he would eliminate bureaus. During the last 8 years, instead of eliminating bureaus, he has established more bureaus in the country than any 10 Presidents have established. We are getting top-heavy,

and we want to eliminate one or two of them.

Mr. LANHAM. We want to get this through, because it is recommended for our defense by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Justice, which have been recognized institutions of the Government for 150 years.

Mr. RICH. We ought to eliminate some bureaus that are now making the Government top-heavy so that we do not swamp things.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. If the House passes this bill as written today it will require every man who has an invention to get a permit from two sources, not one. In passing this bill you are going to set up a confusing situation.

Mr. RICH. We are not going to permit you by unanimous consent to establish any more bureaus. You have enough, and it is about time you stopped.

Mr. LANHAM. May I repeat in that regard that the information the gentleman from New York has received is evidently incorrect. This bill requires the establishment of no new bureau. The War Department and the Navy Department have now, and have had for years, their forces working with the Patent Office on these inventions, and they are the very same ones who will continue to investigate them and determine which ones are primarily useful for national defense.

Mr. RICH. That statement is authentic, then, and we can count on the fact that no new bureaus are to be established under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. No bureaus whatever are to be established, and there was no such testimony before our committee, and no intimation of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am reluctant to engage in this discussion because, as recently as 9 o'clock last night, information came before me that indicated that this bill should receive some study, and I have not had an opportunity to give that study. It seems that the matter of control of the export of patent information is one which at one time was under the control of the State Department, and now, as the gentleman from New York has said, is under the control of a bureau or division set up in the War Department under General Maxwell by Executive order. Under this Executive order this control, which was formerly in the State Department, is now being exercised by the War Department. The control is exercised by the War Department from the standpoint of national defense.

It seems also that the Patent Office would like to have this work transferred there, inasmuch as it deals with patents. I am told that the decisions are all cleared through the Patent Office to be sure that patent rights are observed, but that, as long as the final word remains with the War Department, the primary consideration in the granting of permits for the export of patent information will be whether or not military secrets are involved. It is felt by the persons with whom I was talking that it is best to have the War Department continue. I am not convinced in my own mind that that would be true under all circumstances, but at least there is ground for considering that point in these times. It was further suggested that the businessmen of the country who have patents or are interested in them are still addressing themselves to the State Department on this subject, that at least half of such mail that comes before the War Department is addressed to the State Department, and that to transfer this work again to the Patent Office would create a third source of confusion. Hence, in the interest of efficiency, at least during the emergency, it might be well to leave this work with the War Department.

With these questions raised, I hope the gentleman from New York will insist on his request that the bill be passed over without prejudice until the matter can be thoroughly worked out.

Mr. SCHULTE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1073, to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a rule has been granted on this bill, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HULAH DAM, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3936, in aid of the construction of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project, Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAM). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. DISNEY) will explain the bill.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Hulah Dam is one of four that the Army engineers propose to build this year under authorization heretofore passed by the House and appropriations heretofore made. The dam is located in the Osage Reservation. The Osage Indians own the oil and gas rights in common. This dam will inundate several thousand acres of land in that area. There is a comparatively small amount of oil under the land that will be inundated. This bill provides a means by which the Army engineers may acquire the right-of-way, which includes payment for the oil and gas rights.

Mr. SCHULTE. Is this dam a part of the chain to which the Governor of Oklahoma is objecting ?

Mr. DISNEY. No; it has no relation whatever to that.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will it be necessary for the Government to pay these Indians for the oil in the land that is covered by this water?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; as any other right-of-way.

The other day an inquiry was propounded when this bill was before the House as to what the damage would be. I said it would be relatively small. A report has been made to the Secretary of the Interior by a special committee that estimates this amount as larger than it was understood it would be, but this report is not binding on him. A new report should be made because the first was made on an erroneous theory, that is, that the oil should be paid for in place. That is not the correct theory on which to adjust the damages. The Indians are entitled to the damage they sustain due to the additional cost of producing the oil in inundated land.

Mr. RICH. What is it estimated it will cost the Federal Government?

Mr. DISNEY. Under that report, the cost aproached $1,000,000, but the Army engineers will not pay that sum, so I am advised, and they will probably ask for a new report. The Army engineers think that damages will not run to more than a quarter of that sum, if that much.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to receive the benefit if the dam is constructed?

Mr. DISNEY. It is a flood-control dam.

Mr. RICH. It is for the benefit, also, of this Indian tribe, is it not?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, incidentally; and of the whole area.

Mr. RICH. Are they going to make a deduction of the benefits the Indians will receive?

Mr. DISNEY. That should be a part of the report and I am sure it will be.

Mr. RICH. How do we know that this is adjusted? Has it been before a committee?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. What committee has reported this bill?

Mr. DISNEY. The Committee on Indian Affairs. An identical bill has been passed by the Senate and is here, and if there is no objection to the present consideration of this bill I shall ask that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. RICH. Did any House committee have this bill under consideration?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. RICH. Have they passed on the bill unanimously?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. When I say "unanimously," of course, I do not know whether all the Members were present or not, but there was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Were there any dissenting votes in committee against the bill?

Mr. DISNEY. No.

Mr. RICH. It does not seem to me that we should permit to go through here by unanimous consent any bill as important as this, one that is going to require $1,000,000, without any definite determination of the cost.

Mr. DISNEY. There is where the gentleman is in error. It is not going to involve $1,000,000 because the Army engineers are not going to pay that amount.

Mr. RICH. How do we know that by the time the Indians put in their claim, if the matter has not been adjusted, the Army engineers will weaken and permit the Indians to get $1,000,000 or $2,000,000?

Mr. DISNEY. That is neither within the range of possibility nor plausibility. This matter will be handled just as the Army engineers handle all matters with respect to purchase of rights-of-way from citizens.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice until the next calendar day, so we may know definitely that the Army engineers and the Indians have come to a complete agreement.

Mr. DISNEY. There is no use doing that, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, because it is a matter of negotiation between the Army engineers and the Secretary of the Interior. This report, as I have stated, while it is in the nature of an official report, was based on a wrong theory, and a new report will have to be made for the engineers will not build the dam.

Mr. RICH. We have had dams built down in the Tennessee Valley where they brought in great claims for marble and all sorts of things to be covered by water in the dam and I do not think we ought to build the dam and give complete control and pay for everything that may be underneath the ground that is not determined before we make possible the authorization. It is not good business. This is no necessary to national defense.

Mr. DISNEY. I may say that the dam is not going to be built until these departments have arrived at a definite conclusion.

Mr. RICH. Let them arrive at the amount they are going to pay first, so we may know what we are doing.

Mr. DISNEY. This measure simply authorizes them to arrive at a conclusion, and even if the bill went over you would still have the same problem.

Mr. RICH. Why have they not authority now to reach a definite conclusion?

Mr. DISNEY. They would have to go to court and it may be of doubtful legality whether they can condemn these oil rights. This is simply permissive legislation.

Mr. RICH. It states here "in aid of the construction," and so forth.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Is there any provision in this bill to use pen stocks to develop power?

Mr. DISNEY. Hulah is not a power dam.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Would not that water develop power if properly conserved?

Mr. DISNEY. I doubt that seriously.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Was that gone into by the committee or does the gentleman know?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know whether that was gone into or not.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. So far as I am concerned, there is not any bill going through here providing for flood-control dams that would produce power unless there is provision for the pen stocks.

Mr. DISNEY. I may say to the gentleman, in answer to that, I am as much interested in power as he, in that area, as the gentleman knows, and this could not be worked out as a power dam. It could not be used for both power and flood control.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Then I withdraw any objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. As a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, it was my understanding that the cost would probably amount to what the Army engineers figured would be the difference in the cost of drilling and handling any oil under the water and the cost if the land were not submerged. Is not that true?

Mr. DISNEY. That is the correct theory, and this report already made, which I am talking about does not go on that theory and is an incorrect report. It will have to be changed or the dam will never be built.

Mr. BENNETT. May I inquire further how far this proposed dam is from the Grand River Dam, which does provide a vast amount of electricity?

Mr. DISNEY. A considerable district, and on a tributary of a tributary of the Arkansas River.

Mr. RICH. How deep will the water be in this dam?

Mr. DISNEY. Not over 60 or 65 feet.

Mr. RICH. Then the Government would be put to the extra cost of drilling under 60 or 65 feet of water.

Mr. DISNEY. Most of it will not be that deep. The difference in the cost of drilling in inundated territory and non-inundated territory can be scientifically arrived at. I hope the gentleman will not object, because this is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. RICH. It does not seem reasonable to pass this legislation at this time, and it ought to go over.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DISNEY. I shall have to object to that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

MISSION INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2308) to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a lease bearing date of December 8, 1939, between the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians of California and the city of Palm Springs, Calif., in the following words, is hereby ratified and confirmed:

This indenture of lease executed at Palm Springs, Calif., as of the 4th day of December 1939, by and between the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians of California, the party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as lessor, and the city of Palm Springs, a municipal corporation of the State of California, the party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as lessee, both of said parties being within the county of Riverside, State of California.

Witnesseth, that the lessor hereby leases to the lessee the land and premises in the city of Palm Springs, county of Riverside, State of California, described as section 18, Township 4 South, Range 5 East of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian, for a term of 25 years, beginning on the 1st day of January 1941 and ending on the 31st day of December 1965, for the rental for said premises for said term which the lessee agrees to pay to the lessor which shall be 10 percent of the gross receipts of the lessee for the use of said premises during said term, it being agreed, however, that the minimum rental which the lessee shall pay the lessor shall be the sum of $640 per annum, payable in advance on or before the 31st day of January of each year of the term of this lease, and that during the month of January 1942 and the month of January of each year thereafter of said term, the lessee shall furnish to the lessor a sworn statement of the gross receipts received by the lessee for the use of said premises for the preceding year, and on or before the 31st day of said month of January in each said year of the term of this lease the lessee shall pay to the lessor in addition to said sum of $640 an amount equal to 10 percent of the excess, if any, of said gross receipts over and above the sum of $6,400.

The term "gross receipts" as used herein for the purpose of calculating the amount of said rental is herein defined as being all sums of money received by the lessee for the use of said premises for the purposes herein specified during each annual period of the term of this lease.

Said demised premises shall be used by the lessee and its sublessees for public airport and other uses and purposes.

Upon the termination of this lease by surrender by the lessee or by dispossession of the lessee by the lessor or by any authority superior to the lessor, all rent and liabilities of the lessee accruing thereafter shall cease and the lessee may within a period of 60 days remove any and all improvements placed upon said premises during the term of said lease save and except buildings permanently affixed to the land, but, upon failure to remove same within that period, any improvements remaining thereon shall become the property of the Agua Caliente Band of Indians.

It is expressly understood and agreed by and between the parties hereto that the lessor does not assume any responsibility for damage caused, either directly or indirectly, by any operations of the lessee under this contract, and the lessee hereby agrees to hold the lessor harmless for any damage which may result from the operations of the lessee, or of its employees or agents under this lease, whether the acts causing such damage be negligent or otherwise.

The lessee must comply with all State, sanitary, health, and housing regulations.

The lessee agrees that it will not use, or permit to be used, any part of the premises for the manufacture, sale, gift, storage, or drinking of intoxicating liquor or beverages, so long as these are prohibited by law upon the demised premises.

This lease may be canceled by the lessor at the discretion of and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for failure of the lessee to comply with any of the terms thereof.

The rental herein required to be paid by the lessee to the lessor for the use of said premises during said term shall be paid to the legally authorized agent of the lessor entitled by law to receive the same and receipt therefor, and such payment shall be a full discharge of the lessee therefor.

It is agreed that the lessee may enter upon said premises immediately upon the lawful ratification and approval hereof, and prior to the beginning of said term for the purpose of improving and preparing said premises for use as an airport.

In witness whereof the parties hereunto have subscribed their names and affixed their seals as of the day first hereinabove mentioned. (Executed in quintuplicate—five copies.)

AGUA CALIENTE OR PALM SPRINGS BAND OF MISSION INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA.
(By) Willie Marcus Belardo, chairman; Lee Arenas, vice chairman; Lena C. Welmas, secretary; Juana S. Hatchitt, member of council; Clemente Segundo, member of council; Carrie Pierce Casero; Francisco Patencio; Viola J. Hatchitt; Frank Morro; John Joseph Andreas; John Joseph Patencio; John Anthony Andreas; Moreno Patencio; Ramon Manuel; Santos Albert Patencio; Eleteria Arenas Nicholson; Marcus J. Pete; Florida Patencio Roxey; Anna J. Pierce; Cecelia Patencio Roxey; Baristo Sol Santiago; Genevieve P. St. Marie; Virginia Patencio Siva; Ramalda Lugo Taylor; Augusta Patencio Torro; Matild Patencio Welmas; Frank Segundo.

CITY OF PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.,
By PHILIP L. BOYD, *Mayor*.
GUY PINNEY, *City Clerk*.

I, Clemente Segundo, hereby certify that all the persons named as signers on the lease of the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians for section 18, township 4 south, range 5 east, Riverside County, Calif., are all duly enrolled and qualified members of said band; that they have read or had read to them and interpreted to them said lease, made to the city of Palm Springs, Calif.; that they have expressed their understanding of the same and desire to have the same approved and put into effect for the mutual benefit of all, both the Indians and white residents of the said city. That the terms were explained and approved by all signers.

Witness my hand this 6th day of December 1939.

CLEMENTE SEGUNDO.

I, Lena Welmas, hereby certify that I am the acting secretary for the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians of California, and secretary of the acting council. That I certify that all the persons named as signers of the foregoing described lease are Indians qualified to sign the same, and that the said lease has been thoroughly discussed and read and explained, particularly to those who could not read or understand the English language. Particular care has been exercised to give a thorough explanation to those not understanding the English language. That I have personally seen to giving full explanations as to the same.

Witness my hand and seal this 6th day of December 1939 at Palm Springs, Calif.

LENA C. WELMAS.

Approved.

WILLIE MARCUS BELARDO,
Chairman.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "confirmed" and before the colon insert, the following: "subject, however, to the conditions stated in section 2 hereof."

On page 7, at the end of the bill, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. No assignment of the foregoing lease shall become effective until approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, and all revenues payable to the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians under the terms of said lease or any assignment thereof shall be remitted to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs reservation.

"The construction, maintenance, and operation of any airport on the land covered by said lease shall conform to such requirements as may be prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO NORFOLK & WESTERN RAILWAY, ROANOKE, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1421) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed, in consideration of $100, to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., the following-described property located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.:

All that certain strip or parcel of land situate in the county of Roanoke, State of Virginia, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point corner to lands of the Veterans' Administration and right-of-way of Roanoke terminal division of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., said point being north fifty-two degrees three minutes east twenty-six and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet from the center line of old west-bound main track of said railway at station 139 plus 47.4 also north fifty-two degrees three minutes east from the center line of present west-bound main track MP N-261 plus two thousand nine hundred and forty feet, more or less, as measured from Norfolk, Va.; thence with the northern line of said right-of-way northwestwardly about three hundred and fifty-six feet to a point radial to said center line of old west-bound main track at station 142 plus 91.3, said station being also in the center line of a culvert; thence through the lands of Veterans' Administration by a straight line eastwardly about three hundred and eighty-five feet to a point in an offset in said northern line of right-of-way; thence with said offset south fifty-two degrees three minutes west, crossing a rail monument at forty-three and six-tenths feet, a total distance of seventy feet to the point of beginning, containing two-tenths of an acre, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, STATE OF OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1420) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed title to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes to the following-described strips of land of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio:

PARCEL NO. 1

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5 east, Jefferson Township, and section 36, township 4, range 5 east, Madison Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land twenty-five feet in width west of and adjacent to the existing west right-of-way line of Gettysburg Avenue, extending from the north right-of-way line of Germantown Pike to the south right-of-way line of Eaton Pike, the west line of said tract being forty-five feet west of the east line of said sections and parallel thereto, containing two and five-tenths acres, more or less.

PARCEL NO. 2

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5 east, Jefferson Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land five feet in width north of and adjacent to the existing north line of the Dayton-Liberty Road, and extending from the north right-of-way line of the Germantown Pike to the east right-of-way line of Princeton Drive, the northern line of said tract being thirty-five feet north of the south line of said section and parallel thereto, containing three-tenths of an acre, more or less.

PARCEL NO. 3

Situated in section 1, township 3, range 5 east, Jefferson Township, and section 36, township 4, range 5 east, Madison Township, county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, being a tract of land ten feet in width east of and adjacent to the existing right-of-way line of Princeton Drive, and extending from the north right-of-way line of the Dayton-Liberty Road to the south right-of-way line of the Eaton Pike, the east line of said tract being thirty feet east of the west line of said sections and parallel thereto, containing one and three-tenths acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. Such grant shall be conditioned upon the approval by the proper authorities of the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, of an agreement to (a) move the one-story frame building (wash house), the two-story brick building, the reservoir, and the pump house, and fill in the gaps which removal of the buildings will leave in the fences, in accordance with specifications to be furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; (b) restore all areas within the reservation affected by this work as nearly as possible to their original condition, including any necessary sodding, all without expense to the United States. The deed authorized by this act shall contain express reservations that should the land cease to be used for highway purposes then all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to and revest in the United States, and such deed shall contain a covenant that title to the buildings and other improvements presently located on this property shall remain in the Government, and that when their removal becomes necessary for widening of the roadway they shall be moved therefrom and relocated at the expense of the county in accordance with specifications to be furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4692) relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration Facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves the disposition of personal property of deceased veterans. The bill has been on the calendar only a short time. It is rather complicated, and I feel it would be to the best interest of all to have the bill go over for another fortnight, so that more Members might have the opportunity to examine it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when this measure was before the Veterans' Affairs Committee we had the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs before us. The bill involves only personal property of veterans who die in veterans' facilities who have no living relatives whatsoever, who die intestate. A great many of them leave small amounts of personal property that the Veterans' Administration does not know what to do with. There is no objection to it from any veterans' organization.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The practice has been in vogue for many years, as far as soldiers' homes are concerned, and if this bill is enacted into law, the veteran when making application for hospitalization will simply agree to the disposition of his property in case of death and leaves no relatives.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The only possible conflict that could arise would be between the State and the Federal Government on the grounds that what little he leaves would escheat to the State, but it would probably cost the State more to handle it than it would be worth, nine times out of ten if not ninety-nine times out of a hundred.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I have a case involving only $140 in my district right now, consisting of a man's personal belongings.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This money is used for the benefit of the veterans in that particular institution. What little it brings is used for their benefit.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not discussing the merits of the bill at all.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The bill was before the committee and was gone into quite thoroughly. A great deal is to be said in favor of the bill and I quite agree that something of that sort should take care of the cases the gentleman mentions. However, looking at it legalistically, there is a chance of there being a serious conflict in some cases between the State laws and the Federal laws. In practically every State, the property would naturally escheat to the State, where a deceased person dies intestate.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that there cannot possibly be any conflict, because the veteran agrees to this arrangement when he enters the hospital. The only exception would be where the veteran is insane. His agreement would not amount to anything in that instance.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. There might be a case where the veteran is picked up in an incompetent condition, not mentally, but physically, and he had been unable to agree to anything when he entered the hospital.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If he does not agree, then this does not apply. But this will take a great deal of grief off of the Veterans' Administration and help dispose of a lot of virtually worthless property that these veterans are leaving in the various hospitals where they pass away. I think if you would take a vote of the veterans of the United States they would practically all agree that this measure should be passed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I assume there are a lot of old suitcases and trunks and other personal property, junk, that has accumulated in great quantities and is taking up space in the veterans' facilities?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And there is nobody to receive it except the State, because this applies only to veterans who have no relatives and who have made no will. Shall we call on each State to send and get all these old trunks and old suitcases and things like that, merely because in one case out of a hundred there might be a few dollars' worth of property?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And this bill will relieve that situation?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This bill will relieve that situation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned that this money be used for the benefit of the veterans. Will the gentleman please tell the House just how the veterans will be benefited?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The veterans have a post and they have a fund that they use for recreational purposes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman, when mentioning post means hospital?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. At the hospital, to buy literature, magazines, newspapers, and various things that the veterans who are able to stir around may entertain themselves with. This fund is used for that purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there any limitation as to amount?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there anything that might be construed to dispense with the administration of an estate and the payment of taxes?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; I do not think so, where a veteran makes this agreement when he enters the hospital. If he has much of an estate, he will not go to the hospital. He will take care of himself. But where he goes to the hospital and signs this agreement, of course, when he dies his property is disposed of in the way provided in this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. It is only when he has no relatives?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It is only when he has no relatives and has made no will.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. What provision does this make for the disposition of property?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The Administrator may sell it or dispose of it or do whatever is necessary.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Is there any limit as to the amount of property involved?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, no. As I said just now, there will not be one out of a million that has any property to amount to anything. If he did have, he would not have gone to the hospital. If he were wealthy, he would take care of himself.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, the gentleman from New York has raised the question of the statutes of escheat, which may be met.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I understand, but I do not think there is a State in the Union that will go into dissolution because they did not receive this property. In fact, I think it would cost them more to take it, as a rule, take care of it and transport it, than it will amount to, anyway.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand it, when the veteran enters the hospital he certifies that he has no will that he has——

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; he does not certify to that.

Mr. MICHENER. But he signs an agreement?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If he dies intestate and has no relatives, but he can make a will any time up to the time his breath leaves him.

Mr. MICHENER. Then he is not bound when he enters?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, no.

Mr. MICHENER. He has the time between the time he enters and the time he dies to make a will if he so sees fit?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that such little bagatelle of property that one of these veterans may have under those circumstances as a rule is the proceeds of the money paid him by the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Of course.

Mr. JENNINGS. And would it not be much better to let that money go into a fund that would inure to the benefit of other veterans than to let some State clear across the continent undertake to

pay the freight or express on some old suitcase or trunk with his few belongings, and let it go into a fund under the escheat laws of that State?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This is already the law with reference to veterans in soldiers' homes and regular establishments. We are merely trying to apply this law to get rid of a lot of worthless property, you might say, that is being left by these veterans who die intestate and without relatives.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What provision does this bill make with reference to claims against the estate?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAM). The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF PENSION TO WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4845, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the author of the bill, knows this bill does not belong on the Consent Calendar. We have a rule among the unofficial objectors that any bill which will cost more than $1,000,000 we will ask to have go over without prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. of course, I cannot agree to the request.

This bill is very mild, and it is very necessary. We have many thousands of World War veterans who have reached the age of 65. If they were Spanish-American War veterans, they would get $60 a month. We have provided they shall get only $40. Many of these veterans who are rated as non-service-connected total and permanently disabled received their disabilities in the service and have been struggling along on $30 a month. If they were Spanish War veterans or Civil War veterans, they would get $60 or more. We have been very conservative. We have merely raised it to $40. I hope the gentleman will not ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. KEAN. But I have submitted the request.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman knows that as soon as this comes up for a test in the House this will be passed overwhelmingly, and likewise in the Senate. I venture the assertion that the gentleman himself will vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I can not agree to let it go over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker. I think the gentleman should let it pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object to the request?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I object to the bill's going over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NATIONAL CEMETERY, PORTLAND, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 950, to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a similar bill has already passed the Senate. Does the gentleman from Tennessee intend to ask that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill and amended to conform?

Mr. GORE. That will be done as soon as the House bill is passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CEMETERY NEAR PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 793 has passed the Senate. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session. This bill, H. R. 950, is a companion bill. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to establish and maintain a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., for war veterans. The Secretary of War is authorized under the terms of the bill to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are, in his judgment, necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such a cemetery. At the present time there is great need for such a cemetery. Existing facilities are wholly inadequate to care for the burial of veterans in the Northwest area. The Federal Government had a plot set aside in the Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland for the burial of deceased veterans, but this plot is fully occupied. The State of Oregon purchased adjoining land a few years ago to provide facilities for veterans' burial which was intended for a limited time only, and I understand is now entirely inadequate. Funds are not sufficient to maintain this plot adequately and to provide for the increasing number of burials of veterans made necessary by deaths in this locality.

The nearest veterans' cemetery is in San Francisco, 1,000 or 1,500 miles distant from the various portions of the territory which would be served by a veterans' cemetery in Portland. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

State of Oregon:	
World War veterans	41,219
Civil War veterans	41
Indian war veterans	47
Spanish War veterans	2,673
Peacetime veterans	398
State of Washington:	
World War veterans	64,999
Civil War veterans	46
Indian war veterans	65
Spanish-American War veterans	4,169
Peacetime veterans	747
State of Idaho:	
World War veterans	15,457
Civil War veterans	11
Indian war veterans	19
Spanish War veterans	672
Peacetime veterans	103
State of Montana:	
World War veterans	20,610
Civil War veterans	5
Indian war veterans	75
Spanish War veterans	892
Peacetime veterans	148
Alaska: Total	2,500

The average age of the World War veterans is 48, Spanish-American War veterans, 66; Civil War, 96; Indian War, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day, Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day, Civil War 3 a day, and Indian war 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian-war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are approximately 4⅔ deaths per day. This figure does take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the deceased veterans in the above-mentioned States would only have to be transported for burial in this proposed cemetery a radius of 400 to 500 miles, with the exception of Alaska, which is some 1,200 miles away. At the present time, if a deceased veteran is to be buried in a national cemetery, his body must be sent to San Francisco, which would be a distance of from 1,000

to 1,500 miles, or even farther if coming from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that should be taken into consideration is the fact that in the last year or so there have been established numerous Army and Navy camps in the Northwest. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland-Columbia Airport; McChord Field, at Tacoma; Pendleton; Spokane; a large munitions dump at Hermiston; Army camps at Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis; Navy stations at Tongue Point, at the mouth of the Columbia River; and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel in these various camps would run well over an additional 100,000 men who would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery.

We also have in this Northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland: One at Walla Walla, 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics were furnished to me by Mr. Alfred P. Kelly, State commander, American Legion, and I feel certain that they are correct.

Under the increased military activities in the Northwest incident to the present program of national defense, Portland is the principal center of extensive military activity. The number of the Army and Navy personnel in active service in the various encampments in the Northwest are considerably in excess of 100,000 men, and these numbers are being steadily increased. As I have stated, there are five veterans' hospitals in the radius of Portland as the center. Most of these men reside in the Northwest in the area which will be served by a national cemetery. It is but natural, of course, that there will be a number of deaths in addition to those taking place in normal times and after the intensified defense program ends. These men who have taken part in it and have been enrolled in the service will be eligible for burial in the veterans' cemetery as death may overtake them in the future. These increased demands will greatly overburden the already inadequate burial facilities.

I am advised that there is a tract contiguous to the existing plot being used by the Federal Government for the veterans' cemetery which is available at a nominal price through the activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and the Portland Chamber of Commerce, working through their council for national defense. All of these organizations are urging the passage of this bill.

The board of control of the State of Oregon has tendered to the War Department without charge the present State veterans' cemetery which adjoins the plot now being used for veterans by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of Public Law No. 774, passed at the Seventy-fifth Congress, which authorizes the Secretary of War to establish and maintain a national cemetery upon land received from a State which he deems suitable for national cemetery purposes.

The War Department reports that no existing laws will be affected by this legislation, and it is estimated that approximately 14,000 burials would be made in a cemetery such as the one proposed, and that the establishment of cemeteries is one of general policy for the Congress to determine. I made inquiry of the Secretary of War with reference to the plans, if any, of the War Department to establish in this area of facilities to care for the burial of veterans on April 29, 1941, and I received a reply from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, stating: "Your inquiry as to whether any provision has been made by the War Department for a national cemetery in Oregon is therefore answered in the negative."

I am glad this bill meets with the approval of the Committee on Military Affairs and I trust it will receive the approval of the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 793), to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. And a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 950) was laid on the table.

RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR COAST GUARD LIGHT STATION RESERVATION AT AU SABLE, MICH.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4903, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized to exchange all of that certain tract of land west of Hurricane River situated in lot 2, section 3, township 49 north, range 15 west, Alger County, Mich., containing two and seventeen one-hundredths acres, more or less, constituting a part of the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich., for a tract of land for a road right-of-way described as follows: A strip of land sixty-six feet in width and five hundred and five feet in length, more or less, lying thirty-three feet on each side of a center line commencing at a point on the southerly section line of said section 3, forty-five and three tenths feet true west from the one-quarter post of sections 3 and 10; thence south forty-two degrees no minutes east forty-eight and four-tenths feet; thence around a twenty-five degree curve to the right, two hundred and six and four-tenths feet; thence south nine degrees thirty-six minutes west twenty-one and eight-tenths feet; thence around a forty-six-degree curve to the left one hundred and forty-seven and no tenths feet; thence south fifty-seven degrees fifty-seven minutes east eighty-one and four-tenths feet to the west right-of-way line of the existing road, containing in all seventy-seven one-hundredths acre, more or less: *Provided*, That title to the land to be acquired shall be subject to the approval of the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That the conveyance of the land of the United States shall be by quitclaim deed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAREY ACT LANDS IN WYOMING

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 879, relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for use in connection with the Eden water conservation and utility project in the State of Wyoming and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the Secretary of Agriculture may accept on behalf of the United States the reconveyance of any lands within the Eden project which have been patented to the State of Wyoming pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. 372, 422, as amended).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEETING OF DIRECTORS OF METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 191, to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meeting.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas explain the joint resolution and tell us what it will cost?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The cost cannot exceed $14,500, for that limitation has been placed in the joint resolution, and the cost may be a lesser sum.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to have a conference as the result of which it is hoped there will be worked out by the governments of the Western Hemisphere a system of weather reporting so that we may have the benefit in commerce, aviation, and agriculture of reports as to weather conditions prevailing throughout this hemisphere. This will be helpful in many different ways as the gentleman can realize.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has explained the joint resolution very well. I am in sympathy with the objectives of the joint resolution because we have a great shortage of meteorologists in this country. The Weather Bureau has been searching the country over for men trained in this field and schools are putting in courses in meteorology, but I wanted to know if there was a limitation on the cost that could be incurred under the bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The cost may not exceed $14,500.

The gentleman realizes of course that because of the wars prevailing in the larger part of the world we receive no weather reports from countries that ordinarily would report because such reports would be of advantage to the enemy. The only reports we receive now are from certain isolated countries. We need these reports in this hemisphere.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very well acquainted with that situation. In view of the fact that the committee of which I am a member makes appropriations for the Weather Bureau and the Department of State, I am well acquainted with what the gentleman is trying to do, but I want to be certain that there is a limitation on the amount of money that is going to be spent for this conference.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. All we are doing by this joint resolution is expanding the theories and discoveries of Matthew Fontaine Maury who was pathfinder of the seas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 81 be substituted for House Joint Resolution 191.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and is hereby, authorized to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942, and to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $14,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; communication services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); travel expenses; local transportation; hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; transportation of things; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; entertainment; official cards; badges; purchase of newspapers, periodicals, books, documents, maps, charts, etc.; stationery; and such other expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of observance of appropriate courtesies in connection therewith, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 191) was laid on the table.

CLARK FORK, IDAHO, FISH HATCHERY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3466, to authorize the Department of the Interior to accept title to the fish hatchery at Clark Fork, Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if our good friend, who we all know is interested in wildlife, will explain this bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a modern, up-to-date fish hatchery that has been constructed and is in operation. Just now it happens to be an orphan. The State cannot maintain it and this is to turn it over to the Government. It has cost about $60,000. It is well equipped and modern in every way. There is a rearing pond and a fine plant, supplied by electricity and convenient to some of the best fishing waters in the whole Northwest. It is a valuable facility. It does not cost the Government anything. The Government is going to get it as a free gift, and I may add that the Sportsmen's Association of Bonner County, Idaho, took up a subscription, bought the land and presented the site free of cost to the Government.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. How does the gentleman explain section 2, that $15,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of additional ponds, and so forth, when he states it does not cost anything? The gentleman is asking right in the bill for $15,000.

Mr. WHITE. That is an authorization to permit construction of an addition to the facility. The fish hatchery is a going concern now. That $15,000 may never be used. This is an authorization that was suggested by the Fish Commission. It is a constructive thing, it is in operation, and the streams are being stocked from this fish hatchery right now.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman stands up here on the floor and says it is not going to cost anything he does not mean that.

Mr. WHITE. I mean to acquire title to the project. It has already been constructed and is in operation.

Mr. RICH. Why is not a bill like this brought in in the regular way? Did the Bureau of Fisheries approve the project?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Where is the letter to that effect?

Mr. WHITE. The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has that. We were in consultation with them. They came before the committee and worked out the details of the whole legislation and the provisions of the law.

Mr. RICH. It seems strange to me that the State of Idaho does not want to take it over. It is stated in the report that it is now in danger of being lost. The State of Idaho does not want to handle it. Now you want to turn it over to the Federal Government. They sponsored it and they brought it into being. Now you want to turn it over to the Government.

Mr. WHITE. I will correct the gentleman. It was sponsored by the Sportsmen's Association. It so happens that the State of Idaho is short of money at the present time.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think the Federal Government is loaded up with money? If the gentleman can show me where the Federal Government has a right to take this over and operate it, this is not the proper way to legislate.

Mr. WHITE. The Federal Government is operating a wonderful system of fish-culture facilities throughout the country and this adds one of the most valuable and important to those facilities.

Mr. RICH. The Government has put into being more fish hatcheries in the last 7 or 8 years than it did previous to that by 10 times. We must now act carefully and wisely. When you fellows start something out there in Idaho, and you have fallen down and failed, you want the Government to come in and take it over. It does not seem right.

Mr. BLAND. This was established, I think, with Idaho funds, partly voluntary contributions and partly with W. P. A. donations. A considerable amount of money has been expended. There is danger that the hatchery will be lost unless it is taken over by the Government. The testimony was that the hatchery is a rather valuable unit in that it provides a stock of fish for stocking the Forest Service area and throughout an extensive area in northern Idaho.

The expenditure of $15,000 is necessary to do some construction work and to make some repairs to carry it on. For what is there the Government does not pay anything, but is likely to lose what it has already put in unless it is taken over.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to take it over?

Mr. BLAND. The United States.

Mr. RICH. Who would take it over if the Government did not—the State of Idaho?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know whether it would or not.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman a letter from the Fish and Game Commission stating that they want this hatchery taken over by the Government?

Mr. BLAND. The Bureau of Wildlife has not been reporting favorably on any hatcheries because they are working out some other policy. My recollection is that while they thought that this was valuable, in consequence of that policy they did not report it.

Mr. RICH. Then if you do not have the sanction of the Bureau for this acquisition, certainly we cannot permit this bill to pass here by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAND. As the gentleman stated, the hatchery would otherwise be closed, and the committee feel that it would be much better to save what we have already put in there.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe Idaho will permit it to close. I believe that is a poor way for us to legislate. If the Bureau of Fisheries under those conditions will not even recommend it, why should we permit this bill to go through? We should legislate in cooperation with the recommendation of the Department.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

USE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 287, to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atlanta National Guard target range, Georgia, comprising 134$\frac{2}{10}$ acres of land, being no longer required for National Guard purposes, is hereby incorporated in and made a part of the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga.

SEC. 2. That the tract of land, comprising thirty-sixth one-hundredths of an acre, with dwelling house thereon, adjacent to the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del., heretofore acquired as a part of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal property, being no longer required for that purpose, is hereby incorporated in and made a part of the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4476, providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill contains 16 sections, most of which deal with unrelated matters. The bill is 7 pages long. I believe it is entirely too complex to be on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. FADDIS. I may say to the gentleman that practically everything in this bill passed in the last War Department appropriation bill as legislative matter in that bill. As the gentleman will recall, I objected strenuously to its being included in that bill. The principal reason I did so was that the committee in the meantime had considered all this matter very thoroughly—had spent several months going into the matters contained in the bill. We have put some amendments into the bill which we believe to be necessary in the interest of keeping everything properly in line and well regulated.

There is nothing very complicated in the bill. If these items were to come in here as separate bills, I do not believe a Member of the House would object to any of them.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman look at section 15 and inform me if that section was included in the appropriation bill? It waives all requirements as to performance bonds on cost-plus contracts. I do not recall that provision being in the appropriation bill.

Mr. FADDIS. No; sections 15 and 16 were not in the appropriation bill. Neither one of these sections was in the appropriation bill. The provision as to performance bonds was put in the bill on request. The performance bonds are on contracts on the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, not on contracts entered into through competitive bidding.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The reason for that is that the Army has in its hands all the money necessary for the completion of the contract. The Army can hold it back or pay it out, as it likes. Where it is a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, it is really the Army doing it and paying merely for supervision in the form of a fee.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman mean the Army really has to pay the performance bond?

Mr. MAY. They eliminate the cost of a performance bond because they have the cash.

Mr. GORE. Who gets the benefit of that elimination, the War Department or the contractor?

Mr. MAY. The War Department saves it by not requiring it. If it were required, the contractor would have to pay for it and put it in as part of the cost. The only thing the contractor is paid for is his supervision, and that is known as a fixed fee.

Mr. GORE. I believe the gentleman gives a satisfactory explanation about that, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MAY. May I make this further explanation: All the matters in this bill have been matters of controversy between the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Military Affairs for several months. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] fought that question out on the floor the other day quite extensively. What we are trying to do is bring about harmony between the two committees and eliminate that opposition.

Mr. GORE. May I ask this question about section 8? You say in section 8 that certain things shall be done without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended. Was that legislation contained in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; I believe it was.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee does not wish to object to the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. The bill, as the gentleman says, is rather long and complicated, and it establishes substantive law. I believe it ought to be on the calendar a longer period of time than it has been, in order that everybody may have an opportunity to study it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3182, to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky inform us about how much this blanket authority is going to cost?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as some of you may know, I am just out of bed, and I hope you will indulge me while I very quietly make an explanation of the reasons for this bill.

Most of the Members of the House know that the Tennessee Valley Authority has had under construction since 1933 a series of high dams in the Tennessee River. They started out originally with one or two and finally agreed to stop constructing them when they had completed what they said was a unified system of 10 dams in the Tennessee River. They are now coming in, as I understand, under a cloak of national-defense necessity and asking for three more. However, that is a matter that does not arise here except that it is mentioned for the purpose of explaining just how this thing may be affected throughout the river area. They seem never satisfied unless they are permitted to spend unlimited millions in their altruistic and socialistic activities.

The particular instance in which this bill is made necessary is the construction of what is known, or was known originally, as the Gilbertsville Dam, located 22 miles from the mouth of the Tennessee River. It is now called the Kentucky Dam. This dam, when completed, will be approximately 160 feet in height and nearly 10,000 feet long. It will create a lake or reservoir of water 184.6 miles in length, will submerge 400,000 acres of the richest lands in the Tennessee Valley, and in some places where streams come into the main river opposite each other the water level will be some 12 miles in width. By reason of this very large water reservoir and other reservoirs above, there will be submerged, when the water is at

its height, a number of highway bridges across the Tennessee River.

In addition to this, as a matter of course, when the water is 160 feet in height at this dam it will submerge large areas of the lateral streams that run into the Tennessee River in that distance of 184.6 miles. All up these lateral or side streams are small highway bridges built by the counties and by private owners and they will be submerged.

The only purpose of this bill is to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to enter into contracts with the counties, the States, the municipalities, and all the people affected who own bridges or structures across these lateral streams.

It likewise affects the railroads, and while the Hobbs-Truman bill, that we passed last year, dealt with the construction or reconstruction of railroads, it did not have anything at all to do with highway bridges. So we have included both in this measure, and for your information, the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee, at which the Tennessee Valley Authority was represented by their general counsel and their engineer, and at which the State of Kentucky was represented by its highway commissioner and its highway engineer, it appeared that there is one instance at least where the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroad crosses the Tennessee River where it will be necessary to remove that railroad for a distance of 4 miles and will thereby necessitate additional trackage of some 20 miles. In addition to this, that railroad bridge, together with one highway bridge, the name of which I do not now recall, in western Kentucky, will have to be raised about 31 feet above its present height so as to be above navigation requirements when the reservoir is full of water. In other words, the T. V. A. proposes to raise the water level 31 feet higher than God has ever dared to raise it, and thereby enlarging and extending the dirt fills or approaches that come to these bridges, and it will involve so much that we have no evidence as to the amount of the cost, but the original estimate of the T. V. A. as to the Gilbertsville Dam was about $90,000,000. They revised that to $100,000,000 and later to $112,000,000, and, of course, I think personally when we get through with all these things they will cost $150,000,000, although I may be in error about that. The T. V. A. has the very happy faculty of juggling figures so that no one can accurately estimate the cost of anything they do.

The only thing in the world this bill does is to authorize them to negotiate with the people affected for the replacement, repair or improvement of these bridges, railroads and highways, but as to all the structures, they must have the approval of the Board of Engineers of the War Department as to whether or not they meet the requirements of navigation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Who pays the cost of these removals or the changes in the highway bridges and railroad bridges?

Mr. MAY. That brings up a question I have overlooked. That is to be paid for by the Tennessee Valley Authority and they say in this bill, "out of appropriations." I thought it should have been paid out of their earnings. They claim to have six or eight million dollars of yearly net earnings, but the committee has reported the bill as a means of protection to counties, municipalities, and private owners of bridges, and railroad companies that own bridges, who are at no fault whatever about the matter. The Congress is to blame for everything that has been done about it. I may add that I am not much to blame in this respect. Mr. DONDERO, I think the House knows very well the attitude of the gentleman from Kentucky regarding T. V. A.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any idea to give the House as to how much it will cost and if so, will the T. V. A. be back here asking for additional appropriations in order to make these changes?

Mr. MAY. I do not know about that. There is some evidence I had overlooked with respect to the cost of one of these bridges. The highway bridge in Kentucky will cost about $450,000 additional, according to the estimates.

Mr. DONDERO. But the gentleman has no estimate of the sum total of additional cost involved in this bill?

Mr. MAY. I have not, but I may say that unless you do pass this bill, the railroad company that is not to blame in any sense, the highway people who are not to blame in any sense, the counties that own highway bridges that have been submerged or will be submerged are not to blame in any sense, and they will suffer or the work will stop.

Mr. DONDERO. And they have no money to make the changes.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHORT. And it is not a question of whether we approve or disapprove of T. V. A., because many of our members on the Military Affairs Committee, who have always opposed and bitterly fought T. V. A., are in favor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that request, as it will slow up construction by the T. V. A.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MAY. I object to the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF WAR TO ACCEPT LANDS FROM TUCSON, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1062), authorizing the Secretary of War to accept a gift of lands from the city of Tucson, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept as a gift to the United States title to all or any part of the following-described lands, owned or optioned by the city of Tucson, Ariz.:

Gila and Salt River base and meridian: Sections 25, 36, and all of that portion of sections 34 and 35 lying north of the right-of-way of the Southern Pacific Railroad, township 14 south, range 14 east; sections 31, 32, the southwest quarter section 30, township 14 south, range 15 east; sections 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 13, 24, the south half and the northwest quarter section 1, the northeast quarter, the north half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 8, the north half, the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter section 15, the northeast quarter, the north half of the southeast quarter, the north half of the northwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter section 23, the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter and the east half of the southeast quarter section 25, township 15 south, range 15 east; sections 30 and 32, the southwest quarter and the west half of the northwest quarter section 7, the south half, the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter section 18, the west half, the west half of the northeast quarter, the west half and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter section 19, the south half of the southwest quarter section 20, the west half and the southeast quarter section 29, the north half, the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter section 31, township 15 south, range 16 east.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PERMITTING CANADIAN SHIPS TO TRAVEL BETWEEN AMERICAN PORTS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 166, to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr Speaker I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 65, and amend it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting House Joint Resolution 166, with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 65, to permit travel by a ship of Canadian Registry between American ports.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of any of the coastwise laws of the United States, one passenger ship of Canadian registry shall be permitted to travel beween

Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., for the purpose of transporting members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15–18, 1941, inclusive; and such passenger ship shall be further permitted to remain at Milwaukee, Wis., during the period of such national convention of the American Legion: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision of section 4488, Revised Statutes, or regulations issued thereunder, any passenger vessels, American or Canadian, which transport members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15–18, 1941, inclusive, shall not be required to carry accommodation for more than 50 percent of persons on board in lifeboats and pontoon life rafts: *Provided further*, That not less than two-fifths of such accommodation shall be in lifeboats and three-fifths may be in collapsible boats or rafts, under regulations of the Board of Supervising Inspectors, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, applicable to such vessels during the interval May 15 to September 15, inclusive."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) was ordered to lie on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice. I have been disturbed for a number of years about these road-building and bridge-buildings activities in foreign countries south of us at the expense of the American taxpayer. I realize that this measure comes to us by way of a Western Hemisphere defense proposal. That argument has some merit, but there are other debatable questions on this entire good-neighbor program which we from an agricultural country have much to worry about. If you read the report on this bill, you will soon learn that our farmers will have little benefit from the entire program, because long before this new World War broke out action had been started to develop the great agricultural resources of those foreign countries south of us.

Take, for instance, this international-highway program. I am not opposed to it except where our taxpayers are called upon to foot the bill. This bill asks that we spend $20,000,000 to build roads and bridges in foreign countries. We have thousands of miles of our own roads which need improving, and right now we are holding hearings in the House Committee on Roads on an emergency national-defense highway bill. Thousands of our own farmers are still in the mud and are asking us to help them reach our main highways with the farm produce which our fighting forces will need in time of stress and which our markets demand in normal times. Let us finish our own highway-construction work before launching on a gigantic program of building roads and bridges in foreign countries.

Now, as to the statement I made that this program was launched long before the new World War broke out, I call your attention to the bridge we helped build at Choluteca, in Honduras, in 1937. That bridge cost about half a million dollars, and our taxpayers paid $250,000 toward its construction. There are no roads or approaches on either side of this bridge, and it is high and dry, with no one using it. It is just a half-million-dollar bridge setting out there alone, with no roads in any direction—just standing there alone. I think it was just so much money taken away from our taxpayers for which no one in the world received a penny's worth of benefit since it was constructed.

In fairness to those who backed the construction of this bridge, I wish to explain to the House that the Choluteca bridge was constructed on the basis that it would become part of the International Highway construction, and that it is said to be now located on the route of this proposed highway.

But here was an expenditure which the taxpayers of our country should know something about. An expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars of money of American taxpayers in a useless bridge in a foreign country—a structure which is high and dry, with no means of using it, and a structure which has been there all these years, representing useless spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want this country prepared against any eventuality so far as national defense is concerned. I have supported, and will continue to support, all legislation to make that program successful. But I cannot go along with this sort of thing. I fought it before, and I shall fight it now. I can see no good of dumping millions of American taxpayers' dollars into these foreign countries to develop their farms. My own farmers need too much attention and help now. I want my own farms developed, and I want to do my utmost to do everything I can to help my own farmers to stay on their farms. To continue to dump money into foreign farming countries just means added assistance in putting our own farmers into competition with the cheap products of foreign farmers. I just cannot see the logic of that. My memory of conditions on the farms in my own district is too fresh for me to desert my own farmers in this hour of their great need. To do for foreigners more than we will do for our own people just does not make common sense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska that the bill go over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4841) to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Archives Trust Fund Board Act."

SEC. 2. A board is hereby created and established, to be known as the National Archives Trust Fund Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall consist of the Archivist of the United States, as Chairman, and the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be members ex officio, and three other members appointed by the President for a term of 6 years each. The first appointments shall be for 2, 4, and 6 years, respectively, and appointments to fill vacancies during term shall be for the unexpired term. The Board may function notwithstanding vacancies thereon, and three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Membership on the Board shall not be deemed to be an office within the meaning of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Board is hereby authorized to accept, receive, hold, and administer such gifts or bequests of money, securities, or other personal property, for the benefit of or in connection with The National Archives, its collections, or its services, as may be approved by the Board.

SEC. 4. Any moneys or securities composing trust funds given or bequeathed to the Board shall be receipted for by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall invest, reinvest, and retain such moneys or securities as the Board may from time to time determine. The Board shall not engage in any business or exercise any voting privilege which may be incidental to securities in such trust funds, nor shall the Secretary of the Treasury make any investments for the account of the Board which could not lawfully be made by a trust company in the District of Columbia, except that he may make any investment directly authorized by the instrument of gift or bequest under which the funds to be invested are derived, and may retain any investments accepted by the Board.

SEC. 5. The income from any trust funds held by the Board, and the money received and proceeds from the sale of securities and other personal property, as and when collected, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States in a trust fund account to be known as the National Archives Trust Fund, subject to disbursement by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, on the basis of certified vouchers of the Archivist or his duly authorized agent, except where otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift or bequest, for and in the interest of The National Archives, its collections, or its services, including but not restricted to the preparation and publication of special works and collections of sources and the preparation, duplication, editing, and release of historical photographic materials and sound recordings. The Archivist may make sales of any such publications and releases authorized by this section and paid for out of the income derived from trust funds at a price which will cover their cost and 10 percent added, and all moneys received from such sales shall be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the trust fund account herein provided for.

SEC. 6. The Board shall have all the usual powers and obligations of a trustee with respect to all property and funds administered by it, but the members of the Board shall not be personally liable, except for malfeasance.

SEC. 7. Gifts and bequests received by the Board under the provisions of this act, and the income therefrom, shall be exempt from all taxes.

SEC. 8. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Board shall have authority—

(a) To adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(b) To appoint, or to authorize the Archivist to appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws, all necessary employees, and to fix their duties; and

(c) To adopt bylaws, rules, and regulations necessary for the administration of its functions under this act.

SEC. 9. No compensation shall be paid to the members of the Board for their services as such members. All costs incurred by the Board in carrying out its duties under this act, including the expenditures necessarily made by the members of the Board in the performance of their duties and the compensation of persons employed by the Board, shall be paid out of income from trust funds available to the Board for the purpose. Any expenses of the Board, including the cost of its seal, not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by it, may be paid out of the appropriations for The National Archives as other costs and expenses of The National Archives are paid; and such sums as may be necessary for such purposes are hereby authorized to be appropriated. Unless otherwise restricted by the instrument of gift or bequest, the Board, by resolution duly adopted, may authorize the Archivist to use for such purposes, or for any other purpose or purposes for which funds may be expended under this act, the principal of any gift or bequest accepted under this act.

SEC. 10. Employees of The National Archives who perform special functions for the performance of which funds have been entrusted to the Board shall not be subject to the proviso contained in the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1917 (39 Stat. 1106), that no Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and that no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States; nor shall any additional compensation so paid to such employees be construed as a double salary under the provisions of section 6 of the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes (39 Stat. 120), as amended (39 Stat. 582).

SEC. 11. The Board shall submit to the Congress an annual report of the moneys, securities, and other personal property received and held by it and of its operations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out the word "Secretary" and strike out all of lines 9 and 10 and insert after the word "the" on page 1, line 8, the following words: "chairman of the House Library Committee, and the chairman of the Senate Library Committee."

Page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and strike out, on line 6, the words "of business."

Page 4, line 22, after the period strike out the words "any expenses of the board," also strike out lines 23, 24, 25.

Page 5, strike out lines 1, 2, and on line 3, the words "ized to be appropriated." Strike out all of section 10, beginning on page 5, line 9, and ending on page 6, line 5, at the period.

The committee amendments were agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF FIRST 10 AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 120, to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Commission, to be composed of seven members, as follows: Three individuals to be appointed by the President of the United States, two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and celebration on December 15, 1941, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the final adoption as part of the Constitution of the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights. Such comprehensive plan shall provide for appropriate and suitable celebrations on such day in each of the 48 States, and shall, insofar as possible, be prepared and carried out in cooperation with official agencies of the States and the political subdivisions thereof, and with representative civic organizations.

SEC. 3. (a) Without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions. The compensation of such secretary shall not exceed $2,500 per annum.

(b) The Commission may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary in the execution of the functions of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission, including necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses (not in excess of $5 per day) incurred by the commissioners while absent from their places of residence upon the business of the Commission, and by the employees of the Commission while away from their designated posts of duty upon the business of the Commission, shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall expire not later than January 15, 1942.

SEC. 4. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and prayer.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all of sections 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Page 3, line 12, strike out "SEC. 4. The" and insert "That the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGISTRY OF PURSERS AND SURGEONS ON VESSELS OF UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3864) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939 (Public, No. 251, 76th Cong.; 53 Stat. 1145), is amended to read as follows:

"That there shall be registered staff officers in the United States merchant marine in the following grades: (1) Chief purser, (2) purser, (3) senior assistant purser, (4) junior assistant purser, (5) surgeon. The Secretary of Commerce (in this act called the Secretary) shall register, and issue certificates of registry to, qualified individuals applying for registry in such grades, as hereinafter provided, and every such individual when so registered and serving in the staff department on a vessel of the United States shall rank as a staff officer on such vessel. Officers registered under the provisions of this act and pursers' clerks shall constitute a separate and independent department on vessels of the United States to be known as the staff department. Such staff department shall be composed of a medical division and a purser's division. The medical division shall be under the charge of the senior registered surgeon on such vessel, who shall be responsible solely to the master. The purser's division shall be under the charge of the senior registered purser on such vessel, who shall be responsible solely to the master. On oceangoing vessels licensed to carry more than 100 passengers such officer in charge of the purser's division of the staff department shall be a registered chief purser; and whenever more than 3 persons are employed in the purser's division of the staff department on such vessels, there shall be a minimum of 1 registered senior assistant purser and 1 registered junior assistant purser in such purser's division of that staff department. No person shall be eligible for registry as a staff officer under the provisions of this act who is not a citizen of the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "clerks", insert "and such persons as may be assigned to the senior surgeon."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC VESSELS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 346, to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill would make

a change in substantive law. I do not think I have any objection to the purposes, but I do think it would be well for the chairman of the committee to explain how many ships may be destroyed under this and the extent to which the legislation will go.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, according to the testimony before the committee, there are about 11 ships, all small vessels—patrol boats and vessels of that type—that would probably be used as targets.

Mr. GORE. Ships out of use?

Mr. HESS. They have been taken out of commission. They are no longer in use by the Navy. They have been passed on by the Board of Survey and surveyed as absolutely not fit for military use.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The testimony disclosed it would cost more to salvage the ships than the ships are actually worth. Therefore they want to use them for experimental purposes, aerial torpedoes, magnetic mines, and so forth, all of which is very important. They are absolutely worthless old ships.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, be, and he is hereby, authorized to use for experimental purposes vessels of the United States Navy stricken from the Navy Register pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296; 34 U. S. C., sec. 491): *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall first determine that the interests of the Government would be best served thereby: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall make an annual report to the Congress of all vessels disposed of under the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES FOR RENTAL QUARTERS OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS IN CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 874, relating to allowances for rental quarters of certain naval officers stationed in the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. I hope the gentleman will find it possible to withdraw his objection, because this was a great injustice to these officers. If I may explain just a moment, the officers of the Navy during these several years, who were at the Panama Canal, had to rent quarters. They rented quarters from civilian employees of the Canal Zone. The homes were built by the Government and rented to Canal Zone employees. They had 2 months' vacation and an officer would rent a house for 2 months.

The Comptroller General ruled that these were Government quarters because the Government owned them, but they had to pay the civilian employees who had the long-term lease on it. The Comptroller ruled on the one hand that they were Government quarters, so that they would not give them their customary allowance, but they had to pay the civilian employee whatever he decided to charge for them. The result was that they had to pay considerably more rent than the Government would allow them for, because they interpreted them as Government quarters. If they had actually been civilian quarters they would get their allowance, $60 or $80 or whatever it was, and could have gone and rented quarters anywhere they could get them. But interpreting these as being Government quarters, the Government would not give them their normal full allowance. All this does is to pay them the difference between what they actually had to pay out in cash and their Government allowance.

Mr. GORE. As I read the report, I thought the Government allowed a full allowance, but that the deductions were made for the amount which they had paid for furniture, lawn accessories, refrigerators, and so forth, over and above the usual allowance which the Government makes.

Mr. MAAS. No. These civilian employees, in addition to charging them for rent, charged them any price they saw fit for the furniture, refrigerator, and so forth, which normally is included in Government quarters. So that the Government did not allow them any money to pay for that, because they interpreted them as Government quarters. Had they actually been naval quarters it would have included the furniture, refrigerator, and so forth.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A bill dealing with this same subject matter passed the Congress last year and it was vetoed by the President. We have now complied with the suggestion in the veto message and the bill is recommended by the Budget, recommended by the Navy Department, and it only applies to a certain number of officers. The total amount involved is $3,000 for officers who were there during 1935 and 1936.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SCHULTE. My recollection is that it was a difference in the way the Army quarters were provided.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. The original bill we passed gave the cash difference between what the Government allowance would have been and what they paid.

Mr. SCHULTE. What is the Government allowance today?

Mr. MAAS. It depends on the rank. It is anywhere from $60 to $120 in the very high ranks. This does not give them any cash allowance.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman kindly clarify that for the benefit of some of us laymen who do not know what that means?

Mr. MAAS. Sixty dollars would go to a man of a particular rank. A full lieutenant in the Navy would draw this $60 a month.

Mr. SCHULTE. That is in addition to his pay?

Mr. MAAS. That is right. That is for rent, light, heat, and fuel.

Mr. SCHULTE. What is his pay?

Mr. MAAS. It is according to his rank.

Mr. SCHULTE. Well, what is the salary of a lieutenant?

Mr. MAAS. A lieutenant's base pay is $250 a month.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It all depends. It depends on longevity. All pay in the Navy is based upon longevity.

Mr. SCHULTE. But the minimum is $250?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would not say that the minimum was $250. A lieutenant may get $3,500 a year or $3,000. The pay scale differs according to longevity—length of service controls. But I say to the gentleman that this bill is absolutely fair and we have complied exactly with the suggestions of the President in his veto message. It is recommended by the Navy Department to do justice to those officers serving in the Canal Zone.

Mr. SCHULTE. Would the gentleman object to a request that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; I am never going to object to such a request.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF APRIL 15, 1935

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1469, to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the grade of aviation cadet is hereby created in the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve. Aviation cadets shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy from male citizens of the United States under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That each aviation cadet shall sign an agreement, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he be a minor, to serve for a continuous period of not more than 4 years on active duty, unless sooner released: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to discharge at any time any aviation cadet or to release him from active duty.

SEC. 2. The first proviso of section 5 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1176; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 853c), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That aviation cadets and officers commissioned pursuant to authority contained in the Naval Aviation Reserve Act of 1939 may be required to serve on active duty for a continuous period of 4 years or for such periods as they agree to serve under the provisions of section 1 of the act approved April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), from date of appointment as aviation cadet."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPTURED AIRCRAFT MADE PRIZES OF WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 992, to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 1131 and 1132) be amended to read, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 4613. The provisions of this title (title LIV) shall apply to all captures of vessels, including aircraft, made as prize by authority of the United States or adopted and ratified by the President of the United States: *Provided*, That the terms 'vessel' and 'ship' as used in this title (title LIV) shall include aircraft, and that the term 'master' as used in this title (title LIV) shall include the pilot or other person in command of such aircraft: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting, or in any way impairing, the legal right of the Army of the United States or any component part thereof, while engaged in hostilities, to capture any enemy property or neutral property used or transported in violation of the obligations of neutrals under international law, wherever found and without prize procedure.

"SEC. 4614. The term 'vessels of the Navy' as used in this title (title LIV) shall include all armed vessels, including aircraft, officered and manned by the United States and under the control of the Department of the Navy."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF INACTIVE-DUTY PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4338 to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted men of the Marine Corps who were transferred to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve prior to October 1, 1940, after completion of 16 or 20 years of service, and all such transferred members of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who were subsequently retired prior to October 1, 1940, and in whose cases the retainer or retired pay was computed on the basis of the pay authorized for enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades, shall, from and after October 1, 1940, be entitled to retainer pay or retired pay computed on the basis of the increased rates of base pay and longevity pay provided for enlisted men of the Marine Corps by section 12 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 8 and 9, and on page 2, strike out all of line 1 to and including the word "grades."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAAS: On page 1, strike out the words "Marine Corps" from the title, and on line 3, after the word "the", insert "Navy and"; and on line 4, strike out "Marine Corps"; and on line 6, strike out "Marine Corps"; on page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "of the Marine Corps"; and further on line 6, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and add: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the pay now being received by any such enlisted man."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUILDING GUARDS EMPLOYED IN BUILDINGS UNDER JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY DESIGNATED UNITED STATES BUILDING POLICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1409, designating building guards employed in buildings under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency as United States Building police, and for other purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, according to the report this would arbitrarily raise the salaries of some privates from $1,200 to $1,900 per annum. I would like to know from the chairman of the committee if I am correct in my understanding.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is incorrect in his understanding. May I say in the first instance that this is exactly in the terms of a bill that was passed in the House in the last session of Congress.

These men are paid far below the compensation of men who render less service in other branches of the Government. These men receive only $100 per month. They are policemen, they are firemen, they are custodians, they are watchmen. This bill would raise their pay from $1,200 a year to $1,500, whereas the privates in the Metropolitan Police get $1,900 a year and privates in the United States Park Police get $1,900 a year, many of whom do not have duties comparable to those performed by these building guards.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Under the schedule set out in the hearings it is said that the salary of the United States special police ranges from $1,200 to $1,500 for privates, whereas United States Park Police salaries run from $1,900 to $2,400, and the bill provides that they shall be paid on the same schedule as the park police.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure the gentleman will find, on looking at the bill, that the building guards will not reach that grade according to the terms of the bill for several years. The bill provides that they shall receive $1,500 the first year and an increase of $100 a year for each year of satisfactory service until a maximum of $1,900 has been reached. May I say that eventually they would get only what the United States Park Police are now getting, yet they have many duties in addition to being policemen. They have to take special training as firemen, as policemen, and in many other capacities. They are custodians; they are watchmen; they are policemen; they are firemen. They make arrests within their buildings where they are justified, and they can go to court. They are paid grossly inadequate salaries in comparison with those rendering similar service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO COASTWISE LOAD LINE ACT, 1935, AS AMENDED

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4988) to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to so modify the Load Line Act as to give the Department of Commerce the right to add slightly and within the margin of safety to cargo vessels operating coastwise and intercoastal, the immediate object being with respect to tankers thereby to increase the transportation of oil at the rate of 40,000 barrels in order to try to relieve the situation which now exists as to gasoline along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is about a 3-percent increase?

Mr. BLAND. It is about a 3-percent increase.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is not carte blanche legislation, but each ship would have to be certified by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BLAND. That is the testimony of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it would not apply to any passenger ship?

Mr. BLAND. It would not apply to any passenger ship or to any so-called coastwise ship that operates other than between ports within continental United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is emergency legislation with a time limit?

Mr. BLAND. It has a time limit and applies during the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, but not after June 30, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended by the act of June 20, 1936 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 46, sec. 88a), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by the addition immediately thereafter of the following: "*Provided, however*, That during the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, but not after June 30, 1943, load lines may be established or marked on any vessel, which load line gives a lesser freeboard and less buoyance than the load line established by the International Treaty on Load Lines

of 1930, when, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such load line will not be above the actual line of safety."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 10, after the word "vessel", insert the following: "(except a passenger vessel) while engaged on a coastwise voyage by sea from port to port in the continental United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALTERATION, RECONSTRUCTION, OR RELOCATION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY AND RAILROAD BRIDGES BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 153 on the Consent Calendar and the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3182) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever, as the result of the construction of any dam, reservoir, or other improvement under the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, or amendments thereto, any bridge, trestle, or other highway or railroad structure located over, upon, or across the Tennessee River or any of its navigable tributaries, including approaches, fenders, and appurtenances thereto, is endangered or otherwise adversely affected and damaged, including any interference with or impairment of its use, to the extent that protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement is necessary or proper to preserve its safety or utility or to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both, the owner or owners of such bridge, trestle, or structure shall be compensated by the Tennessee Valley Authority in the sum of the reasonable actual cost of such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement: *Provided*, That in arriving at the amount of such compensation the bridge owner shall be charged with a sum which shall equal the net value to the owner of any direct and special benefits accruing to the owner from any improvement or addition or betterment of the altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced bridge, trestle, or structure. The Tennessee Valley Authority is empowered to contract with such owner with respect to any such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement, the payment of the cost thereof and its proper division, which contract may provide either for money compensation or for the performance of all or any part of the work by the Tennessee Valley Authority: *Provided further*, That the payments herein provided for shall be made only out of appropriations available for the major project which requires the protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement.

In the event of a failure to agree upon the terms and conditions of any such contract, or upon any default in the performance of any contract entered into pursuant to this act, the bridge owner or the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have the right to bring suit to enforce its rights or for a declaration of its rights under this act, or under any such contract, in the district court of the United States for the district in which the property in question is located. In any such proceeding the court shall apportion the total cost of the work between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the owner in accord with the provisions contained in this section. Any judgment, award, or decree rendered against the Tennessee Valley Authority under this section may be satisfied out of appropriations available for the major project which requires the protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, at the end of the bill, insert: "*Provided*, That, prior to such alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of said bridges, the location and plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War in accordance with existing laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 2, line 20, strike out all the proviso down to and including line 24 and insert: "That the payments herein provided for shall be paid out of the earnings of the Authority."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. It is not in order for the simple reason it attempts to insert new matter into the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it merely strikes out a proviso which provided that it should be paid out of appropriations made by the Congress and inserts "to be paid out of the earnings of the Authority."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] will be rereported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendment offered by Mr. KEAN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is willing to hear the gentleman from Mississippi, but the Chair sees sees no reason why the amendment is not germane.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment for the simple reason that it attempts to take the funds derived from the sale of power and allocate them to the payment of this expenditure when, as a matter of fact, this expenditure should be charged just as much to flood control and navigation as to power and, besides, it would require probably that this improvement be postponed until the end of the year or until such time as the profits from the sale of power would take care of it.

Everyone knows that they are using all the power generated in the Tennessee Valley Authority now and are clamoring for more power for national defense. Everyone knows that there has been a drought in the Tennessee Valley area.

To say that these roads shall not be moved, to say that these improvements shall not be made, until a sufficient amount shall be taken from the profit from power to take care of it, I submit not only places an unjust burden upon the funds derived from the sale of power but it also places a burden upon the Tennessee Valley Authority that I seriously doubt it will be able to meet, and, in my opinion, instead of clarifying the situation you are merely confusing it, and preventing the doing of what the original bill intended.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this bill would go through without any controversy because of the apparent hardships that are being imposed on certain private industries, as well as States and municipalities, but the gentleman from Mississippi seems to believe that the T. V. A. is an institution that is exempt from any sort of consideration by this Congress and that it ought to be turned loose, with the bridle taken off, which has already been done to the extent that it is now vigorously opposing having its auditing and accounts placed under the control of the Comptroller General of the United States, as all other Government agencies are.

All this amendment does is to provide that instead of payment for this work being made out of new appropriations by the Congress, since this involves an item as to the cost of which we know nothing and that reaches out in every direction, we would require that it be paid out of the earnings of the Authority.

In the hearings last year, in connection with the insistence of the Authority that it be permitted to pay out some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 in taxes to the people of Tennessee, Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama, it appeared that they had a net earning of $7,000,000. I believe that if they made that much last year, in view of all the expansion for national defense for which they are now clamoring and the added use there will be of their electricity, they ought to be able to meet these bills without difficulty.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Does the gentleman feel that the adoption of the amendment will interfere with accomplishing the purposes of the bill?

Mr. MAY. Not at all.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Under the circumstances under which we are now considering the bill, that being the case, it would be difficult to justify not accepting the amendment.

Mr. MAY. It might result in referring the bill back to the committee or some other delay that ought not to occur, so I insist that the amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CEMETERY, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., was passed be vacated, and that the bill be considered at this time, in order that an amendment may be offered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANGELL: Page 1, line 7, after "donation", strike out the comma and the words "purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 162) to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes, strike out everything after the enacting clause, insert in lieu thereof a similar House bill, H. R. 4851, and pass the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that pertains to the appointment of warrant officers and chief warrant officers in the Army. The Senate has already passed the bill, and we wanted to take up that bill and substitute the House bill for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the difference between the two bills?

Mr. FADDIS. The House bill is preferable to the Senate bill because we have taken care of the interests of the National Guard and the draftees, and have placed certain other restrictions in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are those restrictions? This is quite important legislation, and the House would like to know something about it.

Mr. FADDIS. One restriction is that not more than 1 percent of the men in the Regular Army shall be warrant officers. Another is that men shall serve at least 1 year in the Army before they are appointed to the position of warrant officer. Another is that no one shall be appointed chief warrant officer who has been a field clerk or quartermaster clerk.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] know that this bill was going to be called up today?

Mr. FADDIS. No; I do not know that he did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I must object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Mississippi is going to call up a very important bill, and I believe that a quorum should be present. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Allen, Ill.	Hébert	Ploeser
Andrews	Heffernan	Plumley
Barry	Hill, Colo.	Powers
Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Bloom	Hobbs	Richards
Boykin	Hoffman	Rivers
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hope	Romjue
Burch	Jacobsen	Scanlon
Camp	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Jensen	Schuetz
Capozzoli	Johns	Scott
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Chapman	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Ohio
Clark	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Pa.
Clevenger	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Cluett	Kopplemann	Starnes, Ala.
Collins	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Copeland	Lea	Sumners, Tex.
Costello	McArdle	Terry
Courtney	McGranery	Thill
Cox	McIntyre	Thom
Delaney	Maciejewski	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	Maciora	Tibbott
Dies	Magnuson	Tolan
Ditter	Marcantonio	Treadway
Douglas	Merritt	Voorhis, Calif.
Eaton	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Fish	Myers, Pa.	Ward
Flaherty	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Forand	O'Day	Whelchel
Geyer, Calif.	O'Leary	Winter
Gifford	Oliver	Wolcott
Grant, Ind.	Osmers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Toole	Wright
Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Hare	Plauché	
Harris, Va.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING MORE ADEQUATE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4) to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended, by adding a new paragraph, IV, thereto to read as follows:

"IV. (a) Subject to the income limitation of part III, paragraph II hereof, as amended, the surviving dependent widow as hereinafter defined, child, or children, and/or dependent mother or father of any deceased person who served in the active military or naval service during the World War, and whose service therein was as defined by part III, paragraph I hereof, as amended, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, $20; widow and one child, $28; widow and two children, $34 (with $4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $12; no widow but two children, $18 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $24 (equally divided) (with $3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $20; or both, $15 (each).

"(b) As to the widow, child, or children, the total compensation payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $56. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $56, the amount of $56 may be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe."

SEC. 2. For the purpose of payment of compensation under the provisions of this act, the term "widow" shall mean a woman who was married prior to July 3, 1921, to the person who served; or who was married prior to May 13, 1938, to the person who served, provided a child was born of such marriage: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 13, 1938 (Public, No. 514, 75th Cong.), insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall govern the determination of eligibility of a widow for benefits under this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is the identical bill that passed the House last year as H. R. 9000. My recollection is that on a roll call it passed by a vote of 259 to 1. It provides compensation for the widows and orphans of veterans of the World War and for their dependent parents.

In framing the measure we have followed as best we could the policy now in

effect wth reference to veterans of the Spanish-American War and veterans of the Civil War.

This measure provides that where a widow of a veteran who served 90 days, I believe, has no children, but who married the veteran prior to 1921, she is entitled to compensation of $20 a month. If she has children and married the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, she would be entitled to $20 a month, with $8 additional for the first child and $4 a month for each additional child.

It provides also that in case there is a child but no widow, the one child draws compensation of $12 a month, two children would draw $18 a month, and three children would draw $24 a month, with $3 a month for each additional child.

The bill also provides for dependent fathers and mothers, where there is only one of them, the amount of $20 a month, and where there are two it provides $15 a month each. This is a diminishing group. Some people have objected to including the dependent parents, but this is a diminishing group because these people are practically all well beyond the age of three score years and ten. Some have contended that these old people are taken care of under social security. This is not true. Social security does not include the great agricultural masses of this country, and while in all the States they have an old-age pension, based on a 50-percent contribution by the States, in many of the States it is so small that it is of very little value to these old people, and we do not think that an old man or an old woman who furnished a son to the World War who has now passed away, probably as a result of his service to his country, and on whom these parents were dependent—we do not think they ought to be forced to go to the poorhouse to get something to eat while we are putting so many on the relief rolls who were not even born in the United States. Therefore, I have no apology for putting that provision in the bill.

This measure passed last year and for some reason it died in the Finance Committee of the Senate. If I know how the veterans of this country feel, they are not going to let it die there this time.

We have been very conservative in our requests, as every member of the committee will tell you. Where we provide only $20 for a widow of the World War, a Spanish-American War widow under the same circumstances gets $30 a month. So nobody can contend that we are overreaching or demanding too much for the widows and orphans of these men we sent to the last war to make the world safe for democracy, to end all wars, and to guarantee the integrity of small nations. Nobody can contend that we are going beyond the bounds of reason by asking this small pittance for these dependents who are now unable to take care of themselves.

Let me call attention to the fact that in 1924 we passed a bill providing that any veteran of the World War who broke down prior to January 1, 1925, should be presumptively service-connected or presumed to have acquired his disabilities in line of duty. Later we tried to extend that to 1930, but failed. There were untold thousands of these veterans who came home with incipient or insidious diseases contracted in line of duty—men who did not want to ask for anything; many of them men who did not know there was anything wrong with them; and thousands of them did not know they had a right to apply, and they let the period pass and later broke down, and have now passed away and left their widows with these little children to drag through this depression with no compensation at all.

I know some people will say that the Spanish-American War widows are older, but I submit that it is more necessary to provide compensation for the widows with little children around them. And, besides that, 22 years after the Spanish-American War the Congress paid the Spanish-American War widow without a child just exactly what we are providing for World War widows in this bill.

This measure has the unanimous support of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am the chairman. It has the support of the veterans' organizations, and I believe it has the support, as it had before, of more than 90 percent of the membership of this House.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. The statement that only one person voted against the bill I think is not correct. Volume 86, page 6002, of the RECORD shows there were 247 yeas and 31 nays, not on a roll call.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, no; I think we called the roll on that bill.

Mr. KEAN. I just went and looked it up.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And what is the vote?

Mr. KEAN. 247 yeas, 31 nays.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is about 10 to 1. But I think the gentleman looked at the wrong place or he would have found the vote about as I stated.

Mr. KEAN. Yes. I just wanted to correct the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is mistaken, but that is a safe margin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] said that there were 31 who voted against the bill. If there had been a roll call, does the gentleman from New Jersey contend that there would be that many votes against it?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think the gentleman from New Jersey would not embarrass himself by answering that question. It is possible to get a roll call on this bill, and he or any other gentleman can do it by making the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. GREEN. Is not this the same bill substantially as the one that passed the last Congress?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It is.

Mr. Speaker, we have done the best we could under the circumstances, and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation voted this bill out unanimously. I hope it will pass unanimously.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain tables and information regarding the history of the widows and orphans compensation and pension bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 minutes. My views are well known to the Members of the House. I have spoken frequently in favor of this bill, and have voted for it. This is an extremely important measure, and I feel that if we are not careful, in view of all the money that is being appropriated for other things, the veterans will become the forgotten men and women, and we must see to it that that does not happen.

I point out to the House that in this bill there will be only a limited number of widows and orphans who will receive the benefits of the bill. There is a provision that the widows and orphans and dependent fathers and mothers must be dependent before they may receive any compensation. In other words, there is a needs clause in the bill. The load of the dependent fathers and mothers is a decreasing load, as their deaths increase every year. I point out to the House also the fact that many of the records of the veterans overseas, and even in this country were lost, hospital records, diagnosis records, so that it has not been possible for the veteran and his wife, and for his widow and dependents afterward to prove service connection for the veteran, or any degree of service-connection disability whatsoever. I also point out that while it is said that paying compensation to dependent fathers and mothers of veterans is a new departure, yet in the employees' compensation law there is a provision for compensation to be paid to the dependent father and mother of the employee and also to the widow of the deceased.

The report of the Committe on World War Veterans' Legislation upon this bill is most complete, and under permission given previously I am including it as a part of my remarks. It follows:

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred H. R. 4, entitled "A bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes," having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

For several years bills have been referred to the committee providing compensation benefits for the widows, children, and dependent parents of World War veterans without regard to the cause of the veteran's death or the requirement of the existence of a service-connected disability at the time of death. H. R. 4 provides such a grant and the report of the Veterans' Administration on this bill is self-explanatory and is as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 25, 1941.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: This is with further reference to your letter of January 8, 1941, requesting a report on H. R. 4, Seventy-seventh Congress, a bill to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes, which provides as follows:

"That part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by

adding a new paragraph, IV, thereto to read as follows:

"'IV. (a) Subject to the income limitation of part III, paragraph II hereof, as amended, the surviving dependent widow as hereinafter defined, child or children, and/or dependent mother or father of any deceased person who served in the active military or naval service during the World War, and whose service therein was as defined by part III, paragraph I, hereof, as amended, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"'Widow but no child, $20; widow and one child, $28; widow and two children, $34 (with $4 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $12; no widow but two children, $18 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $24 (equally divided) (with $3 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $20; or both, $15 (each).

"'(b) As to the widow, child, or children, the total compensation payable under this paragraph shall not exceed $56. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $56, the amount of $56 may be apportioned as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.'

"SEC. 2. For the purpose of payment of compensation under the provisions of this act, the term 'widow' shall mean a woman who was married prior to July 3, 1921, to the person who served; or who was married prior to May 13, 1938, to the person who served, provided a child was born of such marriage: *Provided*, That the provision of section 3 of the act of May 13, 1938 (Public, No. 514, 75th Cong.), insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall govern the determination of eligibility of a widow for benefits under this act."

This bill is identical with H. R. 9000, Seventy-sixth Congress, on which the committee rendered a favorable report (No. 1829) March 25, 1940.

Part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, which the bill proposes to amend, grants pension on account of disabilities or death not the result of service, under the conditions hereinafter outlined. Disability pension is payable to any honorably discharged veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, Philippine Insurrection, or the World War who is permanently and totally disabled not as a result of misconduct and not the result of military or naval service, if such veteran served at least 90 days or was discharged for disability incurred in line of duty and was in the active service before the cessation of hostilities. Death pension is payable to the widow or children of any deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection at the rates prescribed on the enclosed chart, provided the service of such disabled veteran was as above described. Under the existing provisions of part III, and as proposed by the bill, death pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. Part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, makes no provision for the payment of pension to the widow or children of a World War veteran. The bill would provide such a pension and in addition would include dependent parents.

The following criteria would govern eligibility for pension in addition to the service requirements heretofore set forth:

(1) The period of the World War would be deemed to have ended November 11, 1918, unless the veteran served in Russia, in which case the date would be extended by virtue of section 1 of Public, No. 344, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 26, 1935 (38 U. S. C. 704a), to April 1, 1920. Section 5 of Public, No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, which provides that "except as to emergency officers' retirement pay, reenlistment in the military or naval service on or after November 12, 1918, and before July 2, 1921, where there was prior service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, shall be considered as World War service under the laws providing benefits for World War veterans and their dependents," would also be applicable.

(2) The above-described income limitation would be applicable only in the case of children, in view of the provision of the bill which limits payment of compensation to dependent widows and dependent mothers and fathers. The condition of dependency would be determined under regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Administration.

(3) The term "widow," as defined by section 2 of the bill, would mean a woman who was married prior to July 3, 1921, to the person who served; or who was married prior to May 13, 1938, to the person who served, provided a child was born of such marriage; and the following provisions of section 3 of the act of May 13, 1938 (Public, No. 514, 75th Cong.), would govern the determination of eligibility of a widow for benefits under the proposed act:

"That all marriages shall be proven as valid marriages according to the law of the place where the parties resided at the time of marriage or the law of the place where the parties resided when the right to compensation accrued. Compensation shall not be allowed a widow who has remarried either once or more than once, and where compensation is properly discontinued by reason of remarriage it shall not thereafter be recommended. No compensation shall be paid to a widow unless there was continuous cohabitation with the person who served from the date of marriage to date of death, except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the person who served, without the fault of the widow."

(4) The term "child" would be that as described in paragraph VI, Veterans' Regulation No. 10, as amended, which provides that:

"The term 'child' shall mean a legitimate child or a child legally adopted, unmarried, and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, except that the payment of pension shall be further continued after the age of 18 years and until completion of education or training (but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years), to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn."

(5) The administrative and penal provisions of title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the Veterans Regulations would be applicable.

While Congress has not heretofore seen fit to enact a service-pension law on behalf of widows and children of World War veterans, Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended by Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, provides benefits on account of non-service-connected death as follows:

"(a) To the surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person who served in the World War before November 12, 1918 (or before April 2, 1920, if the person was serving with the United States military forces in Russia), who, while receiving or entitled to receive compensation, pension, or retirement pay for 10 percent disability or more presumptively or directly incurred in or aggravated by service in the World War, died from a disease or disability not service connected.

"(b) To the surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased World War veteran who served within either of the above-described periods and who was honorably discharged after having served 90 days or more (or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty) and who died from a disease or disability not service connected and at the time of death had a disability directly or presumptively incurred in or aggravated by service in the World War for which compensation would have been payable if 10 percent or more in degree."

The foregoing benefits are not payable to a widow without child, or to a child if such person's annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with a child if she has an income which exceeds $2,500.

There is enclosed as part of this report a comparative chart showing widows' and children's rates of pension payable under the Spanish-American War Service Pension Act of May 1, 1926, under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part II and part III, and those proposed by H. R. 4.

While the proposed rates are lower than those prescribed by section 2 of the Spanish-American War Service Pension Act of May 1, 1926 (38 U. S. C. 364a), as reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935 (38 U. S. C. 368), the standards of entitlement are different.

For example, under the bill, service before the beginning date of the World War, if in a period of service extending into the World War period, may be counted, whereas under the Service Pension Act of May 1, 1926, service prior to April 21, 1898, the beginning date of the War with Spain, cannot be counted. The act of May 1, 1926, does not require continuous cohabitation on the part of the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (although it is required of widows of veterans of the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection), whereas the bill, by incorporating an applicable provision of section 3 of the act of May 13, 1938, supra, makes continuous cohabitation a prerequisite to a widow's entitlement. Under the act of May 1, 1926, only a legitimate child is included within the definition of that term, whereas the bill would include an adopted child. Under the act of May 1, 1926, pension on behalf of a child is discontinued when the child reaches the age of 16 years, whereas the bill would permit an unmarried child to receive benefits until its eighteenth birthday and thereafter until 21 years of age if attending an approved course of training.

In every instance the rates prescribed by the bill exceed those provided by part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, based upon non-service-connected death and limited to widows and children of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection veterans. The proposed rates approximate those prescribed for a widow under 50 years of age by part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, based upon service-connected death in other than a period of war service. Enactment of such rates would therefore disturb the balance now existing between rates based upon service-connected death resulting from a period of service other than wartime, and those based upon wartime non-service-connected death.

In view of the unprecedently large numbers involved and the increasing yearly cost, it is believed that any legislation proposing a service pension on behalf of widows, children, and dependent parents of World War veterans should be considered in the light of the historical background and circumstances surrounding the original legislation with respect

to World War veterans and their dependents, and also in the light of recently enacted laws granting benefits to dependents of deceased World War veterans where the death was not due to service but the veteran at time of death was suffering from a service-connected disability.

The original World War veterans' legislation was predicated on a desire to overcome the disadvantages of the pension system as it existed in the United States prior to the World War, and to evolve an entirely new plan including liberal provision of compensation based upon workmen's compensation standards rather than the idea of a Government pension, provision for insurance against death and total permanent disability, vocational rehabilitation, and other benefits in keeping with the modern attitude of the Government's responsibility toward those who incurred disability or the dependents of those who died as a result of military or naval service. The new plan was designed to replace the old policy whereby pensions were granted not only on account of disability or death incurred as a result of military service, but also on account of death or disability in no way connected with that service. It was designed by the Government, after expert thought and study, for the purpose of obviating what were deemed to be defects in the old pension system.

Since the enactment of original legislation with respect to World War veterans, numerous liberalizations have occurred, including the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, whereby monetary relief was afforded to thousands of widows and children of World War veterans, and legislation permitting the indulgence of legal presumption of service connection of certain disabilities whereby compensation was awarded to thousands of World War veterans and their dependents who could not otherwise prove service connection. These and other enactments granting enlarged benefits to the World War group have served as the ground for not reviving the principles and policies followed by the Government in extending relief to veterans of wars prior to the World War and the dependents of such veterans.

The act of June 28, 1934 (Public No. 484, 73d Cong.), provided compensation for widows and children of deceased World War veterans at rates lower than service-connected death rates if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause, not due to misconduct, was entitled to or receiving compensation, pension, or retirement pay for a directly service-connected disability of at least 30-percent degree. The underlying theory of this law was that it could not reasonably be said that a 30-percent service-connected disability might not be related to the cause of death. In other words, the law in effect recognized a presumption that the service-connected disability, if 30 percent or more, was related to the cause of death regardless of what the evidence revealed or did not reveal in the individual case. Section 1, Public, No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, eliminated the misconduct bar and included presumptively service-connected cases. The act was further liberalized by Public, No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, August 16, 1937, by reducing to 20 percent the 30-percent disability requirement, and by Public, No. 514, Seventy-fifth Congress, May 13, 1938, the percentage requirement was still further reduced to 10 percent. A still further liberalization was provided by Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, as heretofore set forth.

It is believed that the committee will wish to bear in mind that the Government's first obligation properly extends to those disabled in active duty in the military or naval service and to the dependents of such persons who die as the result of such disability. In at least one instance in the past relief extended to non-service-connected groups, as the result of economic depression, resulted in decreased relief to service-connected groups, as evidenced by the effect of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933.

Pertinent to this proposal to enter a new and extensive field of relief is the question of the Government's existing and potential obligation. World War service-connected disability cases now total more than 349,000 and, it is believed, these cases will continue to increase. Each of these cases is potentially in line for death-compensation benefits either service-connected or under the liberal provisions of Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, described above. Disbursements to World War veterans for non-service-connected permanent total disability will continue to increase for many years as will the cost of domiciliary and hospital care. Further, there is the larger question involving the Government's defense program requiring expenditures of billions of dollars in addition to which there will flow increased expenditures for relief to veterans (and their dependents) of our defense forces.

Estimate of cost of the proposed measure for the first year is as follows:

	Number of cases	Estimated cost first year
Widows alone	29,300	$7,032,000
Widows with children	60,000	24,689,000
Children alone	20,800	4,199,000
Total	110,100	35,920,000
One-half cost	55,000	17,960,000
One parent	28,300	6,792,000
Both parents	4,900	1,764,000
Total	33,200	8,556,000
One-half cost	16,600	4,278,000
Estimated cost [1]		22,238,000

[1] Based on experience it is estimated that not more than one-half of those entitled would apply and be paid the first year. Therefore, one-half cost has been used.

Income provision contained in paragraph II of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) has been applied. The term "dependent" widow may result in a denial of benefits in some cases where the income limitation would not bar payment but no estimate can be made as to the number of such cases.

Cases cannot be added since parents exist with other beneficiaries.

Following is a summary of the rates of pension now being paid the dependents of Spanish-American and World War veterans:

DEPENDENTS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS, INCLUDING THE PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION AND BOXER REBELLION, FOR DEATH ON ACCOUNT OF SUCH WAR SERVICE

Act of March 20, 1933

Under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1933, and the Executive orders which followed, the surviving widow, child, or children, and dependent parents of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion, who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service, may be entitled to receive pension at the monthly rates prescribed as follows:

Widow under 50 years of age, $30.

Widow 50 to 65 years of age, $35.

Widow over 65 years of age, $40.

Widow with one child, $10 additional for such child up to 10 years of age increased to $15 from age 10 (with $8 for each additional child up to 10 years of age, increased to $13 from age 10).

No widow but one child, $20.

No widow but two children, $33 (equally divided).

No widow but three children, $46 (equally divided) (with $8 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided).

Dependent mother or father, $20 (or both, $15 each).

The total pension payable under this law may not exceed $75. Where such benefits exceed $75 the amount of $75 will be apportioned.

The term "widow" of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection for the payment of benefit described herein means a person who was married to the veteran prior to September 1, 1922.

The term "child" for the payment of benefit described above means a legitimate child or a child legally adopted, unmarried, and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 the child becomes permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect except that the payment of pension may further continue after the age of 18 years and until completion of education or training in an approved school but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years.

Act of August 13, 1935

Under the act of August 13, 1935 (Public, No. 269, 74th Cong.), all the pension laws in effect March 19, 1933, which granted pensions to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents, were reenacted in their entirety.

Under the general law or act of July 14, 1862, as amended and reenacted, the surviving widow, child, or children of dependent relatives of veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or Boxer Rebellion who served between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, may be paid a pension, providing the veteran died in the service or died from a disability incurred in the service in line of duty and regardless of the character of his discharge. The rate of payment ranges from $12 to $30 per month, depending upon the kind of services rendered and the rank of the veteran at the time he contracted his fatal disability, with $2 for each of his children under the age of 16, which pension may be continued after age 16 to or for a helpless child. The minimum rate for the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War or Philippine Insurrection is $25. This pension is payable to the veteran's dependents in the following order of preference:

1. To the widow, regardless of the date of her marriage to the veteran or her financial condition.

2. If there be no widow entitled to payment, then to the veteran's child or children under age of 16 or helpless.

3. If there be no widow or child entitled to take and the mother is without adequate means of support other than her own manual labor and the contributions of others not legally bound for her support, then to such dependent mother of the veteran.

4. If there be no widow, child, or mother entitled to payment, then to the father, except that his earnings are considered in determining whether he be dependent.

5. If there be no widow, child, mother, or father entitled to payment, then to the orphan brothers and sisters under 16 years of age.

Under the act of May 1, 1926, as reenacted, the surviving widow and minor children of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or Boxer Rebellion who died in the service of a disability incurred in line of duty may be entitled to a pension of $30 per month plus $6 additional for each minor child under 16 years of age.

DEPENDENTS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS, INCLUDING PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION AND BOXER REBELLION, WHOSE DEATH WAS NOT CAUSED BY SUCH WAR SERVICE

As is the case with veterans, the widows and children of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection whose death did not result from diseases or injuries incurred or aggravated by military service may be entitled to a pension under the act of March 20, 1933, or under the pension acts which were reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935.

Act of March 20, 1933

Under the act of March 20, 1933, the surviving widow and children of any deceased person who served in the active military or naval service, during the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection may be entitled to a pension at the following rates:

Widow but no children, $15 per month.

Widow and one child, $20 per month (with $3 monthly for each additional child).

No widow but one child, $12 per month.

No widow but two children, $15 (equally divided).

No widow but three children, $20 (equally divided, with $2 monthly for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided).

The total pension payable cannot exceed $27 monthly. Where such benefits would otherwise exceed $27 monthly the amount of $27 may be apportioned.

Act of August 13, 1935

Under the act of August 13, 1935, there was reenacted the act of May 1, 1926, Public, No. 166, Sixty-ninth Congress, under which widows and minor children under 16 years of age, or helpless, of a person who served in the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or Boxer Rebellion, may be entitled to a pension at the rate of $30 per month, plus $6 additional for each minor child under the age of 16, which pension may be continued after age 16 to or for a helpless child. The veteran must have served 90 days or have been discharged for disability contracted within service in line of duty within the following periods:

Spanish-American War: Period of the War with Spain was from April 21, 1898, to April 11, 1899, inclusive.

Philippine Insurrection: The Philippine Insurrection was from April 12, 1899, to July 4, 1902, inclusive.

Boxer Rebellion (China relief expedition): The period of the Boxer Rebellion was from June 16, 1900, to May 12, 1901, inclusive, provided the person actually participated therein.

The veteran must have been honorably discharged from all contracts of service during the period of the war, insurrection, or rebellion. No period of service rendered prior to April 21, 1898, nor subsequent to July 4, 1902, may be counted in computing the 90 days nor can short periods of service in two or more designated periods be combined to create the 90 days required unless service was continuous.

The term "widow" means a person who was married to the veteran prior to September 1, 1922, and includes such a widow who has been remarried once or more than once if her subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce on any ground except adultery on the part of the wife.

In case of death, remarriage, or forfeiture of the pension by the widow, the child or children stand in the place of the widow and receive the full pension she would receive. The term "child" means a legitimate child under 16 years of age regardless of marriage.

HALF PENSION PAYABLE TO WIFE OR CHILDREN OF A VETERAN

Act of March 3, 1899

Under the act of March 3, 1899, which is among the laws reenacted on August 13, 1935, it is provided that one-half of the pension due any veteran, who is a resident of the United States, who served prior to April 21, 1898, or to any veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection, may be paid to his wife or children under the following conditions:

1. If the veteran deserts his wife for more than 6 consecutive months and his wife is of good moral character and in necessitous circumstances, or if there is no wife entitled to this pension, deserts his legitimate child or children under 16 years of age or his permanently helpless and dependent child or children; or

2. If such a veteran enters the United States Soldiers' Home, the Naval Home, or a State home, one-half of his pension which accrues during his residence therein may be paid to his wife, she being a woman of good moral character and in necessitous circumstances, or to his children unless they are also in a home provided for wives and children of soldiers and sailors.

COMPENSATION FOR WIDOWS, CHILDREN, AND DEPENDENT PARENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS WHOSE DEATH RESULTED FROM SERVICE

Act of March 20, 1933

Under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1933 (Public, No. 2, 73d Cong.), the surviving widow, child, or children and dependent parents of deceased veterans of the World War who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service, are entitled to receive compensation at the same rates prescribed for dependents of Spanish-American War veterans.

The term "widow" of a veteran of the World War means a person married to the veteran prior to July 3, 1931, and who has not remarried.

The term "mother" or "father" means the natural mother or father of the veteran or the mother or father of the veteran through legal adoption.

Act of July 19, 1939

Under the provisions of the act of July 19, 1939 (Public, No. 198, 76th Cong.), the rates of compensation payable under the existing laws or veterans regulation, to a surviving widow, child, or children, or dependent mother or father of any World War veteran who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War, are as follows:

To a widow under 50 years of age, $38.

To a widow 50 years of age or over, $45.

Widow with one child, $10 additional for such child up to 10 years of age, increased to $15 from age 10 (with $8 for each additional child up to 10 years of age, increased to $13 from age 10).

No widow but one child, $20.

No widow but two children, $33 (equally divided).

No widow but three children, $46 (equally divided) (with $8 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided). As to the widow, child or children the total compensation payable under this section cannot exceed $83.

This act also provides for compensation at the rate of $45 per month where there is only one dependent parent and $25 per month each if both mother and father are surviving and dependent and the veteran's death is due to service.

The increased rates provided by this law are payable in the event the amount of compensation authorized and the amount of compensation, pension, or yearly renewable term or automatic insurance does not equal or exceed the above rates.

The term "widow of a World War veteran" means a woman who was married at any time prior to May 13, 1938, to the person who served; who lived continuously with the person who served from date of marriage to date of death, except where there was separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the person who served, without the fault of the widow, and who has not remarried.

COMPENSATION TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF WORLD WAR VETERANS WHO DIED FROM DISABILITIES NOT INCURRED DURING THEIR WAR SERVICE

Act of June 28, 1934, as amended

Under this law the payment of compensation is authorized to the unremarried widow and children of a person who served in the World War on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918 (before April 2, 1920, if the veteran served with the United States military forces in Russia), and who at the time of his death was suffering from a disability directly or presumptively incurred in or aggravated by service during the World War for which he was receiving or entitled to receive compensation. Compensation may also be paid to a widow and minor children of such person, if at the time of the veteran's death he had a service-connected disability for which compensation would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree, provided he was honorably discharged after having served 90 days or more or if having served less than 90 days was discharged for disability incurred in line of duty.

Compensation under this law is not payable to any widow without child, or a child whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with child or children whose annual income exceeds $2,500.

The monthly rates of compensation for widows and children are as follows:

Widow with no children, $30 per month.

Widow with one child, $38 per month (with $4 for each additional child).

No widow but one child, $15 per month.

No widow but two children, $22 (equally divided).

No widow but three children, $30 (equally divided) (with $3 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided. The total compensation may not exceed $64 per month).

Payments of this character usually commence as of the day following the date of death if claim is filed within 1 year. In all other cases payment commences from the date of filing claim with the Veterans' Administration.

The widow must have been married to the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, and must not have remarried.

The term "child" means a person unmarried and under the age of 18, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child, a child legally adopted, a stepchild if a member of the man's household, an illegitimate child, but, as to the father only, if acknowledged in writing signed by him or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support, or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child. The payment of compensation may be continued after age 18, and until completion of education or training in an approved school, but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time in support of H. R. 4, a bill providing more adequate compensation

for certain dependents of World War veterans. This bill is identical to H. R. 9000, passed by the House during the Seventy-sixth Congress.

This legislation has the support of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with their auxiliaries. Such support has been given based on the experience of these organizations in every town and city in the United States in observing the conditions confronting the dependents of World War veterans.

The chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], has presented to the House a comprehensive analysis of the bill in his remarks. The committee report likewise gives detailed information concerning this legislation which makes it obvious that it is unnecessary for me to dwell at length on this measure.

I feel that the time allotted to me should be used in furnishing the following pertinent information that is a compelling reason for the enactment of this legislation.

According to the Veterans' Administration, the average age of the veteran of the World War is 48 years as of January 1, 1941. Due to increasing age and the fact that the type of service rendered during the World War has resulted in disabilities, the daily death rate among World War veterans is 103, according to the Veterans' Administration. This daily death rate will naturally become higher with each additional year.

While we are speaking of the average age of the World War veteran, I have here a very interesting chart showing the estimated number of World War veterans by age group living at the beginning of each calendar year. This chart was prepared by the Veterans' Administration, and I wish at this time to request permission to insert same in the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert the chart at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Estimated number of living World War veterans at the beginning of each calendar year, by age group

Year	Total	Attained age										
		45–49	50–54	55–59	60–6	65–69	70–74	75–79	80–84	85–89	90–94	95–99
1952	3,458,422	226	373,734	1,005,150	952,664	179,410	34,377	10,089	2,370	387	15	
1953	3,387,014	52	216,310	1,718,402	1,109,799	287,444	39,467	12,235	2,844	440	21	
1954	3,311,547	2	81,506	1,465,118	1,284,364	416,549	45,467	14,716	3,270	529	26	
1955	3,231,774		9,667	1,105,689	1,482,252	558,141	53,052	17,602	3,746	595	30	
1956	3,147,472		1,234	646,899	1,703,580	702,451	68,500	19,716	4,392	665	35	
1957	3,055,079		213	345,863	1,719,554	818,109	142,555	22,621	5,068	754	42	
1958	2,957,932		48	199,552	1,544,676	952,238	228,244	26,024	6,189	913	48	
1959	2,855,926		2	74,995	1,312,062	1,100,984	329,279	30,040	7,454	1,052	58	
1960	2,749,005			8,887	987,617	1,268,811	438,380	35,146	8,901	1,200	64	
1961	2,637,204			1,134	575,912	1,455,241	547,946	45,383	9,800	1,407	71	
1962	2,516,235			196	307,037	1,461,275	637,387	97,320	11,321	1,618	81	
1963	2,390,818			44	176,213	1,302,998	740,874	155,520	13,065	2,004	100	
1964	2,261,294			1	65,936	1,099,835	855,331	222,536	15,122	2,418	115	
1965	2,128,088				7,805	823,051	983,491	292,979	17,756	2,877	129	
1966	1,991,788				995	478,043	1,124,304	361,950	23,199	3,154	152	
1967	1,842,555				171	253,010	1,114,824	419,543	51,246	3,587	174	
1968	1,693,440				39	143,535	978,528	485,331	81,617	4,167	223	
1969	1,545,493				1	53,186	814,583	557,143	115,462	4,849	269	
1970	1,399,808					6,272	601,790	635,975	149,724	5,730	317	
1971	1,257,491					797	346,167	720,495	182,109	7,889	334	
1972	1,119,616					137	182,415	707,893	210,870	17,021	380	
1973	987,193					31	102,244	612,235	243,957	28,275	450	1
1974	861,148					1	37,544	503,707	280,262	39,104	529	1
1975	742,332						4,430	368,187	319,797	49,287	630	1
1976	631,534						564	210,341	361,482	58,279	867	1
1977	529,457						97	110,046	349,561	67,373	2,379	1
1978	436,704						22	60,552	294,560	77,981	3,588	1
1979	353,717						1	21,927	237,407	89,703	4,678	1
1980	280,719							2,590	170,314	102,251	5,563	1
1981	217,695							331	96,019	115,067	6,276	2
1982	164,392							57	49,510	107,561	7,257	7
1983	120,367							13	26,302	85,616	8,428	8
1984	85,021							1	9,274	66,029	9,707	10
1985	57,598								1,097	45,475	11,014	12
1986	37,178								141	24,751	12,273	13
1987	22,683								24	12,243	10,401	15
1988	12,954								5	5,935	6,997	17
1989	6,853									1,946	4,887	20
1990	3,328									231	3,075	22
1991	1,462									30	1,408	24
1992	563									5	542	16
1993	182									1	173	8
1994	46										40	6
1995	8										5	3
1996	1										1	

Budget and Statistics, Veterans' Administration.

Estimated number of living World War veterans at the beginning of each calendar year, by age group

Attained age	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
25 to 29												
30 to 34												
35 to 39	11,068	1,414	245	56	2							
40 to 44	1,304,670	765,062	410,535	238,326	90,036	10,691	1,366	236	54	2		
45 to 49	1,823,976	2,102,566	2,136,345	1,934,814	1,655,710	1,254,991	735,415	394,322	228,655	86,295	10,242	1,308
50 to 54	753,698	956,957	1,116,212	1,301,575	1,507,983	1,743,152	2,008,021	2,037,762	1,842,698	1,574,670	1,191,578	697,802
55 to 59	86,583	111,490	225,704	361,738	526,354	709,554	898,946	1,048,225	1,221,810	1,414,901	1,634,450	1,881,052
60 to 64	39,295	44,621	51,462	58,982	67,827	78,937	101,514	206,514	330,959	480,839	646,753	817,375
65 to 69	14,286	16,933	19,620	23,611	28,353	33,998	38,334	44,167	50,653	58,288	67,902	87,451
70 to 74	5,501	6,334	7,170	8,546	9,792	11,255	13,209	15,293	18,453	22,175	26,551	29,884
75 to 79	1,597	1,985	2,399	2,734	3,258	3,702	4,173	4,725	5,647	6,481	7,439	8,727
80 to 84	303	384	444	577	708	844	1,003	1,207	1,376	1,643	1,861	2,092
85 to 89	36	48	55	67	78	107	125	143	188	229	274	324
90 to 94	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	12	14
95 to 99												
Total	4,041,017	4,007,798	3,970,194	3,931,029	3,890,105	3,847,205	3,802,111	3,752,600	3,700,491	3,645,531	3,587,462	3,526,029

Average age in 1940: 47.
Budget and Statistics, Veterans' Administration.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting observations made reveals that the last World War veteran is expected to die in 1996 and that his age should be approximately 95 years.

Turning our attention to H. R. 4 and the fact that 103 World War veterans are dying daily, for every married veteran that dies he leaves 2.12 children, according to statistics of the Veterans' Administration. In other words, about 76 percent of the veterans of the World War are married and at death leave a wife and two children.

In addition to providing benefits for the widow and orphans, this bill provides likewise for the dependent father and mother of deceased World War veterans. With the average age of the World War veteran 48 years, according to the Veterans' Administration, the average age of the mother is 75 years and the annual death rate is estimated at 77 for every 1,000 mothers; the father's average age is 78 with an annual death rate among the fathers of 108 for every 1,000 lives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman advise the House as to what is considered a dependent mother and father?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the gentleman will permit me to continue I will discuss that term in a moment.

The mortality rate which will increase rapidly with each succeeding year is destined to eliminate the fathers and mothers within a comparatively short number of years. There is one fact that each Member of the House should remember and consider in connection with H. R. 4, and that is that this legislation is not a general pension to either widows, orphans, or parents. If you will refer to the bill, page 1, lines 7, 8, and 9, you will note that the word "dependent" is not alone applied to the widow and orphan, but likewise to the mother and father. This word "dependent," which means there must exist a definite need, eliminates at least 75 percent of the widows, orphans, and fathers and mothers. It means that there must be a very definite need.

From a letter dated April 19, 1940, received from General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I wish to quote the following in regard to dependency. He says in part—and this is with reference to H. R. 9000 of the Seventy-sixth Congress:

> Should the bill in its present form be enacted into law, in determining the dependency of a widow, the Veterans' Administration would employ a rule somewhat similar to that now applying in the determination of dependency pertaining to parents. Under the existing regulations there is used as guide the rule that where the income of one such person is $50 a month, there arises a presumption that dependency does not exist. However, dependency may be established notwithstanding the $50-income rule if conditions are shown to exist which warrant a determination that the income of the widow is insufficient to provide for her reasonable needs.

It is obvious that General Hines' interpretation of the word "dependent" establishes a needs clause, and such a requirement meets the criticism of many who have failed to take such a provision into consideration.

Then, too, the Veterans' Administration estimates, as you will note in the committee report, that, based on experience, not more than 50 percent of those eligible will apply the first year. This is usually the result of lack of information or interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this pension is allowed, irrespective of the cause of death of the veteran?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct, but dependency must first be established.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. It will not affect compensation that is paid to service-connected cases?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No; it will not.

The policy of this Government in paying pension benefits has long been established. Since 1776, when the first Pension Act was approved, this country has paid pensions to widows and dependents of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, Indian wars, Civil War, Spanish-American War, as well as to the widows and orphans of those who served in the Regular Establishments of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

For example, the widows of Civil War veterans, if married prior to June 27, 1905, may receive a pension at the rate of $30 monthly if under 70 years of age, and $40 if over the age of 70 years. If the widow was married during the veteran's Civil War service, a pension of $50 is payable.

The provisions of the existing law under which these benefits are paid do not require that the widow show dependency.

Under existing pension laws where the veteran did not die due to a service-connected disability, $30 is payable to the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran, with $6 for each child under 16 years of age. There is no maximum to the amount payable nor is there any requirement that those receiving benefits have the needs clause applied.

Contrasting the provisions of H. R. 4, it simply means that the dependent widow, father, or mother of the deceased World War veteran will receive $20 monthly, while the widow with one child receives $28; the widow with two children $34; with $4 for each additional child, but in no case can the widow receive over $56 monthly.

You will recall in my discussion of the benefits payable to the widows of Civil and Spanish-American War veterans no needs clause was applied, but under the provisions of H. R. 4 the word "dependent" means a needs clause must be applied before a meager $20 monthly benefit may be awarded.

In conclusion, H. R. 4 has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and I trust will have the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

It is incumbent on this Nation to care for the dependents of those citizens who fight its wars. The payment of pensions is a strong national-defense policy and regardless of the cost such a policy is the cheapest and greatest insurance this country can ever have to safeguard its cherished possessions—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the able chairman of this committee has explained in detail this bill which has been before the House before and which passed by an overwhelming majority on the other occasion. I sincerely hope that today it may pass by a unanimous vote.

You have heard the problems discussed from time to time with reference to the needy. You have heard discussions with reference to the work program. You have heard that in these present days there have been cuts in the W. P. A. There is a situation now existing by reason of those cuts where many veterans' wives, children, and dependents are cut off from the work they have had heretofore.

There is great need today for this particular bill. It has been needed in the past, but probably more today than ever before.

If I could analyze the various letters that come in, I could tell you that seldom a day passes but what one to five letters come in, telling me that they are widows of veterans and telling of the struggles they are making, and the tiny youngsters they are trying to help along and to support. I think we should not longer delay passing this bill.

I want to compliment the chairman of this committee [Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi] for his consistent work on behalf of the veterans and his diligence in his efforts to bring up this bill as well as other legislation on behalf of the veterans.

The time is limited in this debate, but the veterans' widows and dependents are in dire need in many sections of the country. The sooner we show the appreciation of the service rendered by their loved ones who passed on, the sooner we show the true spirit which we talk about exemplifying. I hope that every Member on the floor today will vote in favor of this bill.

This bill is fair, probably not liberal enough, but is a starter. It is inconceivable to me that a great government should fail longer to provide for the dependents of its soldiers, many of whom are actually in dire need.

The committee has considered every aspect of the case. It was my pleasure to move to report it favorably, and all Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, favored it. It has long been needed. Let us help a "Buddy's" widow

or dependent parent or child today. Let us join in a big vote for this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4 makes provision for a group of widows and children not heretofore provided for; namely, the widows and dependents of deceased World War veterans who did not die as a result of service-connected disability, whereas the ones who have had provision made for them up to the present are the widows and children of those veterans who died as a result of a service-connected disability. I can understand and appreciate that greater consideration should be shown to the veterans of the World War who have service-connected disability, but I cannot understand why this extra consideration should extend beyond the grave and that the widows and children of veterans of the World War who did not die as a result of a service-connected disability should not have equal provision made for them. They can be just as hungry, just as needy, just as much in want as the others; and in many instances the others may be better off because of provision made for the soldier by the Government during his lifetime. H. R. 4 will in part correct this inequality and will put the widows and orphans of the non-service-connected World War veterans somewhat on a par with those of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection. In all fairness I urge the passage of this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a fine contribution. Is it not a fact that living expenses are much greater today than they were in the days of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Unquestionably so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also it is much more difficult for the widows to secure employment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Very much so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have been a member of the committee reporting this measure, H. R. 4, favorably and that it was voted unanimously by our committee. I do not want anyone to look on this bill as social legislation. We have from time to time passed social legislation which was meritorious, however I consider this measure and its purpose even in a more sacred light than social legislation. This is nothing more than a debt due by every citizen and every resource of the United States, and one which has been sorely neglected in the past. I hope now that there will not be a dissenting vote to the passage of this bill. I have always personally felt that I was under lasting gratitude and obligation to the brave sons of this great Commonwealth who fought through the horrors of the World War and to those loved ones who gave them up to join the mighty armed forces of the United States, and a deeper obligation to their children who, in so many instances have to give them up on account of injuries and hardships they received in the service. I can find but one objection to this bill and that is, it is not generous enough in its effect. It may be argued that the provision for dependent fathers and mothers should be striken for the reason that they would be cared for by social-security benefits. This, however, is sadly untrue; we had just as well deal with facts and all you have to do is just look about you and you will see the fallacy of this argument. Think of the great mass of veterans who belong to the agricultural group who are not touched by social security.

I know that the membership of this House will not deny the loved ones of these worthy heroes, and that this bill will carry by one of the largest majorities the House has ever voted a measure, and therefore, with these concluding words I will yield back the remainder of my time. The call of justice, since the erection of these walls, has never rung within them in louder tones for the passage of any bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in this day when we are thinking so much about defense for future wars, I feel certain the making of ample provision for soldiers of previous wars as well as for their widows and orphans is one of the very best ways to provide for defense. Men now called upon to serve their country should know that in the event they become incapacitated they will be cared for during their declining years. Soldiers will fight best when they know that in the event they do not return from any possible battle line their dependent widows and helpless orphans will at least receive the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, very often those of us who march away to battle under the strains of martial music feel that we are making a great sacrifice. Let me remind you that those who remain at home also serve. Public acclaim is not forthcoming for the little woman who stays at home with the children.

The bravest battles ever fought
Shall I tell you where and when
On the maps of the world you will find them not
For they were fought by the mothers of men.

In conclusion, let me state that I hearily endorse the provisions of the pending bill and sincerely trust that it will pass not only for humanity's sake, but as an important provision in our much needed defense program.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my wholehearted support of H. R. 4, unanimously and favorably reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

It provides compensation for surviving dependent widows, children, fathers, and mothers of deceased persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service during the World War and received an honorable discharge. This bill provides compensation at the monthly rates as follows:

Widow, but no child, $20 per month.

Widow and one child, $28 per month.

Widow and two children, $34 per month (with $4 for each additional child).

No widow, but one child, $12 per month.

No widow, but two children, $18 per month.

No widow, but three children, $24 per month (with $3 for each additional child, divided equally among them).

Dependent mother or father, $20 per month (or where both are living, $15 per month each).

The total compensation payable to the widow and children of a veteran cannot exceed $52 per month. This compensation will be paid to a widow in the event she married the veteran prior to May 13, 1938, provided a child was born of such marriage. In order for the widow to secure compensation if no child was born of such marriage, she must have married the veteran prior to July 3, 1921.

This is the identical bill to H. R. 9000, which was passed by an overwhelming majority in the Seventy-sixth Congress, but on which no action was taken in the Senate. This bill is not as liberal as the pensions provided for the widows and children of Civil War, Indian war, and Spanish War veterans. Widows under similar circumstances of veterans of those wars receive $30 per month, without being required to show dependency.

Under the present law, widows and minor children of World War veterans in order to receive compensation must show that the veteran either died of disabilities contracted in the service or had a permanent service-connected disability of at least 1 percent in degree at the time of his death. In the former case, the widow is allowed $38 per month and in the latter case $30 per month. Under the bill before us, it is not necessary for the widows and minor children and dependent parents to show that the veteran died of a service-connected disability or had a service-connected disability of any degree at the time of his death.

Under the present law, dependent parents cannot receive compensation unless the death of the veteran was due to service-connected disabilities. This measure will be of great benefit to thousands of needy widows, minor children, and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans.

I introduced a bill in 1928 in the House to grant pensions to widows and minor children of World War veterans without it being necessary to show that the death

of the veteran was due to service-connected disabilities, and I introduced a similar bill in the Senate in 1930. I have always believed that this legislation was just, and I am happy to speak and vote for the bill before us.

Many of us would prefer a more liberal bill; however, it is brought up under suspension of the rules, and no amendment can be offered to the bill. It must be accepted or rejected as is.

I might say, however, that this measure if enacted into law will prove to be a great blessing to all those widows and minor children and dependent parents who have been unable to establish that the veteran's death was due to service or that the veteran had a service-connected disability of 1 percent or more at the time of his death, and it will prove to be a great blessing to many more future widows, minor children, and dependent parents of veterans who have been or will be unable to establish service-connected disabilities.

The widows, minor children, and dependent parents of these veterans need this help.

Wars are expensive. We must constantly bear in mind that war is the most expensive enterprise on which this Nation may embark. It means the loss of the lives of countless numbers of our defenders. It means thousands of others will be maimed, rendered sightless, lose their health and their minds. It also means widows, orphans, and dependent parents.

The aftermath of war generally costs more than the immediate expenses of war. It is generally admitted that before we are through paying for the first World War, it will have cost this Nation a hundred billion dollars. In a little over a year, Congress has appropriated and authorized the expenditure of more than $43,000,000,000 for national defense alone and there has been no declaration of war. If this Nation becomes an active belligerent in the European-Asiatic-African war, there is no way to estimate what the cost will be. We know it will be much greater than the other World War.

When we entered the other World War, our national debt and obligations were a little over $1,000,000,000. If we enter this war in the near future, we shall start in the war with national debts and obligations exceeding $60,000,000,000. Hon. Jesse Jones, who has a commanding position in connection with the finances of this Government, stated some time ago that our national debt in the near future would be at least $90,000,000,000.

The average age of the World War veteran is now 48 years. There are tens of thousands of these veterans who are either disabled or unable to find employment and are receiving no compensation or pensions from the Government. They are in needy circumstances. This is true as to the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of tens of thousands of deceased World War veterans. While this Nation is pouring out billions of dollars for relief in various forms and for defense of nations and peoples throughout the earth there are those today in Congress and in the administration who are opposing this bill that will cost the taxpayers approximately $22,000,000 the first year. This is less than one-third the cost of a battleship. Congress has appropriated and authorized more than a hundred million dollars a day since June 1, 1940. Therefore, what we are proposing to give to the needy widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased World War veterans for 1 year is less than one-fifth of what we are spending and proposing to spend in 1 day in preparation for another war.

The measure before us is a part of the unfinished business of the last World War. Those who are now urging us to get into another World War should stop and think of the cost in lives, in tears, and in treasure. They must know that it means the lives and crippling of perhaps a million American boys, and more than a million more widows and orphans, and tens of thousands of dependent fathers and mothers. I regretted today to see a bill objected to for the benefit of totally disabled World War veterans. I had hoped it might come up and be passed.

Why create more disabled American boys and multiply the number of widows and orphans in this country when we have not taken care of those who did defend the country and the widows, orphans and the dependent parents of tens of thousands of World War veterans who are now dead? Because of these, and many other considerations, I have constantly opposed measures that would involve us in the present European-Asiatic-African War. It is not our war. We were not consulted.

For us to take care of those who have defended our country, and their widows and orphans, and provide for our national defense, and to provide for our needy people will be heavy enough burden for the American people.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. If it has taken us 23 years to get the pensions of the last war straightened out, how many years will it take to get straightened out on the pensions of the war we are about to enter?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I hope that we may be spared involvement in the present World War. I have said before, and I still believe it will be the longest, the costliest, and the bloodiest war in which this country has ever engaged.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON].

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is most timely, and I am going to support it with all the energy at my command. I served on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation during the Seventy-fourth Congress and have studied veterans' legislation, just as I have studied the question of war and peace ever since I came out of that conflict in 1918, from whence arises this problem we are discussing.

I am free to say that there is nothing within the power of the people of the United States that they can give either to the veterans of the World War or to their widows and orphans that is good enough for them or that will ever repay the debt of gratitude the United States owes to them, whether they lost their lives or were wounded or did not get to the front. The mere fact that they offered their lives should be sufficient justification for the passage of this legislation.

There is nothing wrong with this bill except that it does not go far enough. I think we should take care of these people in a still greater way than we are aiming to do in this bill. It grants pensions to dependents of a World War veteran who served 90 days and was honorably discharged and died of a non-service-connected disability, as follows:

Widow, $20, with $8 for the first, $6 for the second, and $4 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $12; two children, $18; three children, $24; with $3 for each additional child; dependent parents, $30; dependent parent, $20; total compensation to widow or children, $56. A widow must have married the veteran prior to July 3, 1921, unless a child was born of such marriage.

Mr. Speaker, nobody suffered more in the World War than those mothers and fathers who saw their sons march away to fight on foreign soil. The man who dies in the blinding flash of an enemy's gun in the excitement of battle does not suffer anything as compared with the misery the mother goes through day after day and night after night.

The estimated veteran population of the State of Kansas is about 65,000, and under State laws veterans, their wives or widows, and minor children are to be supplied with the necessaries of life in their homes; but the State does not make any direct provisions for relief to World War veterans or their widows or orphans.

The bill will take large numbers of women and children from the relief rolls. The widows of World War veterans, the widows of veterans who honorably served their country in time of war, should not be forced to seek the relief rolls in order to get something to eat.

Let us be fair to this deserving group of widows, orphans, and parents, and pass this bill by a unanimous vote.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join many other Members of this House in giving my active support to H. R. 4, reported by the World War Veterans' Committee, to provide more adequate compensation for widows, orphans, and aged dependents of World War veterans.

The pending legislation, as has been pointed out, is a belated recognition to the needy widows and orphans and other dependents, many of whom have been sorely neglected and ignored in veterans' legislation that has heretofore been enacted by the Congress.

As pointed out a few minutes ago by the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], this bill passed

the House without any appreciable opposition during the last Congress; but for some reason, or without any reason at all, the bill died in a committee of the Senate.

I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey a while ago, who insists that there was not actually a roll call on this bill when it passed the House a year ago. He states that he has taken occasion to look up the record, and finds that there were 31 Members, out of a membership of 435, who stood up in opposition to this bill. Of course, their names are not on record if there was not a roll call. We therefore do not know how many of them were returned to the House, but I do not hesitate to predict that on the record or off the record there are not a dozen Members in this House who would oppose the pending legislation. It is fair, just, and equitable, and should have been enacted years ago. My only criticism of the measure would be that it does not yet place widows of the World War on exactly the same basis as those of Spanish War veterans.

Frankly, I cannot conceive of so fair a measure having any opposition, and therefore I ventured the suggestion that had there been a roll call, 31 Members would not have gone on record as being opposed to the pending legislation. I personally know that the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars have been active and insistent for several years that legislation of this kind be passed, and I sincerely hope that there will not be a vote cast against the bill on final passage today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to support this bill. I think it is one of the most meritorious bills that has come before this Congress during the present session.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from Idaho when he referred to the time it will take to get over the effect of this war, as we have never gotten over the effects of the other one. Our hospitals are still full of the injured in body and mind. We are still paying debts and will continue to pay, pay, and pay. I want to add the statement that it will take more money to keep starvation from the doors of the American people after this war business is over than it will take to carry it through. It will cost about $100,000,000,000 to prepare to defend ourselves and to defend England and save the British Empire. Then it will cost an equal or greater sum to prevent our own people from starving after peace is declared and the boys return home and the defense factories are dismantled. So indeed the future is not bright.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am in strong support of H R. 4, now before the House. For the past several sessions I have had before the World War Veterans' Committee a bill which I introduced and which has for its purpose practically the same provisions as embraced in the bill now before the House.

The last session of Congress we were able to pass the Rankin bill which embraces this substance and the one before the House now is practically the same. It would provide pensions to dependent widows, orphans, and parents of all deceased World War veterans, regardless of the cause of the veteran's death. Under existing law, service connection of the veteran's death must be shown in order for these dependents to draw compensation or pension. The bill now before the House, H. R. 4, would eliminate the requirement for service connection to be proven.

There are any number of cases in my district—I am sure there are also cases in the district of each of my colleagues—where this bill will apply. Dependents have been unable to establish satisfactory proof that the deceased veteran had service connection of disability. I voted for this legislation at the last session of Congress and will vote for it today. I earnestly hope the Senate will pass the legislation and it will become law before adjournment of the present session. It is worthy and should be immediately passed.

I have before the World War Veterans' Committee also a bill which would give free dental services to all veterans, regardless of service connection of dental or other ailment of the veteran. Practically all veterans of the World War are now experiencing serious dental trouble. It is very difficult for them to have dental work performed by veterans' facilities unless the dental condition is service-connected. With enactment of the bill which I have introduced, they will be able to obtain this needed service promptly in all veterans' hospitals and facilities.

I have before the World War Veterans' Committee also a bill which would give straight service pension to all World War veterans regardless of whether or not the veteran has service-connected ailment. Under existing law only those who are totally disabled can now draw unless, of course, they have service connection. A veteran may have as much as 95 percent disability, not service-connected, and yet not draw any pension. My bill now before the committee would cure this defect and grant straight service pension to all World War veterans, and I would like to inquire of Chairman RANKIN what progress the committee is making on legislation for a straight service pension to all World War veterans.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; not yet. That matter is under consideration.

Mr. GREEN. I trust your committee will give serious and prompt consideration to straight service pension legislation for all World War veterans and report it promptly to the House for passage. These veterans have now waited some 22 years for pension. Practically all of them are in need of pension for the support of themselves and the care of their families. Spanish-American War veterans and veterans of the Civil War—Union Army—were granted pensions, I believe, in less time than 22 years which these World War veterans have now waited.

I strongly urge that your committee act promptly on this legislation because while we are preparing for future wars and for general defense by huge expenditures, we should not forget veterans of past wars who have made our free Government and liberty possible.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, naturally, it is in the interest of everyone to see that the ex-service men are taken care of. I certainly believe the Members of Congress want to do everything they can for anyone who is willing to give his life to his country.

I just question that we are to be able to continue for any great length of time what we are doing now for the ex-service men for the services they have rendered their country. If we do not change the order of things in Congress so that we can keep from wrecking this Nation financially, that is exactly what is going to happen. I ask, How long are you going to be able to pay the pensions that we have now granted unless we endeavor to economize in the operation of Government? We are just about at the $60,000,000,000 mark in the red so far as the national debt is concerned and we have given for war purposes for 1941 and 1942 the sum of $37,200,000,000, which will increase our national debt to $100,000,000,00 very shortly.

How much longer are you going to be able to pay the ex-service men the debt of gratitude this Nation owes them? How much longer are you going to be able to do that?

I know the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the other Members of Congress are interested in these men. But you are approaching the danger mark in the operation of this Government. You have unstintingly backed the New Deal and given it everything it wanted, you have given them large sums of money, but now is the time to start economizing in the operation of our Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. DOWNS] one-half minute.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 4, a bill to provide adequate compensation for widows and children of World War veterans. This measure rectifies an inequality which has long existed. Widows of veterans of other wars are receiving pensions, while the widows and children of World War veterans have been ignored.

As a service officer of the American Legion, I have had ample opportunity to observe the suffering among widows and children of the World War veterans. As an active veteran, I have long advocated the adoption of such a measure.

Certainly in these days, when we are spending billions of dollars for defense and to build up an Army and a Navy, we should not forget the men who fought in the last war and their wives and children.

The amounts of the pensions granted in this bill are not great, and I feel that this measure should be supported by every Member of the House of Representatives.

I urge the adoption of this measure with a unanimous vote.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] may I say that the World War veterans are not responsible for this tremendous debt. The World War veterans are not responsible for the pension policy of this country. I might remind him that when his party was in power it established this pension policy, after that war which Governor Bob Taylor of Tennessee said "put Yankee Doodle on the pension list and Dixie on crutches." So we are merely following the policy laid down by the gentleman's own party, however we are not going as strong. We are also trying to make this apply to all American people.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman honestly believe in his own heart that we are going to be able to continue paying our veterans if we break down this Government financially? Now, answer that honestly.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not, and I am not in favor of breaking down the Government financially and what little goes to these dependent veterans will not break this Government down financially.

Mr. RICH. It is not this legislation that is going to break it down. It is the other things you are doing.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The other things are not before the House now. What is before the House now is this bill for the dependents of these unfortunate veterans who have fought our battles in time of war and who have now passed away.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on the suspension of the rules and the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi) there were—ayes 144, noes 4.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and pending that, may I say that an agreement has been entered into providing that general debate limited to 1¼ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5049, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last regular supply bill for the Congress for the fiscal year 1942. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is made up of 11 subcommittees. There are 10 regular bills, and this is the tenth and last one for the fiscal year 1942. I have served on two other subcommittees and I have acted as chairman of this one.

We have already voted to appropriate considerably more than $30,000,000,000 this year. This small District of Columbia supply bill seems very insignificant and unimportant when compared to the vast sums which have heretofore been appropriated. However, this is not an unimportant bill.

In this bill we make appropriations for the running of the city of Washington. The eyes of the Nation and the eyes of the world are focused on the Capital City of this Nation. It has been an interesting experience to work with my colleagues on this committee in preparing this appropriation bill for our Nation's capital. We are fortunate in having an exceptionally fine subcommittee, composed of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BEAM], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], and myself, on the Democratic side, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] on the Republican side.

We have gone through the Budget estimates and considered all the facts and circumstances, and we have done our best to bring in a good bill. We believe we have brought in a good bill. We have had much able assistance from the Commissioners and from the very fine clerk of this committee, Mr. William A. Duvall.

There are hundreds of items in the bill, and it is easy to see that some difference of opinion may exist as to the various amounts in the bill. We have done our best to be fair and considerate of all the interests concerned. I have every confidence that the Members of the House of Representatives will go along with us in our effort to pass this bill as expeditiously as we can in order that it can go over to the Senate, be considered there, and finally become the law before the beginning of the new fiscal year on the 1st day of July.

It has cost an average of $43,000,000 a year to run the District of Columbia during recent years. This sounds like a sizable sum, but when we consider that it costs nearly $600,000,000 a year to run the big city of New York, the amount of money required to run the District does not seem so tremendous.

The average amount required to run the District during the last 10 years has been about $43,000,000 a year. Last year we appropriated about $50,500,000 for the fiscal year 1941. This year we are recommending an appropriation of about $52,500,000, the largest sum that has ever been recommended for the District of Columbia.

We have cut the total amount recommended to us in the bill by 2 percent. We have increased the amount over 1941 by $2,000,000. The Budget had recommended an increase of $3,000,000. We gave two-thirds and cut off one-third of the additional amount recommended for this year.

The District of Columbia gets its revenue from various sources. We may first consider the revenue it receives as a lump-sum contribution from the Federal Government. Much of this money is for services rendered by the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is not the forty-ninth State. It is a Federal city. It belongs to all the people of the Nation. There are some advantages in living in the Nation's Capital and there are some disadvantages. People cannot vote here. They do not have certain other privileges that we have elsewhere. They cannot participate in governmental affairs. On the other hand, they have certain advantages.

Inasmuch as Washington is the Capital City of our Nation, I believe every Member of Congress has every right to take pride in the Capital of the Nation. I want my Capital City to be the best run city in America and to be the best Capital City in the world. I am perfectly willing to appropriate money out of the Federal Treasury and from the pockets of the taxpayers of the District of Columbia to make this city as nearly as possible measure up to the aspirations of the American people.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman says he wants this Capital City to be the best run Capital in the world. Is the gentleman cognizant of what appeared on the front page of the Washington News of February 10, showing a black-out of a large area that touches the very Capitol Grounds itself, where men in uniform are forbidden to go? Is the gentleman familiar with that situation?

Mr. MAHON. I shall not take the time to discuss that item. I do not have the paper before me. And this committee is not charged with legislation involving the District. We make the appropriations. I deplore any condition which is bad.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that is a fact?

Mr. MAHON. I certainly cannot recall what appeared in a paper on February 10.

Mr. WHITE. It is a national disgrace, right in the shadow of this Capitol. This is not the best-run Capital City in the world by any manner of means.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman says this is not the best-run Capital City in the world.

Mr. WHITE. I say the paper says it.

Mr. MAHON. I shall be glad to join with the gentleman in helping it become the best-run Capital City. It is not perfect, of course. We are making a lot of mistakes, as we always will as long as humanity is imperfect.

The first thing we might consider from the standpoint of revenue for the District of Columbia is the $6,000,000 Federal contribution. The committee had no special concern with this item because the revenue act, the enactment of 1939, fixed the annual Federal contribution at $6,000,000.

In addition to this $6,000,000 there are taxes collected from the residents of the District of Columbia, about $38,500,000 for the regular fund, from which appropriations are made, about $6,000,000 for the gas fund, from which we make appropriations, and about $2,500,000 for the water fund, from which we make appropriations.

This committee takes the money which it is anticipated will be received for the coming fiscal year and decides what it can best do with it. It cuts the pattern to fit the revenues which may appear to be available.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I observe in the report that you expect to raise $43,712,162. You have an item here of $38,533,000 plus to which I wish to direct your attention for a moment. That is to be raised from taxes on real estate, tangible property, public utilities, banks, and so forth.

Mr. MAHON. Right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Referring in particular to the tax rate on real property, what rate does the gentleman have in mind in arriving at the figures he has given?

Mr. MAHON. We have in mind the existing rate of $1.75 per $100.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And that statement did not contemplate any raising of that rate?

Mr. MAHON. This is an appropriating committee, as the gentleman well knows, and we did not give consideration to the tax rates prevailing in the District, because we knew approximately how much money we might anticipate, and we have tried to appropriate that amount of money to the best advantage.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MAHON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman thinks I should not ask this question, the gentleman can disregard it. Does not the gentleman think that the rate of $1.75 should be raised at least to $2.25 or $2.50?

Mr. MAHON. That is a question that is highly controversial, and we have had a lot of debate about it. I want to get this bill through the House so we can send it to the Senate, and for that reason I would rather postpone consideration of that matter until it is before the House. I shall be pleased to discuss it when the question comes before us.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I had in mind was that if that rate were raised and a little higher rate imposed on gasoline, we would not have to have this extra $6,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. That would all depend on what we undertook to do with the money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In hurriedly going over the report, a copy of which I have just secured, I note that in at least three places you have provided for the appropriation of a certain amount of money and you further provide that the expenditure of at least part of such money shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. We are continually providing in appropriation bills a clause setting aside section 3709, which, as the gentleman knows, provides for advertising for bids. Why is it necessary in connection with these appropriations to have a special provision that section 3709 shall not apply? If we are going to do this in connection with every bill that comes before us not an emergency, let the departments and the District of Columbia spend the money we are appropriating without regard to advertising, why not go ahead and repeal the section entirely?

Mr. MAHON. These are small appropriations which I believe total less than $100 and it is not deemed desirable by the Commissioners to make these contracts by advertising. To do so would require time and expense.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no. Why should we permit them to hire engineering services, and so forth, in connection with construction, also in connection with the reservoir next to McMillan Park, without any regard to section 3709 in the expenditure of such money? It is not an emergency.

Mr. MAHON. All major contracts and all construction work are let on a basis of competitive bidding. In the matter of personal services in connection with plans, there are some few exceptions which have been made in the interest of speed and economy. The District Commissioners, of course, are charged with the responsibility of running the District of Columbia, and we have gone along in this bill as best we can with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to enable them, with assistance, to properly carry on the program of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCHRAN. But they can carry on by competitive bidding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe it will save a little time, if I may state that I expect to make a point of order against that provision wherever it appears.

Mr. MAHON. Now, I should like to discuss a few of the major items in the bill. The largest item in the bill is about $13,500,000 for the schools of the District of Columbia. We are recommending the appropriation of $315,000 more this year than we appropriated last year. We are appropriating $1,675,000 for additional school buildings and facilities that are so badly needed, many of them in the southeastern section of Washington. We feel that with such an appropriation the schools will be in much better condition to operate in 1942.

The police item as recommended in this bill will be about $3,500,000, which is $95,000 in excess of the sum appropriated last year, and will provide for 54 additional policemen. This is in accord with the Budget.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Referring to the subject of the schools, I notice the committee has recommended a provision requiring tuition to be paid by nonresident pupils.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I recall that provision was in the appropriation bill as passed last year. Why is it necessary to reenact such a limitation?

Mr. MAHON. It was in the bill when it passed the House, but on account of opposition of the Senate it was stricken out in conference.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman have any assurance it will be retained this year?

Mr. MAHON. It is impossible to tell what may happen in conference or what may happen in the other body, but I think it is a just and fair provision, and I am in favor of it and shall do all I can to keep it in the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. I, too, am strongly in favor of it, and I simply wanted to hear the gentleman's assurance to the House that so far as he is concerned when the bill goes to conference he will do all he can to see that this limitation is retained in the measure.

Mr. MAHON. I certainly shall, and I thank the gentleman.

Referring again to the Police Department, it may be pointed out that in spite of the almost impossible traffic difficulties in Washington, Washington won the award as the safest city in the Nation

for 1940 in its population class. Major Brown, Superintendent of Police, and his aides should be commended for this accomplishment. Much yet remains to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes more. We recommend nearly $3,000,000 for the Health Service which is an increase of a quarter of a million over last year.. We are providing for the beginning of construction of the northwest health center and are providing also additional personnel for Gallinger Hospital.

For Public Welfare we are recommending almost $8,000,000 to take care of our various public-welfare institutions. We are eliminating the recommendation for the acquisition of a site for a public-welfare center, because we cannot anticipate what the future may hold and we do not think it wise to begin a three-million-dollar construction program.

We are providing for the sum of about $5,000,000 or more for a highway-improvement program. We are taking the gasoline-tax revenues and doing our very best to enable Captain Whitehurst, the able gentleman in charge of that work, to do a better and bigger job for the highways and streets in the city of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, there are innumerable other items in the bill, but I have used almost 20 minutes, and I shall not consume further time. The figures which I have used are approximately correct. The exact sums and the details as to all the items appear in the bill and in the report which you have before you.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the point of highway improvements in the District, and highway funds, are any of those funds to be used for the construction of super second-story highways that I have read been recommended?

Mr. MAHON. Captain Whitehurst, of the Department of Highways has, with the assistance of others, prepared what is commonly called the Whitehurst plan, which would call for the expenditure of $44,000,000, but this bill does not provide any sum for superhighways or superstreets in Washington. It does, however, provide for some of the things embodied in the so-called Whitehurst plan.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman spoke about the gasoline-tax fund, and the purposes for which it will be used. Is the gentleman contemplating the 2-cent gasoline tax fund which is now being collected, or is he contemplating any increase in that tax fund?

Mr. MAHON. We are not contemplating any increase. Personally, I should like to see the gasoline tax increased, and a real highway and street program undertaken in Washington, but that is not the prerogative of this committee. We are taking only the money at hand and trying to appropriate it as best we can.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. If the gentleman has not already touched upon the proposed bridge across the Anacostia River and the tunnel under the Potomac River, will the gentleman please do so?

Mr. MAHON. There are no funds in this bill for the purpose of constructing or making preparations to construct a bridge at South Capitol Street, across the Anacostia River.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not because we contemplate that in the defense-highway bill that can be taken care of?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. We thought it best to defer action. We do provide in this bill for cooperation on the part of the District Commissioners with the officials of Virginia in connection with the proposed tunnel and bridge to connect Alexandria with the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is just a proposition to study the plan?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HOUSTON. To get rid of the bottleneck there?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of paying a compliment to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the members of our committee, and especially to our clerk, Mr. Duvall, without whose services we perhaps would have been somewhat lost, owing to the fact that the membership of the Board of Commissioners in Washington is practically new and because of the untimely death of Mr. Donovan, who was the budget officer for the District.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today the bill making all of the regular annual appropriations chargeable to the District of Columbia, including the permanent Federal contribution of $6,000,000 and also items chargeable on account of the park areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, the National Park and Planning Commission, and the Zoological Park.

The total amount represented in this bill is $52,547,081, which represents a decrease over the budget estimate of over $1,000,000, but represents an increase of over $2,000,000, compared with last year.

Washington, our Nation's Capital, is one of the most beautiful capital cities in the world. Its planning is being continued as closely as possible from the ideas of the Father of Our Country, George Washington. We are pleased to report to you that your committee, in making these appropriations from year to year, is endeavoring to lend its support to those who have charge in carrying out these ideas. In spite of thoughts to the contrary, it is the belief of every member of your committee that the entire membership of Congress is anxious to cooperate with all concerned to aid and assist in making Washington the most beautiful city in the world, and we are happy to report to you that there are indications that this cooperation between Members of Congress and the people who live in the District is growing closer. With such cooperation which Members here welcome we feel confident that the objectives of the friends of our Nation's Capital will eventually be reached.

With the world confronted again with an international war, your Nation's Capital has become a boom city. The population is growing as it never has grown before. Emergency items continue to confront the people and the Congress. No one knows what the future holds both from the standpoint of the city's growth and from the standpoint of what may happen when the post-war period arrives. In making these appropriations your committee has taken all of these perplexing matters into consideration.

The board of trade reports to us that the population of the District is now well over the 750,000 mark. The pay roll represents around $30,000,000 monthly. The city appears to act as a magnet for people from every State of the Union, and the building boom is not keeping up with the demands from people for some place in which to live. There are no longer available skilled mechanics in the District, and in spite of these activities the committee is informed that no less than 18,000 people are here looking for some kind of employment.

The city is managed under a commissioner form of government, the Commissioners being appointed by the President. It has proved to be a good government. It is fairly free from the usual organized graft and rackets which may exist in some other cities of this size. Generally, the taxpayers are receiving better government than do people in many other cities. In spite of this the city government is having considerable difficulty in the elimination of many law violations, and the committee feels it has provided sufficient funds to solve these problems.

Washington is the Federal city and in spite of the fact that the citizens do not have a vote or a franchise it is generally agreed that the management of the government has been the best possible under the circumstances. To the general public it is somewhat discouraging that the taxpayers here do not have a voice in the management of their government. Taxation without representation is a question which has disturbed many serious-thinking people in this District. Until some other method of managing the affairs of this city is reached, Congress will have to continue doing the best it can to represent the people here in such a way that there shall be no discrimination in any place. In this effort on the part of Congress it is hoped that closer relationship and better understanding between the people here and the Members of Congress be one of the objectives of all concerned. We both have a common objective—to make Washington the world's model city.

In spite of the great growth of the city with its intricate traffic problems, Washington this year won the award for the safest city, so far as traffic is concerned. This for cities of Washington's size. This reflects great credit upon the officials in charge of traffic and streets, who are continually working out plans for more improvement.

The committee working over these bills from year to year has considered the taxpayers' interests as its first interest. In the hearings which contain over 1,000 pages, you will find that every opportunity was given to everyone who so desired to be heard. Generally the taxpayers here are much better off as compared with the taxpayers in most of the communities of our country. The benefits of owning property in this District are unusually good, comparatively speaking. Sources of additional revenue have not been exhausted and can be called upon for additional revenue without reflecting much of a burden on the taxpayers.

While dual systems prevail here the committee has joined with others to give the colored population fair consideration. Of the approximately 760,000 people here there are about 175,000 colored. The attendance in the elementary schools here show that about 43 percent are colored. The bill provides considerable sums for school improvements as well as improvements in all departments.

Supplemental estimates came to us after the committee started hearings on this bill, and many of these items are included. The total here represents the largest sum ever appropriated for the city, but in spite of this the hearings and report which we submit will show some surpluses.

The great influx of new people into the city, along with the 50,000 or more soldiers in its vicinity, becomes a strain on the District government. Emergency items are expected, and the legislative committee of this House is already going into these matters, and they will be brought to your attention in the near future. We call to your attention, however, that the happy state of boom times must have an ending when peace comes to the world again, and in planning for the future it is suggested that the committees in charge of new legislation take into consideration the economic problem which is bound to confront this city, as it will affect the entire Nation, when that post-war period arrives.

Many Members have asked us if we have provided sufficiently for the Police Department. The bill provides for what was justified for additional police along with two-way radio cars; emergency ambulance cars, and other necessary expense which the committee felt was needed to take care of the present requirements. The city has its own police system, which can be augmented by the Capitol and Park Police when necessary. There is some argument in favor of better coordination between the Park and Metropolitan Police. The determination of jurisdictional police lines, especially during this emergency, should be made soon. The combining of the Park Police with the Metropolitan Police should be given serious consideration.

Each year the committee is confronted with the fact that the States of Maryland and Virginia profit to a great extent by the appropriations we make here. The free tuition to students from other States relieves the taxpayers of Virginia and Maryland to a total of more than $250,000 annually. The officials in nearby States find it not too difficult to send their indigent and sick to Washington, with the result that quite a sum in these appropriations go to relief, the burden rightfully belonging to the taxpayers of other States. This is only one item which is discriminatory to the taxpayers here. There are quite a few others which time does not permit for detail, but which can be found by reading of the hearings we present to you today.

The total asked for in this bill, $52,547,081, comes from the following sources: Gasoline tax, $5,995,839; water revenues, $2,839,080; real-estate taxes, tangible property, public utilities, and banks, $37,712,162; lump-sum contribution from Federal treasury, $6,000,000. The committee felt it had no legislative jurisdiction over the six million lump-sum contribution which reflects the contribution of taxpayers from every State in the Union. Whether the amount is too low or too high it was generally thought is a matter for the legislation committee. It is hoped some reasonable formula can be worked out in order that the services rendered to the Federal Government by the District government can be reciprocated on a fair and equitable basis. It is felt, however, that the committee has provided sufficient funds for the District compared with available revenues

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have taken up sufficient time of the House in this general statement, and I expect to take the floor when we read the bill for amendments to discuss the item of the testing laboratory which the committee felt should not be put into use at this time. Briefly, the city has $100,000 invested in this laboratory. The machinery is in good shape and the Commissioners want to put it to use. It was closed in 1930 during Economy Act. It was thought that the Bureau of Standards would do the testing free of charge. However, it is found that last year the District paid $48,000 for this testing. Without additional appropriations we can here allow the District to use their own laboratory and make some savings to the taxpayers. I will furnish more information on this item later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At this point I should like to say that the members of the subcommittee, without exception, feel that a tribute should be paid to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the committee; Mr. Duvall, the clerk of the committee; and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], the ranking minority member. These men are those who really do the work, who work out this bill, and should be commended. I have recently noticed that in another body the Member who was to become chairman of the committee dealing with District affairs suggested that he should be provided with a special assistant over and above the regular committee assistants. I understand that has been approved and will cost the Government $5,000. Now, I do not object to his having what assistance he needs, but I do suggest that may be an indication of the value of the services that these men are giving to this committee, which earns them no particular credit or glory back in their districts. It is a patriotic public service performed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the clerk of this committee. Those of us who have seen them work really appreciate the work they have done.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to thank the gentleman for his compliment. The gentleman himself has labored long on this and other important appropriation bills. I know, too, my chairman and others who are given this praise appreciate it very much.

The gentleman refers to the expenditure of approximately $6,000 for legal advice in another body in connection with the work for the District of Columbia. That is just another tribute in recognition of the services which were rendered to this District by the late Dan Donovan. In speaking about that service, I wish to call your attention to the fact that Dan Donovan was the District of Columbia, insofar as Budget figures are concerned. Right now there is quite a little reorganization going on in the District Building because of the passing on of Dan Donovan. He will be sorely missed here.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said that the tax levy was $1.75 per $100?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the gentleman tell me the assessed valuation of the real and personal property of the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. We are led to believe that property is assessed at full valuation. If the gentleman will look through the hearings, he will find the figure on the total valuation.

Mr. BENNETT. I will say for the gentleman's benefit that I inquired the price of a house and they asked $13,500. Then I asked about the assessment, and it was assessed at $5,000. In my home city we pay about $4 per $100 taxes, and I think that is probably about the average rate over the Nation for school, county, and State purposes. Does the gentleman feel that a city which has been for the last 10 years enjoying a tremendous boom while the rest of the Nation has been suffering from great depression, is paying its share of the cost of government? If that is the case, I am for the bill; but it does appear to me that the people of this city, who are enjoying such a tremendous boom, business of all kinds flourishing, real-estate values very high, rentals very high, ought to pay something like the rest of us pay in taxes, and then let the Federal Government make up the necessary difference.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to tell the gentleman that the case to which he refers may be some of the isolated cases which the hearings refer to. The committee has called upon those assessors who were called before the committee to make every effort to make some equitable taxation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has made a very interesting observation on the interest of the Members in the Capital City, the District of Columbia, but the attendance here this afternoon during the discussion of this $52,000,000 appropriation bill does not support the gentleman's observation.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman himself is present, and I am sure he has great interest in the future of our Capital City. I am sure many Members may right now be transacting important business for their constituency.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has given a good deal of study to the whole fiscal problem of the District of Columbia. I have just been advised by the chairman of the committee that it is not the province of this subcommittee to raise any question as to how to provide this money. A larger appropriation bill has been introduced this year based upon the same methods by which the taxes were raised a year ago. The present tax rate in the District of Columbia is $1.75. Does not the gentleman think it ought to be raised? The gentleman does not need to answer it if he does not wish to.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas is not asking me an embarrassing question. I am glad to answer it. I will say the tax rate is much lower in Washington than it is in my State, Nebraska; and I am sure the taxpayers in the District of Columbia would be very happy to pay their share of the expenses of running the District if they were called upon to do so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is just a matter of giving them the opportunity to pay the tax.

Mr. STEFAN. There are a number of items in the city of Washington which could be tapped for additional revenue. The gentleman will find on reading the hearings that the commitee went into many of these sources of revenue which may be tapped to provide additional money to keep the District going.

I may say to the gentleman from Kansas he will find that notwithstanding this is the largest appropriation ever made for the District of Columbia, there are yet some surpluses in the Treasury of the District.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the question of the tax rate, will the gentleman advise us what it is on incomes for the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. There are detailed statements on that in the hearings.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is about 1 percent, is it not?

Mr STEFAN. Just about.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not sure whether there is an income tax in Nebraska but comparing the District of Columbia tax rate with that of my own State, New York, it is about one-quarter in Washington what it is in New York. I mention this simply to show that the unusually low real-estate-tax rate in Washington in comparison with other States is no lower than the income-tax rate here in Washington compared with other States.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right. The people of Washington enjoy greater benefits than do the people in New York or in Nebraska, yet I think there is something to be said on their side.

Notwithstanding the fact the Federal Government contributes $6,000,000 to the total expenses of the District, the people of the District pay out large sums for the care of indigents and transients from other States, for schools, for taking care of cripples, for sick relief. It is now a boom town, as has well been said, is growing like a mushroom, and will continue to grow, and we may well inquire what is going to happen here in the post-war period. Right now everything is confusion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Speaking of taxes, I note that the gasoline tax in the gentleman's State, Nebraska, and in my State, is 5 cents a gallon.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. Nebraska is a great road-building State. We pay heavy taxes, we pay large automobile taxes, and large real-estate taxes, but we are the white spot of the Nation. We have no indebtedness. As a matter of fact, the framers of our constitution made it absolutely impossible for us to spend more than we have in the treasury. If it is not in the treasury we cannot spend it. We in Nebraska may be old-fashioned but we still believe in not spending when we do not have it to spend.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the same condition exists in my own State, Indiana. In the District of Columbia, however, the people pay but 2 cents a gallon tax on gasoline. Does not the gentleman believe it could be increased and thereby reduce the amount taken out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is a great lawyer and a great Hoosier with a great record. He has done a wonderful service for his constituents here in the National Congress. He is more clever than I and he is asking a leading question. I may say, however, that the gas tax in Washington is only one source that may be tapped for additional revenue.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman has spoken of the gasoline tax. Does the gentleman realize that notwithstanding the fact that Nebraska has a 5-cent tax on gasoline, even gas produced in Oklahoma is sold cheaper in Nebraska than it is in the neighboring States?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the people of Nebraska are happy to enjoy that advantage. We pay for what we get.

Mr. WHITE. It is cheaper there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman care to say anything about the comparative assessed valuation and the basis used in the District of Columbia as contrasted with other cities of the country?

Mr. STEFAN. I think we have that in the hearings, and I will let the hearings speak for themselves, because our time is limited.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I note on page 9 of the report a reference to 146 children of Army and Navy officers and Members of Congress in the enumeration there of nonresident children, then a later statement to the effect that the committee believes this is an unfair burden on the taxpayers of the District. May I ask the gentleman if this report means that the committee considers the children of Congressmen who have to go back and forth during the year from their homes to schools here in the same category as the thousands of people who have settled jobs in Washington where they are supposed to live all the year around?

Mr. STEFAN. Absolutely not. The gentleman answers his own question. The committee did not so interpret that and it is not intended to interpret it that way. What the committee wants to tell this House is that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia and taxpayers in your State and mine have been called upon to give free tuition to the extent of $270,000 to students who live in Maryland and Virginia and who come here to get free tuition.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have had three children in the District schools who accompanied my family and I when I came to Congress and who spend a part of the year here. I feel that the situation of Congressmen and their families is different from these others.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But may I say that rather than have this injustice continue, I would be willing, and I feel other Members of Congress would be willing, to pay a tuition rather than have these others escape scot free as they are doing.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is very kind in his observation. There is no reason why the taxpayers of Ohio, Nebraska, and other States, including the District of Columbia, should relieve the taxpayers of Maryland and Virginia from their real responsibility. If we are here to represent the taxpayers who have no voice let us be fair and represent them.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, if the gentleman from Ohio who comes to Washington to represent his constituents prefers to live out in Virginia or Maryland and not be a resident of the District of Columbia, this bill would provide for taxation of his children.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course.

Mr. MAHON. Anyone who comes into the District to live 1 year, or 1 month, or whatever length of time, and brings his family here and is a resident here, would not pay any school tuition.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I ask the gentleman from Texas a question along that same line? I noted that reference to the fact there were 146 children of Members of Congress in the schools. Does that mean 146 children of Members who are not living within the limits of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have that portion of the hearings before me. The gentleman from Nebraska may be able to answer that question.

Mr. STEFAN. According to the bill all of those who are enrolled now will not be affected by the tuition.

Mr. COLE of New York. Certainly the gentleman will agree that a person living in the city of Washington whether he is a Member of Congress or a clerk down here in a department store, who pays rent or who owns a home and pays taxes, contributes to the school system of the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. Anyone who is a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia should not pay a tuition. I want to give people the same treatment accorded to my own people of Nebraska.

Mr. COLE of New York. What difference would it make?

Mr. STEFAN. Not a bit.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. I inquired of the gentleman from Nebraska as to the assessed valuation and he referred me to the hearings. I notice the gentleman from Texas has also referred to the hearings. I should like to inquire when the hearings were printed?

Mr. MAHON. On Wednesday of last week.

Mr. STEFAN. On Wednesday of last week, and they contain 1,004 pages. The hearings have information on every subject the gentleman may have in mind.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not a fact that the hearings were not available until 30 minutes ago?

Mr. STEFAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. They were here last Friday. I did not mean that the gentleman had sufficient time to read the hearings of over a thousand pages. I did not go into detail either because our time is limited. I know how hard the gentleman works for his people and I compliment him for his efficiency.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not interrogating the gentleman to embarrass him, but may I ask the gentleman if he does not agree with me that this idea of spending tens of thousands of dollars to have hearings before committees printed, then not making those hearings available in order that we may have a chance to look at them before we consider the bill, is foolish?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I just want to point out to the gentleman who has just spoken that these hearings were printed on Wednesday and were available to any Member of Congress on Thursday. He could have received them and looked them over as early as last Thursday.

Mr. STEFAN. I sympathize with the gentleman's statement. Very few Members go over 1,004 pages because they have other hearings of a similar nature. Sometimes you pay very little attention to what is going on in the District of Columbia, but I know the gentleman himself has been very much interested in all this legislation, and I wish to compliment him on that and appreciate the questions he has asked.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman. May I say that copies of the hearings are never available until the bill is called up.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday when the appropriation bill went through for the Tennessee Valley Authority, House Joint Resolution 194, there was a rider in the form of section 2 on the joint resolution and it was passed with the resolution. This section reads as follows:

> The appropriation to the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency for construction of temporary office buildings, contained in title III of the Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby amended by inserting the words "or near" after the words "on Government-owned land in."

That was a very artful amendment. I took the trouble to look up the original act, and it reads as follows:

> For the construction of temporary office buildings for general use on Government-owned land in—

After the word "in" comes the amendment, so that it reads—

> in or near the District of Columbia.

If they had put the amendment before the words "in the District of Columbia," it would have read—

> for general use on or near Government-owned land in the District of Columbia.

Then it would have been in the District of Columbia. It is now—

> in or near the District of Columbia—

which goes to the situation I want to discuss for a moment.

On February 10 one of the metropolitan dailies of Washington, the Evening News, carried a front-page blackout of a district right here in the shadow of the Capitol; in fact, that area adjoins the Capitol grounds and extends over to the Army War College. This is what is said on the front page of that paper about the conditions here in the Capital of the United States:

> A No Man's Land for uniformed men south of the Capitol and "danger streets" all over town have been worked out by police and submitted to the War Department, the News learned exclusively today. The Department is expected to approve the recommendations.

This is a description of a district right here in the shadow of this Capitol:

> The area (black on the map) bounded roughly by Fourth Street SW. on the west, P Street SW. on the south, Canal Street SW. on the north, and New Jersey Avenue SE. on the east will be "out of bounds," and nobody from Fort Meade or Arlington Cantonment had better be caught inside its purlieus.

What do you think of that? Is it not a national disgrace that right here in the shadow of this Capitol, between the Capitol and the beautiful residence area reserved for our Army officers at the War College, there is one of the most disgraceful sections of the country, banned to the boys in uniform because it is in such a corrupt condition?

We have a Fine Arts Commission, a National Planning Board, and a Zoning Commission, and they are doing a splendid job, but they want to carry these Government departments over across the Potomac River onto land that is overflowed whenever there is an excessive rise in the Potomac River. You recall that the airfield over there has been under water in recent years. The bridge across the river is one of the most heavily-traveled arterial streets leading out of the District. Evidently we must leave this festering sore down here while we go across the river and construct temporary buildings.

I am wondering just how much influence the real-estate operators have here in the District. We were edified not long ago with a picture showing the blasting down of a large expensive apartment house so that the new War Department Building could be erected on that spot, while we have this area down here between the Capitol and the War College that is neglected and in a terrible state. I am told by the United States marshal that it is one of the most crime-infested sections in the city of Washington. I am wondering what we are going to do about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman understands that under this amendment to the Supplemental Defense Act these builings are to be located on land owned by the Government of the United States?

Mr. WHITE. I suppose the gentleman refers to an experimental farm over there that is under water periodically.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I am interested in finding out is what the connection was with real-estate sharks, and whether the Government would be dealing with real-estate sharks more in building on its own land or in cleaning up some of this area the gentleman has mentioned. I would like to see these areas cleaned up, as far as that is concerned, if it can be done reasonably when we can afford it.

Mr. WHITE. Anybody who has been in Washington during a flood of the Potomac River and seen sandbags piled around the Munitions Building and

knows the condition of those sites down there and the inconvenience caused persons in the Government, particularly Members of Congress, through having to leave their work and travel all over the District, particularly down in that section, when the buildings could be grouped around the Capitol, can easily understand how the influence of the real-estate people has come in for a great many years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman understands that these are temporary buildings?

Mr. WHITE. I understand that, but once this movement across the river is started there will be no end to it. I believe it is a disgrace to leave this condition down here between the Capitol and our heavy investment in the homes of the elite of the Army located in the beautiful grounds of the War College. When you show the Capitol to people from outside the District, you are ashamed to go through this area to get to the War College.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. Is the gentleman opposed to the decentralization of the Government?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly believe we should put these buildings around the Capitol, so that they can be centralized and be convenient for the conduct of the Government business.

Mr. SCHULTE. Would the gentleman oppose a bill that would have as its purpose the building of several of the Government buildings in the State of Idaho?

Mr. WHITE. I certainly would oppose it. I believe it would be the height of folly. I think the place for the Capital is in the District, where it was intended to be, and I think we ought to utilize this space adjacent to the Capitol and destroy these old, cheap buildings and clean up these purlieus and rid the Capitol area of this national disgrace.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in line with the last observation of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], I think these informal observations I shall make might properly be classified and titled "O, Columbia, there is a jam on the payroll ocean."

The press yesterday announced that the pay roll here for the month of May was about $29,000,000. The press announced yesterday in its business summary that since May of 1940 there are about 42,000 new pay checks in Washington, D. C. That is really something to smoke in your pipe when the folks back home read it.

Only today at his press conference the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as I understand, made the statement that he is opposed to decentralizing certain agencies of government, and noted particularly the S. E. C., the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission. And I believe, as I read the notice put on the board in the press gallery today, it stated that probably a decentralization move would receive only 10 percent of the vote of the House, but I submit to you that this congestion in the Nation's Capital has gotten serious. It was the 21st of January that I made my first observations on decentralization and introduced a bill to set up a special committee to investigate the matter. That was 6 months ago, or will be in the next few days. Today confusion moves upon us.

I should observe that one of the chain drug stores here announced that last year it sold 40,000 alarm clocks, but I imagine that was not even enough to awaken the Federal branch of the Government to the fact that we have congestion, frustration, confusion, and bewilderment in the Nation's Capital.

We were advised yesterday by Mr. Jerry Kluttz, of the Washington Post, and by Mr. Palmer, the Federal Housing Coordinator, that they are engaging new personnel in Washington at the rate of 190 a day. We have about 175,000 Federal employees on the pay roll already and the District of Columbia has 15,000. So if the population of the District of Columbia is 750,000, we have 1 person on the pay roll for every 50 people in the District for the District government itself and 1 Federal pay roller for every 4 persons in the District of Columbia population.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not just for the moment, please.

I am just frankly wondering and sparring a little for the answer as to what we are going to do about it. I have Mr. Palmer's release before me and he says some rather interesting things, and being Coordinator of Federal Housing, he ought to know something about it. Among other things, he says:

> It is indicated that at least 12,000 more are going to be added between now and the 1st of January, 1942.

And still anotner authority says that at least 25,000 more defense workers are going to be brought in before January 1, 1942.

Well, what are we going to do with them? It has been stated that they are going to ask 10,000 nondefense workers to pick up their tools and baggage and start elsewhere so they can use the place where they now reside for official Federal office space for the defense workers. So we will take 10,000 out of places where they now live and that space will be devoted to office space for anywhere from 12,000 to 25,000 who will come in with their families, and the crush will be greater than it ever was in the history of the District of Columbia.

Let me read you Mr. Palmer's language:

> It is indicated there will be a minimum of 12,000 new employees in Government activities during the fiscal year 1941 and 1942.

And here is some more of his language; and this is rather interesting in line with decentralization:

> Although Government workers are also vital to the defense program, it may be much more practical to move the activities of purely peacetime agencies to a locality where there is not only more housing but also more available office space and other facilities; in fact, the lower cost of living in some communities should be an advantage to the Government workers by such transfer; as a matter of fact, in many cities there has been an exodus of population resulting from the dislocation caused by the defense program.

It is said there is 35,000,000 square feet of office space available in other sections of the country, and this space is probably available in buildings that must be taxed, that suffer impairment through depreciation, buildings that are owned not by one owner but usually by stockholders and bondholders who are holding senior and junior liens, who are expecting some kind of return. Why, in common sense, cannot this Government be equitable with people of that type and give them some return by decentralizing some of these agencies, thereby utilizing spare space in other sections of the Nation.

Perhaps we ought to be a little more discriminatory in our language. I agree with the speaker. We ought not to send the S. E. C. outside of Washington. I am willing to leave the Commission and enough stenographers here to give them a Government entity in Washington, but I want to take the other hundreds and the other thousands who are filing and beating typewriters and doing all the incidental routine work that can be done just as well in Bingville or Wichita or Kansas or Pittsburgh or any place in the United States of America as it can in Washington, D. C.

Take, for instance, the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is quite all right to leave the Commission here, and probably enough help to take care of the immediate staff, but what about the Bureau of Valuation, for instance, that has been pecking along for a generation evaluating railroad properties all over the country. Why cannot that work be done up in Des Moines, Iowa, as well as it can in Washington, D. C.? What about the Bureau of Accounts Regulation, the Locomotive Inspection Service, the Safety Signal Service, the Motor Carriers' Division, and others, who could do their work in Chicago or Peoria or Columbus, as well as in Washington?

Let us take the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Security and Exchange Commission—and I am somewhat surprised that the speaker should mention that Commission, because Mr. Frank, the chairman, told me that he was regionalizing the Commission, and that he had already set up two regional offices, and if this idea proved successful he was going to decentralize the Commission. The bulk of the work can be done elsewhere, and there will be no interruption of the functions of the Commission in its contact with the Chief Executive, and with the other governmental agencies with which it does business.

Mr. HOUSTON. And why would it not be practical to move the Federal Land Bank and the Farm Credit Administration out somewhere into the Middle West?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They can operate just as well there and do their work

out there. Of course we have one farmer I understand in the District of Columbia, and that is the reason, I suppose, we keep them here.

Mr. HOUSTON. And would not the city of Wichita, Kans., be a reasonable place to have them located?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that in the gentleman's district?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And does not the gentleman think that the Indian Office might not well be located somewhere in the Dakotas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. These nondefense agencies could well be demobilized and the situation here eased. It would not be necessary then to heap these vast burdens upon the District of Columbia and burden the District with additional pay rolls. For another thing, we are bound to have more policemen to preserve order and safety. The bill before us provides for 55 additional policemen. Soon Superintendent Brown will be here asking for some more. You cannot invade a town with people, make a jammed-up, boom town, without proper policing and supervision. And so one thing works with another; and, of course, the taxpayers of the District of Columbia will have to pay the bill, unless through generosity and moved by charitable impulses the Federal lump sum should be increased.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. And is it not a fact that lower Manhattan, in New York City, being the financial center of the universe, would be an ideal place for the main administrative branch of the Security and Exchange Commission, particularly in view of the fact that that agency was set up for the purpose of correcting so-called abuses and some actual abuses in our national exchanges centered in New York City? Consequently, is it not plain common sense and good business to move that agency there, where there is ample office room in some of the big buildings downtown, and have the agency right there where it will be available for the use of the financial district and those who come there to obtain aid and a solution of their financial problem?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. Along that line, no other than Mr. Al Smith was at the White House recently and, so it is said, indirectly suggested that he has several floors available in the Empire State Building that would nicely house several Federal agencies; and I think that is quite all right.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And does not the gentleman from Illinois think that the Capitol might better be located in the center of the Union; say, near Topeka?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is Topeka the center of the Union?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the Security and Exchange Commission and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe I mentioned the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. The standing Committee on Indian Affairs has been handling bills from time to time and getting in representatives from the Indian Affairs Bureau to advise with Representatives of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two more.

Mr. WHITE. It is necessary for representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to have contact with Members of Congress, asking for reports, and having conferences with Representatives as to the effect of legislation, and does the gentleman not think that these departments should be convenient to the Capital and does the gentleman think that it would be a wise thing to send them far afield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed; but this is mostly field work. I have no objection to keeping a central staff here, the Commission itself, its assistants, and a sufficient office staff to run the ordinary affairs of the Commission here. But all of that work that requires so many thousands of people ought to be decentralized and sent to other sections.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman realizes that the S. E. C. does maintain a branch in New York City and in other parts of the country. But coming to this particular legislation that was mentioned, would the gentleman consider the location of buildings and departments across the Potomac River close to Washington to be decentralization?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Let me illustrate. Every once in a while I get a veteran's case. I call up and they say that the files in that case are at Dwight, Ill., or Hines, Ill. They have to send out there to get the files. I have to wait for them to send out and get the files and bring them to the central office. I could have written an air mail letter to Hines or Dwight and saved 3 or 4 days. Here we have a great mass of stone and concrete impounding all these files, when there are thousands of places the files could be just as well kept, and these people could be doing this work there.

Mr. WHITE. You do not call buildings across the Potomac decentralization, do you?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely not. That is not going to solve the problem. They are talking about building a new bridge to make Washington more accessible to Virginia and $548,000 is made available to make a preliminary study for a bridge to get these people over from Virginia to the District of Columbia. After a while we will have a lot of tunnels and subways or bridges to handle this unless we take it in hand now and decentralize these functions.

Here we have an area 7 miles square that we call the District of Columbia. The executive branch, after receiving authority from Congress, fills it with executive agencies that may soon employ 200,000 persons. Add to that the 15,000 now on the pay roll of the District of Columbia. The result is what? Not only confusion but inefficiency, lost motion, and a waste of time. Can anyone expect that such a mass of people huddled into so small an area can be efficient operatives in the business of national defense? Obviously they cannot, and we as a Congress would serve the cause of efficiency, economy, and equity if we took definite and heroic action and undertook the business of decentralization and diffused the many nondefense agencies to other sections of the land.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, Germany continues to write the blackest and bloodiest page in her long history. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to place in the RECORD a statement of charges by the Honorable Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, predicated upon the second white paper issued by the Polish Government in exile. The paper filed with the State Department is intended to prove by documentary evidence the barbarous extremes to which the Germans have gone in order to exterminate millions of helpless and enslaved Poles, who only yesterday were free, self-supporting, and happy. The statement appearing as an article in the Washington Post, June 8, 1941, is followed by a forceful editorial in the same paper of the 9th instant, which I desire also to insert in order that the American people might be more fully informed.

In submitting the clippings for verbatim reproduction I want to call to the attention of the House two errors which, for the sake of veracity, should be corrected.

I have ascertained through the State Department that the translation or typographical composition is in error in two instances which I detect. In the paragraph which refers to the deportation decrees and the inhuman clearing of more than a million and a half Poles who are being driven out of cities and villages that their Polish ancestors lived in for centuries, the words "majority of Germans" should appear as minority of Germans.

Reference to a retroactive decree shows in error "October 1, 1919," which should be October 1, 1939.

[From the Washington Post of June 9, 1941]

POLISH HORROR

Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, in a letter to Secretary Hull accompanying the latest White Paper on conditions in Poland, concludes that the Nazi method of exterminating Poland is being "pursued in a manner unprecedented in the annals of human history." Such a conclusion is substantiated from the record of the White Paper which was summarized in a copyrighted article in yesterday's Post. It is a horror story which would be incredible but for its careful documentation. Some of the details are too gross for polite reading, and are not to be found in our summary, but they deserve a full reading at a time when the air has been filled again with a Nazi peace offensive. For this grim recital will give the reader a case study of the Weltenschauung, or philosophy, of the Nazi state in action. This philosophy uses lies and the gullibility of other people as the means of revolutionizing and brutalizing the world on the Nazi model. The progress of one lie may be followed from this and past White Papers. First there was the soothing syrup of September 1938, when the Poles were being softened for the slaughter. Adolf Hitler then rebound himself to respect the ten-year peace treaty with Poland. "Here," he said, "the road to understanding had to be

found, and it was found." He went on to forecast the constant improvement of relations. For, he said, "we are two peoples. They shall live. One cannot annihilate the other. I recognize this, and we must see it: a state of 33,000,000 people will always strive for an outlet to the sea." Within a year, however, the soft words had been forgotten. Poland suddenly found herself faced with ultimatums, and then her territory was invaded. Yet even after the invasion Gen. von Brauschitsch, commander in chief of the German forces invaiding Poland, declared "The German forces do not consider the inhabitants as enemies. Every rule of international law will be observed." The latest White Paper now provides the apotheosis of this particular lie's progress—one country in process of annihilating the other without any regard for any kind of law or any canon of decency.

In Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler, in sovereign contempt for the individual, says that the masses "quickly forget." They do. But, in order to help them forget, Hitler makes his evil policy assume all manner of appealing shapes with which to beguile the unwary. In this description he is helped by the fact that the people, eager for peace, try to forget. But we shall forget the intrinsic badness of Hitlerism only at our peril. The Polish story shows that if we seek to accommodate within the veins of the world community a virus of such hideousness, it will end up by destroying us, too.

[From the Washington Post June 8, 1941]

ENVOY'S WHITE PAPER CHARGES NAZIS MAKING SLAVES OF VANQUISHED POLES IN MASTER PLAN FOR EXTERMINATION OF RACE

(By Barnet Nover)

In a document which Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, has presented to the Department of State on behalf of his government elaborate proof is advanced in support of the charge that Germany is engaged in a deliberate and systematic effort to reduce the Polish population under her rule "to a state resembling slavery" and "to bring about the biologic destruction of the nation." Russia, which has been in occupation of the eastern two-fifths of Poland since September, 1939, is similarly accused of waging a campaign of unprecedented terrorism against the Poles.

The document is the second "White Paper" issued by the Polish government since the war began. The first dealt with the period leading up to the outbreak of hostilities and with the military struggle that followed in Poland. The present White Paper, copies of which have been distributed to neutral and Allied governments, bring the story of what happened in Poland up to the spring of this year. Replete with documentation, a large part of it from official and semiofficial German sources, it tells a grim story of how a nation of 35,000,000 inhabitants is being ground under foot by its German and Russian conquerors.

The documentation begins with the proclamation of General von Brauchitsch, commander in chief of the German forces invading Poland. Dated September 1, 1939, it contains the statement that: "The German forces do not consider the inhabitants as enemies. Every rule of international law will be observed." In the months that followed, according to the White Paper, this pledge proved to be just another German scrap of paper. "There is not a single principle of the rights of man nor a single stipulation of positive international law which has not been trampled under foot by the occupying powers." Citing the provisions regarding the treatment of prisoners, the rights of the civil population in occupied areas and other clauses of the Hague Convention of 1907, the White Paper alleges that every one of these provisions has been violated by Germany and Russia.

The bulk of the White Paper deals with the situation in that part of Poland under the heel of Hitler. It cites decrees and ordinances issued by the German Government and its agents in Poland which suggest the deliberate intention to destroy the Polish nation, exterminate a part of the Polish population and reduce the remainder to the status of slaves.

The German mayor of Lodz, Uedelhoer, is quoted as saying: "We are the masters. We must then act as masters. The Pole is a slave and must serve us. Our backbone must be made of steel and we must never admit that Poland can ever be reborn."

Herr Greiser, the gauleiter of Posnan province, in a speech on October 6, 1939, promised his hearers that "in ten years there will not be here (in western Poland) a single clod of earth which is not German and not a farm which will belong to any other than our own colonists. They are already arriving from every province of the Reich, from the Baltic states, Lithuania, Rumania, Russia, Italian Tyrol, to establish themselves in this region * * * If God exists it is He who has chosen Adolf Hitler to chase (the Poles) out of here."

The White Paper cites German decrees, and eyewitness depositions telling how west Poland was cleared of Poles, more than a million and a half being driven out of cities and villages that they and their ancestors had lived in for centuries and that had never had more than a small majority of Germans. The deported individuals were given extremely little time to get ready to leave their homes. One such order, included in the White Paper, told the recipient (an inhabitant of Leslau) that he must leave in 20 minutes. He was told he could take along food for several days, 200 zlotys in cash and one valise. He was warned not to take any papers of value, any jewelry or objects made of silver. He was especially warned not to lock any chests and take the key away.

MUST STEP ASIDE FOR GERMANS

The plight of these refugees poured into the so-called Government General (the area not directly annexed by Germany but subject to her control) is told in a series of heartrending depositions by victims who ultimately managed to flee Poland. The deportees were sent in unheated boxcars sealed for the duration of the trip which took days and sometimes weeks. Many men, women, and children froze to death, for the winter of 1939–40 was especially cold in Poland. And those that arrived, with little more than the clothes on their back, were thrown on the mercies of a population already reduced to a state of destitution. In the meantime their homes, their belongings, as well as the property of the Polish state and of Polish organizations in the annexed area, were confiscated. But those who, temporarily, were allowed to remain behind in west Poland were not much better off. The attitude of the German authorities is illustrated in an order issued to the Polish population of Torun (Thorn) on October 27, 1939, by the chief of police of that town. Here are some extracts from that order:

"In order to correct the insolent attitude of a part of the Polish population, I order the following:

"1. Polish inhabitants of both sexes are ordered to step aside and give way to representatives of German power every time the latter are garbed in uniform or wear a brassard. The street belongs to the victors, not the vanquished.

"2. The Polish inhabitants of the masculine sex are required to uncover in the presence of leading personalities of the state, the party, the German armed forces.

"3. In commercial establishments and markets representatives of the German power, German nationals and racial Germans (Volksdeutsche) must be served first, only after them come the conquered.

"4. Wearing of Polish school uniforms, caps with emblems, etc., as well as the wearing of national emblems by Polish railway and post-office officials is forbidden.

"5. Polish women who accost racial Germans or who insult them will be sent to houses of ill fame.

"6. The Poles who have not yet understood that they are the conquered and that we are the conquerors and who agitate against the foregoing orders will be liable to the most severe punishment."

WARSAW MAYOR REPORTED SLAIN

Such regulations, however, were very mild in comparison with what actually happened in various parts of occupied Poland. According to the White Paper it was not long after General von Brauchitsch pledged scrupulous observance of the rules of international law that the German invaders began to seize hostages to make sure of the good behavior of the conquered population.

In Warsaw, after the fall of that city, Stefan Starzynski, the heroic mayor, together with a dozen other important individuals agreed to assume the responsibility for the execution of the agreement to turn over Warsaw to the conquerors. This was done. When the Germans arrived Starzynski was arrested, put in jail, and then disappeared. According to information received by the Polish Government he was later assassinated in a German concentration camp, probably Dachau.

Indeed, by retroactive decree of October 1, 1919, German tribunals in Poland were permitted to convict a Pole on the basis of his wartime or prewar attitude toward Germany. Many were arrested on that ground and many were executed. To break the spirit of the civil population punitive expeditions were sent out to villages and towns and mass executions carried out that were wholly terroristic in nature.

The White Paper declares that in Bydgoszcz (Bromberg) the victims numbered 10,000.

"These massacres," says the document presented to the State Department, "constitute the most expeditious means for the Germanization of a city which, before September 1, 1939, was only 6 percent German in population." In all the Polish Government estimates that in the neighborhood of 70,000 Polish civilians, including women and children, have been executed by the conquerors, principally the Gestapo.

In addition to terror and deportation other methods have been used in the German-occupied part of Poland to exterminate part of the Polish people and destroy Polish national life. A definite and deliberate and far-reaching attempt has been made, not without a very considerable measure of success, the White Paper reveals, to pauperize the Polish people and thus forcibly compel them to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Germans.

ALL BUSINESS NOW IN GERMAN HANDS

In the annexed part of Poland all Polish businesses and industries have passed out of Polish hands. The same thing is now happening in the so-called Gouvernement General. In addition to military requisitioning which has been going on all the time, a German decree of January 24, 1940, cited in the White Paper, gives the Nazi authorities in Poland the right to take over private property if it "serves the public interest." How slight a barrier that is to wholesale confiscation can be seen in the fact that while the decree specifically declares that "personal belongings are exempt from seizure" there is excluded from this exemption all "luxury articles" and those articles "which go beyond what is necessary for modest living."

The White Paper avers that this scientific pillage is motivated by more than the desire for loot, either by the State or by individuals,

though in some instances works of art taken from Polish museums and private collections have found their way to the homes of the gauleiters. It is also intented to destroy those elements of the population—intellectuals, businessmen, industrials, and others—who might serve as the centers around which resistance might be organized.

The White Paper goes into some detail in emphasizing, as Cardinal Hlond, the Catholic primate of Poland, has done in his two reports to the Vatican, how the Catholi church in Poland has been subjected to persecution and pillage. The reason is the same. And the same motive is to be discerned in the proscription of books that keep alive the Polish national spirit, the drastic regulation (amounting practically to suppression) of the publishing of other than propaganda tracts inspired by the Nazis, the looting of Polish scientific institutions of their laboratories, and tools and the elimination of Polish in most schools in the occupied area.

A further reason for the economic strangulation of Poland is that through this device Poland can most easily be fitted into the German economic orbit. In a confidential circular of January 25, 1940, addressed to the German authorities in Poland, Dr. Hans Frank, the governor-general declared the objective to be the expansion of agriculture, forestry, and mining in the occupied country to be his aim. And he also favored the recruiting of 100,000 Polish workers to be sent to Germany. Apparently this proved impossible. The next step in the direction of making the Poles actual slaves was then taken through the issuance of a decree supplementing an earlier decree establishing a system of compulsory labor so that persons subject to this decree could be sent to Germany.

There the Polish workers in the fields and factories are required to wear on their chests a violet P on a white square so that the Herrenvolk will be duly warned and avoid friendly relations with the conquered slaves.

In the meantime, an additional source of Polish labor is available to the Nazis in the prisoners of wars who, despite The Hague Convention, are being forced to indulge in work of military importance while being subjected to harsh treatment, prevented from getting the benefit of the ministrations of the International Red Cross, and served food only a sixth to a half as plentiful, the White Paper declares, as that served to the German troops.

400,000 DEPORTED TO SIBERIA

Incredibly bad as is the plight of the Poles under German rule, the plight of the Jews in Poland is even worse, the White Paper makes clear. It cites the various decrees issued by the Nazis in dealing with the Jews in Poland. They are drastically restricted in their economic life, not permitted to travel on trains, or leave their ghettoes without permission, and must wear a distinctive badge. An item from the Litzmannstaedter Zeitung dated February 16, 1941, reprinted in the White Paper tells of two Poles who were sentenced by the special tribunal of Lodez, one to 4 months', the other to a year's, imprisonment for having sent food and tobacco into the ghetto. Other cases of that kind are cited.

In the Soviet part of Poland conditions were easier at first, the White Paper says, but the oppression and terror are now no different there than they are in the German part. An estimated 400,000 Poles, says the White Paper, have been deported to central Asia and eastern Siberia.

In his covering letter to Secretary Hull, the Polish Ambassador declared that "the documentary evidence to which they refer in their note constitutes but a fraction of the vast number of facts which go to prove the extent of moral and material destruction intentionally caused by the German and Soviet Russian authorities of occupation, and the inhuman treatment to which the population of Poland is being subjected. These acts of unprecedented terrorism and of refined cruelty quite openly aim at the extermination of the Polish nation.

"As compared to the situation of occupied countries during the World War, in the course of which the authorities of occupation showed a certain degree of respect for international law, and to some extent admitted the work of the Red Cross and other institutions to relieve the sufferings of the civilian populations in occupied countries—in the present war the conduct on the part of the German Reich and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics virtually precludes all contact with, as well as any moral and material aid to, the practically enslaved populations of the occupied countries. In acting thus, the authorities of occupation are undoubtedly anxious to prevent the leakage of any information about the inhuman methods applied by them to these populations.

"Much irreparable damage has already been caused in Poland, and the ruthless application of terrorism and of methods of mass extermination of innocent civilians, including women and children, is being relentlessly pursued in a manner unprecedented in the annals of human history.

"The Polish Government deems it their duty at this time to bring the bare facts of the appalling sufferings of the Polish nation to public knowledge, and to appeal to the sense of justice of all the allied and neutral powers, as well as to the public opinion of all nations, who value the moral and cultural achievements of civilized humanity.

"While reserving their right to refer to article 3 of the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 at the appropriate time, the Polish Government desires to call the attention of the Government of the United States to the countless instances of violation of the most elementary principles of ethics and international law which, up to the present time, have been perpetrated on Polish territory by the authorities of occupation of the German Reich and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The Polish Government desire further to stress that they have already declared as illegal, null, and void, all the regulations and decrees issued by the authorities of occupation in violation of international law."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill to expend about $52,000,000 for the District of Columbia, and the items for the expenditure are given in the bill. We are advised by the committee that they are based upon the approximate income that was raised last year. I take the floor at this time particularly to call attention to an amendment I am going to offer to this bill in a few minutes to strike the $6,000,000 Treasury contribution to the District of Columbia that will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers who do not live here.

I am not for a single moment opposed to the expenditure of the money provided in this bill. I want to join with other Members who have spoken during the day in favor of providing everything that ought to be granted for this great city of Washington. I realize it takes a lot of money to run this city. I do want to direct your attention at the same time to the fact that the city of Washington and the people of this city have a great many advantages that you do not have in other places or cities of comparative size. One of them is the low rate of taxation on real and personal property. In the District of Columbia we have a tax rate of $1.75 per hundred. You do not find this tax rate matched anywhere in cities of comparative or even smaller size.

The same thing applies to the tax on gasoline. Washington has the lowest tax rate on gasoline, except one—the State of Missouri, whose tax rate is the same. In 47 States the gas tax is higher. So, this afternoon all I want is to permit the taxpayers of the District of Columbia to have a chance to come a little nearer to paying their fair share of the expense of running their government; that is all; not any more than their fair share. That is all I ask for. So I suggest that we strike this $6,000,000 from the bill and let us raise the tax rate to $2.50 per hundred. Let us raise the rate on gasoline by 2 cents and you will have more money than the $6,000,000 you propose to take from the Federal Treasury, that is almost bankrupt right now.

Now, you are going to say, "You cannot raise any more money under this bill." No; but leave out the $6,000,000 for the present and let us try to raise it. Give this Congress a chance to vote on a bill that is pending before the committee right now. Bring the bill to the floor of the House and vote on it.

If this Congress thinks the low tax rate paid by the property owners in Washington is enough; if they believe the folks at home should help pay for running the District, all well and good. All that I ask is that the folks here be given a chance to pay near their share of taxes. Then if more is needed, look to the Federal Treasury. But not until then.

It has been said that the property owners of this District want to pay their share of expense of running the Government. Why not let them do it?

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Iowa.

Mr. HARRINGTON. What is the tax rate on real estate in the largest town in the gentleman's district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, about twice what it is here.

Mr. HARRINGTON. About $3.50 per hundred?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. I think it would be fair to state that the tax rate runs from about $3 to as much as $4.75 in my State. Even more in some places. In no city, large or small, does it compare with the tax rate in the District of Columbia. I have a list of the cities in my State, as well as in the gentleman's State, and I do not believe he will find one city that even begins to compare with the tax rate that is provided here.

Something was said about the matter of laying a burden on the people of the District. What burden, pray tell me? Where is the burden on a property owner in a city that has never known there was a depression? During the so-called depression years, this city was growing all the time. Let me call your attention to just a few of the advantages that go to the property owners. Do you know of any city in the United States where the Government built a waterworks system for the city? An airport, the finest in all the world, has just been completed just

outside the city. It cost somewhere between $16,000,000 and $20,000,000. Who paid for it? The United States Government, of course. I have plenty of places in my district where cities would be glad to contribute one-half the expense of building an airport at a very moderate cost, if the Government would pay the balance. Do you know of any place where rents are higher and property is more in demand than in Washington? Water rents are lower. Local income-tax rates are lower. No inheritance taxes are charged, as in almost all States. Mr. Chairman, I think that if the people of the District were familiar with all the facts, they would be willing to pay a little more of their share of the expenses of running the government.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does not the gentleman feel they pay a fair share of the costs of running the government when they pay $46,000,000 out of $52,000,000?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I rather think that is begging the question. This money is not for running the Government of the United States. This appropriation is for the government of the District of Columbia, which is after all the city of Washington. I say they are not paying their share so long as they enjoy a tax rate of $1.75 per hundred on assessed valuation, when the people in your part of the country, and mine, pay even twice that amount.

I have just directed your attention to some of the benefits that have accrued to the property owners of this great city, and there are many more of them. Look at the rents that are paid, look at the business that is enjoyed by the merchants. Nowhere in the whole country, let alone you State and mine, do we have the per capita income they have here in this great city of Washington.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make two or three observations with respect to the pending bill. This bill calls for the appropriation of more than $52,000,000.

The District of Columbia is now paying a tax of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline plus 1½ cents per gallon to the Federal Government. The pending bill contains a contribution of $6,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for the use of the District of Columbia and that sum will go toward the general expenses of the District. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] spoke on the question of real-estate taxes in the District of Columbia. I want to call especial attention to the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia.

As I said before, the tax on gasoline in the District of Columbia is 2 cents per gallon. With the exception of Missouri every State in the Union pays a higher gasoline tax than do the people in the District of Columbia. In Missouri the gasoline tax is 2 cents per gallon. In my own State, Indiana, the tax is 4 cents per gallon. I want to analyze the gas tax in the various States by groups, without naming each State separately. I do not desire to trespass upon the time of the House unduly.

In 10 States the State tax is 3 cents per gallon and the Federal tax, 1½ cents, is added. In 17 States the State tax is 4 cents per gallon, to which the 1½-cents-per-gallon Federal tax is added. There are 11 States in which the tax is 5 cents per gallon, to which, of course, the 1½-cents-per-gallon Federal tax is added. In 5 States the State tax is 6 cents per gallon, to which the Federal tax is added; and in 3 States the State tax is 7 cents per gallon plus the 1½ cents Federal tax. The average in all the States is 4.4 cents per gallon, but in the District of Columbia it is only 2 cents per gallon.

Recently I observed, and I know this cannot be contradicted, because it came from the Commissioners of the District, that an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the gasoline tax of the District of Columbia would raise additional revenue of between $1,000,000 and $1,500,000, depending upon how much gasoline is purchased. A 2-cent increase in the gasoline tax, or making the local District tax 4 cents per gallon in conformance with a bill I introduced on April 28, 1941, H. R. 4549, would raise approximately $3,000,000 of additional revenue. The increased real-estate taxes provided in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Rees] would raise approximately $3,000,000. With these two added taxes the District of Columbia would have the $6,000,000 that you are seeking to take from the Federal Treasury under the provisions of this bill. I maintain it is entirely unfair to the taxpayers of the various States for them to pay a larger amount of taxes, in the States, than the people in the District of Columbia are required to pay, and then be called upon to make their contribution to aid in paying the taxes in the District. When the people in the District of Columbia pay taxes equal to, or nearly equal to, that paid by the taxpayers of the several States, then there will be no necessity of making a Federal contribution to the District, and our taxpayers will not be required to help pay the taxes for the people in the District of Columbia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and take this time to read from page 217 of the hearings bearing on the assessed valuation of real estate in the District of Columbia. The following colloquy took place between Dr. Havenner and myself:

Mr. HOUSTON. You say you cannot buy any property at the assessed valuation?

Dr. HAVENNER. I do not know of any.

Mr. HOUSTON. I understood that the assessed value around here was 100 percent.

Dr. HAVENNER. Well, it is. The assessed value is 100 percent.

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, whose value is it?

Dr. HAVENNER. The Assesor's office.

Mr. HOUSTON. He determines the value, the Assessor's office?

Dr. HAVENNER. The Assessor's office; not the property owners.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is the contention of all these tax people that the District of Columbia tax rate is too small on real estate.

Dr. HAVENNER. May I say that the United States Bureau of Efficiency some 10 years ago went very thoroughly into that question and took every city in the United States comparable with Washington and it compiled statistics of the assessment and tax rates and submitted those figures to the Congress of the United States. And those figures showed that the tax rate of Washington was fair and equitable as compared to the tax rate in other cities when you consider the assessed valuation.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is the whole question right there.

Dr. HAVENNER. That is the whole story. It has gone up a little since then.

The gentleman from Kansas said they did not tax on the full value. I am pointing out that the testimony is to the effect that property is assessed 100 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I call the gentleman's attention to a report of the comparative tax rates in 301 cities that is provided by the Bureau of Government Research. This particular report puts the assessed value in Washington at 90 percent.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is valuation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So far as the city of Washington is concerned. Using that as a basis, the tax rate here would be 15.75. Then to be fair on the same basis you would put New York City's rate at 27.36, Cleveland, Ohio, at 25.56, and Wichita, Kans., at 22.70, which is almost twice as much.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, any revenue (not including the proportionate share of the United States in any revenue arising as the result of the expenditure of appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and prior fiscal years) now required by law to be credited to the District of Columbia and the United States in the same proportion that each contributed to the activity or source from whence such revenue was derived shall be credited wholly to the District of Columbia, and, in addition, $6,000,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be advanced July 1, 1941, and all of the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 2, line 6, after the words "District of Columbia" strike out the remainder of line 6, and all of lines 7 and 8, and in line 9, strike out "1941."

Mr. REES of Kansas. This amendment seeks to strike from the bill the item of $6,000,000 that is being taken out of the Federal Treasury to help pay the expenses of running the city of Washington. The whole appropriation is for approximately $52,000,000. My contention, as I have said before, is that we should not call upon the taxpayers in your district and mine to pay this bill, while the people in the city of Washington enjoy a lower tax rate than you find almost anywhere in this country. The distinguished chairman of this particular committee says that his committee does not have control of the question of raising additional revenues. That is all right as far as it goes, but there have been for some time bills pending before the District Committee and before this House

that do provide for raising the revenue, and they should have had consideration before this particular bill came to the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, all I ask right now is that this House have a chance to vote on the question of increasing the tax rate in the District. Hold this item of $6,000,000 back until we vote on a revenue bill. Then, if this House decides it would rather charge the item of $6,000,000 up to the taxpayers of their people, all right. Or if, after you have provided the additional revenue by providing a fair tax rate, we find more funds are needed, we can discuss the matter of charging the deficit to the Federal Treasury. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about increasing the gasoline tax in the District. Let us find out whether this House has the courage of its convictions and wants to put that tax somewhere in line with the tax paid in your State or mine before you do the thing you are doing this afternoon. Almost all States collect inheritance taxes. Do you not think that matter could at least be considered?

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested by some Members who have preceded me that properties in the District are assessed on or nearly their value. I want to pursue that just a little further. I would like to take a moment to direct your attention to an example or two. Take the building known as the Lafayette Building. It is assessed at $6,263,000. The R. F. C. has a loan on that building for $6,000,000. Either the loan is too big or it is valued too low. Here is another one: There is a bill pending before this House asking for authority to buy a tract of 9½ acres, known as Temple Heights, for $900,000. I think it is located near Connecticut Avenue in the northwest part of the city. The assessed valuation of this property is $560,103. I really believe, generally speaking, properties in the city are not taxed too high.

Mr. Chairman, here is something that should be of interest to the membership of the House. In 1932, when values were supposed to be at the low real estate in the District of Columbia was listed at $1,226,691,000; in 1941, after the millions of dollars in improvements and new homes and hotels and apartment houses have been built, the value is fixed at $1,211,208,484. A decrease of $16,000,000.

A great deal is being said about the difference in valuations in various cities. I would call your attention, briefly, to a study made by the Detroit Government Research Association. That organization placed the assessed value in Washington at 90 percent of actual value. That would make the rate $15.75 per thousand. On the same basis we have these comparative figures:

Washington	$15.75
New York	27.36
Chicago	33.71
Detroit	33.23
Boston	40.60
Baltimore	30.34
Kansas City, Mo	32.79
Kansas City, Kans	30.53
Topeka, Kans	29.47
Wichita, Kans	26.32
Tulsa, Okla	26.92
Des Moines	41.25
Scranton, Pa	36.71
Jacksonville, Fla	37.71

Mr. Chairman, I know it is rather popular to vote for the things Washington wants. I want her to have the best just as you do. But, really, do you not think it a little unfair to saddle this $6,000,000 on the people of your district and mine and permit the people of this great city to enjoy the prosperity and the things that go with it, and at the same time pay less taxes than other people?

Mr. Chairman, let us strike out the contribution of $6,000,000 until we have at least made an effort to raise it right here in the District of Columbia. This is no more important to me than it is to you.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman believe that the United States Government should receive police protection and fire protection and be charged no taxes, with the tremendous amount of grounds and the improvements thereon, belonging to the Government, without contributing to the city of Washington?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wish I had time to answer the gentleman from Missouri. So far as fire protection is concerned, the waterworks system was built by the Federal Government and not by the District or the city of Washington. But that is not the question. The reason for the great property values is because of these Government buildings and equipment and all that go with them. Property would have little value if it were not for these Government buildings and the huge expenditure that is made by our Government. It is the Government, I dare say, that does the contributing.

Out in the city of St. Louis, in Kansas City, Topeka, or Wichita are Government buildings. I am sure the gentleman would not expect the Federal Government to contribute to these cities because of these Government buildings and the space they occupy.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again, that I do not want to deprive this great Capital City, the greatest Capital in all the world, of anything to which it is entitled. Neither do I want to deprive the people of this great city of a chance to help provide the requirements under the pending bill. I think it is fair to the people of Washington and to the overburdened taxpayers through this broad land of ours that we withhold this appropriation of $6,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAHON. I asked unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 13 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, then I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE].

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, I realize it is not very popular to get up on the floor at the present time in defense of an appropriation bill that seeks to appropriate money for the District of Columbia. There seems to be an undercurrent of opposition to anything we do for the District. Some of it is justified, some of it has been brought on by officials of the District of Columbia because of the antagonistic attitude they have assumed toward Members of Congress in trying to browbeat them into submission. A great deal of it is not justified. It was my privilege to talk a few minutes ago with Commissioner Young.

Russell Young, as we know, was recently appointed on the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia. He is a very able and efficient Commissioner, whose loyalty to the people of the District of Columbia is very evident. He is highly respected by everyone. I am under the impression that Commissioner Young will go down in history as one of the most popular Commissioners the District has ever had.

In talking with the Commissioner, he told me that the appropriation that was allotted to the Gallinger Hospital will be cut because the W. P. A., which now has about 50 persons working out there, paying them out of W. P. A. funds, is going to take them off because of the slash that was voted here in this House while we were considering the W. P. A. program. That is just part of the story.

We are attempting here to give to the District of Columbia $6,000,000. I believe it is no more than fair that the Federal Government, by virtue of the tremendous amount of property it occupies here, should contribute something to the upkeep of the municipal government. When I came to Washington not so many years ago the properties on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue were owned by private individuals, but since that time the Government has bought all that property on the one side of the street and built on it, and of course the revenue that was derived from that property in the form of taxes does not come in any more. So you can see that, as the Government continues to build, the taxable properties come off the tax duplicates and cannot be assessed by virtue of the fact that it is Federal property. The only solution to this problem is that the Government must contribute its proportionate share to the upkeep of the city. And of course this being the capital city of our Nation, and we all take a lot of pride in it, naturally it is only reasonable to assume that we want everything to be the best. Just think, hundreds of thousands of people come here each year to see this beautiful city. Of course that means that we need more streets, highways, police, firemen, and other needs that every first-class city requires.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, as far as the streets are concerned, the property owners pay only 25 percent of the cost of building the streets.

Mr. SCHULTE. Where does the other 75 percent come from?

Mr. REES of Kansas. From the Federal Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, my personal friend, the ranking minority member of the committee who is a very able and conscientious member and deserves much credit for the fine work he is doing.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Kansas is absolutely right as to the 25-percent payment in regard to streets, but 25 percent is charged to the abutting property owner on each side. The rest of it comes out of the Treasury of the District of Columbia. Repaving is done free of charge; there is no charge for repaving or repairing or re-laying new pavement. So the 25 percent to which my colleague from Kansas referred is absolutely correct, but it is 25 percent charged the property owner on each side of the street, making a total of 50 percent, and the other 50 percent is taken out of the District of Columbia treasury.

Mr. SCHULTE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I believe the Federal Government has a duty it owes to the people of the District of Columbia, and that is to pay its share of the upkeep for this city. No question but what the city is being crowded with buildings. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has introduced a bill and made recommendations for the decentralization of this Government. I am very much in accord and sympathy with that idea. I believe it is a very constructive thought. I only wish it were possible to get the thought across to the powers that be that it is essential and necessary, that a great many Federal buildings be located in other parts of the country, and be much closer to the people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. May I say that we are the powers that be. It depends on Congress. We could order a decentralization tomorrow, to start the day after.

Mr. SCHULTE. I am very happy to accept that suggestion from my good friend from Michigan, but I am wondering how many Members of the House will go along with that bill if and when it is presented to the House.

Mr. DINGELL. I will be the first one.

Mr. SCHULTE. It will take a great many more.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Did the gentleman say "decentralization" or "dehydration"?

Mr. SCHULTE. I said "decentralization." In view of a fast-growing Government, I think it is absolutely necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, apparently this question of taxation for the District of Columbia is gazed on in a rather abstract manner and with indifference by the majority of the Members, as evidenced by the fact that there is such a small attendance this afternoon. This lends a great deal of color to the justifiable complaint of the people of the District that we who are legislating for the District of Columbia do not take to heart the problems of the people of the District, who are otherwise unrepresented.

I was very deeply impressed by an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star of last Friday, June 13, bearing on the question we are now debating. I wish to read one paragraph of that splendidly written editorial, which I believe all of us would do well to consider and consider carefully. Here it is:

> The proposal to increase the real estate and personal property tax is a grave threat to the District. It would increase a tax that, with the scale of assessments, is already too high.

Parenthetically, I may add that according to my understanding the assessments in the District of Columbia on real estate are approximately at 100 percent of the actual value of the property. We do not have this same system in other parts of the country. I believe that is a key point in considering a fair tax rate and tax system for the District.

Proceeding with the reading of the editorial:

> It would add to the already complex and distressing difficulties of housing the low-salaried Federal employees, brought here to man the defense machinery. It would contradict almost every principle of sound, not to mention fair, taxation and it proposes to do exactly what the imposition of a local income tax was supposed to avoid.

There is the meat of the coconut. We have here at the seat of our National Government 60,000 or 70,000 new people brought in since this defense emergency arose. It is incontrovertible that this great increase in population carries with it a corresponding increase in the cost of local government. Is it fair to ask the local government of the District of Columbia to carry the entire burden, which, as I understood, would be the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas? On the contrary, we should invite into our councils the duly designated agents and spokesmen for the people of the District. We should sit around the table with them and, working in concert, evolve a fair and equitable schedule for taxing their property and for allocating the proportions of the cost of local government to be respectively borne by the country at large and by the citizens of the District. That is only fair and right. Any other procedure borders on the captious and the arbitrary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, repeatedly this afternoon it has been stated that this is the Federal city. Certainly the clearest indication of that fact is that the Congress of the United States raises the taxes for the District and spends the revenues which are collected, and the men and women who reside in this jurisdiction have not even a vote for President of the United States. Neither do they have representation in the Halls of Congress nor any direct control or voice over the operation of their local government. We make all laws for Washington.

I have very high personal regard for my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]. I know they have given study to the subject of increased local taxes. However, it is only of 6 or 8 weeks' duration that they have introduced bills which are before the District Committee. As chairman of that committee these measures will be considered when the gentlemen request hearings.

The Members know that last year I introduced a bill which would have raised the gas tax in the District. I realize we have a complicated system here in connection with the tax structure, and as one Member of this Congress these gentlemen will find me ready to go forward and explore all proper sources of taxation for the District of Columbia. This is not a matter which calls for a hasty conclusion. I do say, however, that it will be absolutely wrong for this Committee this afternoon to consider for a single moment the slashing of the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia. In 1929 the Federal Government gave $9,000,000 and in 1931 and 1932, in each of those years, we contributed of Federal funds $9,500,000 to the running of the District government. Certainly, we cannot here today strike out the Federal contribution to what has been called the Federal city.

Let us think carefully on this matter. I want to cooperate as the chairman of your legislative committee, and I am sure that the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia want to cooperate, but this, certainly, is no time for the Congress to cut from the running of the District of Columbia the Federal funds which are so badly needed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If this $6,000,000 is left in the bill and you raise your $52,000,000 by including it, would there not be a tendency on the part of the committee to give very little consideration to the raising of tax rates for the purpose of increasing the funds of the District, and could it not then be said, "We already have our budget, we have our funds, why increase the tax rate when we do not really need the money?"

Mr. RANDOLPH. I can understand the contention of the gentleman, but I do want to say that he himself has been a Member of this Congress for many

years, longer than I have, I believe, and he has only presented a bill on this subject in the last few weeks. Is not that true?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman might find that there was one introduced last year.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Perhaps I am in error, but I know my colleague has not asked for a hearing.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But there have been no hearings.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And, as I believe, no request from my friend from Kansas for a hearing on the subject of an increased real-estate tax. There were hearings on an increased gasoline tax.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in 1939 the House of Representatives and the Senate passed a revenue act for the District of Columbia which was signed by the President and became the law. Title I reads as follows:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized to be appropriated as the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia the sum of $6,000,000.

This is not a legislative committee. In this bill we are endeavoring to appropriate money for the running of the District of Columbia and we are recommending the largest appropriation bill for the District of Columbia in the history of the Government, but the Federal contribution is below the average of the last 10 years, although it is in accord with the law of the land. If we should strike this $6,000,000 from this bill we would completely wreck the bill that your committee has given a lot of time and consideration to in its formation. This would affect every item in the bill. It would completely wreck and demoralize the whole bill that we have presented to you, and I do not think you are going to consider for a moment striking out this $6,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am sorry, but I have only 3 minutes.

It is true that the District of Columbia is not comparable to our own States and to our cities, but the District of Columbia does not belong to the people of Washington. It belongs to my constituents and your constituents. The District of Columbia is in the hollow of the hand of the Congress of the United States. It is of the people of the United States. It is not a State, a Territory, or a province. It is the seat of the Federal Government, and it belongs to all the people. It does not belong to the people who live here. It belongs to all our people, and we in the Congress run it as we choose. We deny District of Columbia residents the right to vote; we deny them a lot of privileges. We give them a lot of privileges. Personally, I would not exchange the privilege of being a Texan for the privilege of being a resident of any city, even my capital city in which I take great pride. I would not exchange my privileges in Texas where we have the right to vote and to be elected to office and participate in governmental affairs for the privilege of being a citizen of this voteless Federal city, despite the fact that some may claim the Washington tax rate is lower than tax rates elsewhere. Washington residents do not have the voting privilege because they are in the Federal city and we in the Congress are running it, and we are going to continue to run it, and we are going to give our capital city $6,000,000 to supplement the local contribution in taxes of something like $43,000,000 or $45,000,000, to run it for another year. I appeal to you to go along with your committee; we have worked hard and unselfishly on this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman rightly contends that as long as the Congress of the United States operates the District of Columbia, then certainly there is a duty that we appropriate a certain amount of Federal funds toward the running of this government.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly. I am not only appropriating money for the District of Columbia. I am appropriating money for my Government, for my country, for my constituents, because this is our city.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Is it not properly a matter that should come before the legislative committee, this business of striking out the Federal contribution?

Mr. MAHON. That is true. We are approaching the end of the fiscal year, and those who wish to change the tax provisions of the law undoubtedly have the right to do so, but this is not the place to set up a new tax system.

Mr. McCORMACK. And how long did the subcommittee consider this bill?

Mr. MAHON. We considered it for 2 weeks in active hearings and a good deal longer than that otherwise.

Mr. McCORMACK. For several weeks?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And this is the sound judgment of the committee?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and I have every confidence that the House will go along with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

For personal services, $87,020, plus so much as may be necessary to compensate the Engineer Commissioner at such rate in grade 8 of the professional and scientific service of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, as may be determined by the Board of Commissioners, and including $3,500 for examination of estimates of appropriations and for other purposes without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations contained in this act for the payment of personal services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the two civilian Commissioners, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade, but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided further*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service; (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed, as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act; (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit; (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law; or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that any portion of the bill be subject to amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. And to points of order?

Mr. HOUSTON. And to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider points of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 22, beginning in line 18:

Including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements.

It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded. It is my understanding that the gentleman from South Dakota has a number of points to offer, and he might offer them all at once and have them disposed of in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to consider them separately. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on page 35, beginning in line 17, I make a point of order to the following language:

Including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements—

on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on page 51, on line 25, I make the point of order to the language beginning in that line and continuing on page 52:

to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements.

I make the point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 62, beginning in line 10, I make the point of order to the following language:

Provided, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation, together with $25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, may be used during the fiscal year 1942 as a revolving fund for the purchase of food stamps from the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the food-stamp plan of that Department for the distribution of surplus commodities, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, said revolving fund to be reimbursed from time to time from the proceeds of sale of such stamps: *Provided further*, * * *.

Mr. MAHON. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the language on page 82, beginning in line 18:

by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, and civil-service requirements.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on page 87, beginning in line 7, I make a point of order against the proviso reading as follows:

Provided further, That the Commissioners are authorized to employ necessary engineering and other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on pages 92 and 93, beginning in line 25 on page 92, and ending in line 3 on page 93, reading as follows:

For continuing the development of a plan to insure an adequate future water supply for the District of Columbia, including engineering and other professional services by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, also on page 93, beginning in line 18, I make a point of order against the language reading—

without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, or civil-service requirements.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on page 102 there is a section which waives section 3709, where the amount does not exceed the sum of $100. I would like to make a point of order against that section because I understand a waiver of minor amounts is carried in various statutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The language is unnecessary. The point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Without objection the Clerk will be authorized to correct section numbers.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 34, line 14, strike out all of lines 14 to 19, both inclusive.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 13 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, I understand the chairman of the committee will reserve 5 minutes to oppose the amendment?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, unless the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] has sufficient time to discuss his amendment I would like to be heard. I would not take any time under the circumstances, if the gentleman from Maryland has ample time to discuss his amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 16 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, will strike out a restrictive legislative provision prohibiting the use of any of this money for the education of children who do not reside in the District of Columbia. If this is adopted it will be the first time it has been adopted in a District of Columbia appropriation bill.

At the present time there are some 750 children attending the schools of the District of Columbia from my county, which adjoins the District. In return for that, the University of Maryland gives a differential to resident students of the District of Columbia who are attending the University of Maryland. I think they are allowed $75 a year credit on their tuition.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I wish to correct the gentleman at that point. It is true the University of Maryland, only a few miles from where we stand, contributes between $75 and $100 toward the tuition of every student from the District of Columbia, but in case of premedical students, those taking the course at College Park preparatory to a medical course receive a differential of about $150.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Supplementing that, there are certain facilities in connection with the land-grant phase of the University of Maryland which are afforded free to the students of the District of Columbia.

My home county, Prince Georges, has certain schools near the District line, particularly at Bradbury Heights, where there are no district schools immediately contiguous to that area. There the children of the District of Columbia attend, and attend absolutely free. I am told that in that school there are approximately 50 students from the District of Columbia. This situation prevails at many other Maryland schools. I am told that there are from 80 to 100 children of the District of Columbia who are wards of the charities of the District of Columbia who are now boarders in private families in Maryland, paid for by the District of Columbia, and that we accept those children free in our Maryland schools.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mrs. BYRON. Somewhat the same condition prevails in the counties of my district. In Montgomery County there are at least 50 District of Columbia children attending Maryland schools. I am very much interested in the gentleman's amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. SASSCER. I think the situation is quite similar in the gentlewoman's district.

A moment ago the able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said he had great pride in the District of Columbia; that we should attempt to maintain it as a great city; and called attention to the fact that substantial sums of money had been appropriated from the General Treasury in support of the District of Columbia budget and the general expenses of the District. With this I am in complete accord.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have the time I requested.

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes were allotted to this debate. The Chair did not know the gentleman from Maryland was seeking recognition.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I was on my feet seeking recognition.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentlemen from Maryland [Mr. COLE and Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment is very fair, in that it would continue the reciprocity between our schools, our university, and the District. Under the existing law only children whose parents are employed in the District can attend the District schools, and there are not a great many who do that.

It is bad procedure to attach legislation to an appropriation bill. Matters of this kind should be considered by legislative committees. Would it not be far better, even though you are inclined to oppose this amendment, to introduce a legislative bill and have it referred to the appropriate committee, which, I assume, would be the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on Education? That committee could then study the various phases of reciprocity—the various equities or inequities, as the case may be. Why add an amendment to an appropriation bill changing existing laws, procedure, and regulations when the purpose of this bill is just to make appropriations? Large sums are appropriated for the District of Columbia from the General Treasury. It is therefore unfair to bar nonresident children of parents who are employed here. Although they live in Maryland, many of those parents retain their residences in your States.

I respectfully urge and ask the Members of the House to adopt this amendment in a spirit of fairness and of better legislative procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, you are again hearing the same arguments from Virginia and Maryland. It has been said this proposal is somewhat new. It is a very, very old proposal. We have had it here every year since I can remember.

You are now called upon in a proposed amendment to build schools in the District of Columbia for the free tuition of students from two States—Maryland and Virginia. What about our other States. The hearings are full of information on this subject, which indicates that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia and the taxpayers of your States—because the $6,000,000 of Federal contribution is reflected in these expenditures, it must be paid by your taxpayers—are assuming the responsibilities of the taxpayers in nearby Maryland and Virginia. We heard from school experts and local taxpayers. Let me give you some real information on this subject. This House has gone on record time and time again to relieve the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, and my State, and your State from this discriminatory use of their money to relieve the taxpayers in Maryland and Virginia. Before our committee came people who asked of us to build our schools closer to the Maryland and Virginia lines in order that the children of Maryland and Virginia might more easily reach the schools of the District of Columbia. To secure free tuition at the expense of people in our States and this District.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], for whom I have a high esteem, is continually fighting for his district and the people of his district. This item means $188,296.77 for his district and his State every year. That is a large amount of money. To the able gentlemen from Virginia who continue to oppose this limitation of funds it means $70,646 every year. The total benefit to the taxpayers of these two States is $258,942.77 every year. Why should we ask our people to favor in this way these two States?

Let me give you now the number of individuals benefited. From Maryland 27 people go to our Teachers' College every year, 777 students go to the senior high schools; there are 486 junior-high-school students, 56 vocational students and 674 elementary students. The people in Virginia send 19 to the Teachers' College, 358 to the senior high schools, 193 to the junior high schools, 25 to the vocational schools, and 81 to the elementary schools. All free of charge. And remember, Mr. Chairman, this does not include one child of an Army officer, Navy man, enlisted man, or Member of Congress. Do not forget, you are appropriating $13,000,000 here for schools in this District.

If you adopt this amendment you will have fastened on your own taxpayers in your own States and the taxpayers of the District of Columbia a burden which is absolutely the rightful responsibility of the taxpayers of two neighboring States who are continually coming into this District and chiseling on the money paid by the people here and by your own constituents.

I hope this amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia, the Federal City, not to provide school facilities for Maryland, Virginia, or any other State. This is the reason the bill carries the provision which is being objected to by the able gentleman from Maryland. I commend the gentleman, and other Members from his State, for their keen interest in a matter which involves their State. I am sorry that I must present a different viewpoint.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Gladly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Many people working for the Government live in Virginia because they have to live there. Those people never have added a great burden to the Virginia side by their children going to school over there, and, likewise over in Maryland, people live in Maryland who work here in the Capital City. Does not the gentleman think it is fair for those children to come here and go to school? Should there not be some recognition of that problem? Their living is here in Washington, their interest is in Washington, they are there because it is necessary for them to get a place in which to live. It seems to me there should be reciprocity both ways in this matter.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I wonder if the gentleman is willing to also take into consideration the fact that the District of Columbia is without a land-grant college? All of the high schools of the District are privileged to use the University of Maryland without additional expense, like the land-grant law provides, and also their students attend the university without any additional charge at all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of this bill to provide funds for public education in the District of Columbia, and we are providing thirteen and one-half million dollars. There is a clamor for more money to support the children of the District of Columbia who live here for a short or long period of time. It is the obligation of the people of Maryland and Virginia, Ohio, and other States, to provide facilities for their children. If people elect to live in Virginia and in Maryland, then let them assume the obligations which they have over there of voting, paying taxes, and educating their children there.

The superintendent of schools, Dr. Ballou, advocated the thing the committee is advocating. The board of education points out that earlier it was not possible for the children in Maryland and Virginia to get these facilities in Maryland and Virginia, but that situation no longer exists. In Maryland and in Virginia and in the outskirts of Washington they have adequate facilities to take care of these children and they ought to pay their taxes out there and educate their children there. If they come to Washington they ought to pay tuition. The people of Virginia are not making a valuable contribution to the District of Columbia in this matter. It is true that in Maryland the tuition in the University of Maryland for a student from Maryland is $188 and the tuition for a student in the University of Maryland from the District of Columbia is $238. The student from the District pays $50 more than the student who lives in Maryland. So the argument of the gentleman from Maryland is not substantiated, because the District of Columbia student is paying $50 more tuition in the University of Maryland than the students of Maryland. It is true that Maryland gives the District of Columbia student a better tuition rate than it gives students from other jurisdictions.

Dr. Ballou, superintendent of schools, in commenting on this thing, was very vigorous in his advocacy of the position

which the committee has assumed. I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5049, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks, two newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks on H. R. 4 this afternoon, the report that goes with the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JACOBSEN (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE), for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 913. An act to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will start hearings in room 1304, New House Office Building, on Tuesday, June 17, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Proponents will be heard during the first week of hearings.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (ALLEN of Louisiana).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 622, H. R. 2287, H. R. 4937, H. R. 4983, and S. 215.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents has tentatively scheduled a further hearing on the subject of royalty payments, as covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 1015, House Office Building. Interested parties are requested to contact the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

662. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

663. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $5,500 (H. Doc. No. 277); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

664. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for salaries and administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $2,400,000 (H. Doc. No. 278); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

665. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting additional estimates of appropriations for salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $300,000 (H. Doc. No. 279); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

666. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $100,000, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 280); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4590. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 173. Joint resolution to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5063. A bill to increase the compensation of the members of the armed forces; to make intangible property bear its fair share of the cost of national defense; to provide for the proper administration of this act; to provide penalties for the violation of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 5064. A bill to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 5065. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to the definition of the term "security" contained therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5066. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Hudson River, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 5067. A bill authorizing the establishment of a filing and indexing service for useful government publications; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 5068. A bill to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515, as amended, of the Revised Statutes; sections 1 and 3 of the act approved February 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1147); and section 3744, as amended; 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5072. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of a naturalized wife residing abroad with her husband, a native-born national of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution providing for the filling of vacancy which will occur August 6, 1941, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Member of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution authorizing the printing, with illustrations, of the proceedings of the national encampments of various veterans' organizations in the United States as separate House documents; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 238. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the pamphlet containing information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution relative to Federal funds to States providing assistance to blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, relative to the coinage of memorial 50-cent pieces in honor of the late Will Rogers; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Memorial No. 9, relative to citizens of the United States physically incapacitated from earning a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their concurrent resolution relative to the National Recovery Act of 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolution No. 58, relative to the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of George Garcavy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER:

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Catherina Migliore and Anthony and Rose Migliore; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1426. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of sundry residents of Whitewater, Kans., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1427. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of sundry residents of Clarion County, Pa., urging enactment of the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1428. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., urging the State federations and individual clubs to cooperate with the health departments and all other agencies working for the prevention, control, and cure of heart disease, cancer, pneumonia, tuberculosis, influenza, and syphilis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1429. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., urging the President of the United States to proclaim the first Saturday of the month of May as "Women of the Americas' Day" in recognition of the contribution that women of the Western Hemisphere can make toward the progress of humanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1430. Also, petition of the General Federation of Women's Clubs May 19, 1941, at Atlantic City, N. J., urging the study of and aid to local housing needs with a view of providing better homes and seeking inclusion of representative women on State and local housing authorities; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1431. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the American Labor Party, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Hobbs bill (H. R. 3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. Also, petition of the Unicorn Press, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the continuance of the 1½-cent-per-pound book postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1433. Also, petition of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, opposing any change in the existing law that would add additional burden on the American consumer and cause further unemployment in the cane-sugar-refining industry in the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1434. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting that the Congress of the United States permit no reduction in the existing tariff rates on tungsten and tungsten products in this proposed reciprocal trade treaty with the Republic of Argentina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1435. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Thelma W. Clark and 146 other citizens of the State of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1436. Also, petition signed by A. W. Comstock and 21 other citizens of Curry County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1437. Also, petition signed by John Winders and six other citizens of Rogue River, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1438. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition signed by Edor Erickson and 216 others, of Hamilton, Mont., urging the passage of House bill 4000, a bill stop the sale of all alcoholic beverages inside Army and naval camps and to authorize creation of zones around those camps for the prevention of taverns and vice districts in close proximity thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1439. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 202, San Francisco, Calif., opposing the proposal of a 20-percent increase of the Federal excise tax on automobiles, as suggested by Price Control Administrator Leon Henderson; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1440. By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire: Resolution of the New Hampshire Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars, favoring convoys; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1441. Also, petition of sundry residents of Lisbon, N. H., and other neighboring towns, opposing passage of House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1442. By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of Mrs. L. J. Duddleston, secretary, and the members of the Mothers Club of the Methodist Church of Lavalle, Wis., seeking enactment of legislation to safeguard the health and morale of the youth called out under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1443. Also, petition of Mrs. W. H. Wilson and the other members of the Bible School of Lavalle, Wis., seeking enactment of legislation to safeguard the health and morale of the youth called out under the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1444. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Polish Central Association of Cudahy, Milwaukee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1445. Also, petition of the city of Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1446. Also, petition of the Birmingham Aero Club, Alabama; petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a separate, unified air force in the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1447. Also, petition of the National Pension League, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a pension for alleged people of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1448. Also, petition of the Traffic Club of Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1449. Also, petition of the National Association of Motor Bus Operators, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to House bill 4077, concerning motor carriers and license fee in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1450. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of J. I. Robison and others of College Place and Dayton, Wash., urging the passage of House bill 4000, to prevent the sale of alcoholic beverages inside Army and naval camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, our Heavenly Father, for all those providences which have been Thy messengers to us and brought us rich gifts; nothing is abiding except it is rooted in Thy love. We pray that we may find our Sabbath of rest in labor, giving courage to befriend, pity to protect, and rectitude to reveal another's rainbow. We pray for wisdom and mental ease to prepare us for toil, to stimulate action, and to nerve us for the coming day.

Almighty God, by reading, meditation, and by earnest prayer may our country be brought into such an expectant and responsive mood that it shall see and grasp the things freely given us of Thee. Cries the Prophet, "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well." With our feet on righteous ground and with our eyes uplifted, may we wait for the light which may be delayed but will not be denied. O Thou who didst die for us and art living for us a life that is more glorious than dying, disarm the hand of rebellion, that our fellow countrymen may testify against sin which blasts national cooperation, which upholds the right of force to rule the world, and which condemns the power and the hope of the glorified Cross to minister to struggling humanity. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Roche, Connell & Laub Construction Co.;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y. Upham;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum; and

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act, approved June 10, 1922, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila;

S. 296. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an assay office at Helena, Mont.;

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 374. An act to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy;

S. 1110. An act to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony;

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1392. An act for the relief of Homer J. Swope;

S. 1398. An act for the relief of Elinor Leugers;

S. 1426. An act for the relief of Otis Thompson;

S. 1467. An act to amend section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes;

S. 1512. An act to amend the Alien Registration Act, 1940, by making it a criminal offense to reproduce alien-registration receipt cards;

S. 1529. An act to amend the act approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 383), relative to retirement of officers of the United States Navy after 30 years' service;

S. 1557. An act to provide for reimbursement to the holders of cotton-pool participation trust certificates, and for other purposes;

S. 1580. An act to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes;

S. 1608. An act for the relief of the Neal Storage Co.; and

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Flag Day address delivered on June 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from a constituent dealing with the labor situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Milo J. Warner, head of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any previous special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE PERIOD FOR THE SALE OR DESTRUCTION OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION AT THE NEW YORK AND SAN FRANCISCO WORLD'S FAIRS OF 1940

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Ways and Means Committee, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937—Fiftieth United States Statutes, page 668—concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and

for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this joint resolution is simply to extend the time within which the goods referred to therein are to be returned to other countries.

Mr. BUCK. The joint resolution extends the time from 6 months after the closing of the fair to 18 months after the closing of the fair and inserts a provision that releases the Fair Corporation from any liability after the goods have been entered through the customs house.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. BUCK. It is a unanimous report as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] can testify.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution "To permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the New York World's Fair 1939, New York City, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes," approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "within 6 months" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "within 18 months," and by adding a new section thereto reading as follows:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of the said joint resolution of August 16, 1937, as amended, or any regulation issued pursuant thereto, the New York World's Fair 1940 Inc. shall not be liable for the payment of any duties, charges, or exactions in respect of articles entered under the provisions of the said joint resolution if such articles have been or shall be entered under the general tariff law and the general customs regulations in force at the time of such entry. Nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the New York World's Fair 1940 Inc. to reimburse the United States for the actual and necessary customs charges for labor services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported, incurred prior to entry under the general tariff law."

With the following committee amendments:

In line 4, on page 2, strike out the numeral "2" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3."

On page 2, after line 20, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That the joint resolution "providing for the importation of articles free from tariff or customs duty for the purposes of exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition to be held at San Francisco in 1939, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187) as amended and supplemented, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "within 6 months" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "within 18 months" and by adding a new section thereto to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Nothwithstanding any provision of th said joint resolution of May 18, 1937, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation issued pursuant thereto, the San Francisco Bay Exposition shall not be liable for the payment of any duties, charges, or exactions in respect of articles entered under the provisions of the said joint resolution if such articles have been or shall be entered under the general tariff law and the general customs regulations in force at the time of such entry. Nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the San Francisco Bay Exposition to reimburse the United States for the actual and necessary customs charges for labor services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported, incurred prior to entry under the general tariff law.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and to further amend the amended joint resolution approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to me from Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a letter addressed to me by Philip Murray, of the C. I. O., in connection with two and a half billion dollars for W. P. A. and also my reply thereto. I think I have given him the right answer on that matter.

Thursday I am going to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Madam Perkins, who takes exceptions to remarks I put in the RECORD. I have made reply thereto, and I hope every Member of the House who is interested will read this letter today and the one I shall put in Thursday.

PROPERTY SEIZURE BILL

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGREGOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a resolution adopted by the Presbyterian Church.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION CO.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I note the Army officers have taken over the North American Aviation Co. in California and they have discharged some radical labor and trouble raisers. They have not obtained permission from the National Labor Relations Board to do that, and the first thing they know they will have to put those fellows back on the pay roll and pay them from the time they checked them out. That is the situation in which your Uncle Sam will find himself. The people do not want such unjust laws and such procedure. Just imagine some poor manufacturer who is trying to do an honest, conscientious, legitimate job, running his plant, employing labor, and doing as good a business as possible, and having a good big pay roll, when along comes a few trouble raisers and dissenters, yes, and Communists, and he would like to lay them off because they will wreck him if he does not; but he cannot do it because this Congress has passed laws that will not permit it; and there you have the situation. Until you change the Wagner Act and the N. L. R. B. you will continue the bad practice now in vogue. Congress should enact laws at once changing the Wagner Act and the N. L. R. B., so that trouble raisers, Communists, and men whose object is to destroy, interrupt, and corrupt honest, sound labor, and wreck business. Will you do it? When? I say you should do it now. Now is the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

DEFENSE BONDS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] stood in the Well of this House and issued a challenge to Representatives from other districts to match the patriotism and loyalty of the

Exchange Club in Tuscaloosa, Ala., in respect to what their civic organizations were doing about buying defense bonds. He proudly stated that the Exchange Club membership had subscribed 100 percent in the purchase of defense bonds. Since that time I have talked with various organizations in my city about accepting this challenge of Representative JARMAN, and they informed me that they are now working toward that 100-percent goal. Therefore, on behalf of the various organizations in the city of New York, I am willing to accept this friendly challenge.

At this point I wish to direct the attention of the House to a news item in this morning's New York Times, concerning an appeal made by my friend Postmaster Albert Goldman to the residents of the Home of the Sons and Daughters of Israel at 232 East Twelfth Street, New York City. This home for the aged is under the direction of Rabbi Bernard Bergman.

Postmaster Goldman stated as follows:

> This is the first time in all my endeavors for Jewish charities here and in Palestine that I have appeared before any group of people where we should be giving out bonds to help in your welfare rather than appealing to you for bonds for the safety of the world.

The impressive talk of the postmaster was met with a prompt and enthusiastic response on the part of the old folks, especially Tobias Wildstein, who is 109 years old. He was the first in line to buy a defense bond and, speaking in Yiddish, this venerable gentleman said:

> I hope these few cents will build fortresses for our country.

To me this fine old soul, in buying a bond to aid his adopted country at such a great sacrifice, set an example that could well be emulated by every person living under the Stars and Stripes.

There is one thing better than good government, and that is government in which all the people have a part.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—WHAT IT MEANS TO THE FARMERS

Mr BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

RAILROAD YARDMASTERS OF NORTH AMERICA

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a resolution passed by the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., in convention, May 13, 1941, at Buffalo, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ARGENTINE AND URUGUAY TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of Members from the agricultural sections of the country to the hearing that is to be held next Monday morning before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in the Tariff Commission Building on the proposed Argentine and Uruguay trade agreements. In these agreements it is proposed to reduce the tariff on canned beef and various other competitive agricultural commodities. I hope the Members will exercise the privilege they have of protesting any further reduction of the tariff on any of these competitive agricultural commodities at this hearing. Since the Congress last year defeated the amendment I offered to provide for Senate ratification of all future trade agreements, we are now in a position where we can only protest. I hope the Members from the agricultural sections will exercise that privilege next Monday morning in an effort to preserve the American market for the American farmer and livestock producer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 214, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 4473, a bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, this rule does not waive any points of order, nor does it restrict in any way, nor is it a gag rule. It is an open rule. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, and after that the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule.

The bill which this rule makes in order has been reported by the unanimous vote of the Naval Affairs Committee. It was stated to the Rules Committee that there is immediate need for this legislation, due to the tremendous increase in our naval forces. The bill provides for temporary advancement of many Navy men. I am of the opinion that at this time it is actually necessary that this legislation be passed.

I realize that in the Navy, as well as in the Army, there are gentlemen who are continuously devoting a great deal of their time and energy to seeing how they can gain promotion and advancement, but that is nothing but a human sentiment which all men cherish—promotion and advancement. However, it is unfortunate that frequently men who are not deserving, and who do not have the ability, are promoted and advanced. I hope that at this time only the most efficient, the most capable, and the most deserving men will obtain promotions which will be made from time to time in the interest of greater efficiency and will bring our Navy to such a high standard that it will excel any and every other in the world. I have all confidence in these men. I hope many of them will receive promotion in the interest of the Navy, to which they are entitled.

In view of the fact that there is no opposition to the bill, and I hope there will not be to the rule, I shall not take any more of the time of the House.

I now yield 30 minutes, which I promised, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has stated in detail and with great decision, as is his custom, the purposes and objects of this bill. Therefore it is not necessary for me to say anything more as to the reason why this bill should not have the unanimous support of the House. It is an actual defense measure, aimed to benefit the Navy and to promote officers in the Navy during the emergency, and appoint enlisted men as officers for the duration of the emergency. The Army already has this right, and I cannot conceive of any reason why this bill should not be passed. It comes to you with a unanimous report from the Naval Affairs Committee and the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a total of 5 minutes, and I will appreciate it if I may be notified when I have consumed 5 minutes. I wish to say just a few words about our Navy. There are still some people in the United States who are talking about this country as if it was in the same position as Holland, or Denmark, or Poland, or Abyssinia, those nations without navies, and other nations very close to the borders of Germany. I heard General O'Ryan, a distinguished gentleman, make a speech day before yesterday in my district for 45 minutes. He said he did not believe that Germany could invade England, 20 miles away. I hope he is correct. But he said it would be very easy for Germany to invade the United States, 3,000 miles away. I confess I could not follow his logic or his reasoning, in view of the fact that our Navy is seven times larger than the German Navy today, and every day we are launching some new warships, and Germany is losing some of her fleet, either the *Bismarck*, or some submarine, or destroyer, or some other war vessel. It is a war of mutual destruction. Germany is losing warships, Italy and Great Britain are also losing warships, and we are building them. In the past few months we have launched three of the greatest battleships in the world, the *Washington*, the *North Carolina*, and the *South Dakota*,

all three of 35,000 tons. Those three mighty battleships are bigger than the entire German Navy. These three modern battleships that we have launched within the last few months are more powerful than the German Fleet; yet there are those in this country who say that we should be fearful of attack by the German Navy across 3,000 miles. Some people seem to think that every time Hitler sneezes we should shudder or look under our beds every night to see if Hitler was not there, or the Germany Navy. Is it not about time for some sound, common-sense thinking, rather than to be carried away by hysteria that because Germany cannot invade England, 20 miles away, she can invade us, 3,000 miles away, in spite of the fact that we have the greatest navy in the world?

We are discussing a Navy bill. I hope that every time a Navy bill comes up somebody will take the floor and point out in simple language that we, for the first time since the Civil War, have the greatest, the largest, the finest, and the best Navy in the world. If any other navy or group of navies are looking for trouble from us we will give them all the trouble they are looking for. The fact is that if all the navies of the world combined they could not make a dent on ours if they come over here 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or twice as far across the Pacific; and we continue day after day to build and launch warships while the other nations, the warring nations, are losing theirs in a war of mutual destruction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I presume on the good graces of my colleagues today to talk to them a little because I have some information I feel they should have, particularly in view of the state of affairs existing in the country. I want to talk this afternoon on the general proposition that we cannot run this war like a W. P. A. art project and expect to get anywhere with it.

It is all right to be chasing totalitarians from our doors, but while we are doing that we had better be sure they do not come in the windows from our home-grown gardens.

Big business is being abused for being too big, but bigger things are being demanded of it. If things are not going as they should, either to aid England or defend ourselves, is it not about time we find out what is the trouble? Who or what is responsible for the "red" led defense strikes? Whose is the responsibility for stoppages in defense industries occasioned by labor difficulties, marked not by the support of a majority seeking economic betterment but by a minority whose prime purpose seems to be something else? Why a stoppage in a vital defense industry of such character as to lead the Attorney General to characterize it as an insurrection rather than a strike? By what processes have we come to the point where at the hour of our great need we must call out the Army to make it possible for workmen to go into a factory where military planes are being made?

It is about time we began getting some of the answers. Possibly it is no use locking the barn door after the horse is stolen, but I am sure we still have some horses in the barn, and it is about time we began looking after them.

I charge that we have had too much governmental pampering and coddling of subversive, destructive, and communistic influences among those persons who are making a racket out of labor. And we have had too much condoning, if not actual promoting, of that force, violence, and racketeering which is so much a part of all un-American activity. We have had too many in the Government who, being charged with administering good American law, have been more interested in following the Moscow party line.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I am against all dictatorships, not just two-thirds of them. Now, let us get down to some cases and some facts and figures. We all know of the action of the President of the United States in calling out the Army to open the North American Aviation Co. plant at Inglewood, Calif. That action generally is approved by the public. The public likewise deplores the fact that a situation exists which makes it necessary to call out the Army; but we all recognize the necessities of national defense. We all knew that something had to be done to provide those 10 planes per day for the defense of this land. I personally have called upon the President to take some affirmative action, and particularly have I called upon him to use his great influence to drive out of the ranks of labor those communistic influences and those subversive influences and even—yes—to drive out of the ranks of his own administration people who have been condoning that sort of activity.

What happened out there in that plane strike? I think we ought to have something of a picture of it.

The North American Aviation plant was struck. There are a lot of different contentions about the calling of the strike and how many really wanted to strike. I do not want to go into all the details about that. The fact is that on Monday morning the State and local authorities tried to open the plant but apparently they were unable to do so. Then the Army was called out. They forced the picket line back and as a result I understand a majority of the workers of that plant came back to work. It seems to me that is rather clear evidence that the majority of the workers in that plant were not in sympathy with the strike.

I have always said that in peacetime I would be very, very reluctant to vote for—nay, almost completely against—the absolute outlawing of the right of workers to strike. A strike for economic betterment supported by a majority in peacetime is something which is most difficult for any one of us to say should be completely outlawed.

But apart from the rightness or the wrongness of this strike, what is the situation out there now? The gentleman from Pennsylvania called the attention of the House to the fact that eight of the leaders who called the strike were told by the Army to pack up their tools and get out. If the employer did that, he would be charged before the National Labor Relations Board; and as I understand the circumstances that existed there, there is no question in my mind but what the Labor Board would order the reinstatement of those men—and, what is more, their reinstatement with back pay. Those men have already filed a petition with the regional office in Los Angeles for reinstatement. They have alleged section 8 (1) and section 8 (3) violations under the Labor Act, alleging interference and discrimination. I am informed that the Labor Board wired the regional office to take no action because they had no jurisdiction since the Government took the plant over. But, Mr. Speaker, the people running the plant were charged with carrying on and operating it. Is not the Government in very much the same position as the employer? I do not know what ultimately will come of this action before the Labor Board as to whether the men will ultimately be reinstated. When the Government took over, they did not waste much time ousting these eight men.

I wish to call attention to another thing out there. I served during the last Congress on what was known as the Smith committee, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. We investigated certain activities of the Labor Board and its personnel in connection with the administration of the so-called labor-relations law. In the course of that investigation we found that a man by the name of Abraham L. Wirin, who was born in Russia, had been taken on as a senior attorney by the Labor Board in 1935. He had served as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union from 1933 to 1935, where, to use his own words, he was engaged in "defense of workers, for the most part 'radical' and Communist."

In his application he stated as follows, and I want you to pay attention:

> Now that I am being frank and in a confessional mood, let me say that I think that a couple of years with the Board might give me that prestige which I think I need in being counsel for the Civil Liberties Union. I think if the vigilantes knew I had been a high Government official, their irresistible passion to kidnap, tar, or feather me in strike situations might be somewhat resisted.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of that or because of it, that fellow was taken on by the Labor Board and the most terrible storm of protest arose from California. The junior Senator from California, Mr. McAdoo, protested this appointment in unmistakable language to the Labor Board. Organizations all over the State of California wrote to the Labor Board and charged this man with having been communistic in his activities, aiding and

abetting subversive causes in the Imperial Valley and all up and down California, deploring his employment with the Labor Board.

Did the Labor Board lay that man off on that showing? Oh, no. He was stoutly defended by the then Chairman, Mr. Madden, and stoutly defended by the present member of the Board, Edwin S. Smith. His time with the Labor Board was something upward of 2 years. I do know that he resigned because he guessed wrong on the decision of the Supreme Court. I do not know how much prestige his employment has given him, but my information is that presently he is the attorney for these eight labor leaders out there who have been ordered out by the Army; and he and his law firm, I am further informed, have been representing the local union leaders who called the strike and who have come up against such strenuous objection by the Army and the Government.

Now, just to pursue the matter a little further. When Wirin asked to go back with the Labor Board in 1937, Edwin S. Smith, present member of the Board, wrote this:

DEAR AL: Our conclusion that it was undesirable to appoint you to the Los Angeles job was for policy reasons. We felt that the Board won a rather important moral victory in not being thrown off its base by all the ballyhoo on your original appointment; however, to put you back in Los Angeles, where all the trouble started, would in a sense be tempting fate. I am quite sure the old outcry would be redoubled and the Board accused of deliberately trying to provoke hostile reaction.

The Labor Board was informed of Wirin's radical tendencies and conduct. He should never have been employed.

That is not the only case where I say the people of this Government have fostered persons of radical and communistic tendencies. The hearings of the Smith committee disclose that in connection with the Cincinnati Filling Machine Co. case an employee by the name of Mischeff was discharged. The employer contended that he was a Communist. In the course of the hearings down there Philip G. Phillips, the regional director of that office, communicated with Nathan Witt, who since has been let out of the Board as secretary of the Board, regarding admission of evidence to show that this employee was a Communist. And here is what Phillips wired to the Board here in Washington:

There is no doubt that discharge was union activities and that company discovered communistic angle later. Have interviewed witness personally and he admits being active in communistic party. Company is willing to have consent decree entered withdrawing recognition from company union as bargaining agency, etc., but insists we drop discharge cases in exchange. Local C. I. O. unwilling to do so, claiming obligation to Communists such that they must proceed. Please advise, realizing that trial will receive much publicity due to prominence of firm. Will proceed with such evidence as cannot raise issue until I hear from you.

Subsequently Mr. Phillips said, in the course of that hearing:

I do not know whether Mischeff is a Communist or not, and I don't care.

There was the Harbor Plywood Corporation case, tried on the west coast. The trial examiner wrote this letter to the Chief Trial Examiner of the Board:

At the conclusion of today's session I was busy keeping out of the record any evidence of communistic and American Legion activities on the west coast. A Board witness testified that an officer of the respondent told him that he (the witness) could not be on any union committee because he was a Communist. Respondent concern denies that the officer made such a statement but wants to prove by cross-examination of the witness, that the witness has been identified with the communistic movement on the west coast and that the American Legion in its patriotic campaign has investigated that movement.

That is not all. The then chairman of the Labor Relations Board appeared before the Senate committee and he was asked by Senator Holt of West Virginia:

Senator HOLT. Dean, do you mean to say that an employer saying to his employees that the leaders of a union are communistic would be coercive?

Mr. MADDEN. I think that under many circumstances it would be. I think that the effect of it would be unless you had some of these other circumstances that I speak of, which would make the union feel that it was on very firm ground. I think if I were an employee of that employer, I would say to myself, "My boss thinks that this union is communistic. If I have something to do with this union, you will think I have leanings in that direction. Bosses do not like employees who have those leanings. It will not be safe for me to have dealings with this union."

I think that the effect of it would be to interfere with the right of that employee to choose a union that he wanted, and it would interfere with the right of that union to grow.

To my mind there should be no question about the right of an employer to discharge an out-and-out Communist who is interfering with proper operation of his plant.

I asked the question when I started out, What is there in our processes, what is there in the conduct of the affairs of our country that has turned loose throughout all of our system of production these communistic, subversive, and racketeering influences that are causing presently so much trouble and so much disturbance? I say that much of it can be traced to the activities of those who have been charged with making this system of ours work, and who, in my opinion, have not shown the proper consideration for that system.

I think that in considering this whole matter of the action of the Labor Board in connection with this problem we have to keep in mind that the right exists under the act to order the reinstatement with back pay employees who contend and show, at least to the satisfaction of the Board, that they have been discharged by reason of discrimination for union activity.

A long time ago, it seems to me, because so much water has gone over the dam since that time, we had an epidemic of so-called sit-down strikes. They were popularly condemned by, I think, the overwhelming majority of the people.

One of those cases came on before the Labor Board. The Labor Board ordered the reinstatement of those employees on the theory that they had been discriminated against for union activity, and that unlawful seizure of the property, violence in connection with the labor dispute, and destruction of the property were not sufficient grounds for the avoidance of their reinstatement.

Subsequently that case went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court in what is known as the Fansteel Case reversed the Labor Board and said that under those circumstances employees were not entitled to be reinstated by the Labor Board and given back their jobs.

A great many people thought that that would settle the matter. I say to you in all deliberation that the Labor Board in my honest judgment has not followed the dictates of the decision laid down in the Fansteel case. Time and again they have ordered the reinstatement of employees who have engaged in violence; yes; and even been convicted of violence in connection with labor disputes.

The Smith committee, of which I was a member, reported certain amendments to the House. One of those amendments would have specifically provided that the Labor Board could not order the reinstatement of an employee if it was shown that he had engaged in willfull violence or malicious destruction and seizure of property in connection with a labor dispute. The House adopted those amendments by a vote of 2 to 1. I say that that amendment and some of the other amendments that were included in those proposals would have done much to avoid the unpleasant circumstances in which we presently find ourselves.

They would have done much to clarify the labor policy of the Government. They would have done much to set forth an outline of the things that an employee can do and some of the things that he cannot do, to the end that our whole process of production in this trying time would have been carried out without many of these stoppages.

You all know that the democratic process was not permitted to be completed. In the other body those amendments never came out of committee and were never considered.

I say that the Labor Board has given only lip service to the doctrine announced in the Fansteel case. In the Acme-Evans case, which came from Indianapolis, Ind., they said:

Although we do not condone even minor violence or disorder.

They have constantly stated that principle; yet in the Ford-St. Louis case, and I am reading from page 41 of their decision, this is what they said:

As to 46 of the persons whose reinstatement we shall order, the respondent contends that because it believes them guilty of "unlawful and wrongful acts" it should not be required to employ them. In large part the acts complained of consist of threats and other verbal excesses such as are frequently encountered during organizing drives and strikes, and afford no basis for withholding a remedial order of reinstatement. During the strike, in addition, 15 of these men were arrested and charged with crimes. One was acquitted after trial and the cases of 6 were dismissed without trial. So far as the Board has been able to ascertain only 4

convictions resulted. Bee Butler, James Pradee, Fred Beeler, and Russell Fairchild were tried in the St. Louis circuit court and found guilty of common assault, a misdemeanor. Butler and Pradee were fined $100 each; Beeler and Fairchild, $10 each.

Listen to this astounding declaration of the Board, in contemplation of the Fansteel decision:

Our review of the evidence relating to the conduct of strikers and victims of discrimination discloses no individual whose return to work under normal conditions free from the respondent's unfair labor practices would not effectuate the policies of the act. The respondent's contention is accordingly rejected.

In the Fein's Tin Can Co. case, in New York, a man by the name of Engargola was convicted of assault at the time of the strike and was sentenced to jail and fined by the court, and ordered by the court to stay away from the employer's premises, but the Labor Board, under a pretext that I say would not stand any careful analysis anywhere, ordered the company to take Engargola back, to reemploy him, in spite of the fact that the court in its order had ordered him to stay away from the premises.

I spoke of the amendment that was offered to relieve an employer of the duty of reinstating an employee who has engaged in willful violence or unlawful destruction and seizure of property. I believe that amendment ought to be written into the law of the land. I believe everyone should be put on notice that he cannot beat people up, club them, upset their cars, and bash in their heads, throw rocks through their employer's plant windows, tear up his machinery, and sabotage his factory, and then have the Government say, "Mr. Employer, you have to put that fellow back to work."

Sometime ago I introduced a bill, and I made what I thought was a pretty good speech on it, just to put that one amendment in the act. The chairman of the Committee on Labor wrote to the Board for an opinion of that bill. She sent me a copy of their report, and it is one of the most amazing documents I have ever read in my life. In this report they recite again the doctrine of the Fansteel case and give lip service to the doctrine of that case. Remember, that is that if an employee is guilty of violations of the criminal law in the unlawful destruction and seizure of property and willful violence, his employer does not have to take him back. But they say to the Committee on Labor on that proposition of violence—

The chief reasons for opposing the proposed amendment are as follows:

(1) Violence and the unlawful destruction or seizure of property everywhere constitute violation of local penal law and are subject to punishment by local authorities. There is no evidence that local enforcement officers have been lax generally in the application of the local penal law, and certainly not to such an extent as would warrant the exercise of Federal power.

I wonder when the Labor Board ever got scary about the exercise of Federal power anywhere.

Especially is there no reason for the extension of Federal power into spheres heretofore regarded solely as the concern of the State, county, or municipal authorities. The proposal would tend to expand the Board into a gigantic police court, with numerous agents in all parts of the country, having concurrent jurisdiction with local authorities to investigate and pass upon the conduct of thousands of employees.

They pass upon them anyway. I can show you their decisions. They hear the evidence. Why not pass upon the matter of violence? Why not pass upon the matter of the destruction and seizure of property?

They have plenty of people to do the job, and they are doing it all the time. The trouble is they just very seldom ever seem to find that any employee has been sufficiently or terribly bad to justify his losing his job.

Then they say this further thing:

(2) Similarly, there is no reason to impose a double penalty upon employees. Willful violations and unlawful destruction and seizure of property are punishable under local law. The proposed amendment would permit the employer to discharge the employee at will, and thus would add a second and more drastic penalty.

The Fansteel doctrine, to which I say they give lip service, recognizes that local officers may prosecute in the local courts violations of the criminal law, but it also provides against reinstatement. What sort of an inconsistent position do we put ourselves in when we say to the local officers, "Uphold the law, protect workers, see that these plants are operated and kept open as against willful violence and destruction," and at the same time permit a situation to continue in Washington by which we say to the employee, "Your employer has got to take you back regardless of the criminal violations you resort to, and the willful violence and unlawful destruction and seizure of property which you may carry on." We cannot pass the buck to local authorities that way. We should not hesitate to assume our fair responsibility to maintain law and order.

I only wish I had time to continue a discussion of this amazing report. Suffice it to say that the very arguments of the Board against my amendment fly completely and directly against the rule in the Fansteel case. That is the reason legislative action is necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, and I hope the House has listened, with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who preceded me. He knows the situation with respect to the National Labor Relations Act and its administration as well as any man in this House, and I think it is most timely that he should talk to you on that subject this morning and bring to your attention some of the things so well known to the businessmen of this country and so well known to the members of the select committee, and I fear not quite so well known to the general membership of the House.

As he has told you, we passed certain amendments last year. Those amendments were reintroduced at the beginning of this session and lie now, as was expected, in a pigeonhole in the Labor Committee.

Those amendments and other amendments to this act ought to be adopted. The need for them in this emergency is infinitely greater than it was when this House passed them a year ago, in anticipation of the very conditions which have arisen by strikes in defense industry.

I want to say a word to you along the same lines that the gentleman from Indiana has spoken relative to the subversive interests in this particular branch of your Government. Some of you will recall that last year this House by a vote deliberately abolished a certain bureau in the Labor Board, and they abolished it on account of the subversive statements of the head of that Bureau. Just last week this House, on a roll call vote, voted that none of the money in the appropriation bill which we passed for W. P. A. should be used for the payment of the salary of David Lasser. Well, now, look back and see what happened last year when we undertook to cut off the salary of the head of the Economic Division of the Labor Board. What did they do? After Congress acted the Labor Board merely changed the name of that Bureau to something else, and proceeded along their way, ignoring and defying the action of Congress. I am wondering, since you have acted on the matter of David Lasser, if the W. P. A. will not, following the example of the Labor Board, simply change the name of Mr. David Lasser and continue him merrily along on your pay roll.

We are not getting at the root of this evil by just taking one subversive individual here and one yonder, and separating them from the pay roll. What I want to know is why does not this Congress and this administration do something about the people in power and in authority in these bureaus and agencies who are stacking your Government in key positions with that kind of subversive individuals? That is the real question, and that is the way to get at the root of this matter. Do not go and pick up some little clerk who has said something and throw him out, but throw out the fellow who put him there. They are the people who are causing the damage.

Now, with respect to this Labor Board, they have changed the Board a little bit, but what do we find about the Labor Board? For instance, Mr. Edwin S. Smith is still today a member of that Labor Board, and in our investigation we found that Mr. Edwin S. Smith was not only a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which has been clearly proven to be a subversive agency; he was not only a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, but he was an officer of that subversive organization, and what happened about that? He is still sitting in the seats of

the mighty. And so your committee, in order to find out all we could about Mr. Edwin S. Smith and his activities, wrote him a letter, and we asked him to please inform the committee what organizations he belonged to, and what do you reckon he replied? He replied, in effect, that the organizations that he belonged to was a matter of his private concern and was none of the business of Congress, and that inquiry of a committee of the Congress which created his job was an intrusion into his private affairs.

Those are the kind of folks that in some of these agencies are on the pay roll of your Government and if you have those kind of people in responsible positions, what do you expect to find down beneath? We have gone into this matter and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has told you of a number of instances. I shall take just a moment more of time to mention one case that he did not mention. I refer to the case of the New York Times. In the New York Times case a woman who was the confidential secretary of one of the officials of that paper was found to be carrying on a communistic agitation in the office of the New York Times. The official called her in and fired her for that specific reason and for none other. She brought her case before the Labor Board and what do you suppose happened? The Labor Board in effect said that it did not make any difference, as in the case which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] mentioned, whether she was a Communist or not, that she was entitled to reinstatement and the Labor Board ordered her to be reinstated. Notwithstanding the fact that she was a known Communist and had been discharged for that reason the Board ordered that she be brought back and given a job as confidential secretary to one of the officials of the New York Times. How are you going to get along with that sort of thing? How are you going to get unity in this country we hear so much demanded when we know and the Congress knows and the people know that we have right in our own Government people who feel that the right of a Communist to work for the Government in its hour of stress is just as great as that of a good, honest American citizen who believes in the principles of democracy?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. It has been charged repeatedly on this floor that there are Communists in this Government. I understand that the Department of Justice has a list of those people. Does not the gentleman feel that it would be in the interest of the country if that list were made public?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I certainly do, if the Department of Justice has investigated the matter and knows the facts. I do not believe in publishing names unless you have the facts; but if the Department has investigated and has the facts, I think this Congress and I think the people of the United States are entitled to know the facts, and I think that the people who are not loyal to this country, who are on its pay roll, ought to be thrown out and thrown out right now.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who preceded me, that each and every man employed by the Government who is not loyal to this Government should be kicked out, removed from the place to which he has been appointed and now holds; but, Mr. Speaker, I fear that some gentlemen in this House and outside of this House are unnecessarily alarmed about the large number of what they charge, disloyal people in the service of the Government, and those who are being charged by the industrialists with being Communists. I think there is much greater danger to this country from the Nazis and Fascists than there is from the Communists or the so-called Communists. Many years ago I remember when every man who advocated the cause of labor was charged with being a Socialist, or with being an anarchist, and all that, and notwithstanding that Mr. Eugene Debs was sent to jail as a leading Socialist and as a menace to our Government, I never found that his teachings and his advocacy of the cause of labor were injurious to America in any way. I regret that all of the blame for strikes has been placed upon the so-called Communists. It is popular today to charge every labor leader who has the courage to aid the cause of labor with being a Communist. Of course the indutrialists do not like these efficient and capable labor leaders who have brought about real progress in the interest of the American wage earner.

Let us look back and see what this great Nation has accomplished, especially in the last 8 years. We have passed laws in the interest of labor that 25 or 30 years ago would have been called socialistic and detrimental to the Nation. Notwithstanding that fact, there are very few in this House today who would have the courage to say that these laws that we have enacted in the interest of the wage earner of America should be repealed. I admit that such an amendment as that proposed by the gentleman from Indiana should have received favorable consideration. We did give it our support, but unfortunately, as I have said, we cannot always control the action of the other body. I know and I am satisfied, notwithstanding the hue and cry against labor and strikes, that the country is in better position today than ever before in the history of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] speaks about needed antistrike legislation. This is in contrast with the position which has been taken by those whom he tries to protect from strikes, because the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, and all officials in charge of the national-defense program do not want any such legislation. They are contented, they are satisfied, because industry is continuously increasing production due to the willingness of labor to cooperate on an understanding basis. Oh, the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Virginia, members of the celebrated Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board lead the country to believe that the American League for Peace and Democracy is a communistic organization. I have called upon them and others who have made the same charges to prove that such was the case, but they never have and never can. There may have been a member or two of that organization affiliated with some other organization which has been blasted, as have some Government employees, with being Communists. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to classify the Ku Klux Klan as communistic, Nazi, or Fascist, yet we have organizations like the Silver Shirts, Christian Fronts, American Peace Mobilizers, and others espousing activities of a subversive character, but we do not hear a word about them. All we hear is about communism and it appears that some gentlemen are more interested to put the stigma of communism on labor to prejudice the minds of the American people against it than they are interested in the national-defense program. I repeat without fear of successful contradiction and I defy any one to disprove that the Nazi and Fascists are 10 times a greater menace to America and its institutions than the Communists. I hold no brief for any of them and they, in conjunction with the other subversive organizations I have mentioned, should be stopped in their disloyal and un-American activities. The continuous attacks on the Communists appears to me to be "much ado about nothing," and is nothing but a smoke screen under which the Nazi, Fascists, Silver Shirts, and other subversive organizations are carrying on their activities.

Mr. Speaker, today there is only one strike in progress, and perhaps before I conclude my remarks that strike in California will be settled.

I know there are some who are criticizing the President for calling out the Army and taking possession of the plant in California, but those are the same gentlemen who charged that he was indifferent to the interests of America in permitting these strikes which were delaying our defense program. But no sooner did he take that courageous stand, than these same gentlemen criticized his action. I deplore that he was obliged to take such steps, but personally I think that was the only thing for him to do at that time. I hope it will have a wholesome effect.

Now, let us see what position we are in. Some claim that the President permitted delay in our national defense. Every industrialist who is a loyal American admits that we are far ahead with our defense program. Surely we have lost some time due to the strikes, but who was responsible for those strikes? Was it the wage earners? No. It was the industrial leaders who refused to abide by the law of the land, the law that you and I and the rest of us enacted. There were four outstanding industrial organizations—the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the International Harvester Co., the Ford Co., and the Allis-Chalmers Co.—which were responsible for 73 percent of the stoppages due to strikes, because they refused to comply with the

orders of the National Labor Relations Board, a Board created by us, and even by the order of the Supreme Court of the United States; but those gentlemen who day in and day out feel that labor organizations should be weakened and who charge everything to labor will continue to make assaults and attacks against labor.

Mr. Speaker, it is strange that the few gentlemen who, at every opportunity that presents itself, criticize and assail labor lay great stress on the fact that some strikebreakers are beaten and assaulted. They do not point to the hired sluggers and thugs of many industrialists. They do not point to the industrialists who have been increasing their profits and who refuse to increase the wages of their workers to provide a decent living for their families. They do not point to the fact that when labor is compelled to strike to obtain a living wage the workers are set upon and beaten and slugged by these industrial nirelings, and in some instances are murdered by their hired sluggers. Of all that we do not hear a word. It is also very queer that most of these attacks on labor come from gentlemen who have no labor troubles in their district or even in their State.

Personally, I am satisfied, and history will prove it, that American labor is loyal and is doing everything in its power to aid the cause of our national defense and preparedness. It is true there are a few here and there who should be eliminated from the labor organizations; but is anything perfect?

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that every effort is being made by Mr. Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, and by Mr. Murray, head of the C. I. O., to eliminate from their midst any members who they think are disloyal to our flag and our institutions or have communistic leanings. I want to congratulate them upon the position they have taken. I pleaded with them for months that they should take that stand, and I am grateful that they have finally taken that position, which is in the interest of our country and their organizations.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. Do you think those who lament our backwardness in preparation, who voted against lifting the embargo, against the conscription act, and against the lease-lend bill are the proper ones to now criticize our present position in preparedness?

Mr. SABATH. Of course not. I agree with the gentleman that they are not, but they will do so. They have delayed our preparedness in every way. I remember how they assailed the President when in 1938 in a mild manner he honestly and truthfully called the attention of Congress to what was transpiring across the seas and the eventual danger to America. Oh, how he was assailed and how he was attacked as a warmonger. Whenever he recommended a program or an appropriation for additional national defense he was assailed that we were spending millions and billions unnecessarily, and he was charged with being a spendthrift. Today they say we did not go far enough and did not work fast enough. I say that no man ever lived who has tried harder to protect our institutions, protect our Nation and the democratic form of Government than our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I think the Nation and the world should be grateful and thankful that America has given to the world such a man as Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee of the House be given until midnight tonight to file its report on the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT SERVICE PAY ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2279) to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act, approved June 10, 1922, as amended, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after "2½", insert "or 3."
Page 2, line 21, after "2½", insert "or 3."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what this is?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House passed this bill to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922, to include retired officers of the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service. The only thing the Senate amendments do to the bill is to add the 3 percent, which would mean simply this, as an illustration: It is to pay those officers and other personnel of the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps who are called back to active-duty pay. If you call back, under the law as it is today, a major general and a brigadier general on the same day, the major general would come back at his regular pay of $7,200 per year. The brigadier general, though higher in rank, might be brought back at $4,500. The Senate amendments were passed to correct a few discriminations of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject The Automobile in National Defense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4473) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill providing for temporary promotion in the Navy, necessitated by the tremendous naval expansion program upon which we are embarked.

Briefly stated, this bill provides for the temporary promotion or advancement of four classes of individuals in the Navy and Marine Corps. These are: First, enlisted men and warrant officers; second, retired officers recalled to active duty; third, officers of the Regular Navy; and, fourth, Reserve officers who are now employed on active duty because of the emergency.

The fact that the Navy Department has recommended the temporary promotion of enlisted men and warrant officers is to me a most healthy sign. The average enlisted man spends several years in the Navy before becoming a petty officer; it then takes him several more years to acquire the experience to hold down the job of a chief petty officer; a few more years' experience and he becomes qualified for a warrant officer, and eventually a great majority who get that far become chief warrant officers. These individuals are essentially specialists. That is, they have spent their entire service dealing with one type of material or one particular activity and they are eminently well suited for additional responsibilities in their own particular lines. The decision to utilize these men in the highest capacity in which they are capable of performing their duties is not only a most intelligent one on the part of the Navy

Department, but it has the happy advantage of opening the door of opportunity to the average American boy who enters the Navy and chooses to pursue this as his life work.

Naval officers are unanimous in their opinion that warrant officers and chief warrant officers are key men on board ship and that many of them are desirable material for greater responsibilities and increased rank.

I take this opportunity to state also that naval officers are universally enthusiastic about the caliber and type of enlisted men and warrant officers in the Navy today. In my opinion, this is one more tribute to the democratic principles upon which this country is founded and upon which the Navy as a military organization is being administered. I think it may be safely said that a closer bond and a closer understanding exists between the officers and men of the United States Navy than in any other organization in the world.

You understand that when a man enlists in the Navy he serves first as an apprentice seaman, then as a seaman second class, then as a seaman first class. By hard work and aptitude he may then rise to become a petty officer of the third class. By the same spirit he becomes a petty officer of the second class, and then a petty officer of the first class. Ultimately he may become a chief petty officer, then a warrant officer, and then a chief warrant officer. This bill permits that group of men who come in from the enlisted ranks of the Navy to obtain temporary appointments as regular line officers, commissioned officers, of the United States Navy. You can readily understand the incentive this will naturally give to the enlisted organization of the Navy. It stimulates ambition, it encourages them, and as I have just stated, it opens the door of opportunity to them to become commissioned officers of the Navy.

Another class of men this bill has reference to is that large number of officers who have been recalled to duty from the retired list. They, by virtue of their experience, are able to perform certain duties far better than the personnel which lacks that experience. It is far better to call back to active duty men who have served from 7 to 30 years and then gone on the retired list than to try to take into that duty new men who have no naval background.

This bill provides that these retired officers, if they are qualified therefor, may be advanced in rank on the retired list while on active duty; and that when the emergency ends these retired officers will retain that rank on the retired list. In addition, provision is made for the temporary promotion of regular officers on the active list, this being necessary because of the requirements of existing law relative to eligibility for promotion with respect to service in grade, and because of the additional responsibilities which must be placed on the shoulders of these officers. It is almost axiomatic that the rank should accompany the responsibility. I have been informed by the Navy Department that these temporary promotions will be made by applying the selection principle and that vacancies will be filled as the need for them arises.

The bill does not permit the advancement in rank of an officer on the retired list unless the officer is called back to active duty.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. Upon whose determination will the change in rank depend?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As to promotion?

Mr. DITTER. Yes. In other words, will a selection board pass upon the merits of those men on the retired list who are recalled for service? Or will that be at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill provides that the method of advancement shall be as the President determines, but the testimony disclosed that it would be determined by the selection system.

Mr. DITTER. Would the gentleman say that that would be the determination of the President?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Section 5 of the bill deals with this subject of temporary appointment, and reads as follows:

> The temporary appointments under the authority of this act shall be in such manner as the President may determine that the needs of the service require, and in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. Would it be in harmony with this if we were to provide for promotions to be taken care of by the system that is presently being used, the selection system? For will not the gentleman agree with me that under the language of the bill as we presently have it the discretion might be lodged completely with the Secretary of the Navy to determine who should be promoted, and who should not be promoted?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope there can be no logrolling or political pressure brought to bear to get any officer on the retired list advanced to a higher rank. He should stand on two things: First, the need and necessity for officers to fill those billets; and, second, the selection system.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman has expressed his hope, and I know from long experience that would be the motivation if the gentleman himself had the matter in charge, but I think he is avoiding the question I propounded when I asked him whether, as it presently is written, the promotion could not depend solely upon the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not interpret section 5 as permitting the Secretary of the Navy to do that. We struck that out and left it enirely to the President. Of course, I know the President will probably do what the Secretary of the Navy recommends in reference to that, or at least I assume so.

Mr. DITTER. Is it a fact that heretofore, by legislation, we have provided the method by which officers are to be promoted in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; by the selection system.

Mr. DITTER. Am I correct in assuming that the Congress has definitely set up the method by which those promotions shall be made?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. DITTER. Am I also correct that in this instance we are not using the same specific language and resorting to the same machinery for the determination of promotions as that to which we have resorted in the past?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As far as writing it in the bill, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DITTER. Then I come back to my original question. In view of the defense that my distinguished friend from Georgia has always brought to bear on the matter of selection, if that defense is meritorious, then why should we not have written into this bill that the same system be followed for the temporary promotions?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. To avoid the logrolling that the gentleman wants to avoid.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. I have absolutely no objection to saying that any retired officer who is called back to active duty and who is advanced on the retired list, while assigned to active duty shall follow the same rules and regulations as prescribed for the promotion of Regular officers.

Mr. DITTER. Do I understand, then, the gentleman from Georgia will see to it that a committee amendment incorporating the very suggestion that he now says he approves will be offered by the committee to this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have not any committee amendment to offer, and the committee has not offered one.

Mr. DITTER. May I ask the gentleman to give such amendment sponsorship, for, with the tremendous influence that he wields here in the House, I know if he were to offer such an amendment, regardless of the action of his committee, such amendment would likely prevail.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I cannot say what position I will take with reference to an amendment until I see the amendment.

Mr. DITTER. I mean incorporating the thought the gentleman suggests.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am thoroughly in accord with the thought, because I would hate to see this bill be used as a means by which political pressure could be used to get this man or that man advanced when there is no justification on his record for advancement.

Mr. DITTER. Or any other kind of pressure?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly. It should stand on its merits, based on the record of the officer and the need for advancement in that class.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I do not believe the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee would want to restrict the operation of this to the rigid system of the selection board for temporary promotions. That is not flexible enough for this emergency.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He has reference only to officers on the retired list who are being called back to active duty. He has no reference to the other two groups that are referred to in this bill, the Reserves and that other group.

Mr. MAAS. I mean we deliberately have left this sufficiently flexible to meet emergency conditions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Here is one of the weaknesses to the whole bill: It is opened to political pressure and all kinds of pressure to get advancement for this or that officer. I want to eliminate that, and if the selective system is good for Regular officers before they were retired, if they are called back to active duty I see no reason why we should not follow the same yardstick.

Mr. DITTER. And by the same token that should apply to Reserve officers? This emergency is not so great.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Reserve officers are on an entirely different footing. The Reserve officers do not have to go before a selection board in the same way that Regular officers have to go before the selection board.

Mr. MAAS. May I say that Reserve officers have to go before the selection board in competition with Regular officers for permanent promotions in the Reserve.

Mr. DITTER. The fact of the matter is the Reserve officer, however, once he takes up active service separates himself from the jurisdictional body of the Reserve group and becomes a part of the Regular active outfit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. During that period.

Mr. DITTER. During that period.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. So once that group has changed its status, why should it not come under the same jurisdictional provisions with reference to promotions?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a great deal of logic in what the gentleman states and I may say, as did King Agrippa, "Thou almost persuadeth me to become a Christian."

Mr. DITTER. If I offer the amendment, I will have the support of my friend from Georgia?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will depend on the amendment. The gentleman will recall that he once offered an amendment that did not accomplish what he intended, but had the very opposite effect. I cannot commit myself until I see the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. On this question of base promotion and the determination by the selection board, I think we should proceed with some caution. It might be justifiable in the case of the retired officer, because when his temporary duty is ended he immediately goes back to the retired list.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. Of course, he goes back with the highest rank he obtained on active duty.

Mr. COLE of New York. The important thing about this bill, to my mind, is the temporary nature of these promotions. These are not permanent promotions. A man might be eligible for a promotion temporarily and not, in the opinion of a selection board, be eligible to hold that rank permanently. If we applied the rule of selection by a selection board to the determination of whether or not these men should be promoted temporarily, we might find ourselves in the situation where an officer selected by a board for temporary appointment at the end of that temporary appointment would go back to his earlier grade, and then when he came up for promotion in the regular manner by the regular selection board, he would have the argument, "Here is a selection board that thought me fit for the promotion."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No man should be promoted unless two conditions exist, first, that there is need for his services in a higher grade, and second, that promotion is made on his merit. I do not want this bill to be used so that pressure is brought to bear on the President or the Secretary or anybody charged with the administration to advance this officer or that officer unless his record justifies it. You give strength to the Military Establishment when you base these promotions on merit instead of political influence or logrolling.

Mr. COLE of New York. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Therefore I hope that if an amendment with that thought in mind is offered it will be agreed to, because that is the way to merit promotion, not because I go to the Navy Department and endorse this man or that man. Let this man's record justify whether or not he gets a temporary promotion or advancement. When you base military organizations upon that basis, then there is no favoritism in it. Suppose, for instance, I should champion the cause of some lieutenant commander and some other man would champion the cause of another lieutenant commander. They might say, "Here is the chairman of the committee coming down here and asking us to advance this man. We have business before the Committee on Naval Affairs all the time." You want to eliminate all those influences. If you base it on a positive system of selection, you are on firm ground. Then when an officer gets a promotion he has won it on his merits and not through political influence.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Does not the gentleman expect that in the functioning of this promotion system they will probably have to refer to the system in vogue in World War days, that if there are a thousand billets to be filled in the upper grades, they will not pick out one or two from this class, or that class, or some other class, but all the persons in the lower grade that have proved their worth by actual service during the preceding year or years will be the ones that will be advanced, so it will be a sort of sheet promotion rather than an individual promotion?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will probably be a sheet promotion, but at the same time it would be some standard or yardstick to govern the promotion. Under the bill as it stands today, there is no standard or yardstick. It is by any methods the President or the Secretary adopt. All I am arguing for is that there should be some standard that is absolutely fair and equitable and just to all of them.

That deals with that type of officer.

The provisions of this bill are made applicable also to personnel of the Naval Reserve, the idea being to parallel for the Naval Reserve, insofar as possible, the system of advancement and promotion provided for the Regular Navy. This is only fair and should constitute a great incentive for members of the Naval Reserve, many of whom have made great sacrifices in order to serve their country during this emergency.

So you see we are trying to give to the Naval Reserve officer the same benefit we are giving to the Regular officer.

I wish to invite attention particularly to the fact that all those members of the Regular Navy who are temporarily promoted under this bill will revert to their permanent rank when the emergency ends. In other words, this is not a continuing promotion, and an officer of the Regular Navy will, in effect, occupy a dual status. For example, a lieutenant commander who is temporarily promoted to commander will, if in the meantime he is not permanently advanced, revert to the grade of lieutenant commander when the emergency is over; but when he eventually retires, if he has not in the meantime been permanently promoted, he will be placed on the retired list with the highest grade held by him while on active duty. This is in keeping with prior provisions of law enacted during and after the last war.

The detailed effects of this bill are set forth in the report made by the Naval Affairs Committee, and it is not my purpose to go into those details at this time. I may say, however, that the subject matter of this bill has been under study by the Navy Department and by the Naval Affairs Committee for a period of several months, and as reported it has the unanimous approval of the committee and the enthusiastic recommendation of the Navy Department. It is my opinion that the problem of expansion of personnel has been approached intelligently, that the necessary safeguards for all concerned are contained in the bill, and that it is absolutely essential to the efficient operation of our Navy that it be enacted into law at once.

Naval personnel legislation is at best a very complex problem. I regard this particular bill as the simplest and most direct step that has been taken in this

respect for a good many years; and for this reason, as well as the others I have already stated, I recommend it to your favorable consideration.

Under existing law the distribution in grades for the line of the Navy is made on a percentage basis, and therefore the number permitted in each grade will depend upon the total number of regular line officers on the active list of the Navy.

The percentage distribution is 1 percent admirals, but limited to a maximum of 70 except during war; 4 percent captains; 8 percent commanders; 15 percent lieutenant commanders; 30 percent lieutenants; and 42 percent for the two lower ranks.

With a limited number of Regular officers of the line, naturally there will be a limited number of officers in each grade. With the rapid expansion of the Navy, both afloat and ashore, there are constant demands for increased numbers of officers in the various grades, which cannot be met under existing law and at the same time keep the number of Regular officers in the line of the Navy within reasonable bounds.

The primary purpose of this bill is to provide the means whereby the necessary number of officers may be temporarily appointed or temporarily promoted to meet the needs of the service as they develop.

Section 1 of the bill specifies when the provisions of the bill are to be in effect.

Subsection (a) of section 2 is an interpretation of the expression "temporarily appointed," as used in the bill.

Subsection (b) lists the different classes of naval personnel who may be given temporary commission not above lieutenant in the Navy and captain in the Marine Corps

This section provides that enlisted men and fleet reservists, if on active duty, holding the rating of first-class petty officer and above may be given a temporary appointment as a commissioned officer in the Navy ranging up to and including lieutenant. Under this provision it will be possible to take a first-class petty officer and give him a temporary appointment as a commissioned officer.

Once the temporary appointments have been made as provided for in this section, such personnel will be eligible for temporary promotion to higher grades in accordance with a later provision in the bill.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes temporary promotion or advancement of the permanent officers on the active list of the Navy and Marine Corps and of those officers temporarily appointed under section 2 of the bill. The provisions of this section are necessary in order to provide that the Navy will be manned with officers of appropriate rank Without this provision there will not be an adequate number of officers with appropriate rank to officer the rapidly expanding Navy.

Section 4 provides that commissioned and warrant officers on the retired list may, while on active duty, be temporarily promoted to higher ranks, the same as officers on the active list It is not expected that there will be any temporary promotions of retired officers in the ranks of commander and captain, but the committee deemed it advisable to make provision for such promotions in case there should be need to do so at some time in the future.

Under existing law, officers who have been retired under the provisions of law and get retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent for each year of active duty cannot count additional years of service on active duty in computing their retired pay when again placed in an inactive status.

Subsection (b) of section 4 permits counting all service on active duty in determining the retired pay to which such officers would be entitled As an example, take an officer who has served 20 years before being retired, he then would be entitled to 20 times 2½, or 50 percent of his active-duty pay on the retired list.

Now if this retired officer is called to active duty and serves on active duty for a period of 10 years, then, under this proposed legislation, he would be entitled to 30 times 2½, or 75 percent of the active duty pay he was receiving at the end of this additional 10 years of service. Without this legislation he would be entitled only to 50 percent of his active-duty pay. As such an officer has served on active duty for 30 years, it is considered only just and fair that his retired pay should be based on the total number of years of active service.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the temporary appointments and promotions shall be made in such numbers as the President may determine to be necessary for the requirements of the naval service.

The President is also authorized to make these appointments and promotions under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

This section really provides the necessary authority to administer the provisions of the bill.

Section 6 provides that temporary appointments and promotions below the ranks of rear admiral in the Navy and general officer in the Marine Corps may be made by the President alone and that promotions to those ranks and above shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This section parallels existing law for temporary promotions in the Army and will permit the appointments and promotions in the lower ranks to be made to meet the needs of the service without any delay.

The permanent status of personnel who may be temporarily appointed or promoted under the provisions of this bill is safeguarded by section 7. This section provides that none of the rights, benefits, privileges or gratuities to which an individual is entitled in his permanent status shall be lost or abridged in any respect by accepting a temporary appointment or a temporary promotion.

This section also provides that enlisted personnel accepting a temporary commission or warrant will be given a uniform allowance of $250. This allowance is the same that is allowed for Reserve officers on being ordered to active duty, and it is only right and proper that the enlisted men should be given the same consideration.

Section 8 provides for retirement benefits for certain classes of individuals who, while on active duty, incur physical disability in line of duty in time of war or national emergency.

Subsection (a) provides that any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Navy, either on the active list or Fleet Reserve, serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade who is physically disabled in line of duty is entitled to retirement benefits in the temporary grade or rank in which serving and with 75 percent of the active-duty pay he may be receiving at the time. Thus, if an enlisted man is serving under a temporary appointment as a lieutenant in the Navy and becomes physically disabled so as to require his retirement he will be retired with 75 percent of the active-duty pay of a lieutenant. Similarly, if a lieutenant in the Navy is temporarily promoted to lieutenant commander and is retired, he will receive 75 percent of the active-duty pay of a lieutenant commander.

Subsection (b) provides that any officer or enlisted man now on the retired list for causes other than physical disability and who may be serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank shall, if he incurs physical disability while so serving, be advanced on the retired list to the rank in which serving and with 75 percent of the active-duty pay thereof.

Subsection (c) provides that officers who are now on the retired list as the result of physical disability incurred in line of duty who incur further physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank shall be advanced on the retired list in the temporary rank in which serving and with 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which entitled while so serving.

Subsection (d) provides that officers on the retired list for reasons other than physical disability who incur physical disability while serving on active duty in the same rank as that held on the retired list shall, if not otherwise entitled thereto, receive 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which entitled when relieved from active duty. This, in effect, provides for the re-retirement of such officers.

Subsection (e) states the conditions under which the above retirements can be made and the degree of disability necessary to make the provisions of this section effective.

Subsection (f) provides the authority under which the retiring boards will function to make this section of the bill workable.

Subsection (g) provides a time limitation within which an individual may have his case taken up for consideration. This limitation allows an adequate period of time for those concerned to submit their cases for decision.

Section 9 of the bill provides that any temporary appointments made pursuant to the authority contained in the bill shall not be counted in any computation to determine the authorized number of officers in any grade. This means that no matter how many temporary appointments that may be made in any

one grade it will not affect the number that may be appointed in any other grade. In other words, the percentage distribution in grades will not apply insofar as temporary appointments and promotions are concerned. Temporary appointments and promotions to the different grades will be made over and above the distribution now provided by law for the permanent establishment only to the extent as officers are required to meet the needs of the service as they arise.

Section 10 of the bill limits to not more than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency the period of time during which the temporary appointments and promotions made under the authority of this bill may be continued in force. This also provides that upon the termination of their temporary status personnel shall revert to their permanent status in the Navy or Marine Corps as the case may be.

It also provides that personnel who have had a temporary status shall upon being subsequently retired, provided they had satisfactorily performed their duty, be retired with the rank they held under their temporary appointment but that their retired pay shall be based on the pay of the rank or rating held at the time of retirement. Any such personnel when subsequently recalled to active duty shall not be entitled to any other rank or rating than that in which they were serving at the time of retirement.

Section 11 of the bill extends generally to the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve and to the Coast Guard the provisions of the bill as they apply to the personnel of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

This bill is necessary because of the rapid expansion of the Navy due to the emergency and to the speeding up of the two-ocean program. It is desirable to use this method of temporary promotion rather than to increase the higher ranks in the Navy permanently.

Under this bill the billets that will be required will be filled in excess of the normal complement of officers of each grade by temporary promotion. When the emergency is over these officers will revert to their permanent grade.

The bill provides that enlisted men of both the Regular service and the Reserve may be commissioned temporarily during the emergency. They will be penalized nothing by accepting this commission, because their promotion in their permanent status can still go on. In other words, a sergeant may be commissioned in the Marine Corps temporarily and can continue up the various pay grades and ranks of sergeantcy to that of first sergeant or quartermaster sergeant. Then when he reverts from his commissioned status to his permanent enlisted status he will have advanced in rank as he would have had he remained in the enlisted status.

The question of the method of providing this promotion is one to which the committee gave a good deal of study, and left it in the discretion of the President, which, of course, we assume to mean largely on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

It is a grave question in my mind whether it would be wise to provide by legislation as rigid a system as the selection system or any rigid system of promotion. This is an emergency. Flexibility is required. We might do an officer a great deal of permanent injury if we require a promotion to be made by a selection board. A selection board might fail to promote an officer temporarily, and might select some officer junior to him for temporary promotion because that officer might be a specialist, and it would do this with no reference at all to the ability of the first officer; yet when the emergency is over or when the permanent selection boards consider that officer they may take into consideration the fact that he was not promoted temporarily, and it may militate against his permanent promotion. That is just one consideration that ought to be given to this matter.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. COLE of New York. If we write into this legislation the requirement of temporary promotion by virtue of formal action of the selective board, and the selective board does promote an officer temporarily, would not that be tantamount to a permanent promotion because of the fact that a formal selective board has passed on this man's qualifications? And even after the temporary emergency is over and a new board comes along to pass on this man's qualifications, that new board will say that he has been selected previously for temporary appointment and therefore they have got to put him up for permanent promotion.

Mr. MAAS. I think that is quite likely, but the whole purpose of a thing like this is for the emergency; and you can imagine a situation in the case of a combatant ship, we will say a destroyer, the captain is disabled or killed in action and a junior officer to him takes command, and then it is the desire of the Navy because he has demonstrated his ability to command the ship to give him the temporary rank so he can continue in command, but they must wait for perhaps 8 months until a selective board has acted. The selection board might not even get to him then. The very heart of this measure is the necessity for flexibility. You can visualize a situation that might apply to the marines, where a man may distinguish himself in action. He may be a lieutenant of a company and his other officers may be killed. But he demonstrates his ability to lead that company and they desire to temporarily promote him to captain, but if we put him under a rigid provision for promotion by selection it might be a year before the board meets. It seems to me to be utterly out of harmony with the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman recognizes, does he not, we should, as far as possible, have some standard by which these temporary promotions may be made. Of course, in the instances to which the gentleman refers, where an officer is promoted on the field or battle or where his record would justify such promotion, even if we did not have a selective-service system, such promotions would be all right. But the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] to me—and with which I am heartily in accord—was that we have a system that is applicable to all alike—one which is fair and equitable and ultimately will eliminate political pressure from being brought to bear to get certain officers promoted.

Mr. MAAS. With the vast establishment we are going to have I do not think there is going to be any question of political pressure. I do not believe political pressure is going to have any important bearing, and the gentleman can well realize that if we adhere rigidly to the selective system for temporary advancement an officer who has demonstrated his ability for higher command in action, and it is the desire of his superiors to give it to him, might have to wait until the matter comes before a selection board, and the selection board members may say, "He is all right, but he is junior to So-and-so and we had better not promote him out of turn."

I see nothing worth while that can be accomplished by such a rigid provision, and I see a great deal of harm that can be done. The purpose of the bill is to meet an emergency, and in order to meet the emergency very wide latitude of administrative discretion must be allowed, and for this reason I hope there will be no such amendment included in the bill.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I believe the gentleman is interested in a group of officers which came out of the World War, the aviation group. As I recall, during the course of the hearings he directed the attention of the committee particularly to that group of men which came into aviation under what I believe he considered to be a contract. I think that is the term the gentleman used—that these men identified themselves with the service during the emergency of the last war and then after the emergency was over the hope was held out to them—yes, and even the assurance—that they would ultimately be promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander. Will the gentleman tell us whether the present bill will give those men any assurance that they will receive those promotions?

Mr. MAAS. I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania that we both have had a great interest in this group and I would be willing to do anything possible to correct what I consider a very grave injustice, but I cannot say truthfully to him that this bill will guarantee them anything. I feel perfectly sure that the group will receive special consideration. While there is nothing in the bill that

will guarantee it, I am convinced that every one of these officers will either be promoted or will be given equal consideration with any other officer in the Regular service or the Reserve, and I am quite confident every one of them actually will be promoted. The thing that was denied them was the assurance of a career of 26 or 28 years, depending on their rank. I do think I can tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they need have no apprehension that they are not going to be kept in the service the 28 years. They will be lucky if they get out in 38 years.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, the gentleman is facetious.

Mr. MAAS. Oh, no; I am not facetious. I am very serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

Mr. DITTER. What I am concerned with is not the matter of their retention, and the gentleman knows that well. We realize they will be retained for the present. What I am concerned about is whether the gentleman feels that there is departmental assurance, if the bill does not give them the assurance, that they will receive that promotion which was a part of the original agreement under which they became identified permanently with the establishment.

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I will say for my part, and I think there is no one in this House who has any greater interest in that group than I have, and I know it is equally shared with my friend from Pennsylvania—I am personally satisfied that if this bill becomes a law those men will be given fair and equal treatment, and they will be given preference even over, we will say, Reserve officers with less experience but equal rank in promotion.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I realize the vast knowledge and experience of my friend, and I have the highest regard for his opinion. I wonder whether he recalls that on page 1179 of the hearings, the name of Julian H. Detyns is listed, and that he has after 20 years of flying finally reached that exalted grade of lieutenant, junior grade.

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I notice that.

Mr. DITTER. Is the gentleman familiar with that case?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman say he feels that record will be conducive to encouraging the group that we are presently calling in in this present emergency, the young men? Will that record be conducive for those men to give their best if, after 20 years this man Detyns has gotten the exalted grade of lieutenant, junior grade?

Mr. MAAS. No; it will not. If that were the rule in the Navy, it certainly would not be conducive to their coming in. It would be very discouraging. But it is not the rule.

Mr. DITTER. Has the gentleman any reason to believe anything different will happen to others?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; because a majority of those are now commanders or lieutenant commanders.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The man that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is talking about is a warrant officer, who came in.

Mr. DITTER. And who were flyers when in that grade. This man I know was flying.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has put a wrong interpretation upon it. The thing we are trying to do is the thing he is complaining about, that we have already done and it has not worked satisfactorily, and that is, to open the door to the petty officers, the warrant officers to get a commission.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct. He can come in under this bill as a full lieutenant.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I am happy that my friend from Georgia has made the statement which otherwise would have been mine. Exactly the situation that he has told us about is the situation I want to avoid—and in his presentation to the House he pointed out that among the merits of this bill is the fact that the noncommissioned officers would have a chance, and I am asking him whether that assurance is to be measured by the yardstick that a noncommissioned officer is going to come up to a lieutenant, junior grade, after 20 years of flying.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He has got to be properly 16 or 18 years in the Navy before he gets to be a chief warrant officer. Then, when he gets to be a chief warrant officer the door of this bill is open to him whereby he can become a commissioned officer.

Mr. MAAS. If he is a chief warrant officer the chances are that he will be made a full lieutenant to start with, and then he is eligible to further promotion without limit. I think the chairman of the committee is right. We are endeavoring in this bill to avoid the thing that happened the last time.

Mr. DITTER. I wanted that assurance from my friend, and now I am satisfied.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman from Minnesota sure that once the chief warrant officer is taken in under this bill then there is no limit to his promotion?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; there is no limit to which he can be promoted, temporarily.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. After a warrant gets to be a commissioned officer, then he can continue to advance as high as he will?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; there is no limit at all.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the so-called caste system among the British and French Army officers contributed in large measure to the inefficiency of those army organizations?

Mr. MAAS. I certainly think it has. I hope this bill will become law very quickly. It is very much needed now. I hope there will be no such rigid restriction written into this bill making it mandatory that all promotions on a temporary basis must be by the selection board.

The bill as reported does not provide that officers temporarily promoted shall receive the pay of the rank to which promoted. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] and I were appointed a special subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee to investigate this subject. We are both thoroughly convinced that when officers are temporarily promoted, they should receive the pay of the grade in which they will serve. The law now provides that this will be so in time of war, but we both feel that it should also apply during an emergency. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] will offer an amendment to effectuate this purpose. It is obviously unfair to promote an officer and then not give him the pay of the grade to which promoted. He is going to assume greater responsibilities and frequently will be put to additional expense. The situation would be very unfair, as you would have two officers of the same rank, working side by side and doing the same work, with one receiving substantially higher pay than the other. If the emergency requires that temporary promotions be instituted, then it also justifies the officers receiving the pay of such promotions. Unless we adopt this amendment, we may very well find ourselves in the position of engaging in an undeclared war, so that the provisions of law intended to give additional pay to officers temporarily promoted would not come into operation under the very circumstances which the law contemplated; that is, in time of war. I am sure that every Member of Congress will see the obvious justice of the proposed amendment, and I hope that when it is offered it will be accepted and included in this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill, I believe it was under the rule, there was considerable discussion about communism. The chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], very properly defended labor organizations and said that they were, by and large, composed of loyal American citizens. But during that debate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], answering a question from the Democratic side, admitted that there were Communists in the Federal Government holding office and receiving pay. I have risen to ask: If that is the case, what are we going to do about it? Is it really a fact that Communists, pledged to destroy our free institutions and, if necessary, overthrow them by force and violence, are holding office in the Federal Government? Many times I have asked this question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He always claimed there were Communists and Communist sympathizers on the Government pay roll, but he never named them. Now it is casually mentioned be-

fore the House as a definite fact that there are Communists and they know who the Communists are, and that they are holding high Federal positions and receiving pay.

It seems to me in these critical days the first thing that should be done is to clean our own house, to purge the Federal Government of all Communist officeholders and all disloyal elements and seditious elements, whether they are Communists or Fascists or any other groups that are un-American and seek to overthrow or destroy our free institutions.

Yesterday the Government ordered the closing of the German consulates in the United States. I assume, not having any knowledge of the subject, that the Government is correct; that the Government believes that those Nazi consulates are spreading seditious propaganda and perhaps committing sabotage in America. For all I know, they may be promoting strikes and labor unrest. If so, of course, the Government is absolutely right in closing all of the German consulates in America; but if we are to close the German consulates, why not go a step further? Why not close the Communist consulates as well? We have known for a long time that the Communist consulates have been centers of sedition and disloyalty, promoting strikes, riots, and revolutionary agitation. It is said by the press that many of the strikes throughout the country in defense works are organized and led by known Communists. So I rise to ask two questions: If it be a fact that we have Communists on the Government pay roll, why does not the Federal Government purge those Communists and throw them out? In the second place, why continue to have Communist consulates in America? Why not close them, too, and stop the opportunity for Communist agitators from abroad to promote strikes in defense works and to delay much-needed defense operations in America?

I do not believe that this will be done as long as Madam Perkins is in the Cabinet. Many of us were opposed to the recognition of Soviet Russia. I know the majority leader and myself have spoken a number of times on the floor of this House urging that we rescind recognition and that we recall our Ambassador. But what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I know of no compromise with any of these disloyal forces, whether they be Communists or Nazis or Fascists. If I had my way, I would send them all back home and put an end to all foreign and un-American propaganda and activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as otherwise specified herein, the authority granted by this act shall be exercised only in time of war or national emergency determined by the President.

SEC. 2. (a) As used in this act, the words "temporarily appointed" shall be interpreted to mean also "temporarily promoted" or "temporarily advanced in rank", as the case may be.

(b) The following personnel of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps may be temporarily appointed to ranks or grades in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, not above lieutenant in the Navy and captain in the Marine Corps:

(1) Commissioned warrant officers.

(2) Warrant officers.

(3) First-class petty officers and above in the Navy and platoon or staff sergeants and above in the Marine Corps, including enlisted men of those grades on the retired list on active duty.

Enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve may also be so temporarily appointed if on active duty in the grades herein specified for enlisted men of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 3. Officers on the active list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps in commissioned ranks, including those appointed under the authority of section 2 of this act, may be temporarily appointed to higher ranks or grades in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps.

SEC. 4. Commissioned or warrant officers on the retired list of the Navy or Marine Corps may, while on active duty, be temporarily appointed to higher ranks or grades on the retired list, not above lieutenant commander in the Navy or major in the Marine Corps. Any officer so appointed shall, while on active duty, be entitled to the same pay and allowances as officers of like grade or rank with equivalent service on the active list: *Provided*, That, except as otherwise provided in this act, any such commissioned or warrant officer so temporarily appointed shall, upon his relief from active duty, revert to the grade or rank on the retired list and to the retired pay status which he would have held had he not been so temporarily appointed.

SEC. 5. The temporary appointments under the authority of this act shall be in such numbers as the Secretary of the Navy may determine that the needs of the service require and in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe.

SEC. 6. Temporary appointments under the authority of this act shall, if they are to the rank or grade of rear admiral in the Navy or general officer in the Marine Corps, be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; if to lower ranks or grades, they may be made by the President alone.

SEC. 7. (a) The permanent, probationary, or acting appointments of those persons temporarily appointed in accordance with the provisions of this act shall not be vacated by reason of such temporary appointments, such persons shall not be prejudiced thereby in regard to promotion, advancement, or appointment in accordance with laws relating to the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and their rights, benefits, privileges, and gratuities shall not be lost or abridged in any respect whatever by their acceptance of commissions or warrants hereunder: *Provided*, That except as otherwise provided herein no person who shall accept a commission or warrant under section 2 of this act shall, while serving thereunder, be entitled to pay or allowances except as provided by law for the position temporarily occupied: *Provided further*, That no person temporarily appointed under the authority of this act shall suffer any reduction in pay and allowances to which he would have been entitled had he not been so temporarily appointed.

(b) Enlisted men shall, upon being initially appointed as provided by section 2 of this act, be paid the sum of $150 as a uniform gratuity.

SEC. 8. (a) Any individual serving under a temporary appointment pursuant to the provisions of this act may, subject to existing law providing for the retirement of officers, and upon approval of the finding of a retiring board that by reason of physical disability incurred incident to the service in time of war he is incapacitated for the performance of active duty, be transferred to the retired list or advanced in rank thereon, as the case may be, with or to the grade or rank in which temporarily serving and with 75 percent of the active-duty pay provided by law for officers of his retired rank and length of service.

(b) Any officer on the retired list shall, upon approval of the finding of a retiring board that by reason of physical disability incurred incident to the service in time of war he is incapacitated for the performance of active duty, be entitled to 75 percent of the active-duty pay provided by law for officers of his retired rank and length of service.

(c) As used in this section, the term "physical disability" as applied to officers on the retired list shall mean that degree of incapacity which necessitates the release of the individual from active duty.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case unless the proceedings of the retiring board are commenced within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment or the release from active duty, as the case may be.

SEC. 9. Commissioned officers appointed under the authority of section 2 of this act shall not be counted in any computation to determine the authorized number of officers in any grade.

SEC. 10. Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel shall, unless otherwise provided herein, revert to their permanent grades, ranks, or ratings.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DITTER. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment. I shall not object if my amendment may be considered at the proper place.

Mr. COLE of New York. That was contemplated in the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York include that in his request?

Mr. COLE of New York. I so include it; yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, in line 10, after the word "personnel", strike out the words "of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "officers", insert "of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, after the word "officers", insert "of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 8, after the word "the", insert the word "Regular", and in line 9, after the word "the", insert the word "Regular."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, in lines 12 and 13, strike out "may also be so temporarily appointed if" and insert in lieu thereof "and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 15, after the word "Navy", strike out the period and insert "or Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAAS. Was the committee amendment on line 9, page 2, agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 21, after the figure "4", insert in parentheses the letter "a."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: In lines 24 and 25, on page 2, after the word "list", strike out "not above lieutenant commander in the Navy or major in the Marine Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "list", strike out the colon and insert a period; and strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage increases in their retired pay. These increases shall be at the rate of 2½ percent for each year of active duty and a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay as authorized by existing law: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the passage of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "Secretary of the Navy" and insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 23, strike out "section 2" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 2 and 3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 6, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$250."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 8, and page 6, strike out all of section 8 and insert in lieu thereof a new section 8, as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) An officer or enlisted man of the active list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, or an enlisted man of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, who incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, shall be retired in such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank.

"(b) An officer or enlisted man of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, be advanced on the retired list to such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank.

"(c) An officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) hereof, be advanced on the retired list to such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank.

"(d) An officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same rank as that held by him on the retired list and if not otherwise entitled thereto, receive 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank.

"(e) The benefits of this section shall apply only to an individual who incurs physical disability in line of duty in time of war or national emergency. In the case of those officers to whom subsection (c) hereof is applicable retirement in the next higher rank shall be effected upon a finding by a naval retiring board that the disability was incident to the service while on active duty in the higher rank and upon a rating by such board, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, at not less than 30 percent permanent disability. In all other cases officers shall be retired in accordance with existing law providing for the retirement of officers.

"(f) The jurisdiction of naval retiring boards is hereby extended as may be necessary in the administration of this section, and their proceedings shall be conducted in all respects as provided by existing law and regulations except as may be necessary to adapt the same to cases provided for in this section.

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case unless the proceedings of the naval retiring board shall be commenced within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned, whichever may occur earlier."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 18, after the word "grade", insert the following: "Commissioned officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps temporarily appointed to higher ranks or grades therein under the authority of section 3 of this act shall be counted only in their permanent ranks or grades in such computation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 5, after the word "ratings", add the following: "but upon being subsequently retired or in the case of retired officers returned to an inactive status they shall, on condition that their performance of duty under such temporary appointments has been satisfactory, be placed on the retired list, or advanced thereon, as the case may be, with the highest rank held by them while on the active list: *Provided*, That, except where specific provision is made otherwise, their retired pay shall be based on the pay of the rank or rating held at the time of retirement: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall entitle such personnel, when recalled to active duty, to any other rank or rating than that in which they were serving at the time of retirement."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia to the committee amendment: Page 9, line 11, after the word "the", strike out the words "active list" and insert in lieu thereof "active duty."

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment should be perfected by also striking out the word "the." In other words, striking out the words "the active list."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. I so modify my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 11, strike out the words "the active list" and insert in lieu thereof "active duty."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 18, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 11. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto shall apply—

"(a) Personnel of the Naval Reserve (except the Fleet Reserve) and the Marine Corps Reserve (except the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve)

in like manner and to the same extent and with the same relative conditions in all respects as are provided for personnel of the Regular Navy, but this shall not be construed to authorize the temporary appointment of the personnel thereof to ranks or grades in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps.

"(b) Personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That temporary appointments may be made to such rank and grade in the Coast Guard, not above captain, as correspond to the rank and grade that may be attained, either permanently or temporarily, by line officers of the Regular Navy of the same length of total commissioned service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 2, line 20, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "and the provisions of paragraph 9 of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 626; U. S. C., title 37, sec. 2), shall be applicable to all officers eligible for appointment or advancement pursuant to the provisions of this act, not only during the existence of a state of war formally recognized by Congress, but also during a national emergency determined by the President."

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, under the original Pay Act of 1922 there were six pay periods set up, starting from $1,500 for an ensign of the Navy and going on up to what a captain would receive, $4,000. In this temporary promotion bill that we are endeavoring to pass today we are going to have to freeze these officers in those pay periods unless we alter the provisions of the original act. In other words, we cannot give them an advance of pay with an advance of rank unless we adopt my amendment. We can do this in time of war by provisions of the original act of 1922, but unless my amendment is agreed to we are going to freeze the pay of many of the officers affected. Even though a man may be a commander in the Navy, he still cannot get the pay until he has served the required number of years, and, of course, that defeats the very purpose of the advancement or promotion we are trying to give him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The distinguished gentleman from California submitted his amendment to me yesterday, and I, in turn, submitted it to the Bureau of Navigation. I am advised by the Bureau of Navigation that it has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the chairman of the committee. I hope the Committee of the Whole will go along with this amendment. I can see no justification for holding these men indefinitely in a pay grade at a time the Navy is expanding, because we need these officers, and when we increase their responsibility by an increase of rank we should be prepared to give them the money that goes with the rank. I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice in support of this amendment, and in doing so I read a short statement made by Commander Hopwood in a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs:

Commander HOPWOOD. I am Commander Hopwood, from the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you favor this legislation or oppose it?

Commander HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration was not referred to the Navy Department for comment, and we have not had an opportunity to find the views of the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, any statements I may make will be the opinion of my own and of the Bureau of Navigation, not of the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Make as brief a statement as you can.

Commander HOPWOOD. The Bureau of Navigation is in favor of the enactment of the proposed legislation. It appears that in the enactment of the Pay Act of 1922, paragraph 8, the wording "during war," the personnel should get certain pay periods according to their rank; it appeared to be the intent at that time that by using the word "war" they meant mobilization of the Reserves with the Regular service. We have that condition today, although it is called a limited emergency; and that is the only justification that we can see to the enactment of the legislation, to place the mobilized Reserve in the same pay status as the Regular officers, since they are serving the country.

I may say he testified at the time there was a so-called limited emergency. Now we have a general emergency.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The amendment would give these people holding temporary rank the pay and allowance of the grade in which they are serving?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. For instance, there will be two officers with the same rank, one having a temporary rank and one having a permanent rank. They work the same hours; they work side by side; they have the same responsibility; yet they do not receive the same pay unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is agreed to.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The amendment would correct that?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DITTER: Page 2, line 20, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That no temporary promotion shall be made in any staff corps of the Navy until the authorized number of permanent officers in each grade or rank has been filled."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman explain the object and purpose of his amendment?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not have the opportunity, as I would under ordinary circumstances, to present this amendment to the chairman of the committee. The purpose of the amendment is this: If there are 20 lieutenant grade officers and there are 10 billets in the lieutenant-commander group to be filled——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In the staff corps?

Mr. DITTER. In the staff corps. It seems to me that instead of using the temporary promotion scheme the present bill provides for, that the promotion of those 10 men from the lieutenant group that are presently in the group and ready to be promoted to the lieutenant-commander group should be resorted to first before there is any resort to this temporary promotion scheme.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the suggestion of the gentleman is indeed a very constructive one and I am grateful for calling it to the committee's attention. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will retire then. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4473) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 214, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, before calling up House Resolution 235, making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 1618, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] if it is not possible to consider this bill by unanimous consent without the intervention of a rule?

Mr. FISH. I believe we shall not take all the time on the rule, but we need some time.

Mr. LEWIS. Very well.

Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 235.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1618, a bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LEWIS Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule making in order consideration of H. R. 1618, and providing an hour of general debate on that bill which has been favorably reported by the Committee on the Civil Service. The purpose of the bill is to correct a situation in regard to the appointment of postmasters in peculiar local conditions. The peculiar local conditions referred to in this proposed amendment to the law exists in some Army posts, in some Veterans' Administration facilities, in some penitentiaries and other State institutions, in some company towns, in some colleges and universities, and in some of the defense-industry towns, where there is no person otherwise eligible under civil-service regulations who is actually a resident within the delivery zone of the town or locality which the post office serves. This bill provides an amendment to the present law—section 2 of the act approved June 25, 1938, Fifty-second United States Statutes, page 1076. I believe the bill is rather clear. A very hasty reading of it will make clear the necessity for the amendment to the law.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following report on this bill (H. R. 1618) by the Committee on the Civil Service:

The Committee on the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1618) to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill is identical to H. R. 10012, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, as it was favorably reported to the House on August 20, 1940. The House failed to take action upon it in the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The following is the report which was submitted in the last session and completely states the purposes of the bill:

"The present law governing the appointment of postmasters of the first, second, and third classes (act of June 25, 1938, 52 Stat. 1076) requires that persons eligible for appointment must have actually resided within the delivery of the office or within the city or town where same is situated for 1 year prior to the date of such appointment, if the appointment is made without competitive examination; or for 1 year prior to the date fixed for the close of receipt of applications for examination, if the appointment is made after competitive examination. Operation of the act develops that there are a number of offices where no applicants can meet the residence requirement of the law. The purpose of this bill is to extend the area involved in such residence in order that qualified eligibles for appointment to these offices may be found. The committee do not propose to change the present rule regarding local residents, but merely desire to amend the law so that appointments can be made at these offices where no one can meet the residence requirements, and thus enable the constituted authorities to appoint postmasters Under existing law, appointments cannot be made.

"The purpose of the amendments is simply to strengthen the language of the bill.

"The bill was introduced by request pursuant to a communication from the Acting Postmaster General to the Speaker of the House. For the information of the membership of the House, that communication is printed below. It gives a good explanation of the bill and its purposes."

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BANKHEAD: In the administration of the act approved June 25, 1938, difficulty is being experienced because of the rigid rule constituting the second sentence of section 2 of the act which reads as follows:

"No person shall be eligible for appointment under this section unless such person has actually resided within the delivery of the office to which he is appointed, or within the city or town where the same is situated for 1 year next preceding the date of such appointment, if the appointment is made without competitive examination; or for 1 year preceding the date fixed for the close of receipt of applications for examination, if the appointment is made after competitive examination."

There are a great many post offices throughout the country where it is extremely difficult or absolutely impossible to fill a postmastership by appointing an applicant who has resided for the prescribed period within the delivery of the office. This is true of several different types of offices, for example, offices located in company towns, military reservations, Government hospitals, and State institutions. As an example, the post office of Du Pont, Wash., is located in a town owned by the Du Pont Co. The postmaster, who has served since 1921, does not reside within the delivery of the office and for that reason cannot qualify for reappointment.

The post office at Hopemont, W. Va., is located in a building of the West Virginia State Tuberculosis Sanitarium. There is no village at Hopemont and the employees of the sanitarium not required to reside there by the nature of their duties live elsewhere, most of them at Terra Alta, W. Va. The application of the postmaster in connection with a noncompetitive examination looking to his reappointment has been rejected by the Civil Service Commission because he does not meet the residence requirements.

In an open competitive examination for the Eloise, Mich., postmastership, the Commission was unable to secure any eligibles because of the fact that the office is located in a State hospital which cares for the indigent, insane, and tubercular patients of Wayne County. There are several post offices located in veterans' hospitals, such as Castle Point, N. Y., and Bay Pines, Fla., where the same condition exists, and post offices located on military reservations, such as Fort Hancock, N. J., Fort Bragg, N. C., and Fort Warren, Wyo., where the postmasters are not permitted to reside on the reservation although they were apparently permitted to do so at the time they were appointed.

The University, La., post office is located on the campus of the Louisiana State University and because of the fact that the acting postmaster, who has served there since the office was established on July 1, 1937, does not maintain his residence on the campus, the Civil Service Commission will not certify him for appointment. It is understood that only a few high officials connected with the university actually reside within the delivery of the office.

The first-class post office at National Stock Yards, Ill., is located in National City, an incorporated town which has no residences of note, being made up chiefly of shacks and hovels. The postmaster and all of the employees of the office reside within the delivery of the post office of East St. Louis, Ill. The postmaster cannot qualify for reappointment because the Civil Service Commission contends that he does not meet the residence requirements as outlined in the above-mentioned act.

A similar situation exists at Mount Vernon, Va., where the office is located on the Mount Vernon estate, preserved as a memorial to our first President. So far as is known, this office serves only tourists and employees of the estate. The acting postmaster actually resides in Alexandria, Va., and, therefore, cannot qualify under existing law for the regular appointment.

Another case where the Civil Service Commission has refused to certify the postmaster's reappointment is Menard, Ill., the office being located in the Southern Illinois State Penitentiary, and serving no one except the inmates and persons connected directly with the institution.

To cure the situation outlined above there is urgent necessity for the amendment of the act of June 25, 1938, and I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the House of Representatives a draft of a bill which it is believed will accomplish the purpose, and it will be appreciated if the necessary steps are taken at the earliest practicable date to accomplish the desired purpose.

It has been ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget that this recommendation for legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

W. W. HOWES,
Acting Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I hope we shall not have to take all the time under the rule. However, we are not pressed for time today, that is to say, we have only one more bill to bring up, and one or two Members want to speak under the rule.

I know of no opposition to the bill or to the rule. It affects a couple of post offices in my own district, but I believe the way the bill is written it protects those post offices and applicants for those positions living in the vicinity. The bill is about as well written to accomplish the object as it possibly could be. The purpose is to enable the appointment of postmasters in Government reservations, Veterans' Bureau hospitals, and other places where the requirement is that the

appointee must be a legal resident. Those places being owned by the Government, under a strict construction of the law they are not legal residences; therefore, the bill provides that the appointing authorities can go into adjoining territory or nearby territory for the appointment of a postmaster in a Government reservation or in a Veterans' Bureau hospital.

I believe the committee has given a good deal of attention to the detail and to the wording of the bill. As far as I can understand it, I believe it does exactly what is necessary in order to comply with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am sending out tomorrow to 100,000 of my constituents a return postal card on the issue, "Shall we enter the war or shall we stay out?"

The Congress alone may declare war. An undeclared war is an invention of the totalitarian nations and utterly inconsistent with democratic processes and the express provisions of the Constitution. The American people, through their elected representatives in Congress, have a right to be heard and to express their views on the greatest of all issues, "Shall we become involved in European and Asiatic wars or shall we stay out?"

I propose to send out a return postal card to every enrolled voter in my congressional district—Twenty-sixth, New York—tomorrow, Wednesday, June 18, in order to ascertain the views of the people on this issue, which transcends all political, social, church, or family affiliations, as it affects the security and destiny of America and the lives of our youth.

This poll is crystal clear on the main issue before the American people, and does not involve such past controversial issues as the lend-lease bill. There is only one yardstick by which to determine this vital decision—and that is, What is best for America?

I have no quarrel with any American for either wanting to go in or stay out of war; that is his or her right as a free sovereign American. I hope all who receive these postal ballots will mark and return them immediately. They must be in my office at Washington by Tuesday morning, June 24, 1941.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. I wonder if the gentleman wou'd accept an amendment to his postcard that I might suggest. Why not ask his people, "Do you love war?" and see what reply he gets.

Mr. FISH. I believe the gentleman knows, as everybody else in America, knows, that there is one great issue before the American people and before the Congress—that is, Shall we go in the war or shall we stay out? That is the only issue. It is not a question any longer of such controversial issues as the lend-lease bill or the repeal of the arms embargo or conscription.

Mr. IZAC. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Those are all water over the dam. The gentleman must admit that we are on the brink of war, and one more push and we might be in the war. Therefore, the people have the right to say whether we shall go in or shall stay out. They are intelligent. They are just as intelligent as the gentleman or any Member of Congress. They have the interest of America at heart. Of course, they hate war. This question is not whether they hate or love war, it is clear-cut, shall we go in or shall we stay out, and the only yardstick is what is best for America.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, the gentleman knows that in all these polls that are being taken, whether by the gentleman or by me, as individuals, it is the way the poll is worded that determines the reply you get. It is bound to be that way. We can word a poll so as to get any reply we want. The American people do not want war, but there may come a day when war is preferable to something else.

Mr. FISH. Why, certainly, the gentleman is quite right. We are not far apart. I am talking about the situation now—not a month from now, but now. I may be for war later on, but I want to know what my constituents' sentiments are today, and that is a crystal-clear issue and the main issue now before the American people. It may be entirely different 6 months from now and in that respect I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] who had intended to speak on the other rule.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I regret I did not seize the opportunity to speak for a few minutes and to make some observations on the last bill that was before the House, but it was due to business and consequent lack of knowledge of what was coming up at that time.

I want to emphasize the necessity of a system of fair and equitable selection of officers and the degree of their advancement as now exists in the Navy or in any branch of the armed forces of the United States.

In view of what has been said, I do not feel that it is necessary to indulge in a long discussion of the importance of selection of able and experienced men in the armed forces of the United States. I think the example I am going to use is especially effective in illustrating the dangers that arise through political pressure or influence or favoritism in advancing various individuals to prominent places of command.

Not long ago the remark was made on the floor that the French and British systems of advancement in the armies and the navies of those countries were responsible in large part for the inefficiency and the lack of success they have had in battle, not only in this war, but in other wars, and then somebody said that the French system was the most democratic system in the world and that their system of selection was conducted according to efficiency and was the proper method of selection. As for the accuracy of this, I cannot vouch.

However, I will go back a few years, long before my days began, to the time when Gilbert and Sullivan's H. M. S. Pinafore was in its heyday, during the period of Victorian England, when, as you will recall, the advancement of men in the Queen's navy was due almost entirely to the ability of an individual to gain favor or to purchase his advancement. I am especially mindful today of a few passages from H. M. S. Pinafore, which I believe illustrate the point I am making, particularly in the scene when Sir Joseph Porter comes upon the stage and begins his autobiography by saying—

When I was young I served a term as office boy to an attorney's firm.
I cleaned the windows and I swept the floor,
And I polished off the knocker on the big front door.
I polished off the knocker so handilee
That soon I was ruler of the Queen's navee.

Then he goes on to say that later he was sent by a pocket borough into Parliament and—

He always voted at his party's call,
And never thought of thinking for himself at all.
I thought so little they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the Queen's navee.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the gist and essence of the failure due in many cases to the high ranking officers in the British Navy, and I hope that that custom will not be allowed to prevail in the American Navy or in any part of the armed forces of the United States. I maintain that men must be able to rise, not because of rank, position, and prestige, but by the only fair, equitable, and American way, through the rewards to effort, trial, ability, and experience.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to submit some questions pertaining to the bill, H. R. 1618, now before us. I ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS] if the language in line 5, page 1, down to and including line 6 on page 2, will permit the situation I now describe. In my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan, I am informed of a situation where the postmaster has recently resigned, and there was appointed to take his place a certain gentleman who is unable mentally to take the civil-service examination. There is considerable difficulty involved in obtaining a proper political appointee

in that particular county to fill this position through the agencies of the Civil Service Commission. As I understand the language to which I have referred, the Post Office Department, for instance, can go into some adjoining county, or we will say, 75 or 100 miles away, and pick out some applicant and bring him to that particular town and who, after sitting for examination, perhaps can qualify as the postmaster. Would this language permit that?

Mr. LEWIS. I would say, "No," but I would defer the answer to that question to the civil-service authority in the House the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and I yield to him.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I would say certainly, "No." This is limited to cases where peculiar local conditions make it impossible to secure an eligible list; that is, where there are no legal residents at the point where the post office is located. If the gentleman will refer to the report on page 2 he will find illustrations of the situation this bill is proposed to cover. The best known is Mount Vernon, Va. There is no legal resident there who could qualify under the present law. It is the purpose to go to an adjacent territory, immediately adjoining, and hold an examination from which to secure an eligible list, and if the community to which the gentleman has reference has a legal resident, then he could qualify.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Georgia has referred to a condition where there are peculiar local conditions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the exact language that interested me very much, because of the case I submit. It is that sort of a situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Georgia suggested Mount Vernon, where there is a different situation. Take the case referred to by the gentleman from Michigan—where peculiar local conditions exist. There are apparently no Democrats who could qualify under the civil service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And who could take the examination.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, there must be an eligible Democrat on the list of three before the Department accepts the list, and I guess we all recognize that. In that case there is a peculiar local condition, in that there are apparently no Democrats in the locality able to qualify under the civil-service regulations.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman permit me to answer the question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. What I am after is information.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], I would say that a situation such as he described does not comply with the proviso that we have here proposed. If there are legal residents who can qualify, no matter what their politics may be, the Commission cannot avail itself of this amendment. It is only used in cases where there are no legal residents, and therefore it is impossible to comply with the qualifications. The language was written into the proposal at the suggestion of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I submit my question in this way; this is not shadow boxing on my part. It is a situation that exists. Let us suppose that in this particular town the examinations are held, and, we will say, only three people sit for the examination. All three, we will say, for instance, are Republicans, no Democrats sitting for the examination. The situation develops after what has already gone before in this particular case, where a very capable, highly qualified, high-standing Democrat was appointed, but resigned, if you please. He did not like the job, and he resigned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A situation has developed where the party machinery today permits the chairman of the county committee, if a vacancy occurs, to nominate temporarily the postmaster. He has been nominated postmaster temporarily. He does not want to sit for an examination, because he holds himself unqualified, mentally we will say, or scholarly; so the whole thing has developed into a condition where it is extremely difficult to get anybody to sit for a civil-service examination. The only question I raise is, can the Civil Service Commission, under a situation of that kind, where there are highly qualified people in the town who would take an examination, but who are of Republican political faith, step out into an adjoining county, for instance, and bring Democratic people in to take the examination?

Mr. RAMSPECK. My answer to that is unqualifiedly, "No."

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a practical matter, if there was no Democrat on the list of eligibles, the acting postmaster, if they could get one anywhere who was a Democrat—whether he could read or write or not—would continue to hold office, and they would repeat and repeat holding civil-service examinations in an effort to get some Democrat qualified. That happens right along.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is not aware of the fact that we have a very capable and a very fine minority member of the Civil Service Commission. I am quite sure that as long as Mr. Flemming is a member of that Commission no such conduct will be permitted to be engaged in by the Civil Service Commission, even if it should be possible that the Democratic members wanted to do such a thing, which I deny.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know anything about Mr. Flemming, but I know that thing has happened under the present administration. I know where they have held as high as two different examinations for a little post office, in an effort to qualify a certain person, when they had three eligibles from the first examination who were all right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Probably that has happened under both political parties. I condemn it whether it is under the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If I may be permitted to explain the operation of the civil service as I understand it, religious and political affiliations are barred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman from Michigan 1 additional minute.

Mr. WHITE. They are barred under the rules of the civil service in grading candidates for civil-service appointments. Under the rules and regulations followed by the Post Office Department, the matter is submitted to a Member of Congress to make the selection, and he in turn submits it to the people of the district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a selection out of the three highest.

Mr. WHITE. Neither Congress nor anybody else can go beyond the three eligibles submitted by the Civil Service Commission, and there is a provision in law that acting postmasters cannot be compensated for more than 6 months if some candidate is recommended or eligible from the civil-service list. I do not care what district you are in, you cannot go beyond those provisions of law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I can see no objection to the passage of this bill. As far as having a Democrat or a Republican appointed postmaster, I think the chances are better under this bill of having a Republican appointed than they are under the present system of appointing acting postmasters.

I did ask that the word "find" be inserted in the bill; also the words "render impossible," with reference to the appointment of people in the immediate delivery zone.

It seems to me it is a fair measure and I can see no objection to its passage. I hope it will be passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert after my opening statement on this rule pertinent portions of the favorable report by the Civil Service Committee on H. R. 1618, including a letter dated June 3, 1940, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from W. W. Howes, then Acting Postmaster General, concerning an identical bill introduced in the last Congress. The necessity of this legislation is fully explained in this letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is this change in the law intended to apply only to communities which have no eligible persons for postmasterships?

Mr. LEWIS. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1618) to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1618, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

On motion by Mr. RAMSPECK, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any controversy about this bill. It has been pretty well explained in the discussion under the consideration of the rule.

The bill was sent to our committee by the Post Office Department in order that they might make legal appointments to post offices such as are described on the second page of the report, where we print the letter from the Post Office Department.

There are certain post offices, like Mount Vernon, Va., and Hopemont, W. Va., at which latter place there is a State tuberculosis sanitarium, and there are certain Army posts and veterans' facilities where, under the present language of the statute, there is no legal residents who can qualify for the position of postmaster. The purpose of this bill is to permit in those cases not the Post Office Department but the Civil Service Commission so to find and then to set up an area adjacent thereto in which they will hold examinations to secure eligibles, from whom a postmaster may be appointed.

Some question has been raised as to how far they could go under this situation. The committee endeavored to make the language just as restrictive as possible, and the language, as it is now written, really, as I recall it, was suggested by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and I think is as tight as we can make it. If any Member has better language to suggest I should be glad to have it, because I am just as anxious as anybody could be to see that postmasters are appointed who live in the communities they serve. In those cases where there is no legal resident, such as I have mentioned, provision must be made for the legal appointment of postmasters.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said he would be glad of suggested changes in the language of the bill. The bill relates only to first-, second-, and third-class post offices, but in many districts there are nothing but fourth-class post offices. What provision is made to take care of such cases?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Postmaster General has authority to deal with that. Fourth-class postmasters are appointed by the Postmaster General, not the President, as are first-, second-, and third-class postmasters.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is this legislation made necessary because of our new Army camps, cantonments, flying fields, and such facilities we are establishing under the defense program?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it is not. Prior to June 1938 the requirements of eligibility for appointment to the position of postmaster was that the person should be a patron of the office. The law was changed at that time and the requirement set up that he or she must be a legal resident of the community, and that brought about this situation. There are, of course, patrons of the Mount Vernon post office. The postmaster himself could be a patron, but there are no legal residents of Mount Vernon. The same thing is true of many of these military posts and veterans' hospitals.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia what is being done in the case of the new camps that are being set up 4, 5, or 6 miles away from a town?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In most cases the Post Office Department is setting up a branch of some larger post office nearby, and they are sending experienced post-office workers there. They volunteer for the service and live on the premises and serve the men in those camps.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman have any idea how many of these cases are now pending?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not believe there are very many. I hesitate to name the number. It runs in my mind that it is somewhere around 40, but I do not think that is exactly correct. I do not believe the number is large.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts care to use her time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time. I know our members on the committee voted unanimously to support the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentlewoman for her cooperation.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076), is amended by changing the period to a colon and adding thereto the following: "*Provided*, That residence within the delivery of the post office or within the city or town where the same is situated shall be essential to the examination, appointment, reappointment, or promotion of applicants for postmaster at offices unless the Civil Service Commission finds that peculiar local conditions preclude or render impossible the application of such requirements. In such cases the Commission may examine and certify for appointment, reappointment, or promotion persons who reside in such area adjacent to, or surrounding, the delivery zone of the post office as may be fixed by the Civil Service Commission."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1618) to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 235, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 236.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 1073, a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, this also is an open rule providing for not to exceed 2 hours' general debate on H. R. 1073, a

bill which would amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

There are rather technical questions involved, and in my time I shall yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the leading authority in the House of Representatives on civil-service questions. In the meantime, however, I assure the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that I shall yield one-half hour as usual to him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize in the beginning the fact that this bill is not my brain child and I had nothing to do with the origin of it or with the drafting of it.

Some 2 years ago the Appropriations Committee directed the Bureau of the Budget to make a study of the question of salary advances. The Budget made this study and presented a report in writing to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] noted that it proposed to amend the Classification Act which comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Committee, and forwarded the report to me with the suggestion that it was a matter to be handled by the Civil Service Committee.

I introduced the bill in the exact form which the Budget Bureau suggested. We held hearings on the bill before the Civil Service Committee at which the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, and one of his assistants, Mr. Young, appeared and testified at length. There was also given the opportunity for testimony on the part of all Federal-employee organizations that were interested in this subject. I made quite a careful study of the report of the Budget on this subject. It is a complicated subject because it deals not with salary raises but with advancement of employees within their grade and unless a person has studied the Classification Act it is a little difficult to understand. For example, we will take a typist or a stenographer who enters the Government service at a salary of $1,440 a year. That is the first step. They can be promoted from $1,440 a year to $1,500 a year, which is the second step. The next step is $1,560 and the third step is $1,620. That grade goes on up to a salary of $1,800.

Under the practice existing for a number of years the various agencies of the Government have gone to the Budget and asked for money for these salary advance steps for their employees. In some cases they sold the Budget on the desirability of giving them new money for that purpose. In some cases those recommendations have come to the Appropriations Committee and have been allowed. The employees have received promotions. In other cases, for various and sundry reasons, certain agencies have not received any money for salary advances, and in some cases where they have received the money for these advances there has been discrimination, either intentional or otherwise, in the distribution of the available funds.

Under the Classification Act nobody can be advanced in salary until and unless the Congress has appropriated the money; therefore, this bill does not take away from the Appropriations Committee the right to control the amount of money that may be used for salary advances. In the fiscal year 1929 the Appropriations Committee allowed $7,000,000 for salary advances. In the current fiscal year I do not think they appropriated anything for salary advances. This lack of uniformity and lack of sound policy in dealing with the question, of course, promotes discord and unhappiness on the part of the employees and oftentimes results in good employees leaving the service.

The Budget Bureau says that over a period of 10 years this plan will add to the annual pay roll $29,000,000 based upon the studies it has made, or an average of $2,900,000 a year, which I think is no more than we have been spending under a haphazard system where some employees are promoted every year, where some employees are promoted as much as a thousand dollars in 1 year, and where hundreds and thousands of employees have had no promotions for many, many years.

There has been no uniformity, there has been no plan, there has been no control over what was done with the money after it was once appropriated, except that certain temporary provisions were written into the appropriation bills from year to year by the Appropriations Committee in an effort to meet the problem as it existed. Therefore, I feel that this is an intelligent, conservative, and an economical plan that was devised by the Budget Bureau and sent to the Committee on Appropriations which in turn was sent to me.

After hearings the Civil Service Committee was convinced it was a good bill and reported the bill just as the Budget Bureau wrote it, with one exception. The Customs employees some years ago had themselves taken out from under the Classification Act and had a separate salary scale set up for that service. When this bill was before the committee they came in and asked that certain of their employees be put back under the Classification Act. That is the only amendment in the bill. It was done at the request of the employees themselves with the approval of the Budget Bureau and the people in the Budget Bureau wrote the amendment and sent it to me with their approval.

The Civil Service Commission has approved the bill. I have discussed it with several members of the Appropriations Committee, and I think that those who have had an opportunity to study it realize this is a sane, sensible approach to a very difficult, technical problem, which they themselves have been worried with year after year and which can only be solved by having some such plan as this.

If there are any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel that in a way this is a further step toward security of salary and pay for a Federal employee in keeping with similar steps we have taken recently in other directions?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think it is an advantageous step for the employees in general. I would not say that it adds anything to their security. It will mean less discrimination toward many employees. I do not say that discrimination has necessarily been intentional. It is just human nature. If you are given so much money, and you have a thousand employees, and there is only enough money to promote a hundred of them, you are going to promote the one you know personally or have some interest in. That is what has happened.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the long run it will mean no more of a Federal expenditure than under the haphazard method we have been using?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Budget Director says it will not over a period of 10 years. He says that after 10 years it will carry itself in that the necessary money will be secured through lapses and through line promotions where new employees come in at the bottom of the grade and some saving is made in that way.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have a feeling amounting to a conviction that it will increase the morale of our Federal employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, and his assistant, Mr. Young, both emphasized that fact. They said they thought it would.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true even under this bill that the Federal employees may not receive their increases in salary due to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations may not appropriate the money therefor?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true. If the Committee on Appropriations does not provide the money they cannot get it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But they will have on the books the advantage of promotion?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I understand, then, that the benefit of this bill is that if Congress does appropriate the money it will go to the persons who are entitled to it under this schedule rather than to some favorites, perhaps, of the people in charge.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. Of course, as I said to my committee, and as I say here now, this legislation is of no value to anybody unless the Committee on Appropriations believes in it and follows it; but I have been told by the leaders of the Committee on Appropria-

tions that they are looking for something to regulate and rationalize the question of salary advances, and I believe they will try it. If it works, it will solve many a headache for all of us.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does this bill mean that advances in salary will be controlled by the action of the Congress rather than at the discretion of the officials who now have the power to increase salaries by their recommendations?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It does not take all discretion away from the executive supervisory officials, but it does limit their discretion considerably, and limits it by action of the Congress.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It permits increases in salary in accordance with the bill rather than in accordance with that discretionary power?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is this bill an admission that under the civil-service practices in vogue in the Government there has been some favoritism played by some in authority in giving salary advances to certain persons under civil service who really are not entitled to it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to my friend from Oklahoma that this bill deals with employees both under civil service and not under civil service. It deals with a question over which the Civil Service Commission has no control and in which it has no voice. It is true, in my judgment, that there have been discriminations in distributing money allowed by the Committee on Appropriations to various agencies for salary advances.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does this bill attempt to fix compensation for those employees only on the basis of their seniority, or does it have anything to do with paying them a salary commensurate with their efficiency?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The test in this bill is based on efficiency and not on seniority at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am very happy to say to my friend that I am for once with him on one of these bills. I believe it is a grand thing that somebody is now ready to admit that even under the civil-service practices there are some ills and there has been some favoritism and prejudice practiced. I am for the gentleman's bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I am delighted that we are together.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. My inquiry may not be exactly pertinent to the bill under consideration, but I should like to know what will be the status of the Federal employees who are now employed in the Treasury Accounts Offices in the different States, in view of the fact that the budget for this year is $2,025,000 as compared with a budget which was in excess of $4,000,000 last year for that same division. I understand approximately 900 employees will very soon be dismissed from the Treasury Accounts Office. What I want to know is whether or not such employees, if retained in the service until after July 1, will be blanketed in under civil service and will be eligible for positions with other agencies of the Government requiring civil-service status.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; they will not be blanketed in if they are dismissed before the 31st of December 1941.

Mr. COOLEY. Is this not a rather unfortunate situation for those employees, in view of the fact that the civil service Executive order goes into effect at a time when they are being forced off the rolls, and they are not now eligible for replacement in any other Federal agency?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I would say it certainly is unfortunate for them.

Mr. COOLEY. Should not something be done by the gentleman's committee to give them a status which would make them eligible for consideration with other agencies? Some of these persons have been with the Treasury Accounts from the very beginning, 5 or 6 years, and they have done faithful and diligent work. Now they are being placed in the position of just going off the roll, with no opportunity to get another job.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I shall be glad to discuss that with the gentleman at some other time. It does not affect this legislation at all.

Mr. COOLEY. No; as I pointed out, it is not pertinent to this particular bill, but it does seem to me that it is a situation which requires some attention. I wish the gentleman would give it some attention.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sympathetic with the gentleman's desire, of course.

Mr. COOLEY. I happen to know that many of these employees would have looked for employment elsewhere but for the fact that they have been lulled to sleep, so to speak, believing that when July 1 came they were going to be blanketed under the civil service and have that degree of security. Now they are unfortunately left out on a limb.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is due to the fact that Congress did not appropriate enough money to continue their employment, and that simply emphasizes what I said a while ago, that no legislation dealing with the salaries of the employees is of any effect unless the Congress appropriates the money to pay them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman agrees with me that even under this bill and under the present system of efficiency rating, if the head of a section, one of the departments within a department, decides that a person does not have very much efficiency, that person will not be eligible for a good rating.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true. He must attain a certain efficiency rating in order to be eligible for promotion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will join with me in seeing that the efficiency system is more equitably administered than it is today.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I certainly will be glad to do anything I can to improve it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the United States News by David Lawrence, entitled "A Billion for Peace."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, despite all of the propaganda that has been poured out upon the American people by various agencies dedicated to the cause of involving this Nation actively in foreign war, I think it may be fairly stated that the great masses of the American people are still definitely opposed to any program that will involve us again in a repetition of the disaster of 1917–18. I am satisfied that the greatest restraining influence upon this administration has been the word that has come here to the White House from millions and millions of people throughout this country who have demanded that the administration take no further steps toward involvement of this Nation actively in foreign war.

I am also satisfied that the administration has lately sent out an S O S call to governmental agencies asking them to go out into the highways and byways of America and sell the cause of participation of this Nation in this war. I have before me now actual proof of the fact that the Department of Agriculture, and especially that portion of it known as the Farm Security Administration, in a public document circulated to their agents

throughout the country, has given definite proof of the statement which I have just made. Let me read this letter, if you please, under date of May 7, 1941:

[Confidential: For administrative use only]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
May 7, 1941.

To: All information advisors.
From: John Fischer, Chief, Information Division.
Subject: Special memorandum on national defense (No. 8).

And may I say to the Members of the House this afternoon that there is nothing phoney about this letter. I have had this letter checked with the Farm Security Administration, and they admit that it was released by them. I presented it to the Secretary of Agriculture this morning at a conference which we had with him, and he stated that he regretted very much that this letter had ever been sent out. This is what they said:

The Department has just received information that the British shipping situation is much more serious than most Americans have realized. While the Department has the exact figures, we cannot pass them on to you for military reasons. In general, however, the situation is this:

(1) British ships are being sunk twice as fast as they can be replaced by the combined effort of British and American shipyards—and at the last report, the rate of loss was still rising.

(2) Tonnage being landed at British ports is less than half of what it was before the war.

(3) In the last month Britain has had to cut down on her imports of armaments from the United States in order to increase imports of food.

(4) The food situation of Britain is so serious that foundation herds of livestock and poultry are being slaughtered.

Department experts emphasize that these facts do not mean that England has lost the war. There is some doubt, however, whether England can hold out through the winter, if we do not take immediate and positive measures to see that American food and war materials are delivered at British ports.

What a British defeat would mean to this country should by this time be obvious to all of us. Many of the best-informed people in Washington predict an invasion of the Western Hemisphere within 90 to 120 days, if Britain is defeated.

Get this—I want this fact to sink in—

The Department feels that the American people—particularly the American farmers—do not understand these facts, and that vigorous action of the type needed, cannot be taken until this lack of understanding is remedied.

Because we must have this vigorous type of action and we cannot get it because the American people do not understand—

For this reason, every agency in the Department has been asked to do all it can to get these facts before the people.

Now, listen to this:

We cannot issue formal press releases or radio speeches on the subject for two obvious reasons—it is not the official job of the Department to discuss international affairs; and indiscriminate broadcasting of these facts might play into the hands of the appeasement propaganda groups.

We are requested, however, to carry these facts by word of mouth to as many as possible of our own officials and other key people in Agriculture such as Farm Security Administration committeemen, etc.

There is a letter sent out by a responsible Government agency which charges that the American people, and especially the farmers, are so dumb that they do not understand and cannot appreciate what the situation is that is confronting America and, therefore, they have been apathetic in their attitude toward the vigorous steps which it is now proposed to initiate to carry out this war policy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Just a moment. It is my considered opinion from talks with the farm population that I represent that they are too smart for that. Do not make any mistake, Mr. Secretary of Agriculture, or the Members of this Congress. Do not think that the farm people of this country do not understand. They understand too well, and they are not going to be driven by deceitful appeals such as this into taking a position that will be a repetition of the experience which they had in 1917 and 1918. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, who signed the letter that the gentleman has referred to?

Mr. KEEFE. The letter is sent out by Mr. John Fisher, Chief, Information Division, of the Farm Security Administration. I say to the gentleman further that it is not in the form of a letter. It is for information, sent out to all the F. S. A. committeemen and to the responsible agencies of the Department of Agriculture scattered from one end of this Nation to the other, and there is no question about the authenticity of the letter.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not questioning that at all. I am just wondering what Secretary Wickard had to say about this.

Mr. KEEFE. Secretary Wickard said this morning when I presented the letter to him and told him that I intended to speak on it this afternoon, that it was very, very unfortunate that such a release had been permitted to go out.

Mr. COOLEY. Then it did not go out with Secretary Wickard's authority?

Mr. KEEFE. I don't know whether it did or not. I assume that it did not, in view of that statement, but what difference does it make? It went out with the authority of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I just wanted to know whether Mr. Wickard approved it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman does not approve it, does he?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. KEEFE. Is there anybody here who approves of it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that I don't think there is any fact stated in that message that every Member of Congress is not familiar with—the fact as to the ship losses, and the food shortage and all those other facts. They have been known to Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The great cry has been that the people——

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman going to ask me a question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I wish the gentleman would please get to it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The great cry is that the people want to know the facts. That is what the appeasement group say, and these are some of the facts being given to the people.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman does not intend to ask a question. He is making a speech.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just one other observation——

Mr. KEEFE. I will answer the question, if it is a question. I do not yield any more. At this time I assume from what the gentleman says and in view of the fact that Members of Congress have this information, that he assumes that we are somewhat superior and the general public throughout the country does not have access to the information that we have. I say to the gentleman that it is my considered opinion that there are millions of people throughout this country who have more information on the subject than many Members of Congress. I do not think Members of Congress should pride themselves on having any peculiar information that is not available to the farmers in my district or to the miners in the gentleman's district.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Now will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman wants to ask a question, I will.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I take it that the gentleman's position is that he does not favor the administration's policy of all-out aid to England, which, in my opinion, that letter only typifies, and that it is necessary to help in getting all-out aid to England.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to see that the gentleman rises on the floor any time anybody sticks a dart into the Democratic administration's policy. He is the mouthpiece, the spokesman, and defender of the administration. I am not in favor of any program on the part of this administration that has for its purpose the involvement of this Nation in Europe's wars. Is that plain?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me that the regrettable part of this letter is not the information attempted to be given out but the method and the policy to which the gentleman refers—forsooth, a letter coming from a bureau in Washington headed "Confidential," the purpose of which is to stress propaganda, and is propaganda, without the people to whom it is delivered knowing the source from which it comes. This letter, coming from a high authority in Washington, directs the little agent out in the country confidentially to spread from person to person this propaganda, not let it be known from whence it came.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point. It seems to me it is beneath the dignity of a great department, such as the Department of Agriculture, to ask these agents throughout the country to do that. What do they have to fear if they published these facts to the world? What do they have to fear, if they are true, if they are the facts? What do they have to fear from publishing it on the front page of every newspaper in America? Did they ask that that be done? No. Their request was that they snoop around from person to person; go snooping around and pass this on by word of mouth. Do not let them know where it is coming from, but pass it on surreptitiously, deceitfully trying to mislead honest people, when they do not have the courage to come out and publish it on the front pages of the newspapers. That is what I object to.

I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] further that I do not concede for one moment the truth of these four allegations set forth in this propaganda literature. I do not concede it for a moment, and if I had time I would answer seriatim each one of these allegations and prove by very competent proof that the statements contained in this letter are propaganda and not facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For 4 years I have tried to cut the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. Now that they are displacing the State Department, I am satisfied that we have given them too much money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Were these letters sent through the mail?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I understand they were sent through the mail.

Mr. COOLEY. Do we not have at present a statute that prohibits the use of the mails for such purposes?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the gentleman knows we have Federal laws on the statute books for everything. Are they enforced? Of course they are not. The question is an academic one.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman called attention to the fact that perhaps the author of that letter was violating a Federal law in that he was using the mails for a purpose which was prohibited?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, well, I was not interested in that subject. I am interested in a much greater subject, as to whether or not the Department of Agriculture or any of its agencies are to be engaged in a snooping campaign of this character. A great agency of the Government, that should have the courage to come out and tell the people honestly and truthfully the facts as they see them, instead of asking their agents to go snooping around from person to person, by word of mouth, trying to put over their vicious propaganda.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the gentleman interested in stopping such procedure?

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I believe the House owes a deep debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Whether you are Democrats or Republicans, as Americans you are talking about the most important issue that confronts the country. This is a deliberate conspiracy to try to break down the will, through trickery, of the American farmer who wants to stay out of war.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, and as further evidence of the situation, at the same time this communication went out we have the spectacle of the Secretary of Agriculture himself going out into the Middle West making warlike speeches, telling the farmers, it is time for you to get excited. You should get excited. Why are you so apathetic about this thing? Are you not aware of the dangers? You people here in the Middle West do not seem to understand. You do not know anything. You are so apathetic. I plead with you to get excited. That is the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is certainly interested in stopping the very thing he is complaining about.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course I would.

Mr. COOLEY. Would you not like to stop it?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I asked the question why the gentleman did not call it to the attention of the Secretary that it might perhaps be a violation of Federal law.

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps that will be an afterthought. I am not interested in that at this time.

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary of Agriculture has an attorney general from whom he can get an opinion if he wants one.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As to the remedy suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, I took occasion last year to call to the attention of the then Secretary of Agriculture, now the Vice President, a violation of law in sending out material, and he ignored it. The gentleman can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion as to how this can be stopped.

I regret I am compelled to consider the suggestion of the gentleman from South Carolina as being purely academic. In the next place, I am not going to waste my time going down there, because prior experiences with the same problem in other agencies of the New Deal show the futility of expecting any action. I have more important things to do here. I am calling the attention of Congress to these facts, and if the Congress has any backbone at all it ought to deal with and stop this sort of thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 2 additional minutes, and I express the hope that he will yield to some of the farmers who want to ask questions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very glad the gentleman has brought this matter to the attention of the House; and in regard to this matter of trying to influence the opinions of the farmers, I quote from the United States News of June 13, page 44, a reliable, reputable periodical, which says:

> The effort to sell the idea of the United States intervention to farmers through A. A. A. committees backfired so seriously that officials were forced to deny its sponsorship.

I am mighty glad the gentleman has made them admit sponsorship through this letter.

Mr. KEEFE. I can simply say that this matter has been fully verified by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The Farm Security Administration fully verifies the accuracy of this release. Mr. Wickard himself stated to me this morning, as I have already said, that it was a very unfortunate thing that this release went out. How much more confirmation is needed?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. GEHRMANN. As the gentleman well knows, about 2 weeks ago I made some remarks on the floor referring to this matter. I did not then know a letter had gone out, but I did know that I received hundreds of letters from farmers wanting to know the source of these suggestions, that these Government representatives were urging them to support convoying in order to boost farm prices. I called it to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, but they denied knowing anything about it.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Perhaps this little effort has been worth while. We have at least cleared up one thing and established that the Department of Agriculture is not above stooping to this sort of snooping tactics of deceit and chicanery to try to influence the farm population of this

country, whom they greatly underestimate. The farmers of this country know what it is all about, and because they do know what it is all about they are against this war program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to a consideration of the pending bill for a few minutes. I have one other request for time and after taking a minute on the bill I shall yield to a distinguished Member of the House who does not appear very often, who also wants to make a few remarks on the foreign situation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules and with practically a unanimous report from the Committee on the Civil Service. It has the backing of those interested in civil service, including organized labor, for it aims to bring about promotions within the civil-service ranks, to provide for step-ups within the grade, and increased salaries. Certainly so far no serious objection has been made to the merits of the proposal. All those supporting the bill claim it will promote the prestige and the morale of the civil service. If this is correct, then the bill is worth while.

The bill is a complicated one. It requires a great deal of study. It has, however, the unanimous support of the committee, and I hope it will be passed by a unanimous vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to one of those Members who is not heard very often in the Congress, but when this Member does speak he is listened to almost with reverence; I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, on June 7 last I sent the following letter to the Secretary of the Navy:

DEAR SIR: I desire to bring to your attention that there is being circulated in the United States literature on stationery bearing the caption "Federal Union." The location of the organization is given as 10 East Fortieth Street, New York. Its declared purpose, according to its prospectus, is to destroy the Declaration of Independence and to curtail the sovereignty and independence of the United States. On its stationery there appears a partial list of council of advisers, and in this list I find the names of Admiral W. H. Standley and Rear Admiral H. E. Yarnell. As the declared purpose of the organization is disloyal and traitorous, inasmuch as it would destroy the independence of the United States and restore this country to the British Empire, I demand that these officers be compelled to sever their affiliation with Federal Union, that they be censured, and that they be removed from the retired list of the United States Navy.

On the same date a similar letter was sent to the Secretary of War in the case of Maj. Gen. G. V. Strong, whose name also appeared in the partial list of council of advisers.

No answer has been received from the Navy Department. The War Department has reported that General Strong has stated that he had not authorized the use of his name on any letterhead and that he had never attended a meeting of the council of advisers.

The objectives of Federal Union are not new. For many years a number of disloyal and seditious organizations have been spending immense sums of money in the United States for the denationalization of the United States, the destruction of the freedom and independence of the United States, the abrogation of our Declaration of Independence, the superseding of our Constitution, and the restoration of the United States to the British Empire.

The organization that now styles itself "Federal Union" is the outgrowth of the so-called Union Now movement advocated and promoted by Clarence K. Streit.

It is shocking to find on the council of advisers of this organization, whose declared purpose is to destroy the Declaration of Independence and to curtail the sovereignty and independence of the United States, high-ranking officers of our Army and Navy who are sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The United States cannot be destroyed from without, but it can be destroyed from within.

In Senate Document No. 182, Seventy-sixth Congress, a report on schools and training courses in Government departments, it is suggested that there is a "tie-in" between lectures scheduled by the Department of Agriculture Graduate School and the movement sponsored by Federal Union. This report, which came to Congress in April 1940, included the statement:

Judging by press releases of the past few months and public utterances of Government officials in high places, the movement has gained such headway as to receive official sanction and advocacy.

The time has come to cleanse the United States Government of those seditious individuals, particularly those in high places, who would destroy the independence of the United States, subvert her national integrity, and nullify her Constitution.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1073) to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1073) to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with Mr. KLEBERG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I went into some explanation of this bill during the consideration of the rule. I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into it further unless some Member has a question about it. As I said then, the bill is one which was drafted after 2 years of study of this problem by the Bureau of the Budget. They feel that in the long run it will result in better efficiency in the Government service and perhaps in an actual saving of money, but certainly in no more cost than we would have under the other system which is a haphazard system and oftentimes works inequalities in the distribution of funds allowed by the Appropriations Committee for salary increases.

The matter, as I said, was initiated by the Appropriations Committee. A study was made at its instance, and a report was made, which was sent to me by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and I introduced the bill as drafted by the Budget. I think it is a step forward, and one that will certainly result in more efficient and more satisfactory service on the part of the various agencies of the Government. Speaking conservatively, it will not cost any more than has been spent under the other system, and perhaps not as much.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to explain to the Committee, in case any of the Members are confused, that the customs employees are thoroughly taken care of under this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill as originally drafted did not affect any of the employees in the Customs Service because they were not under the Classification Act. At their own suggestion, and because of it, the amendment found on page 5 of the bill as section 5 (a) was inserted in the bill for the purpose of taking care of verifiers, openers, packers, guards, inspectors, and station inspectors in the Customs Service. They will be taken out of what is known as the Bachrach Act if this amendment is agreed to and will be returned to the jurisdiction of the Classification Act for salary purposes and, of course, will benefit from whatever salary advancement comes from this bill.

It has met with their approval, and as I said it was introduced at their request. The language has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is very much interested in that matter and was instrumental in working it out to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to make just one observation and pay a compliment to the gentleman from Georgia, who has brought in this bill, together with other measures recently, for the good of the Service. I have received word from numerous Federal employees commending the gentleman from Georgia for the work he has done. I regard the measure before us as supplemental in a fashion to a bill we passed, which will go into effect on July 1. I believe it is H. R. 960. Both of these will help to better the lot and improve the spirit of Government workers.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I think I would be remiss if I let the opportunity go by without expressing my appreciation to the gentleman as chairman of the committee of which I am a member for the fine work he has done in upholding the principles of civil service in the United States. I believe the cordial reception being given to this bill by the membership of the House today is a tribute of their confidence in the gentleman's ability, integrity, and fairness at all times.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I would like to point out to the Committee regarding this bill. It seems to me it is a step in the right direction, although until the efficiency system in the Government is rectified there are no assurances that the people in the various departments will be given the proper ratings before they receive any promotion which would come under this bill. The present system has been extremely bad. In fact, the Appropriations Committee did not like it, either. It developed that certain departments received large appropriations for their personnel, while other departments received nothing. Under this bill that situation will be obviated in a large measure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing the amount and other facts pertinent to the bill as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Statement of promotions and separations during fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, by departments and agencies and by departmental and field services

Departments and agencies	Number of employees on pay roll June 30, 1939 [1]	Promotions in fiscal year 1939								Separations during fiscal year 1939					
		Number of employees promoted	Percent [2]	Type of promotion						Retirements, deaths, resignations, and terminations for cause		Transfers to other departments or agencies		Combined separations and transfers	
				Within grade		Line		Reclassification							
				Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [2]
Executive Office:															
Departmental	244.0	83.0	34.0	48.0	19.7	31	12.7	4	1.6	5	2.0	8	3.3	13	5.3
Field	6.0														
Total	250.0	83.0	33.2	48.0	19.2	31	12.4	4	1.6	5	2.0	8	3.2	13	5.2
DEPARTMENTS															
Agriculture:															
Departmental	12,355.0	3,934.0	31.8	3,512.0	28.4	1,289	10.4	123	1.1	535	4.3	468	3.8	1,003	8.1
Field	26,274.0	8,597.0	32.7	5,294.0	20.1	2,035	7.7	1,268	4.8	1,215	4.6	258	1.0	1 473	5.6
Total	38,629.0	12,531.0	32.4	8,806.0	22.8	3,324	8.6	1,401	3.6	1,750	4.5	726	1.9	2,476	6.4
Commerce:															
Departmental	4,119.0	1,290.0	31.3	509.0	12.4	284	6.9	497	12.1	140	3.4	170	4.1	310	7.5
Field	1,162.0	676.0	58.2	219.0	18.9	54	4.6	403	34.7	64	5.5	17	1.5	81	7.0
Total	5,281.0	1,966.0	37.2	728.0	13.8	338	6.4	900	17.0	204	3.9	187	3.5	391	7.4
Interior:															
Departmental	2,881.0	1,373.0	47.7	909.0	31.6	257	8.9	207	7.2	159	5.5	178	6.2	337	11.7
Field	14,778.0	3,998.0	27.1	2,653.0	18.0	620	4.2	725	4.9	837	5.7	178	1.2	1,015	6.9
Total	17,659.0	5,371.0	30.4	3,562.0	20.2	877	5.0	932	5.3	996	5.6	356	2.0	1,352	7.7
Justice:															
Departmental	2,901.0	887.0	30.6	537.0	18.5	408	14.1	7	.2	101	3.5	65	2.2	166	5.7
Field	3,921.0	1,294.0	33.0	679.0	17.3			615	15.7	210	5.4	16	.4	226	5.8
Total	6,822.0	2,181.0	32.0	1,216.0	17.8	408	6.0	622	9.1	311	4.6	81	1.2	392	5.7
Labor:															
Departmental	1,743.0	297.0	17.0	58.0	3.3	178	10.2	61	3.5	47	2.7	69	4.0	116	6.7
Field	2,836.0	924.0	32.6	884.0	31.2	36	1.3	4	.1	95	3.3	25	.9	120	4.2
Total	4,579.0	1,221.0	26.7	942.0	20.6	214	4.7	65	1.4	142	3.1	94	2.1	236	5.2
Navy:															
Departmental	3,186.0	1,179.0	37.0	620.0	19.5	415	13.0	144	4.5	93	2.9	48	1.5	141	4.4
Field	12,633.0	3,655.0	29.0	1,673.0	13.2	1,667	13.2	315	2.5	432	3.4	137	1.1	569	4.5
Total	15,819.0	4,834.0	30.6	2,293.0	14.5	2,082	13.2	459	2.9	525	3.3	185	1.2	710	4.5
Post Office:															
Departmental	1,289.0	504.0	39.1	410.0	31.8	65	5.0	29	2.2	40	3.1	47	3.6	87	6.7
Field	14,339.0	923.0	6.4	449.0	3.1	441	3.1	33	.2	451	3.1	176	1.2	627	4.4
Total	15,628.0	1,427.0	9.1	859.0	5.5	506	3.2	62	.4	491	3.1	223	1.4	714	4.6
State:															
Departmental	959.0	495.0	51.6	345.0	36.0	111	11.6	39	4.1	48	5.0	15	1.6	63	6.6
Field	334.0	38.0	11.4	33.0	9.9	3	.9	2	.6	33	9.9	8	2.4	41	12.3
Total	1,293.0	533.0	41.2	378.0	29.2	114	8.8	41	3.2	81	6.3	23	1.8	104	8.0

[1] Includes only permanent employees in positions subject to compensation schedules in the Classification Act of 1923. Does not include employees in Executive-order grades and vacant positions. Note that this coverage is smaller than in the survey reported in tables VI and VII.

[2] Percent of total number of employees on pay roll June 30, 1939.

Statement of promotions and separations during fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, by departments and agencies, and by departmental and field services—Continued

Departments and agencies	Number of employees on pay roll June 30, 1939	Promotions in fiscal year 1939								Separations during fiscal year 1939					
		Number of employees promoted	Percent	Type of promotion						Retirements, deaths, resignations, and terminations for cause		Transfers to other departments or agencies		Combined separations and transfers	
				Within grade		Line		Reclassification							
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Treasury:															
Departmental	11,616.0	3,035.0	26.1	1,984.0	17.1	937	8.1	114	1.0	458	3.9	493	4.2	951	8.2
Field	23,566.0	5,114.0	21.7	3,438.0	14.6	802	3.4	874	3.7	1,049	4.4	51	.2	1,100	4.7
Total	35,182.0	8,149.0	23.2	5,422.0	15.4	1,739	4.9	988	2.8	1,507	4.3	544	1.5	2,051	5.8
War:															
Departmental	2,768.0	849.0	30.7	606.0	22.0	175	6.3	68	2.4	98	3.5	101	3.6	199	7.2
Field	32,016.0	8,548.0	26.7	5,630.0	17.6	1,973	6.2	945	3.0	1,256	3.9	539	1.7	1,795	5.6
Total	34,784.0	9,397.0	27.0	6,238.0	18.0	2,148	6.2	1,011	2.9	1,354	3.9	640	1.8	1,994	5.7
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES AND ESTABLISHMENTS															
Federal Loan Agency:															
Departmental	1,587.0	555.0	35.0	231.0	14.6	119	7.5	205	12.9	109	6.9	46	2.9	155	9.8
Field	61.0	32.0	52.5	32.0	52.5					2	3.3			2	3.3
Total	1,648.0	587.0	35.6	263.0	16.0	119	7.2	205	12.4	111	6.7	46	2.8	157	9.5
Federal Security Agency:															
Departmental	6,808.0	5,913.0	86.9	3,953.0	58.1	1,922	28.2	38	.6	361	5.3	708	10.4	1,069	15.7
Field	9,093.3	5,851.5	64.3	4,224.5	46.5	1,531	16.8	96	1.1	597	6.6	217	2.4	814	9.0
Total	15,901.3	11,764.5	74.0	8,177.5	51.4	3,453	21.7	134	.8	958	6.0	925	5.8	1,883	11.8
Federal Works Agency:															
Departmental	7,218.0	4,661.0	64.6	4,052.0	56.1	688	9.5	306	4.2	409	5.7	270	3.7	679	9.4
Field	4,007.0	1,399.0	34.9	981.0	24.5	468	11.7	60	1.7	221	5.5	121	3.0	342	8.5
Total	11,225.0	6,060.0	54.0	5,033.0	44.8	1,156	10.3	375	3.3	630	5.6	391	3.5	1,021	9.1
Alley Dwelling Authority:															
Departmental	31.0	9.0	29.0	8.0	25.8	1	3.2								
Field															
Total	31.0	9.0	29.0	8.0	25.8	1	3.2								
American Battle Monuments Commission:															
Departmental	8.0	[illegible].0	37.5	3.	37.5								12.5	1	12.5
Field	34.0	12.0	35.3	11.0	32.4	1	2.9			1	2.9	1	2.9	2	5.9
Total	42.0	15.0	35.7	14.0	33.3	1	2.4			1	2.4	2	4.8	3	7.1
U. S. Board of Tax Appeals:															
Departmental				17.0	15.3			7	6.3	4	3.6	1	.9	5	4.5
Field	111.0	24.0	21.6												
Total	111.0	24.0	21.6	17.0	15.3			7	6.3	4	3.6	1	.9	5	4.5
Civil Aeronautics Authority:															
Departmental	889.0	240.0	27.0	15.0	1.7	219	24.6	6	.7	88	9.9	14	1.6	102	11.5
Field	2,880.0	717.0	33.2	5.0	.2	593	20.6	119	4.1	154	5.3	22	.8	176	6.1
Total	3,769.0	957.0	25.4	20.0	.5	812	21.5	125	3.3	242	6.4	36	1.0	278	7.4
Civil Service Commission:															
Departmental	1,204.0	372.0	30.9	5.0	.4	342	28.4	25	2.1	38	3.2	50	4.2	88	7.3
Field	434.0	164.0	37.8	1.0	.2	135	31.1	28	6.5	17	3.9	13	3.0	30	6.9
Total	1,638.0	536.0	32.7	6.0	.4	477	29.1	53	3.2	55	3.4	63	3.8	118	7.2
Employees' Compensation Commission:															
Departmental	460.0	107.0	23.3	2.0	.4	58	12.6	47	10.2	33	7.2	54	11.7	87	18.9
Field	56.0	7.0	12.5			4	7.1	3	5.4	2	3.6	1	1.8	3	5.4
Total	516.0	114.0	22.1	2.0	.4	62	12.0	50	9.7	35	6.8	55	10.7	90	17.4
Federal Communications Commission:															
Departmental	403.0	56.0	13.9	6.0	1.5	62	15.4	2	.5	21	5.2	16	4.0	37	9.2
Field	193.0	15.0	7.8			1	.5	16	8.3	4	2.1	5	2.6	9	4.7
Total	596.0	71.0	11.9	6.0	1.0	63	10.6	18	3.0	25	4.2	21	3.5	46	7.7
Federal Power Commission:															
Departmental	539.0	199.0	36.9	124.0	23.0	91	16.9	1	.2	29	5.4	17	3.2	46	8.5
Field	275.0	84.0	30.5	75.0	27.3	16	5.8	2	.7	14	5.1	4	1.5	18	6.5
Total	814.0	283.0	34.8	199.0	24.4	107	13.1	3	.4	43	5.3	21	2.6	64	7.9
Federal Trade Commission:															
Departmental	591.0	241.0	40.8	196.0	33.2	49	8.3	1	.2	20	3.4	10	1.7	30	5.1
Field	89.0	26.0	29.2	15.0	16.9	11	12.4			2	2.2	1	1.1	3	3.4
Total	680.0	267.0	39.3	211.0	31.0	60	8.8	1	.2	22	3.2	11	1.6	33	4.9
General Accounting Office:															
Departmental	2,338.0	487.0	20.8	95.0	4.1	392	16.8			54	2.3	19	.8	73	3.1
Field															
Total	2,338.0	487.0	20.8	95.0	4.1	392	16.8			54	2.3	19	.8	73	3.1

Statement of promotions and separations during fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, by departments and agencies, and by departmental and field services—Continued

Departments and agencies	Number of employees on pay roll June 30, 1939	Promotions in fiscal year 1939								Separations during fiscal year 1939					
		Number of employees promoted	Percent	Type of promotion						Retirements, deaths, resignations, and terminations for cause		Transfers to other departments or agencies		Combined separations and transfers	
				Within grade		Line		Reclassification							
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Interstate Commerce Commission:															
Departmental	1,844.0	601.0	32.6	389.0	21.1	186	10.1	26	1.4	64	3.5	132	7.2	196	10.6
Field	746.0	180.0	24.1	141.0	18.9	39	5.2	.....	.....	38	5.1	12	1.6	50	6.7
Total	2,590.0	781.0	30.2	530.0	20.5	225	8.7	26	1.0	102	3.9	144	5.6	246	9.5
Maritime Commission															
Departmental	816.0	378.0	46.3	284.0	34.8	111	13.6	17	2.1	33	4.0	11	1.3	44	5.4
Field	260.0	113.0	43.5	102.0	39.2	16	6.2	1	.4	9	3.5	3	1.2	12	4.6
Total	1,076.0	491.0	45.6	386.0	35.9	127	11.8	18	1.7	42	3.9	14	1.3	56	5.2
Maritime Labor Board															
Departmental	20.0	9.0	45.0	4.0	20.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	.....	.....	4	20.0	4	20.0
Field	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	20.0	9.0	45.0	4.0	20.0	3	15.0	2	10.0	.....	.....	4	20.0	4	20.0
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:															
Departmental	53.0	10.0	18.9	7.0	13.2	3	5.7	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	5.7	3	5.7
Field	467.0	235.0	50.3	210.0	45.0	25	5.4	.....	.....	18	3.9	21	4.5	39	8.4
Total	520.0	245.0	47.1	217.0	41.7	28	5.4	.....	.....	18	3.5	24	4.6	42	8.1
National Archives:															
Departmental	342.0	223.0	65.2	153.0	44.7	66	19.3	4	1.2	18	5.3	5	1.5	23	6.7
Field	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	342.0	223.0	65.2	153.0	44.7	66	19.3	4	1.2	18	5.3	5	1.5	23	6.7
National Capital Park and Planning Commission:															
Departmental	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Field	8.0	6.0	75.0	5.0	62.5	1	12.5	.....	.....	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25.0
Total	8.0	6.0	75.0	5.0	62.5	1	12.5	.....	.....	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25.0
National Labor Relations Board:															
Departmental	425.0	254.0	59.8	181.0	42.6	98	23.1	24	5.6	25	5.9	8	1.9	33	7.8
Field	378.0	271.0	71.7	201.0	53.2	112	29.6	.....	.....	25	6.6	.....	.....	25	6.6
Total	803.0	525.0	65.4	382.0	47.6	210	26.2	24	3.0	50	6.2	8	1.0	58	7.2
National Mediation Board:															
Departmental	20.0	4.0	20.0	3.0	15.0	1	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	5.0	1	5.0
Field	48.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2.1	.....	.....	2	4.2	.....	.....	2	4.2
Total	68.0	4.0	5.9	3.0	4.4	2	2.9	.....	.....	2	2.9	1	1.5	3	4.4
Railroad Retirement Board:															
Departmental	1,354.0	298.0	22.0	93.0	6.9	205	15.1	.....	.....	54	4.0	28	2.1	82	6.1
Field	1,182.0	105.0	8.9	7.0	.6	98	8.3	.....	.....	6	.5	1	.1	7	.6
Total	2,536.0	403.0	15.9	100.0	3.9	303	11.9	.....	.....	60	2.4	29	1.1	89	3.5
Securities and Exchange Commission:															
Departmental	1,265.0	871.0	68.9	679.0	53.7	181	14.3	11	.9	49	3.9	53	4.2	102	8.1
Field	352.0	220.0	62.5	197.0	56.0	23	6.5	.....	.....	14	4.0	5	1.4	19	5.4
Total	1,617.0	1,091.0	67.5	876.0	54.2	204	12.6	11	.7	63	3.9	58	3.6	121	7.5
Smithsonian Institution:															
Departmental	400.7	49.0	12.2	35.0	8.7	14	3.5	.....	.....	18	4.5	7	1.7	25	6.2
Field	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	400.7	49.0	12.2	35.0	8.7	14	3.5	.....	.....	18	4.5	7	1.7	25	6.2
U. S. Tariff Commission:															
Departmental	305.0	111.0	36.4	68.0	22.3	28	9.2	15	4.9	8	2.6	9	3.0	17	5.6
Field	8.0	2.0	25.0	2.0	25.0	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	313.0	113.0	36.1	70.0	22.4	28	8.9	15	4.8	8	2.6	9	2.9	17	5.4
Veterans' Administration:															
Departmental	4,949.0	1,551.0	31.3	1,277.0	25.8	245	5.0	29	.6	187	3.8	250	5.1	437	8.8
Field	33,257.0	8,603.0	25.9	7,087.0	21.3	1,403	4.2	113	.3	3,638	10.9	88	.3	3,726	11.2
Total	38,206.0	10,154.0	26.6	8,364.0	21.9	1,648	4.3	142	.4	3,825	10.0	338	.9	4,163	10.9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:															
Departmental	446.0	200.0	44.8	188.0	42.2	12.0	2.7	.....	.....	20	4.5	3.0	.7	23.0	5.2
Field	545.0	357.0	65.5	333.0	61.1	24.0	4.4	.....	.....	7	1.3	.....	.....	7.0	1.3
Total	991.0	557.0	56.2	521.0	52.6	36.0	3.6	.....	.....	27	2.7	3.0	.3	30.0	3.0
District of Columbia:															
Departmental	4,408.0	355.5	80.6	91.0	2.1	177.5	4.0	87	2.0	420	9.5	60.5	1.4	480.5	10.9
Field	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	4,408.0	355.5	80.6	91.0	2.1	177.5	4.0	87	2.0	420	9.5	60.5	1.5	480.5	10.9
Panama Canal:															
Departmental	93.0	25.0	26.9	24.0	25.8	1.0	1.1	.....	.....	.....	.....	5.0	5.4	5.0	5.4
Field	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	93.0	25.0	26.9	24.0	25.8	1.0	1.1	.....	.....	.....	.....	5.0	5.4	5.0	5.4

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that the complete committee report which accompanies the bill may be inserted as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

The report follows:

[H. Rept. No. 533, 77th Cong., 1st sess.]

The Committee on the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1073) to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 11, strike out first sentence of section 2 (f) and insert the following sentence in lieu thereof:

"Within the limit of available appropriations, and in recognition of especially meritorious services, the head of any department or agency is authorized to make additional within-grade compensation advancements, but any such additional advancements shall not exceed one step, and no employee shall be eligible for more than one additional advancement hereunder within each of the time periods specified in subsection (b)."

On page 4, between lines 19 and 20, insert a new section 5, as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) Title II of the act of November 26, 1940, entitled 'An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States' is hereby amended by deleting from section 3 (d) (viii) the words 'verifiers, openers, packers, guards, inspectors, station inspectors' so that the paragraph as amended will read as follows:

"'(viii) Offices or positions of clerks and laborers in the Customs Service of the Treasury Department, the compensation of which is fixed under an act of Congress approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 955), as amended.'

"(b) Upon the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall allocate to the services and grades of the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the other positions heretofore covered by said act of May 29, 1928, in the same manner as other positions in the field service of the Treasury Department are allocated under section 2 of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1003).

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to decrease the existing compensation of any employee, but when his position shall become vacant it shall be filled in accordance with the regular compensation schedule applicable to such position."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "5" and insert "6."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "6" and insert "7."

On page 4, line 25, strike out "7" and insert "8."

On page 4, line 25, after the words "effect on", insert "July 1, 1941."

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill is the result of a study made by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to a request of the House Committee on Appropriations expressed in House Report No. 98, dated February 24, 1939, on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bills, fiscal year 1940.

It is not a pay-raise bill, but is a plan to regulate the granting of increases in pay to Government employees on a uniform and definite basis, pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in the proposal.

It is believed that there is hardly a Member of Congress who has not at some time or other had complaints from Government employees that they have not received increases in pay for long periods of time; that when raises are given, favoritism and other factors have played a part. The purpose of this bill is to set up a uniform and fair plan for handling this problem. It aims to bring order out of chaos, and fairness so far as is humanly possible.

The Classification Act which defines and sets up the various grades and rates of pay for governmental employees was originally passed by the Congress in 1923. That law and amendments contemplated that employees who performed their duties efficiently could advance within their grades, and from grade to grade, when their records and qualifications justified it. However, no uniform system has ever been established for granting pay raises. Various departments and agencies of the Government have made representations to the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations for specific amounts for this purpose. The result has been, dependent upon the activity of the particular agency involved, that some departments and agencies have received much more liberal treatment than others. Furthermore after lump sums were granted in the various appropriation bills for salary increases, the discretion has been left entirely in the hands of the administrators of those departments and agencies as to how such funds would be distributed. The only check or system, if it could be called that, has been contained in the language of the various appropriation bills known as the "average clause," and the provisions contained in appropriation bills for the last year or so, requiring the Bureau of the Budget to determine what amounts should be available to the various departments and agencies for administrative within-grade promotions.

This problem has given the Appropriations Committee much difficulty. Your committee has conducted hearings on this bill, invited the chairman and subcommittee chairmen of the Appropriations Committee to appear, and had the assurance that, if we could work out a feasible plan in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, cooperation would be given in getting consideration by the House.

It is believed the statement by Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the committee is a fair and concise description of the bill and its purposes. For the information of the House his statement is printed at this point.

"In the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives requested the Bureau of the Budget to make a survey of the situation throughout the Federal Government service regarding administrative promotions in order that a uniform salary-advancement plan might be developed. The committee request is contained in the following excerpt from the report on the Treasury and Post Office Department's appropriation bill, fiscal year 1940 (76th Cong., 1st sess., Rept. No. 98, p. 7):

"'It appears that there has never been any well-defined policy in the matter of affording salary step-ups in the various departments and independent agencies of the Government within grades of the Classification Act. * * *

"'This lack of consistent approach to this most important problem has resulted in inequities and lack of the uniformity in pay contemplated by the Classification Act. It becomes self-evident to the committee, therefore, that the Bureau of the Budget should undertake a scientific appraisal of this entire question with a view of arriving at some means and method whereby uniformity of treatment in the matter of advances within grades, based on efficiency, may be attained.'

"After receiving the committee's request, the Bureau of the Budget made a survey of the facts regarding salary advancement in the departments and agencies of the Government at the close of the fiscal year 1939. This study confirmed the impression that there had been widespread differences in the opportunities for salary advancements and inconsistencies in the manner in which such increases had been handled among various departments and agencies.

"The more important conditions revealed by our survey and which stand in need of correction are the following:

"1. Employees of the Government holding positions subject to the compensation schedules of the Classification Act have been at a substantial disadvantage relatively in the matter of salary advancement by comparison with employees occupying positions in services covered by statutory promotion plans.

"2. Employees occupying field positions have been under relative disadvantage by comparison with employees occupying departmental positions in Washington.

"3. Substantial differences have been found in the opportunities for salary advancement as between employees in high- and low-salary brackets.

"4. Considerable numbers of efficient employees have remained on the pay roll for periods of 3 years or longer without any increase in salary.

"5. The present lack of controls on salary advancement leaves such wide administrative discretion that uniform standards for determining eligibility for advancement have not resulted.

"6. Employees in agencies financed from relatively small and limited salary appropriations have been at a disadvantage in comparison with employees in agencies financed from large lump-sum appropriations.

"7. In the absence of a uniform salary advancement plan and because of the different methods of appropriating funds, it has been difficult for Congress, for the Bureau of the Budget, and for the departments and agencies to be consistent in the provision for and use of funds for salary advancement.

"8. The 'average clause' contained in appropriation bills seemed necessary in the absence of other effective controls on salary advancement. Although this clause affects a relatively small group of employees at the present time, it presents an arbitrary barrier to salary advancement for the employees affected without regard to their efficiency, length of service, or value to an organization.

"The Appropriations Committee's request for this study stressed the need for uniformity in salary-advancement policies. Uniformity carries with it, however, an inevitable limiting of administrative discretion. Discretion in granting salary advancement is considered by many administrators as an essential prerequisite to the full utilization of the incentive value of promotions. Freedom of administrative discretion is the antithesis of formula; yet freedom of discretion may result in inequities in administration.

"The problem of formulating recommendations for making salary advancements, therefore, calls for a compromise between complete freedom of administrative action and the automatic operation of a rigid formula.

"In addition to uniformity, we have had in mind the following specific purposes and objectives in developing and recommending our salary advancement plan.

"1. To promote economy and efficiency in the Government service.

"2. To recognize superior work, to provide incentives for better performance, to improve employee morale, and to aid in attracting and keeping competent persons in the service.

"3. To remove present inequalities in the administration of salary advancement.

"4. With due regard to efficiency, length of service, and a reasonable period of time required for advancement from the minimum to the maximum salary level of each grade, to afford equal opportunity for all employees in positions subject to the compensation schedules of the Classification Act to attain the salary levels included in those schedules.

"5. To keep the average annual cost of the plan, after the initial period of adjustment,

approximately within the lapses and savings resulting from turn-over of personnel, filling of vacancies at lower salary rates, reduction of personnel through redistribution of work and improved efficiency.

"In order that this question might be approached from a personnel as well as from a fiscal and general management standpoint, we requested the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission and the Council of Personnel Administration. While these agencies and individuals were most helpful to the staff of the Bureau of the Budget in the development of the proposals contained in our report, the Bureau of the Budget assumes full responsibility for the findings and recommendations.

"In brief, the plan which we have recommended and which is now before this committee in H. R. 1073 provides that a salary advancement of one step within the grade shall be given each 18 months to employees in grades where the salary increments are $60 or $100, and in each 30 months to employees in grades where salary increments are $200 or $500 (proposed in the plan to be changed to $250) provided (1) that no other equivalent increase in compensation has been received from any cause during the time specified, (2) that an employee's efficiency, service, and conduct shall have been satisfactory. In order to receive any advancement, an employee must have an efficiency rating of "Good" or better than "Good," and in order to receive advancement above the midpoint of the grade, his efficiency rating must be "Very good" or "Excellent."

"In addition, the plan provides in section 2 (f) for administrative discretion to grant additional salary advancements in unusually meritorious cases. This provision makes it theoretically possible for an employee to be advanced twice as rapidly as under the framework of the general salary advancement plan. We regard such authority as indispensable to effective operation of a promotion plan. Salary advancement, if it is to serve its purpose as an incentive to better work and as a reward for past effectiveness, should not become an automatic right. Any system that does not provide a reasonable amount of administrative discretion in the granting of increases fails to achieve this purpose and becomes entirely automatic in operation.

"Under the proposal for regular periodic increases, it will be noted that employees in grades with minimum salaries less than $3,800 are eligible for advancement to the top of their grades during a period of 9 years. Eligible employees in the higher-salaried groups wait a period of 10 years before attaining the maximum salary for their grades.

"The spread from minimum to maximum salary level and the size of the salary increment steps bears a relatively constant ratio to the base salary for each grade. That is to say, a $60 increment with a maximum spread of $360 bears approximately the same relationship to a base salary of $1,440 as does a $200 increment with a spread of $800 to a base salary of $3,800. It seems entirely consistent with the objectives of the Classification Act that approximately the same period of time should be required for advancement from the minimum to the maximum salary rates in all grades. The proposed plan, requiring 9 and 10 years, respectively, for the full amount of salary advancement, approximates this objective. Since the number of steps in the higher salary grades is smaller than in the lower, it obviously becomes necessary to require a somewhat longer waiting period between increases in the higher brackets if we are to provide for advancement to the top of the grade in about the same period of time regardless of the salary level.

"Particular attention was given to the situation for the classification grades with base salaries of $6,500 and $8,000. At the present time these grades provide for only two salary advancement steps of $500. If the maximum salary for these grades were to be attained in a period of 10 years, it would call for a waiting period of 5 years between increases. This seems to be an unreasonably long period of time; it also results in a minimum of incentive value being attached to the salary advancement plan for these grades. In view of these facts, and in order that employees in these grades may be treated on a basis comparable to employees in grades with a $200 salary increment, section 4 of the bill provides for amending the Classification Act so that these grades will have four steps of $250 each.

"We have considered other possible requirements for the waiting period and have concluded that the arrangement for 18 and 30 months, respectively, is a satisfactory means of spreading salary advancements to the maximum of the grade over approximately the same time period in both low- and high-salaried groups. Also, the length of these waiting periods is such that the cost of the plan is not unreasonable.

"The cost of a salary-advancement plan is a matter of first importance in determining its feasibility. A salary-advancement plan should promote economy. It should in the long run pay for itself. Its operation should not represent an ever-increasing cost of Government services.

"In our report we made a detailed estimate of the cost of our recommended plan. This estimate was necessarily based upon the factual situation existing on June 30, 1939, the date to which our survey data related, and involved certain important assumptions. We assumed that the plan went into operation on July 1, 1939; that the number of employees covered by the plan remained unchanged at approximately 304,000; that the rate of turnover and line promotions existing at the start of the plan continued constantly throughout its operation; that the distribution of efficiency ratings among the adjective categories remained unchanged. All of these assumptions had the purpose of isolating the effect of the salary-advancement plan itself. It was fully realized that any material change in any one or more of these factors would have its corresponding bearing upon the operation and cost of the salary-advancement plan. Nevertheless, the cost figures in our report can be considered as a bench mark. Any increase in coverage would entail a proportionate increase in cost.

"Based upon these assumptions, our estimates indicated that in the first year of operation of the salary-advancement plan approximately 159,000 employees would become eligible for advancement. This number of advancements would represent a net increase of approximately seven and one-half million dollars in the annual pay roll. However, savings resulting from the staggered dates upon which increases are granted would reduce the cash requirement during the first year to five and one-third million dollars.

"The salary-advancement plan with a coverage of 304,000 employees would, after 10 years of operation, result in an increase in the annual pay roll of $29,000,000 above the amount of the pay roll at the beginning of the operation of the plan.

"It is highly significant that the increase in pay roll for each year, if averaged over a period of 10 years, represents less than $3,000,000 per year, or less than one-half of 1 percent of the annual pay roll of approximately $600,000,000 paid to the 304,000 employees covered by the plan.

"After the plan has been in operation for as many as 10 years, the lapses resulting from turn-over and line promotions will almost equal the annual cost of granting the increases to the eligible employees, and there will be little or no further additional cost. The plan will become self-supporting.

"Since the preparation of our report there has been an obvious increase in the number of Government employees, and hence in the coverage and cost of the plan.

"Data submitted in connection with the Budget estimates for 1942 indicate that on June 30, 1940, the number of employees which would have been covered by the plan would have been approximately 346,000, instead of 304,000 reported on the pay rolls in positions subject to the provision of the plan on June 30, 1939. Further increase in coverage is, of course, occurring during the present fiscal year and will continue into next year.

"The increase in coverage of the plan is due not alone to the increasing size of the Government but also to the transfer of positions to the compensation schedules of the Classification Act, as a result of reorganization plans and by anticipated extension of the Classification Act pursuant to the provisions of the Ramspeck Act.

"Expansion in the size of the Government structure creates an increased opportunity for promotion from grade to grade and improved general business conditions have tended to raise the rate of turn-over in Government positions. This increased rate of turn-over and promotion raises the proportion of the total cost of salary-advancement plan which can be borne from lapses and without the necessity for new money.

"However, in contrast to this factor, the restrictions on promotions which are in existence during the current fiscal year and which resulted from certain reorganization changes during the last fiscal year tend to accumulate a backlog of eligibility for salary advancement under the promotion plan. This factor would mean an increase in the cost during the first year of operation.

"It is obvious that these cost factors are complex and interrelated. An accurate estimate of the appropriation needs during the first several years of the operation of the plan would have to be made, as indicated in our report, upon a supplemental or deficiency appropriation basis.

"The present consideration of this problem by your committee is exceedingly timely. The emergency situation calls for the highest degree of employee morale in the Government services. Undoubtedly, the Government is currently losing a number of highly competent persons because of the absence of any salary advancement plan.

"During the current fiscal year, salary advancements are restricted by legislation and by a formula recommended last year by the Appropriations Committee. These restrictions and the formula were frankly recognized by the committee to be a temporary stop-gap until such time as a more adequate long-range plan could be adopted.

"Up to the present time, neither the Budget for the fiscal year 1942 nor the appropriation bills, which have passed the House of Representatives, carry any restrictions upon or any provisions for salary advancement in the next fiscal year. It is obviously of very great importance that a uniform approach to this problem in the next fiscal year be adopted by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has refrained from making any temporary recommendations on this subject for the next fiscal year in the hope that it would be possible for the Congress to adopt a long-range plan."

The committee amendment, putting in a new section 5 in the bill, deals with part of the employees of the United States Customs Service, whose rates of pay are fixed by a special act of Congress (Bacharach Act, 45 Stat. 955) and are not within the terms of the Classification Act. The effect of this amendment will be to put verifiers, openers, packers, guards, inspectors, and station inspectors of the Customs Service under the Classification Act, and thus extend the provisions of this bill to them if it should be enacted. This amendment has the approval

of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The other committee amendments are merely for clarification of the text and fix an effective date.

This bill does not apply to groups whose rates of pay are fixed by special enactments of Congress, such as post-office employees and others, except the group of customs employees above-mentioned.

For the information of the House, the report from the Civil Service Commission is printed below:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Committee on the Civil Service, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Referring to your letter of January 14, 1941, receipt of which was acknowledged on January 16, 1941, we desire to offer the following report on H. R. 1073, a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

H. R. 1073 is a bill recommended to the House Appropriations Committee in a report made by the Bureau of the Budget as a result of a request for a study of the salary-advancement problem contained in the report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1940. A complete discussion of the problem and of the provisions of the bill is contained in the House committee print of the Bureau of the Budget's report. Consequently it is not necessary for the Commission to comment upon these provisions in detail.

A salary-advancement plan from an administrative standpoint is a necessary complement to the existing provisions of the Classification Act. Good salary administration requires the establishment and maintenance of two procedures: (1) The position-classification process results in the analysis and evaluation of individual positions and their classification in such a way that there shall be equal pay scales for equal work. This process is covered by the provisions and the current administrative practice under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. (2) The second process essential to good salary administration involves the determination for each employee of the particular rate of pay within the pay scale for his classification that he is entitled to from time to time. It is this second process with which H. R. 1073 deals. Present conditions, with respect to salary advancements within the grade, are notoriously unsatisfactory. The problem of improving the situation is complicated by the fact that various agencies, administrative officials, and employees have different interests and desires.

The bill prepared by the Bureau of the Budget is, in the opinion of the Commission, a good product which meets well the conflicting interests and desires which are always involved in a problem of this kind. It will certainly tend toward uniformity and consistency in salary administration. We recommend, accordingly, that it receive the favorable consideration of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law are shown as follows (present law is printed in roman, matter to be omitted in brackets, and new matter in italics):

(Act of March 4, 1923)

"SEC. 7. (a) Increases in compensation shall be allowed upon the attainment and maintenance of the appropriate efficiency ratings, to the next higher rate within the salary range of the grade: *Provided, however,* That in no case shall the compensation of any employee be increased unless Congress has appropriated money from which the increase may lawfully be paid, nor shall the rate for any employee be increased beyond the maximum rate for the grade to which his position is allocated. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the promotion of an employee from one class to a vacant position in a higher class at any time in accordance with civil-service rules, and when so promoted the employee shall receive compensation according to the schedule established for the class to which he is promoted.

"(b) *All employees compensated on a per annum basis, and occupying permanent positions within the scope of the compensation schedules fixed by this act, who have not attained the maximum rate of compensation for the grade in which their positions are respectively allocated, shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher rate within the grade at the beginning of the next quarter, following the completion of: (1) Each 18 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are $60 or $100, or (2) each 30 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are $200 or $250, subject to the following conditions:*

"*(1) That no equivalent increase in compensation from any cause was received during such period, except increase made pursuant to subsection (f) of this section;*

"*(2) That an employee whose rate of compensation is below the middle rate of the grade shall not be advanced unless his current efficiency is good or better than good;*

"*(3) That an employee whose rate of compensation is at or above the middle rate of the grade shall not be advanced unless his current efficiency is better than good;*

"*(4) That the service and conduct of such employee are certified by the head of the department or agency or such official as he may designate as being otherwise satisfactory.*

"*(c) The term 'good' as used herein shall be defined in accordance with the systems of efficiency rating established pursuant to section 9 of this act.*

"*(d) For the purposes of this section, the fourth salary rate in grades 2 and 3 of the custodial service shall be considered the middle rate.*

"*(e) Employees eligible under subsection (b) for compensation advancement by reason of service immediately preceding the effective date of this amendment shall be advanced to th next higher rate of compensation within the grade to which their positions are respectively allocated at the beginning of the next quarter immediately following the effective date of this amendment.*

"*(f) Within the limit of available appropriations, and in recognition of especially meritorious services, the head of any department or agency is authorized to make additional within-grade compensation advancements, but any such additional advancements shall not exceed one step and no employee shall be eligible for more than one additional advancement hereunder within each of the time periods specified in subsection (b). All actions under this subsection and the reasons therefor shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall present an annual consolidated report to the Congress covering the numbers and types of actions taken under this subsection.*

"*(g) The President is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section.*"

(Act of May 28, 1928)

"SEC. 13. That the compensation schedules be as follows:

"PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE

"Grade 7 * * *

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be [$6,500, $7,000, and $7,500,] *$6,500 $6,750, $7,000, $7,250, and $7,500,* unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law.

"Grade 8 * * *

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be [$8,000, $8,500 and $9,000,] *$8,000, $8,250, $8,500, $8,750,* and *$9,000,* unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law.

"CLERICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FISCAL SERVICE

"Grade 14 * * *

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be [$6,500, $7,000, and $7,500,] *$6,500, $6,750, $7,000, $7,250,* and *$7,500,* unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law.

"Grade 15 * * *

"The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be [$8,000, $8,500 and $9,000,] *$8,000, $8,250, $8,500, $8,750,* and *$9,000,* unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law."

(Committee proposes to omit words enclosed in brackets.)

(Act of November 26, 1940)

"SEC. 3. * * *

"(d) Except as this Congress may otherwise provide by law, the power granted to the President by this section shall not apply to the following:

* * * * *

"(viii) Offices, or positions of [verifiers, openers, packers,] clerks [, guards, inspectors, station inspectors,] and laborers in the Customs Service of the Treasury Department the compensation of which is fixed under an act of Congress approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 955), as amended;

* * * * *

"*(b) Upon the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall allocate to the services and grades of the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the other positions heretofore covered by said act of May 29, 1928, in the same manner as other positions in the field service of the Treasury Department are allocated under section 2 of the act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1003).*

"*(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to decrease the existing compensation of any employee, but when his position shall become vacant it shall be filled in accordance with the regular compensation schedule applicable to such position.*"

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it has been very distressing to the members of the committee, and many of us have followed very closely the working of the civil service; that certain personnel who have done excellent work during the years of their incumbency in office have not been allowed any promotion nor any increase in pay for a period of 3 years, and even longer. Such a situation is heartbreaking to the employees, to say the least, and certainly a mockery of the merit system in civil service.

I trust that under this bill, Mr. Chairman, an employee will receive his promotion, even if there is no pay for it. This will be helpful to him if he seeks a position on the outside or if he seeks a position in another grade. Even if the Appropriations Committee appropriates no money, the employee will receive certain advantages.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentlewoman speaks of promotions. Now, promotion in private business generally goes with added

responsibility. This promotion the gentlewoman is talking about amounts to only an increased rate of pay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. It does not involve any increase in responsibility; it just adds more pay?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Sometimes it will be an increase in the same grade with added responsibility. As the gentleman knows, there are different promotions in the grade. It will help in a specified grade also. There is the lowest in the grade, and it goes on up to the top.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentlewoman think that if there is an increase in rate of pay there should be an increase in responsibility and the amount of work done?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that will go with it also, although not in all instances.

Mr. WHITE. That is not apparent in this bill at any place.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We all know there are differences within the grade.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that an employee must work 30 months, or have 30 months of service in the grades where the compensation increments are $200 or $250. In the professional, administrative, and scientific services there have been increases in pay of as high as $1,000 to an employee appointed under Executive order who had been in the Government employ only a short time—a manifest injustice to other people within that same grade. Under this bill the increases will be effective only after 30 months of service, and the increase will be $250 and so on up. In this bill the Congress takes back unto itself some of its powers to legislate and direct the departments rather than to pass a blanket authority for the President of the United States to act. In itself that is a healthy thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this is a subject to which I have been giving very serious thought for some time. I came down here 8 years ago, in the month of March. It was recognized at that time that the personnel and the pay of our Government should be more or less reorganized. The Government was in debt. One of the first things Congress did was to pass the Economy bill. They made a horizontal cut as a matter of economy of 15 percent of the Government salaries. They reduced the sick leave and the vacation-with-pay time. Of course, there was a great deal of talk about it.

I voted against the Economy bill for a very definite reason. I was perfectly willing to take a cut in my own salary, and I thought that these well-paid Government employees could easily stand a cut in view of the conditions that I knew to obtain in the farm and industrial sections of this country. But when they tied in the veterans' compensation, the compensation for the men who faced the bullets and made America safe in the World War, I did not go along, and I voted against the Economy bill at that time.

From my experience in agriculture, and in working for a living, and knowing something of the compensation received by the rank and file of the people of this country who furnish the food we eat, our shelter, and the clothes we wear, I feel that our Government employees are pretty well taken care of. Of course, the newspapers in this town, which cater to subscribers who are chiefly Government employees, championed the Government employees and talked about restoring sick leave and vacations with pay, and harped on increased pay.

You would have thought from the position taken by the papers and what went through the columns of the newspapers that we were dealing with a very inferior class of people here and that the civil service had failed to obtain the cream of the crop of people seeking Government employment through civil-service examinations, because they made it appear that if these people lost out on the Government pay roll they were helpless and would starve. That appeal was lost on me, because I knew something of the hardships of the people on farms and employed in industry.

When I see the conditions under which we live in Washington, this being a boom town, and realize the situation here, with the immense amount of people on the Government pay roll, and realize their influence, for they are well organized and their influence is brought to bear on the Members of Congress from all over the country, I wonder if some champion will not get up at some time and talk a little bit on the side of the people who are payin for all this, the taxpayers of the country. Here we have a bill that does not say anything about increasing the responsibility of the people who are going to get these benefits and increases in pay; it simply increases the pay.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield for a question, but my time is limited and I probably shall ask for more time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield a minute or two additional to the gentleman, if necessary.

The gentleman has just suggested that somebody ought to speak on behalf of the taxpayers with reference to the question of the payment of this money to the Government employees. I should be glad if the gentleman would now say a few words on behalf of the taxpayers. I should like to know what he has to say about them.

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, who probably has a big clientele of Federal employees that he has to cater to down in his district, that I am thinking about this $50,000,000,000 debt, and I am thinking about the $1,000,000,000 we have to raise to pay what the bankers glibly call a service charge on the national debt in the form of interest. I am thinking about another hidden charge we are paying in the form of interest on all the $17,000,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes that circulate under this banking system we have. I am thinking about that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thought perhaps the gentleman had something in mind with reference to the bill we have before us when he spoke of the question of the taxpayer. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. WHITE. If this bill does not provide for increasing the load on the taxpayers, I should like to know what it does.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe it does do that. What does the gentleman say about that?

Mr. WHITE. I say that these people who take their coats and hats at 4 o'clock every afternoon, and when a Congressman gets off to go down to transact a little business he finds the Department closed tight. These people take every holiday, and I never knew there were so many holidays on the calendar until I came here to Washington to try to transact a little Government business. They take every Saturday off, every week end. Sometimes when it is a little hot the Departments close up and send them all home, and when it is too cold, they cannot get out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. When I go down to work in the morning I know they are supposed to be at work at 9 o'clock, but I find the streets congested until about 9:30. We are told that if they do not get to work on time they will be penalized. I wonder what happens to that gang that is on the streets between 9 and 9:30 in the morning. How do they manage to get by the regulations?

What I am saying in all seriousness to the civil-service workers and their champion over here is that if they carry this thing too far and get too much and get too far out of balance with the income and conditions of the people that work on the farms and in the factories of this country they are going to find that a sentiment will sweep over this country that will undo all these fine advantages they have. When we have an occasion to take a visitor to the fancy restaurants about Washington, the so-called hot spots, and see a bunch of these people from the civil service that spend so lavishly come in, take a cocktail that costs 65 cents each and meals that cost $2, and then you realize how soft some of these civil-service jobs are.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The gentleman, I know, agrees that this bill improves the situation a good deal because it will prevent, as I said before, any department giving a $1,000 increase to a favored employee who only has worked for the Government a short time and who was appointed under Executive order. It gives the increases to those persons who have worked terribly hard

and have never had the opportunity to have an increase.

Mr. WHITE. Terribly hard? They all have a month's vacation with pay every year. I should like to see the farmer's wife that has that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They do not get too much, I will say to the gentleman. I wish the farmer's wife better conditions also.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say to the gentlewoman that on Saturdays many of the civil-service workers are not there at all, any of the persons in responsible positions, because if you try to transact any business the secretary glibly tells you that Mr. Jones is not in today.

I may also say to the lady from Massachusetts that there are plenty of people working around here who are man and wife and the man is getting about $7,500 a year and his wife is getting $3,000 a year, retirement pay, and all that. They are getting more than a Congressman and they do not have all the expenses that a Congressman has.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. What does the gentleman think about the 4 months' vacation that the members of the Supreme Court take and they get $20,000 a year?

Mr. WHITE. I think the members of the Supreme Court may do a lot of work during their vacation. They have to do a lot of research work and they are doing a splendid job. But I do not think many of these people down here in these departments are doing much of a job.

Let me tell you another thing, and that is that $1,440 a year is low in Washington for a stenographer, while $60 a month is mighty good pay for a stenographer in many of our Western States.

I want also to say to the people who are the beneficiaries of this policy that they had better go easy, because with the debt piling up and conditions becoming as critical as they are, they may find the whole apple cart upset.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to commend the gentleman for what he has said about the wives of farmers and the farmers themselves. It is a known fact that many of them certainly are living under circumstances and conditions far less advantageous than those who work for the Federal Government, and there are lots of farmers and lots of farmers' wives.

Mr. WHITE. When I am passing on this bill I think of the work piled up on the farmers' wives and on the farmers themselves in the State of Idaho and Montana and all the Western States that I am familiar with, and that is also true of the Eastern States, if you please, where they are working all hours and having great responsibilities, including the care of their children, and then I think of the meager compensation they get, which shows that Government pay in the Government departments is so far out of line with the income of the people on the farm for the services performed that I think it is about time to call a halt, and we had better go easy on this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Idaho, [Mr. WHITE], that the Budget reports that after 10 years this will be self-supporting and may cost, as a matter of fact, the taxpayers less than the present system.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. I regret that so few Members of the House are on the floor this afternoon, and that only a small number appear to be interested in what I consider an important item of legislation. It is quite important to the people of the country, and still more so to those who will be affected by its terms.

Do you know we now have 1,260,000 employees in the executive department of our Government—the largest number ever employed by our Government? The number increased by reason of defense activities, but it was on the increase even before the present emergency. I think it is likely that 75 percent of this million will in all likelihood be affected by the terms of this bill. I realize that there are some that do not come under its terms. I do not know what amount it is going to add to the cost. Based on a figure of a little more than 300,000 employees, the added cost was estimated at $29,000,000 over a period of 10 years. If the number of employees is increased to, say, 600,000, then the added cost would be approximately $60,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to direct your attention to this afternoon is that we are dealing with a good-sized problem. The pay roll for these million and a quarter employees runs now at the rate of a little over $2,000,000,000 a year.

I have no objection to increases in pay to those who deserve it because of faithful and satisfactory service. As a matter of fact, I think any employee should be rewarded for faithful and efficient service. I do think, however, that the entire problem should be studied with a view of determining as near as possible the amount of salaries that should be paid to those who are rendering service in the various departments of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, the particular reason given by the sponsors of this legislation is that persons employed by your Government and mine, and who now have charge of distributing extra pay to those who should be entitled to it, are abusing that authority. It seems to me that such a thing is an extremely unfortunate situation. It is charged that in many instances, certain heads of departments or divisions, adjust the extra payments because of their likes or dislikes for certain employees. Let me say again, Mr. Chairman, that while we are giving attention to the matter of salaries, this committee, or some committee should examine the problem of salaries to Government workers. We have had, rather recently, witnesses appear before our committee who feel that the lower-salaried employees are very much underpaid for the services they render, and who feel they are not getting a fair deal. If that is correct, we ought to know it and make adjustments accordingly. Likewise, if there are those who are overcompensated, their wages should also be adjusted. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman of the committee is entitled to a great deal of credit for the manner in which he has handled this legislation. He tells you very frankly, however, that this legislation was prepared by the Bureau of the Budget.

While we are on that question, I believe it is fair that I call your attention to a statement made by Mr. Stengle, a former distinguished Member of this House, and now representing, I believe, the American Federation of Government Employees. Here is what he said in part, when he testified before our committee:

> Those of us who have been here and trying to improve this condition recognize that the report of the Bureau of the Budget as a veritable Magna Carta that will bring new life into the Government service and properly inspire those who are very much discouraged. From the standpoint of the Government this H. R. 1073 will mean a great improvement; from the standpoint of the employees it will mean a very great improvement; from the standpoint of the taxpayers it will mean a very great improvement, because the taxpayers will get more service for their dollars than they can possibly get under conditions through which we have passed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer briefly to a statement made by the distinguished chairman of our committee, when he suggested that if the Congress does not want to allow the increases provided by this bill, it may refuse to do so. I just don't think too much of that suggestion. I think if we promise these increases in salaries, we ought to go ahead and carry out that promise, which after all, becomes more or less of an obligation. Of course, we are all in favor of stimulating loyalty and aggressiveness among our employees.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose this legislation. It provides a number of important and valuable features. It seeks to, partially at least, cure an abuse of discretion. It attempts, to some extent, to give a little more credit for efficiency and faithful service. But it involves a situation that, in my judgment, could be improved if we would do it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think it is humanly possible for the members of the Committee on Appropriations to go in and check on all of these departments and have the knowledge of the expenditures of the department and the salaries and all the things that they should know in passing on an appropriation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; I believe, in view of the volume of legislation that comes before that committee, they do a reasonably good job.

Mr. WHITE. And do we not have to rely almost entirely on the recommendations of these several department heads and the information they bring in from the executive branch?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; it seems the heads of these departments are the

only source of information, except such investigation as may be made by the members themselves.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that these bills come in with 100 to 150 pages from one department to another and that the Members of Congress in the course of a session have to handle at least seven or eight of these bills, and can the gentleman himself know very much about what is in most of those bills?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are probably talking about a different problem, but I realize that we have to depend upon the heads of departments to give the information provided in these bills, and, of course, it is rarely that anybody else testifies on behalf of the bills except those who are most interested in the appropriations. It is up to the members of the committee to determine as best they can whether such authorizations and appropriations should be permitted.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that some of the departments are neglected and are working short-handed, and in an inefficient way, due to the fact that others are receiving lavish appropriations and that the whole thing is not properly adjusted?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not on the Appropriations Committee, but I am sure there is a great deal to be said in favor of the gentleman's contention.

Mr. WHITE. But the gentleman has been in the departments, and he has seen some of them working with obsolete, inefficient material, short of things that money would buy and others are working with more than they need or know what to do with.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the gentleman is more familiar with that situation than I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, a valuable member of the committee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. And has not the gentleman furthermore heard much about a reduction of nondefense expenditures? Does the gentleman think that this bill is a step in that direction or in the other direction?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is not a step in the direction of cutting down nondefense expenditures. It may be unrelated, but this Congress has done very little so far in the direction of cutting nondefense expenditures, although a lot has been said about it. I appreciate the gentleman's position. I want to make this observation, that as a member of the committee I appreciate the assistance of the gentleman on the committee. He has taken quite an active part in the consideration of this measure. I regard him as one of the most careful and painstaking members of that committee.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be very glad to yield to my good friend, the distinguished Member from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does the gentleman consider this comparable to the cut in the W. P. A. appropriation bill the other day and somewhat comparable to the $21 a month that the boys are now getting in the Army?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, I would not want to enter into that comparison at all. I assume that we would have to look at those questions on a little different basis. I do, however, appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to one or two things mentioned by my distinguished friend from Kansas, whose service on the committee I greatly appreciate. He has referred to the number of employees covered by this bill as being more than a million. I wish to point out that, except for those in the departmental service here, the largest group in the Government service—the postal employees—are covered by a different pay schedule and will not be covered by this bill at all. That takes out over 300,000. Then the navy-yard workers have a pay system which is different from the Classification Act, and they go out. There are various other groups. So that I think the gentleman was proceeding on a mistaken assumption when he said it would eventually cover a million and a quarter employees. I do not think it would cover half that amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman will admit, though, that at the rate we are going, it will cover a great many more than the number given by the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Commission, will it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman. Of course, the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, pointed out that since this study there have been some additions to the force, and therefore the figures would have to be increased by whatever percentage of those employees came under the Classification Act. But those who have been added to the navy yards and to the Post Office Department and places like that do not affect this situation. I wanted to point that out because I know the gentleman from Kansas would want the record to be clear on that.

As to the question of the cost of the bill, I have given the House all the information I have on the subject. I have quoted the figures from the Director of the Budget. Certainly I cannot think of any higher authority in the Government than the Director of the Budget as to what it would cost. Of course, that is the maximum that it could be—$29,000,000 for 304,000 employees. What that will actually mean in dollars and cents will depend upon the Appropriations Committee and what action they take under it. We are not removing; we are not in any way affecting the section of the Classification Act which provides that no person shall receive any increased pay until Congress has appropriated the money for it. That is still in the law, and will be after this bill is passed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, if they do not appropriate the money, this measure will not be effective.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Exactly. The gentleman will remember I stated that to our committee when we opened the hearings—that if we did not pass a bill that the Appropriations Committee approved of and would operate under, it would not amount to a thing in the world.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know of any case where the Appropriations Committee ever failed to appropriate money for salaries in the different departments?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I have heard of them doing that.

Mr. WHITE. As a general proposition?

Mr. RAMSPECK. They knocked out the appropriation for one whole agency. Of course, it was restored in the Senate, but they often cut them down or raise them. I am not trying to be facetious with the gentleman from Idaho, but the point I make is that this does not involve general salary increases. In 1939 we appropriated $7,000,000 for this purpose and it was not distributed according to any regular plan.

The Appropriations Subcommittee think we need a regular plant to control it so that all the discretion will not be vested in the heads of the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. WHITE. The pay item of these different departments and bureaus is just a lump sum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. WHITE. And is allocated around by the department itself, is it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That has been true previously and is the reason the Appropriations Committee initiated this step.

Mr. WHITE. It is certainly not the gentleman's contention that the various provisions of the bill will not effectuate a raise in salary. The gentleman does not contend that, does he?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It will effect an increase in the total pay roll; yes.

Mr. WHITE. The bill will increase annual salaries, will it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; but they would be increased without this bill. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. WHITE. And these payments will go to increase salaries without any increase in responsibility.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is not exactly correct.

Mr. WHITE. It may not be exactly true, but it can be worked out that way.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In some cases it is true. I just pointed out to the gentleman that last year, 1939, we appropriated and

spent $7,000,000 for this same purpose but we did not regulate the way it was distributed, that was regulated by the executive branch of the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This bill takes back some of our own powers which we have given away.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I make another point?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This in a measure does justice to the older civil-service employees. For the last few years I have felt that the merit system was taking a vacation. Those on the regular civil-service list who have worked for years have had no real opportunity for a raise in pay. Certainly with this 18 months' provision in the lower brackets and 30 months in the higher brackets this bill gives an advantage to the regular long-time civil-service employee, many of whom who have not had a promotion or raise in pay for 8 years or more. It is a step in the right direction in my opinion.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It will benefit the lower paid employee. It is a matter initiated by the Appropriations Committee so the Congress may have a say in how the increases are distributed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Those appointed by statutory measure have gone ahead of the regular civil-service employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Last year, as I recall, the Budget recommended over $3,000,000 for administrative promotions.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Appropriations Committee cut it out. I voted against cutting it out, as I thought it should have been left in. An investigation was requested so we could get general legislation, a bill such as we have here today to do justice to the civil-service employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct, and that is the reason this bill is here.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas referred to a statement made before the committee by a number of witnesses including a former Member of Congress. Let me point out that the reason for that statement, as I remember quite well, was that another representative, a representative of a union of employees, was advocating mandatory automatic annual salary increases, which would have cost an immense sum of money; and he was making the point, as I recall it, that he preferred to take this bill, which was an intelligent effort on the part of the Budget Bureau to meet a practical situation rather than to be grasping at a straw in the form of mandatory automatic salary increases on an annual basis which he knew Congress would not pass.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was complimenting the gentleman for his views on this particular measure.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, because I think he was taking the right position.

Mr. REES of Kansas. One further observation, if the gentleman will permit. We have before us a bill to increase the salaries of individuals. It is generally understood there are no decreases in the bill, is it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I believe that is absolutely true. There are no decreases in the bill. I want to make just one further observation on that, Mr. Chairman, and that is the gentleman from Kansas said something about desiring further study of this bill. We can study it until the cows come home and yet not know any more than is known by the Bureau of the Budget after their study of 2 years, the results of which are contained in the report of the committee. It is a very interesting study. I wish the membership of the House had time to read it. It has some very interesting things in it. For instance it shows that in some instances during the fiscal year 1939, 5 or 6 percent of the employees in certain establishments got increases of salary whereas in other agencies as high as 75 percent of the employees got salary increases. It shows a discrimination in favor of employees here in Washington against employees back in our home districts in most cases.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would be very glad if the gentleman would take the time to extend his remarks and set out a number of the facts contained in the report. The Members might read the RECORD whereas they will not read the report.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has asked permission, I understand, to have the report printed in the RECORD and also the statement of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is it not fair to say that this bill is designed to do substantial justice to the medium-salaried employees as against the higher-salaried ones?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think that construction might be put on it. I think it will be just to all of them because when higher-paid employees get a step-up they get a larger amount. Under this bill they get it less frequently. I think, therefore, the bill does justice to all. It certainly will insure that the low-paid employees will get a fair break and I think on the whole fairer treatment.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It is a leveling-out process.

Mr. WHITE. On page 4, line 21, there is "Grade 15: $8,000, $8,250, $8,500, $8,750, $9,000. Professional and scientific service: Grade 7: $6,500, $6,750, $7,000, $7,250, $7,500," and so forth.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am familiar with that. What does the gentleman want to know?

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman call those lower-class salaries?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No. I call those all higher class. That is the present law. The only purpose in having that in there is that formerly the steps in those grades were $500 and we have reduced it to $250.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the said act is hereby amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the figure "7" at the beginning of said section, and by adding the following paragraphs as subsections thereof:

"(b) All employees compensated on a per-annum basis, and occupying permanent positions within the scope of the compensation schedules fixed by this act, who have not attained the maximum rate of compensation for the grade in which their positions are respectively allocated, shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher rate within the grade at the beginning of the next quarter, following the completion of: (1) Each 18 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are $60 or $100, or (2) each 30 months of service if such employees are in grades in which the compensation increments are $200 or $250, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) That no equivalent increase in compensation from any cause was received during such period, except increase made pursuant to subsection (f) of this section:

"(2) That an employee whose rate of compensation is below the middle rate of the grade shall not be advanced unless his current efficiency is good or better than good;

"(3) That an employee whose rate of compensation is at or above the middle rate of the grade shall not be advanced unless his current efficiency is better than good;

"(4) That the service and conduct of such employee are certified by the head of the department or agency or such official as he may designate as being otherwise satisfactory.

"(c) The term "good" as used herein shall be defined in accordance with the systems of efficiency rating established pursuant to section 9 of this act.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the fourth salary rate in grades 2 and 3 of the custodial service shall be considered the middle rate.

"(e) Employees eligible under subsection (b) for compensation advancement by reason of service immediately preceding the effective date of this amendment shall be advanced to the next higher rate of compensation within the grade to which their positions are respectively allocated at the beginning of the next quarter immediately following the effective date of this amendment.

"(f) Within the limits of available appropriations and in recognition of especially meritorious services, the heads of departments are authorized to make additional within-grade compensation advancements of not to exceed one step within the grade in any one case and within each of the time periods specified in subsection (b). All actions under this subsection and the reasons therefor shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall present an annual consolidated report to the Congress covering the numbers and types of actions taken under this subsection.

"(g) The President is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 11, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and insert the following: "Within the limit of available appropriations, and in recognition of especially meritorious services, the head of any department or agency is authorized to make additional within-grade compensation advancements, but any such additional advancements shall not exceed one step and no employee shall be eligible for more than one additional advancement hereunder within each of the time periods specified in subsection (b)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the said act is hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"The Civil Service Commission and heads of departments are authorized and directed to take such action as will apply the provisions of this section uniformly to all employees occupying positions within the compensation schedules fixed by this act as nearly as is practicable."

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the said act is hereby further amended so as to provide the following annual rates of compensation and salary steps within grades 14 and 15 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service and grades 7 and 8 of the professional and scientific service:

"Clerical, administrative and fiscal service:

"Grade 14: $6,500, $6,750, $7,000, $7,250, $7,500.

"Grade 15: $8,000, $8,250, $8,500, $8,750, $9,000.

"Professional and scientific service:

"Grade 7: $6,500, $6,750, $7,000, $7,250, $7,500.

"Grade 8: $8,000, $8,250, $8,500, $8,750, $9,000."

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

SEC. 6. Insofar as they are inconsistent or in conflict with prior laws, the provisions of this act shall control.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect on .

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) Title II of the act of November 26, 1940, entitled 'An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States,' is hereby amended by deleting from section 3 (d) (viii) the words 'verifiers, openers, packers, guards, inspectors, station inspectors', so that the paragraph as amended will read as follows:

"'(viii) Officers or positions of clerks and laborers in the Customs Service of the Treasury Department, the compensation of which is fixed under an act of Congress approved May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 955), as amended.'

"(b) Upon the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall allocate to the services and grades of the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the other positions heretofore covered by said act of May 29, 1928, in the same manner as other positions in the field service of the Treasury Department are allocated under section 2 of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1003).

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to decrease the existing compensation of any employee, but when his position shall become vacant it shall be filled in accordance with the regular compensation schedule applicable to such position."

Page 6, line 1, strike out "5" and insert "6."

Page 6, line 4, strike out "6" and insert "7."

Page 6, line 6, strike out "7" and insert "8."

Page 6, at the end of line 6, insert "July 1, 1941."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KLEBERG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1073, to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 236, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Flag Day address made by Sefton Darr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal I am making this evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill H. R. 1073 just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

THE NEW ENGLAND OIL SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1941, the President announced the appointment of the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, as Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense. Mr. Ickes had already issued a statement warning of a shortage of oil and gasoline during the coming winter. He stated that this shortage would be particularly felt in the North Atlantic region, and he threw out a suggestion about the possibilities of "gasless Sundays" for that region. Since then there has been an attempt to mitigate the effect of this statement.

The fact remains that if such a shortage does develop, it will be due in no small degree not merely to negligence on the part of the administration but also to certain definite policies and acts. If the statement was intended merely as an advance warning, it has already done grave injustice, which cannot be remedied, to an important New England industry.

Let me deal with this second point first, and more particularly as it concerns my own State of New Hampshire. The business of serving the many thousands of vacationists who annually visit us has increased rapidly, and now ranks as one of the most important parts of the State's economic structure. The United States census does not separate recreational activities from other forms of business, so that no exact figures are available. The State planning and development commission, however, estimates the annual value of the tourist dollar in the State of $75,000,000. The major portion of this is derived from the summer tourist season, and would be heavily curtailed were weekend traffic to be eliminated during that period. The State highway department estimates that gasolineless Sundays during the 4-month period July–October would result in a 13 percent loss in total annual traffic. This would not only mean a heavy loss in the road toll, on which the highway department is chiefly dependent, but it is believed that the total loss in all forms of recreational income might easily reach $20,000,000. And what is true of New Hampshire is in general true of her neighboring States, though not all of them are so dependent on this particular type of revenue as we.

More than any other industry, the recreational touches all classes in the community. Much of the guest accommodation is in private homes, while the food supplied by our farmers, the business done by storekeepers, movie houses, and so on spreads the expenditures of our guests among a very considerable proportion of our people.

As our many small manufacturing plants of 50 years ago have been driven out of business by larger concerns in other parts of the country, this recreational business has in some degree proved

a welcome substitute and has enabled many of our thrifty and industrious citizens to keep their heads above water and their names off the relief rolls.

All this is dependent on publicity, and, as anyone who has had any experience in that line knows, the public reaction to publicity is a very sensitive thing. At this season of the year, when in many a family all over the country plans for the summer holiday are being made, the announcement on high Government authority that "gasless Sundays" in New England are within the range of possibility will have an inhibitory effect which no subsequent explanations can efface. A family in Washington that might have turned its car toward New Hampshire is apt to say, "Where there's smoke there must be fire; we might get caught up there; better go somewhere else this year." And so a part of New Hampshire's quota of tourists will be added to some other region that already has its share, and a substantial number of citizens from other sections will be deprived of their opportunity of enjoying New Hampshire's glorious scenery and profiting by her bracing air.

At this point in my remarks I should like to quote from resolutions recently adopted at a meeting of the Northeastern Cabin Owners' Association, Inc., held at the Flume Reservation, Franconia Notch, N. H.:

> There is some talk of gasolineless Sundays and perhaps other drastic regulations on gasoline and oil. This naturally greatly disturbs thousands of people who rely wholly on the summer travel for their livelihood.
>
> While we believe that we in New England in the resort business are as loyal Americans as can be found in any industry in the country, and are anxious to cooperate with our Government in anything that will promote our defense program, we feel that such Sundays and regulations would be such a hardship that they would not only injure our business and put many people out of work but would also cause a great loss to the Government in revenue received from admission tickets and many other taxes from the tourist dollar.

So much for injury already caused to the tourist industry of New England by this unneeded and indiscreet piece of publicity from the Petroleum Coordinator. Let us look now at the conditions which caused it, and the reasons for their existence.

There is no shortage of oil. Production at the present time is well below capacity, and can be stepped up, so oil men state, to meet any need which can now be foreseen. As a matter of fact, 2,000,000 barrels are now held up at Gulf ports for lack of transportation. The hold-up comes in the matter of distribution; and this is why the northeastern section of the country is most seriously threatened.

Practically all the oil for the Atlantic seaboard is carried by tankers. In accumulating a pool of 2,000,000 tons of shipping to aid Britain, as directed by the President, the Maritime Commission has hit this tanker fleet hard. It is understood that about 50 tankers have been requisitioned for this purpose; and that all of these have been taken from the fleet of 250 which regularly serves the northern coast. A number of others have been taken over by the Navy. We in New England are in hearty sympathy not only with the national-defense program but with maximum aid to Britain, but we believe that we are being treated unfairly when we are made to bear the whole burden caused by the release of tankers for this purpose.

That the sections of the country that lie nearest to the oil fields and are served by existing pipe lines should be better off is natural, but how are we to account for the fact that our neighbors across the northern border in Canada have no shortage? Their supply comes from our wells, and yet it is officially stated that they not only are not short now but anticipate no shortage, and they are actually advertising in newspapers of the United States that tourists have no reason to fear any restrictions.

Another thing that does not set well is the continued shipment of oil to Japan. So long as our supplies are more than adequate for our own use, the question of whether it is sound policy to appease the Japanese by giving them such quantities from the United States and the Netherland Indies as they need for domestic consumption may perhaps be left to the State Department. Unfortunately, such shipments call for more tankers. We are told that no American tankers are serving Japan, but some have been transferred to Panamanian registry, and it seems to be impossible to learn to what extent these are being employed in the trans-Pacific service. When these shipments run to over 1,000,000 barrels a month, as the Department of Commerce states that they did in the first quarter of the current year, it would seem that the tanker fleet serving American ports must have been affected, directly or indirectly.

We are assured that plans are under way for pipe lines to the Northeastern States. A bill removing obstacles to the construction of such pipe lines has passed the House, but present reports are that it is being held up in the Senate. And when it is finally passed, and priority on materials is granted, at least 6 months will still be required before the lines can possibly be in operation—other estimates run as high as 2 years. Pipe lines "on order" are no more serviceable than munitions on order.

Railroad tank cars have brought only a small percentage of New England's oil. It is stated, however, that 20,000 such cars are standing idle at the present time; and their temporary assignment to this haul might well break the back of the shortage, at least until more permanent remedies have been provided.

The tankers are owned by the oil companies, and in normal times there is a great deal of duplication in their service, tankers of the various great companies calling at the same ports along the Atlantic seaboard. Before removing one-fifth of the Atlantic coast fleet, some plan should have been worked out for the reallocation of the remaining ships, even if this involved Government control. Rationing of tankers should come before rationing of gasoline.

My inquiries lead me to believe that the alarm may have been exaggerated and that ways can be found of meeting the situation before the shortage becomes acute. I want to emphasize, however, the obligation of the Government to provide without delay the necessary coordination of effort to achieve this. And in the meantime I want to protest, with all the power at my command, against this further instance of the tendency of the present administration to talk first and act later, if at all. I say again, as I said at the beginning, that whatever the outcome irreparable harm has already been done; and the more effective the steps that are taken to meet the crisis the less was the need of the scare-head announcements coming at the very opening of the New England tourist season.

This is just one more example of the ever-present possibility of conflict between Government departments — one agency pursuing an objective good in itself without studying its effect on other aspects of our national life. It emphasizes again the fact that our national-defense effort cannot reach its fullest efficiency until it is coordinated under one executive head. We in New Hampshire are prepared to join with the rest of the country in any necessary steps to conserve our oil resources; we shall rejoice if it proves to be possible to release yet more tankers for Britain. But we do object to the Government's taking the easiest way of sectional discrimination, instead of using the vast powers at its command to make plans in advance for an equitable distribution of the burden.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from an investigation dealing with the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that throughout this country—in almost every large city—there seem to be growing up a lot of mushroom newspapers, published by incompetent and unreliable persons, to spread the gospel of communism and fascism, and to teach these poor folks at home who believe in them that their philosophy of government is far better than the philosophy of the American form of government.

I think that, in spite of the fact that I believe in free speech and free press, some statements which appear in these mushroom newspapers, backed by the Fascist and Communist groups should not be allowed to be published as they constitute a danger to our country in these

critical times. They are upsetting our defense program by creating discord among our American people.

They are very careless in libeling American citizens. They even go as far as to libel Members of Congress.

I call particular attention to one of these mushroom papers calling itself La Parola. The editor took the trouble to send a copy of the issue of May 24 to every Member of Congress. I believe he also sent it to every Member of the Senate. The gentleman who owns that paper is a Mr. Valenti. He claims he is an anti-Fascist, although I believe he is hiding behind the cloak of anti-Fascism for personal reasons. During the investigation carried on by the McCormack-Dickstein committee, I remember issuing a subpena to the gentleman, and I remember the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] examining him. This man in his press release of May 24 makes the charge that I did not give him a chance to appear before the committee to present certain evidence he wanted to submit. As a matter of fact, he had the privilege to be heard by the chairman of the committee.

He also makes the charge, Mr. Speaker, that there is a Pope-Dickstein link in Fascist activities. The accusations are false and the article is malicious. I did not want to lose my dignity by raising a question of personal privilege to answer this insignificant group.

I want the country to know that there will be an accounting sometime as to these irresponsible, one-sheet papers, issued in the large cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and others; that they cannot continue to slander and malign people, knowing that they have no facts to back up their accusations. Most of these small papers are published by racketeering groups for the collection of money.

I charge that this Valenti, who is in charge of this one-horse paper, is more interested in his personal gains than in the fight against Fascism. If you will be kind enough to read more of the material which I shall incorporate in the RECORD, you will realize what kind of people he deals with.

You may recall that sometime ago it was necessary for me to take the floor of this House to call attention to the fact that attacks had been made upon an outstanding American citizen, charging him with being a Fascist.

Generoso Pope, who is one of the leading citizens of the city of New York and this country, became the object of scurrilous attacks made by one Giralomo Valenti. It was then necessary to nail on the head the many lies which were uttered against Mr. Pope. I believe I was able to convince this House that these statements were born of malice, and did not have a scintilla of truth behind them, and were particularly put forth with the idea of injuring an innocent man by one who was animated by personal venom.

Since the publication of my speech, the same elements which criticized Mr. Pope previously, saw fit to produce more slander, and the Members of this House were bombarded with press releases, letters, telegrams, and personal messages accusing Mr. Pope of fascistic activities and criticizing me for having taken up the cudgels in his behalf. I do not care to go into a more detailed discussion of the many malicious charges made, but I would like to say a word about the originator of these charges, Mr. Giralomo Valenti, and particularly the character of his associates. Only as recently as April 30, the night before the May Day celebration in New York City, a dinner was held in the city of New York, which was organized by and for Valenti, and where another person named Carlo Tresca, who is a close associate of Valenti and an avowed provocateur, were the principal speakers. To give you an idea who Mr. Tresca is, I have culled a little report from some official files, and will now insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with your permission:

EXHIBIT A

Carlo Tresca. New York Police Record.

Age about 65 years.

Arrested 1917 defrauding through mails. discharged.

Later part of 1917. Arrested in Virginia Minn. Disorderly conduct. Fined.

1923. Defrauding through mails. One year. U. S. Pen.

5-13-27 Arrested Bronx, N. Y. Gun Charge. Dismissed.

6-28-33 Philadelphia, Pa. Arr. Disorderly conduct and suspicious character. Dismissed on writ.

12-16-18 H. T. B.

511 E. 134 NYC.

Anarchist. I. W. W.

10110—308 p. Michelson. Sept. 18-17.

Arrested as anarchist at meeting held by Circolo Filarmonica Italiana. 10110—76 Department of Justice. Aug. 4th-17. arrested with others. I. W. W. at 308 Biddle Street, Chicago, Ill. Was sweetheart of Mary Flynn who published four seditious Italian Newspapers in New York City. 1917.

Tresca, Carlo.

Arrested in New York City, Dept. Justice early 1917, and November 1917. Fwd. rept. re: I. W. W. As Leader who was trying to cripple U. S. Government by causing strikes in munition plants in the U. S. 10312—49 10— N. Y. C. Nov. 29 17.

4-26-18.

226 Lafayette Street. N. Y. C. Subscriber and contributor to Emma Goldman's publication, Mother Earth. N. Y. C. M. I. D.

I also received from my investigators a confidential report of this meeting held on April 30, 1941, which I believe will be of interest to the House, and I therefore ask permission to print this report in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT B

Subject: Banquet and May Day celebration.
Place: 820 Broadway, New York City.
Date: April 30, 1941.
Time: 8:30 p. m.

Attended the "banquet" and May Day celebration of the Centro Recreativo Istrio Triestino, Inc., at 820 Broadway, New York City. Time 8:30 p. m.

This affair was in reality a benefit for Girolomo Valenti, editor of La Parola (The Word) Valenti acted as master of ceremony and introduced each of the speakers, giving each one quite a build-up. The attendance was about 125. The meal served was worth about 35 cents, the admission was $1.50. A collection was taken up for Valenti by two girls passing the hat to all present. Valenti later stated to me that he had collected about $200 clear above all expenses.

A large percentage of this group were former Austrians, who were anti-Fascist, but also were all Socialists and Communists. One battle almost came into existence when one speaker, a nonworker, who was put off the air on WNEW some time ago (I will get his name later) and a delegate of a local of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union got into an argument when they called each other a thief. Someone in the crowd said that they were both right, but the whole affair was shouted down.

Valenti took every opportunity to extol his wonderful work with his paper La Parola. He made a speech between the introduction of each worker. He particularly pointed out, with many shouts and gestures, that Mr. Gene Pope and Congressman DICKSTEIN were afraid of him and that La Parola was going to make them cry for mercy before long. He stated that in La Parola he had a weapon to make anyone come to his terms, if his people, the audience, would support him. He was always followed up by some stooge who would say that now more than ever La Parola needed their moral and financial support and laying stress on "support." He particularly pointed out to them that he was their voice (La Parola). The highlights of the speeches made by Valenti was that they, the workers, had been waiting for over 20 years for the workers' revenge and now, May Day of 1941, they were being rewarded and with a slurring laugh by Mr. Roosevelt, who was taking the fight up for them. Heretofore, the police and other enforcement agencies had hounded them, driving them from street corners and parks, and prohibiting them from speaking. Even in Washington they had been driven away and persecuted, but the hero of the day was Lord Beven, the English Labor Minister. Valenti stated, in concluding his big speech, that Europe had now adopted Mussolini and Hitler as their new god, but the workers of the world had made a new Christ out of Lord Beven. He particularly pointed out that Gene Pope and Congressman DICKSTEIN, who was a Jew, had gone over to the side of capitalism and that they were making every effort with their newspapers and their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to break down where he, Valenti and La Parola, had built up.

Valenti introduced the following guest speakers. In each instance he called them comrades and fellow workers of many years' standing, the first speaker being Carlo Tresca, whom Valenti gave a great build-up and who spoke against every form of government. This man is a well-known anarchist, having been arrested in the past, as records will show, for anarchism and subversive activities. (Attached hereto are criminal records of Carlo Tresca.) He said that Valenti was an amateur and should stop using soft words against Gene Pope and DICKSTEIN and that now the time had come to use cannons, for which he was loudly cheered.

Another speaker of importance was Professor Bertelli, who also spoke against Pope and who said that he had aligned himself with a Jew who was a traitor to his own race. Another speaker, a Dr. Syracuse, spoke against Pope and fascism and still another a poet by the name of Giovanitti, and also spoke against Pope, DICKSTEIN, and fascism. None of the speakers at any time during the evening spoke either for or against communism. The only reference to communism was made by a delegate of the Garment Union, but he was immediately hushed. All the other speakers were delegates or officers of labor unions and spoke the usual May Day hokum, labor against capitalism.

These gentlemen have a sort of connecting link by a bureau known as the Capitol Bureau—La Parola—operating from 1449 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., from which bureau one Ignatius Geraci, calling himself the secretary, is the principal figure. Mr. Geraci took it

upon himself to send through the mail a statement criticizing me for my defense of Mr. Pope and offering to prove by photographic evidence that Mr. Pope had always been a Fascist.

In Valenti's sheet, La Parola, on May 24, 1941, he sees fit to reproduce a check for $100,000 drawn to the order of one Augusto Rosso, which Valenti says was used to finance Mussolini's war of aggression. I call attention to the fact that in the editorial published in Mr. Pope's newspaper, Il Progresso, on May 25, 1941, he made a very detailed explanation of the object of this check. This check, says Mr. Pope, was one of eight checks of a similar amount turned over to a representative of the Italian Government, donated purely for civilian relief, and not for any war purposes, and was delivered at a meeting held at the Madison Square Garden on December 14, 1935. This meeting was attended by some 22,000 persons, among them prominent American citizens, such as the late Supreme Court Justice Cotillo, the present Justice Pecora, the late Congressman Sirovich, and Mayor LaGuardia. I will quote Mayor LaGuardia's utterances at this meeting, and the following statement was made by him at that time:

> Your enthusiasm is fully justified, because I know that every cent which you have given will go to the benefit of the Red Cross and the other relief organizations of Italy.

A society was recently organized in this city under the name of the Mazzini Society, ostensibly as an anti-Fascist organization. The truth of the matter is, that the organizers of this society are Fascists who have fallen apart recently from the councils of the party, and who wish to propagate their own brand of fascism against that officially adopted by the existing Fascist organization. This society pretends to be anti-Fascist, but in reality it is only opposed to present Fascist leaders and wishes to assume Fascist leadership by itself against those who have heretofore been the protagonists of fascism in the United States. Most of the men who are members of this society had at one time or another received high honors and occupied high places in the Fascist hierarchy in Italy. They fell out with their masters, and now they seek to foist on the innocent Italian population of this country their own brand of Fascist ideals under the guise of being anti-Fascist.

Forgetting that the American public is not interested in fascism under any guise and that the average citizen of Italian extraction is concerned with nothing else but purely unalloyed American democracy, this organization takes it upon itself to "educate" the Italian-American population in the principles of fascism, calling it any name but the true name, and seeking to impose their views and standards on an unsuspecting populace. This approach to the masses by sugar-coating Fascist ideals is just another way of disrupting and confusing the democratic processes, something that the skilled exponents of un-American propaganda are so well versed in.

One Prof. Max Ascoli, who is president of this newly formed Mazzini Society, has constantly been attacking Mr. Pope, claiming that the employees of the newspapers owned by Mr. Pope are Fascist sympathizers. The list criticized by Professor Ascoli numbers 13, of which 4 are no longer employed. Of the remaining 9, most are citizens of the United States and others have taken out their first papers. These men are loyal Americans and have no dealing with any Fascist ramifications, whether here or abroad.

Professor Ascoli, the chief provocator of the Mazzini Society and the so-called brains behind the organization, who is stirring up these false allegations is, himself, of questionable background as to political maneuvering abroad. He is at the present time supplanting his political communistic propaganda and aiding in internal confusion amongst Americans of Italian origin. The proof of his vicious campaign against Mr. Pope finds itself as far west as Colorado, where we find a statement coming from The Union, a Western Italian-American newspaper. This slanderous and untruthful press release, I understand, has been sent to the Members of the Congress. It is unfortunate that up to the present time official agencies of this Government have not carefully scrutinized the membership and political aims and un-American techniques of the Mazzini Society and its membership.

Based on this new type of "Americanism," which is a new type of fascism peddled to the American public, it is remarkable to observe that these new protagonists of Americanism are not even citizens of the United States. Most of the managing heads of the Mazzini Society are aliens, and some of them did not even bother to take out their first citizenship papers. And it is this group who is seeking to besmirch the character of an outstanding American, and issues pamphlets and photographs to show that some 20 years ago, or 15 years ago, or 10 years ago, Mr. Pope was received by Italian dignitaries. One must realize that any distinguished American who visited Italy in the last 10 or 15 years would have likewise been similarly received by Italian dignitaries. It is a courtesy which was extended to anyone who was prominent enough to be received by public officials in Italy. It is remarkable that in order to charge Mr. Pope with any Fascist activities these detractors of his should go back 10 or 15 years ago to produce photographs of official receptions, the same type of photographs which could be produced if one were to describe the receptions accorded to any American of standing who had visited Italy at that time. Similar photographs, of course, could be produced to show the reception given to our American minister, consuls, members of the diplomatic corps, and newspaper writers of standing. In short, any distinguished person who visited Italy at that time.

The only interest I have in this Fascist controversy is that of an American Congressman seeking to represent the interests of the American people and determined to see to it that foreign ideologies do not befuddle the American public as to the true meaning of Americanism.

Just as there is an expression that the devil can quote Scripture for his own purposes, so there are many in this country who under the guise of Americanism are nothing else but propagandists for fascism and its doctrines. All those fascistic collaborators and alleged patriots who find fault with each other only because a particular individual may not follow a particular brand of fascism are equally obnoxious to me. I do not care whether you are a Mussolini Fascist or a Mazzini Society Fascist, a Fascist under any designation is equally obnoxious to me.

I must insist that American citizens, irrespective of their national or racial origin, promote American ideas and collaborate in the building up of this country. Any foreign ideologies must be eradicated at the root, and I do not for a moment countenance the promotion of one type of fascism as distinguished from another type, and I believe that if a thorough appraisal is made of all these subversive movements you will notice that, much as they might differ in detail, they are all opposed to American democracy and the American way of living.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the News-Free Press of Chattanooga, Tenn., of Saturday, June 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very fine symposium prepared by the Boston Advertiser explaining why the shortage of gasoline is so detrimental to the interests of New England. It will probably take more than the allotted space in the RECORD, but I think it is very vital to place this in the RECORD as a matter of information. I presented the symposium prepared by the Boston Sunday Advertiser to Secretary Ickes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is it more than two pages?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; it may be more than two pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will have to get an estimate of the cost if it is more than two pages.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will put in as much as I can.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentlewoman will be granted to the extent indicated.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in a conference with Secretary Ickes this morning regarding the shortage of gas, I received very encouraging cooperation from him. He has promised that he will aid in every way to facilitate the laying of the pipe lines. He will facilitate, apparently, by the action he took yesterday, the saving of gasoline for the United States by preventing the shipment from Pennsylvania in a Japanese ship of a large amount of gasoline. I

hope that he will take action to prevent the shipment of more gasoline to Japan.

Secretary Ickes promised me that other constructive pronouncements will be made by him tomorrow or the next day or, anyway, within the next few days.

I have gone into this matter of the so-called shortage of oil and gasoline facilities very exhaustively, Mr. Speaker, and I have asked the Merchant Marine why they gave 50 tankers to England to the very obvious detriment of our own country in loss of available gas and oil for our daily use, and also for our national defense. I have asked the Merchant Marine why they have allowed other countries to have our tankers and our ships with resulting detriment to this country. It is particularly aggravating, even infuriating, to the people of this country when they know that Canada is boasting that she has plenty of gasoline and oil.

I ask the O. P. M., Mr. Speaker, why in their defense program, they have not included more tank cars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I ask O. P. M. why they do not have additional tank, freight, and passenger cars for the emergency? I ask O. P. M. also, Mr. Speaker, where the additional trucks are for our protection even in this gas shortage, and as a part of our national defense?

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, these questions will be answered very promptly. I can find so far no satisfactory explanation of the fact that we are suffering today from a shortage of all these facilities with respect to oil and gas, and other matters of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I made the suggestion today to the Secretary of the Interior that instead of gasless days or gasless Sundays, if a shortage of gasoline must come, that the gasoline be rationed during a week or a month in order that the suffering may not be so great as a result.

As we all know, the House passed a measure to authorize the laying of pipe lines to aid the East. It passed yesterday a bill to allow increased loading of oil in tankers. It will pass further legislation, in my opinion. I ask the support of the House to aid in this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in Committee and in the House, and to include therein certain excerpts from hearings and bureau reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 296. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an assay office at Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 374. An act to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1110. An act to amend section 1118 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against enlistment in the military service of the United States of any person convicted of a felony; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1392. An act for the relief of Homer J. Swope; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1398. An act for the relief of Elinor Leugers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1426. An act for the relief of Otis Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1467. An act to amend section 12 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1512. An act to amend the Alien Registration Act, 1940, by making it a criminal offense to reproduce alien registration receipt cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1529. An act to amend the act approved May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 128; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 383), relative to retirement of officers of the United States Navy after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1557. An act to provide for reimbursement to the holders of cotton pool participation trust certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 1580. An act to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

S. 1608. An act for the relief of the Neal Storage Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 4873 (ALLEN of Louisiana).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, June 18, 1941, for the consideration of H. R. 622, H. R. 2287, H. R. 4937, H. R. 4983, and S. 215.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents has tentatively scheduled a further hearing on the subject of royalty payments, as covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 1015, House Office Building. Interested parties are requested to contact the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

667. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the amount of payment to each person receiving $1,000 or more under the 1939 programs administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with the name and address of the payee, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4733. A bill to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1200. An act to authorize additional appropriations to provide for the further development of cooperative agriculture extension work; without amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1524. An act to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3735. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 413. A bill for the relief of Arma Lee Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2378. A bill for the relief of Arthur

G. Moyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Arnold H. Sommer; with amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Louise Holcomb, George Holcomb, and Cliff Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4622. A bill for the relief of Catharine Schultze; with amendment (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. S. 1166. A bill for the relief of Daniel Steele; without amendment (Rept. No. 782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 5073. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5074. A bill to provide additional safeguards to the Radio Communications Service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 5075. A bill to create a recreation board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5076. A bill to empower the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Kauai to issue improvement bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 5077. A bill to approve Act No. 112 of the session laws of 1941 of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act to amend Act 101 of the session laws of Hawaii, 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of north and south Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, so as to extend the franchise to the districts of Kau and south Kohala, in said county, and extend the term thereof as to the town of Hilo"; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 5078. A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands now in use as an airplane landing field, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr McGEHEE:

H. R. 5079. A bill to authorize the Treasurer of the United States to make settlements with payees of lost or stolen checks, which have been paid on foreign endorsements, in advance of reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5080. A bill to transfer the jurisdiction over District of Columbia credit unions from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Comptroller of the Currency to the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 5081. A bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights of national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to authorize an investigation to determine the reasons for the increased cost of food; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the expenses of the joint committee established under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 40; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to the press; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their act No. 112, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of north and south Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5082. A bill for the relief of John J. Berton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Lt. Paul M. Chambers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Lt. James A. Puckett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Esco Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 5086. A bill granting a pension to Wirt W. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5087. A bill granting a pension to Viola Mae Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1451. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Kenosha, Wis., supporting Senate bill 860, for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1452. By Mr. BUTLER. Resolution of the Propeller Club of the United States, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1453. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, urging the continuance of existing law in connection with the cane-sugar industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1454. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of War to take action as will be necessary to provide steamship service between Pacific coast ports and the Panama Canal Zone at the same freight-rate basis in order that Pacific coast growers, producers, and manufacturers may be enabled to compete with growers, producers, and manufacturers on the Atlantic seaboard in supplying agricultural and manufactured materials and supplies to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1455 Also, resolution of the Conservation Association of Southern California, relative to fire hazard created by a heavy herbaceous growth in California, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1456. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of L. G. Glenn, of Mount Vernon, and numerous other residents of Knox County, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of House bill No. 3852, and the identical Senate bill, to regulate the day on which barber shops in the District of Columbia shall be closed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1457. By Mr. MOTT: Petitions signed by Mrs. Lois F. Schild and 91 other citizens, of Tillamook, Oreg., urging the passage of House bill 2475, a bill to prohibit prostitution within certain distances of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1458. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of sundry citizens of Hurley, S. Dak., petitioning active support to House bill 1036, known as the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1459. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Wagner, S. Dak., petitioning active support toward the enactment of House bill 1036, the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1460. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., requesting enactment of House bill 1036, known as the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1461. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kimball, S. Dak., requesting enactment of House bill 1036, embodying principles of the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1462. By Mr. RANDOLPH: Petition of sundry citizens of Keyser, W. Va., supporting House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1463. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Tioga County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1464. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12, relative to discrimination in steamship service and freight rates between New York and California ports to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1465. By Mr. SIKES: Petition of the Florida State Legislature, House Memorial No. 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in heaven, the fountain of all mercy, help us to learn from Thee the way, the truth, the life. Stir Thou the divinity within us, that it may inspire and dominate our lives, and thus bring us in closer relationship with

Thee and our fellow men, shunning all forms of guilt and passion, and teaching us to bear the yoke of service with steadfastness and brotherly love. Thus may our names be written in the Lamb's Book of Life and our souls filled with peace. Grant that we may be strong and pure and noble, that we may fulfill to the uttermost the obligation resting upon us; and Thine shall be the praise and the glory forever. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 201, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial exercises, as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly, the House stood in recess, to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

JUNE 18, 1941

Prelude, sacred selections (11:15 to 11:45)—United States Marine Band Orchestra
Presiding Officer.....The Speaker of the House of Representatives
Invocation.....The Chaplain Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Lead Kindly Light (Dykes).....Male Quartet
Scripture reading and prayer.....The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members.....The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence
Address.....Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON Representative from the State of Texas
The Long Day Closes (Sullivan).....Male Quartet
Address.....Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON Representative from the State of Minnesota
Crossing the Bar (Barnby).....Male Quartet
Taps.....Winfred Kemp
Benediction.....The Chaplain

MEMORIAL SERVICE

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. RAYBURN, presided.

The Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery:

Almighty God, fount of all life, Thou art our refuge and strength; Thou art our help in trouble. Enable us, we pray Thee, to put our trust in Thee, that we may obtain comfort and find grace to help in this and every time of need; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Jesus said: I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

The righteous live forever, and the care of them is with the Most High; with His right arm He shall cover them, and with His arm He shall shield them.

For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry: Abba, Father. The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together.

For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God.

What then shall we say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Yet love will dream and faith will trust
That somehow, somewhere, meet we must.
Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cyprus trees!
Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
Nor sees the breaking of the day,
Across the mournful marbles play!
Who hath not learned in hours of faith
The truth, to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own!

Lead Kindly Light was sung by the male quartet.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Roger M. Calloway, reading clerk of the House, read the following roll:

ERNEST WILLARD GIBSON, a Senator from the State of Vermont: Born December 29, 1872; soldier; educator; lawyer; deputy clerk, United States district court; member State house of representatives, 1906; member of the State senate, 1908, serving as president pro tempore; State's attorney, 1919–21; Member of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-eighth and the five succeeding Congresses; appointed to the United States Senate November 21, 1933, and subsequently elected for unexpired term; reelected in 1938; died June 20, 1940.

ERNEST LUNDEEN, a Senator from the State of Minnesota: Born August 4, 1878; lawyer; soldier; member of the State house of representatives, 1910–14; delegate Republican National Conventions, 1912 and 1916; served in Twelfth Minnesota Volunteers during Spanish-American War; Member of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses; elected to the United States Senate 1936; died August 31, 1940.

KEY PITTMAN, a Senator from the State of Nevada: Born September 19, 1872; lawyer; member of committee that formulated the "consent" form of government for Nome, Alaska; first prosecuting attorney at Nome; elected to the United States Senate for unexpired term, 1912; reelected in 1916, 1922, 1928, and again in 1934; secretary Senate Democratic caucus, 1913–17; Democratic conference nominee for President pro tempore of the Senate for the Sixty-sixth and the six ensuing Congresses; elected President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, 1933, serving until his death, November 10, 1940.

MORRIS SHEPPARD, a Senator from the State of Texas: Born May 28, 1875; lawyer; first president of the Texas Fraternal Congress, in Dallas in 1908; Member of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-seventh, Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, Sixty-first, and Sixty-second Congresses; elected to the United States Senate, 1913, 1918, 1924, 1930, and again in 1936; was dean of the Congress at the time of his death, April 9, 1941.

WILLIS BENJAMIN GIBBS, Eighth Congressional District of Georgia: Born April 15, 1889; lawyer; solicitor city court of Jesup, 1914; solicitor general, Brunswick judicial circuit, 1924–38; Member of the Seventy-sixth Congress; died August 7, 1940.

GEORGE NICHOLAS SEGER, Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey: Born January 4, 1866; businessman; educator; mayor of Passaic, 1911–19; delegate, Republican National Convention, 1916; president New Jersey State League of Municipalities, 1912–14; city director of finance, 1919–23; Member of the Sixty-eighth and the eight succeeding Congresses; died August 26, 1940.

WILLIAM BROCKMAN BANKHEAD, Seventh Congressional District of Alabama: Born April 12, 1874; lawyer; member State house of representatives, 1900–1901; city attorney, Huntsville, 1898–1902; solicitor, fourteenth judicial circuit, 1910–14; Member of the Sixty-fifth and the 11 succeeding Congresses; chairman, Committee on Rules, Seventy-third Congress; majority leader, first session Seventy-fourth Congress; twice elected Speaker of the House of Representatives; died September 15, 1940.

SAMUEL CHAPMAN MASSINGALE, Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma: Born August 2, 1870; lawyer; member of the Oklahoma Territorial Council, 1902; served as a member of the Second Texas Infantry, Spanish-American War; Member of the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died January 17, 1941.

KENNETH FARRAND SIMPSON, Seventeenth Congressional District of New York: Born May 4, 1895; lawyer; soldier; educator; captain, Three Hundred and Second Field Artillery, United States Army, 1917–19; chairman, Republican County Committee, New York, 1935–40; member, Republican National Committee, 1937–40; delegate to the Republican National Convention, 1936 and 1940; Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress; died January 25, 1941.

WILLIAM DEVEREUX BYRON, Sixth Congressional District of Maryland: Born May 15, 1895; businessman; lieutenant, Aviation Corps, World War; mayor of Williamsport, 1926–30; member of the State senate, 1930–34; member of the Maryland State Roads Commission, 1934–35; Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died February 27, 1941.

PIUS LOUIS SCHWERT, Forty-second Congressional District of New York: Born November 22, 1892; banker; bachelor of science and economics; businessman; ensign, United States Navy; county clerk, 1933–36; Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died March 11, 1941.

ALONZO DILLARD FOLGER, Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina: Born July 9, 1888; lawyer; trustee, University of North Carolina, 1932–38; judge, superior court of North Carolina, 1937; member of the Democratic National Committee, 1936–40; Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died April 30, 1941.

M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN, Fourteenth Congressional District of New York: Born February 5, 1888; lawyer; received degree of bachelor of law, Brooklyn Law School, 1909; admitted to the bar, State of New York, 1910; subsequently admitted to practice in the United States district courts of New York, the Circuit Court for the Second District, and the United States Supreme Court; Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died June 4, 1941.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

Then followed 1 minute of devotional silence.

Dr. MONTGOMERY. Almighty God, from whom we come and unto whom our spirits return, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Thou art our refuge and strength and a very present help in trouble. Grant us Thy blessing in this hour, and enable us to put our trust in Thee, that our spirits may grow calm and our hearts be comforted. Lift our eyes beyond the shadows of earth and help us to see the light of eternity. So may we find grace and strength for this and every time of need. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, a Representative from the State of Texas, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we have met today, in this annual memorial service, to pay just and loving tribute to the memory of our colleagues who have left us.

Since we last assembled in like service, nine Members of the House and four Senators have answered the final summons and responded to their last roll call.

They died in the service of their country, at their post of duty, and those of us who labored with them can best attest to their fidelity and evaluate the quality of service they gave to this Republic.

We knew them in their daily life. We saw them while they were on duty and under fire, meeting crises in passing upon great questions affecting the welfare and destiny of their country, and these are the testing times which determine the character, the caliber, and the fiber of which men are made. Measured by every standard, they were all men of character, integrity, ability, and fidelity.

They were among our ablest and most distinguished Members. Each had his very vivid personality, his lively individuality, and each stood with a marked degree of eminence among us.

Observance of custom and limitation of time prevent my paying tribute to each. Other Members will do this in the printed RECORD. But in passing I cannot refrain from mentioning two of them. One of these had attained the eminent position of Speaker of the House, second only in importance to the Presidency of the United States, our beloved and late Speaker, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, whose brilliant mind, whose charming personality, whose rugged honesty, and whose superb eloquence earned for him during his service of nearly 24 years in the House a national reputation as an orator and a statesman of the first magnitude.

I recall that when Speaker Byrnes, his immediate predecessor, passed away Mr. Speaker BANKHEAD paid tribute to him, and in that forceful and characteristic manner of his, and with deep emotion, said:

I cannot but feel that somehow and in some way his spiritual presence and his solicitude still abide within this Chamber.

Today in this sacred service I likewise feel that the immortal spirit of our late Speaker BANKHEAD abides with us.

The other, Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, the dean of Congress, who served continuously in the Senate of the United States for more than 28 years, and immediately preceding served continuously as a Member of the House for more than 10 years, the length of his continuous service as a Member of Congress being 38 years, 5 months, and 29 days, a record unequaled by that of any other individual with two exceptions since the foundation of our Government.

A knightly warrior, eloquent and able, a loyal friend, with a kind and noble spirit and a soul pure and unsullied, who literally gave his life in service to his constituents and his country—that was MORRIS SHEPPARD.

The lives of all these whom we honor today were doubtless shortened by the service they gave to their country. Illustrative of the high death rate in the House, during my 18 years here I have served under 7 different Speakers, and 4 of these died while holding that high office. Contrary to the popular belief, membership in Congress requires constant labor. The manifold duties here require not only unremitting toil but deep thought, often vexatious worry, and this has been true at all times, but especially so during the grave crisis through which our country has been passing during the past few years.

A few years ago a well-known writer and prominent businessman was elected to membership in the House and after serving a short time and familiarizing himself with the duties here and becoming acquainted with his colleagues, wrote an article for a current magazine entitled "What Surprised Me About Congress," in which he described his disillusionment as to the ability of Congressmen and the amount of work which they do. His conclusion was that, viewing Congress from the inside, he was surprised to find how hard they worked, how much they knew, and the conscientious manner in which they discharged their obligations.

If the American people could see Congress at close range, and follow them daily, they would reach the same conclusion as did the distinguished author of that article.

The Congress of the United States epitomizes and expresses as no other body possibly can the genuine spirit and the profound emotion of American life. To be chosen out of a population of 130,000,000 people to be the Representatives of their constituents in the National lawmaking body is an honor.

Critics may speak in disparagement of our national lawmaking body, but the history of our Government reveals that, by and large, the type of men who have served here excel in character and ability the same number of men in any other similar group.

The membership of Congress, representing as it does divergent views and faiths, both political and religious, and coming from those of wealth and those of poverty, might be compared to a great mosaic, reflecting a true cross section of the American people.

It has always been a popular pastime to ridicule any legislative body, and Congress has often been made the subject of gibe and criticism, but not only the quality of its membership but the importance of the work which Congress performs is a complete answer to those who scoff.

If some foolish and fantastic decision should ever be made that one of the three coordinate branches of the Government should be abolished, the legislative, if a democracy is to survive, would be the last to go. Whatever else may be said about the Congress of the United States, with all of its faults and its foibles, it is the palladium of our liberty, and when Congress falls the Republic will die.

These colleagues of ours were worthy and honored members of this great institution, which constitutes the bulwark of our Government, and they measured up in the highest degree to all responsibilities devolving upon them. They knew first-hand what Congress was and what it meant not only to the present but to the future. Theirs was the responsibility to solve the perplexing problems of economic and social progress, to adjust differences between various contending groups, to pass laws to protect the weak from the strong, and to see that a code of government existed where justice and right would prevail, and where happiness and prosperity might abound.

They were all patriotic Americans, loving its institutions and willing to die, if necessary, to preserve them. They witnessed the threat to democracy, both from without and within, and, belonging to different political parties, may have at times differed as to methods, but all were inspired by the same holy ambition—that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth; that no dictator, however powerful he may be, shall ever lay his unholy hands upon this temple of democracy, established by the wisdom, the blood, and the sacrifices of our fathers.

To those of us who survive they have tossed the torch, and ours is the duty to carry on. Let us make this sacred hour not one of memorial alone but a rededication and rebirth of patriotism. Emulating their virtues and their consecration to duty, "let us highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain"; that in this dark and threatening period which menaces our existence as a nation we shall eschew all bitterness and strife, forget racial and religious differences, adjourn partisan politics, and unite as one great people, under one flag, and with one destiny—that destiny to defend America and to preserve inviolate her institutions.

The votes which our colleagues cast and the speeches which they made are preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but their memory is enshrined forever in our hearts. We shall remember best not their official record but our association with them and the ties of lasting

friendship which death cannot sever and which is one of the compensating joys of our service here.

The greatest comfort and consolation that can come to their families is not alone the splendid record which they made as faithful public servants but the heritage of a good name which they have transmitted to their children, and the love, loyalty, and generous devotion which they bestowed upon their loved ones.

Each geographical section is represented in the list of our sacred dead, New England, the North Atlantic States, the deep South, the great Southwest, the Central, the Midwest, and the far West. All have representatives who have been called by the Divine Master of men to His eternal home. Death is no respecter of sections or of persons; the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the weak and the strong have always responded to its decree, from which there is no appeal.

But there is a comforting and solacing thought, the Christian faith, handed down to us by our fathers, and which shall abide with us forever, that death does not end all; that—

> Behind the dim, unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own—

that there is a spiritual world to which man belongs, and of which he is a part, and the touch of death cannot separate him from this eternal life.

As I think of the departure of our friends, I am reminded of those lines written by Alfred Tennyson, on the occasion of the death of his dearest friend:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

But such a time as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

The quartet sang Crossing the Bar.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, a Representative from the State of Minnesota, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, this day has been set aside from our busy calendar to commemorate the past. It is not so much a day of sorrow as it is a day for retrospection and reflection. Today fond memory is given leeway over the pressing affairs of this troubled world.

Years ago a famous agnostic said that life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. In other words, he saw life as a futile meandering through a desolate desert wilderness, surrounded on all sides by cold and bitter despair.

What a description to give to a triumphant adventure; what a mocking play on words; what a tragic lack of faith in the sublime promise of our Saviour, Teacher, and Master. To me—and I am sure to all of you—life has been a journey, full of pleasant and worth-while contacts, precious friendships, hallowed and cherished memories.

Life is a journey through green valleys where we hear the murmur of the brook as it wends its way toward the sea of eternity; where man is born, attains maturity, strives and accomplishes, according to his abilities and will to attain.

In the springtime we may see the trees and plants shooting their buds, which later burst into a profusion of foliage and flowers, while overhead feathery friends entertain us from dawn to dusk with their sweet and melodious symphonies.

In the heat of midday we may sit in the restful shade beside the brook and drink of the stream of life, contemplating the goodness and the greatness of our Creator and Comforter, while before us pass in kaleidoscopic review cherished friendships of the past, and incidents that are treasured milestones in our journey through life.

In the full richness of fall, when the golden glow is on all nature, we harvest what we have sown. It is then that we garner the fruits of our labor, and reap the blessings of well-spent lives, devoted to the service of others.

The Congress of the United States is a true cross section of America and the American people, and therefore reflects to a faithful degree their views, their hopes, and their aspirations. Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln were true exponents of those ideals, which had their beginnings in the rich and fertile soil of a continent free from the hatreds, fears, and prejudices of the Old World.

Here meet Representatives of the people to legislate for 132,000,000 free men, women, and children. They come from every section of the land, from all stations in life, and reflect every shade of opinion. A few are wealthy, but the majority have only their pay. With us there is no class distinction, no caste system. All work elbow to elbow for the common weal, animated by the same noble ideals and lofty purposes. All have but one goal—the greatest good to the greatest number. Therein, my friends, lies the strength of the Republic; thereon is builded the endurance and grandeur which is America.

Perhaps no other calling is so rich in opportunity for real service to our great country and to the people who have their being therein. It has been well said that "Service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in this world."

The Congress of the United States has been called the greatest legislative body in all the world. My countrymen, it is more than that. In these dark and troublesome times the Congress is the anchorage of free government, a beacon light of hope to the persecuted and oppressed in other and less-favored lands.

To us, it is hard to understand how an individual, or a group, can find it in their hearts to persecute those of other creeds, races, or colors. We must accept the doctrine that God created man in His own image, hence such persecution is a rejection of the Golden Rule, a reversion to barbarism.

These are troublous days, freighted with complex and vexatious problems. At times we almost despair of the future. For a solution we turn here, there, and yon, but we will not despair for we know that in our own hands we hold the solution. The salvation of the world lies in faith, frugality, tolerance, charity, forgiveness, and creative labor.

In these cruel and trying times there is need for humane, honest, wise, and courageous leadership—leadership that is consecrated wholeheartedly to the common weal. The call is for those who will submerge self in the cause of the many. Such are to be found wherever patriotic men and women congregate, and it is on them that the hope and the safety and the perpetuity of the Republic must and will rest.

God give us men who are not afraid to brave the scorn and contumely of passing whims, prejudices, and passions. Almighty God, forsake us not in this troublous hour when courage appears to have taken flight and reason is tottering on her throne.

Mankind has passed through many similar and worse experiences and situations in the past. To cure present-day ills and maladjustments will need time and serious thought, but a people resolved to find the remedy for them will discover and apply them, as surely as the rising of tomorrow's sun. We will not, we cannot, fail to do so

To my colleagues may I offer this encouragement to carry on the battle to preserve republican government at home: "Be strong and of good courage, fear not, nor be afraid of them; for the Lord, thy God, He it is that doth go with thee. He will not fail thee nor forsake thee."

What will come out of the travail and suffering that mankind is now undergoing? It is for us to decide. Shall it be economic and political slavery or continued freedom—freedom to dare, to venture, to achieve, or are we henceforth to live the lives of birds confined in cages? Rather should we not resolve to remain human eagles, free to soar to loftier heights, to attain yet nobler objectives, to accomplish yet greater things? Again, the answer rests in ourselves.

The true spirit of America is epitomized in a statue erected to the memory of the Pioneer Woman, situated on the old National Trail, some miles east of Washington, Pa. There she stands, self-reliant, unafraid, with a babe in arm, an older child clutching her skirt, armed with a deer rifle, peering earnestly ahead for hidden dangers that she fears for her brood but cannot see. Strong, brave, self-reliant, she typifies the America we all revere. She it was who made possible the pacification and development of the great country we all love. She it was who transmitted to us a heritage of bravery, self-reliance, and confidence in ourselves and in our destiny, which gave to us the strength and the will to make of this the greatest nation of which there is recorded history.

Today, as never before, we miss the wise and courageous counsel of our departed friends and colleagues. Would that they were here now to advise us, to tell us what to do. We miss them sorely.

We must cleave to the will and wish to create, to build better and greater. Subversive influences that would undermine the foundations upon which the Republic rests must be eradicated and destroyed. Here, there can be room only for those who love our country, honor our institutions, and revere our traditions. Those who do not subscribe to these requirements must seek haven in other lands. Here, there can be no divided allegiance, no second choice.

Since our last memorial day four Senators and nine Representatives have been summoned to the supreme congress above. For them the turbulence of the forum has subsided. Today they have their place in a higher body where bitter partisan strife is unknown. While they are no longer with us in the flesh, their spirit is ever with us, and the memory of their labors here is an inspiration to us to carry on. Their names are writ in letters of living light on the scroll of service to their country and fellowman. "They are not dead, they are merely away."

"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Since the very inception of Christianity the followers of the lowly Nazarene have been subjected to persecution, oppression, and ridicule. Many have suffered exile from their homeland, and even martyrdom for its sake, but faith ever carried them through, and with the passing of time their number has increased until the cross has been carried into every corner of the earth.

To countless millions it has become a symbol of hope, a refuge in time of storm.

The Christian religion has been assailed times without number, but none have been able to offer anything substantial or tangible in its place. It has been, is, and ever will be the greatest known balm and source of comfort to mankind. It greets us at the cradle, sustains us throughout a troublous life, and its gentle and merciful ministrations enable us to face the end with hope, with courage, and with fortitude.

To the sorrowing mother who grieves over the loss of her child, to the abandoned Magdalen who walks the streets, to the man who has lost his faith, to the wayward son who roams the earth, to the cynic who scoffs and doubts—to these and to all mankind the promises of the Saviour come as a solace in their hour of darkest despair. It is then, one and all turn to Him for hope, peace, and comfort. There is, there can be no other outlet for our heart's desire. In Him rests the hope of mankind. Without that hope life would be a black void.

He has promised us eternal life, free from pain and doubt and despair. We know that He has prepared a place for His children where we shall some day gather, where broken family ties will be reunited, where cherished friendships shall be renewed. What a precious promise; what a glorious fulfillment.

Death is only a quiet door
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.

Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.

There is nothing to trouble any heart
Nothing to hurt at all
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall.

The quartet sang the Long Day Closes.

Mr. Winfred Kemp, principal musician, United States Marine Band Orchestra, sounded taps.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pronounced the benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace; both now and evermore.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess the Speaker called the House to order, and then, pursuant to House Resolution 201, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, declared the House adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents has tentatively scheduled a further hearing on the subject of royalty payments, as covered in House Joint Resolutions 32, 73, and 123, on Thursday, June 19, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room 1015, House Office Building. Interested parties are requested to contact the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

668. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution, to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

669. A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the twentieth annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, submitted in pursuance of section 16 of the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468) (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4137. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of August 29, 1935, relating to Federal assistance in the acquisition and development of State forests, to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions; without amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 5088. A bill to provide for standard daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5089. A bill to grant the franking privilege to members of the military or naval forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 5090. A bill authorizing the establishment of a filing and indexing service for useful Government publications; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou timeless One, Thou source and fountain of all good, who revealest Thyself to the heart and mind of the creatures Thou hast willed to be: Help us to think of Thee until thought fails and faints, like a tired bird beating against the tempest, and our seeming helplessness constrains us to cry out like Thy servant of old, "Canst thou by searching find out God?"

At this the beginning of another day of service, we beseech Thee so to live in us that our lives may be true to the highest laws of being, crowned with the blessedness of faith, and hope, and love unfailing, which means more than happiness.

So may we not miss the spirit of these moments of preparation of our hearts, in which there is not only some tenderness of secret contrition for past failings, but also some fresh stirring of high aims and holy desires that may yield to us a peace which the world can neither give nor take away, after the likeness of the peace that possessed the soul of the Saviour of mankind, in whose gentle name and for whose own dear sake alone, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Monday, June 16, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the

President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 14, 1941:

S. 911. An act for the relief of William J. Furey;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Goss; and

S. 1156. An act for the relief of Jess W. Harmon.

On June 17, 1941:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Arvy A. Lothman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes;

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Maj. R. Lee;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman; and

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie; and

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. RAMSPECK, and Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 768. An act for the relief o. William E. Thomas; and

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4. An act to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 93. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1062. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to accept a gift of lands from the city of Tucson, Ariz.;

H. R. 1073. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

H. R. 1618. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2308. An act to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California;

H. R. 3182. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority;

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939;

H. R. 3338. An act to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Reserve;

H. R. 4473. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs;

H. R. 4841. An act to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4903. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.;

H. R. 4988. An act to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended;

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Bulow	Houston	Stewart
Bunker	Hughes	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	La Follette	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	White
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Downey	Norris	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRAVEL BY A CANADIAN SHIP BETWEEN AMERICAN PORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding the provisions of any of the coastwise laws of the United States, one passenger ship of Canadian registry shall b permitted to travel between Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., for the purpose of transporting members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15–18, 1941, inclusive; and such passenger ship shall be further permitted to remain at Milwaukee, Wis., during the period of such national convention of the American Legion: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision of section 4488, Revised Statutes, or regulations issued thereunder, any passenger vessels, American or Canadian, which transport members of the American Legion and their guests to and from that organization's twenty-third annual national convention, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15–18, 1941, inclusive, shall not be required to carry accommodation for more than 50 percent of persons on board in lifeboats and pontoon life rafts: *Provided further*, That not less than two-fifths of such accommodation shall be in lifeboats and three-fifths may be in collapsible boats or rafts, under regulations of the Board of Supervising Inspectors, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, applicable to such vessels during the interval May 15 to September 15, inclusive.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 65 dealt with the authorization of a ship of Canadian registry to travel between Cleveland, Ohio, and Milwaukee, Wis., in connection with the American Legion convention to be held in Milwaukee this year. It was amended in the House of Representatives in a minor manner. With the consent of the Senator from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT—APPOINTMENT OF A CONFEREE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has resigned as a member of the committee of conference on House bill 2097, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k). The Chair appoints the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] a conferee on the part of the Senate in place of the Senator from Montana.

DOCUMENTS FILED BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, June 19, 1941.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to section 4, Public Law, 108, approved June 10, 1941, has filed with me as Secretary of the Senate two certified copies of each of the following documents:

Charter of Rubber Reserve Company.
Charter of Metals Reserve Company.
Charter of Defense Plant Corporation.
Amendment to the Charter of Defense Plant Corporation.
Charter of Defense Supplies Corporation.
Amendment to the Charter of Defense Supplies Corporation.
Certificate of Incorporation of Defense Homes Corporation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, fiscal year 1942, for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, in the amount of $1,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LANDS FOR THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF PAYEES RECEIVING $1,000 OR MORE UNDER 1939 AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the amount of payment to each person receiving $1,000 or more under the 1939 programs administered under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with the name and address of the payee (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the general court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Commerce.

"Joint resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering the advisability of the completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

"Whereas the claim that the United States needs this seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the project are all out of proportion to the industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue; and

"Whereas the waterway would be ice-bound for 5 months of the year and during that navigation season would provide an easy target for bombing and afford an opportunity for sabotage in the locks and dams of the ship channel; and

"Whereas the project would provide no tolls but would permit free use of the waterway for foreign shipping threatening to ruin New England economy, the railroads, the Atlantic coast shipping and deluging the Great Lakes region with cheap foreign products undermining American labor, industry, and agriculture; and

"Whereas the imperative demands of national defense require urgent use of men, materials, and money in the construction of planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions which would be seriously affected by divergence to an uneconomic seaway project; and

"Whereas the waterway could not be placed in full operation before 1948 and would thus not become part of immediate national defense: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened*, That it is the sense of the general court that the use of the St. Lawrence River for the establishment of a deeper seaway is a wasteful and unwarranted project in the present national crisis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of this State and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate.

"CHARLES H. BARNARD,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"WILLIAM M. COLE,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved June 13, 1941.
"ROBERT O. BLOOD, *Governor.*"

An act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requiring congressional approval, and approved by the Governor of the Territory; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate bill 62

"An act to amend act 101 of the session laws of Hawaii 1921, relating to the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo and Puna, in the county of Hawaii, so as to extend the franchise to the districts of Kau and South Kohala in said county, and extend the term thereof as to the town of Hilo

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. That the title of act 101 of the session laws of Hawaii 1921, is hereby amended to read, as follows:

"'An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala in the county and Territory of Hawaii.'

"SECTION 2. Section 1 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SECTION 1. Franchise. Harold V. Patten, of Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, his associates, successors, and assigns, or such corporations as he may or they shall cause to be incorporated under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii (he or they being hereinafter referred to as "the association"), are hereby granted the right, authority, and privilege to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or elec-

tric power, in the districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, on the Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public and private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which the association may deem advisable, and from time to time for the term of 50 years, for the purposes herein mentioned, to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lampposts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, and to connect the said wires, lines, and conductors, with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamps, lampposts, or other structure or object, and the place or source of supply.'

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. Poles not to interfere with streets. That all poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lampposts, conductors, conduits, and other apparatus constructed, maintained, or operated under, along, upon, or over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, shall be so constructed, and maintained, and operated by the association as not to interfere unnecessarily with the use of such streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes by the public.'

"SEC. 4. Section 11 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 11. Forfeiture of franchise. That if said association, its representatives, successors, and assigns, shall fail or refuse to do or perform or comply with any of the provisions of this act or the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, and continue to refuse or fail to perform or comply therewith after reasonable notice given by the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to comply therewith, said public utilities commission may, with the consent of the governor and of the attorney general, cause proceedings to be instituted before any appropriate tribunal to have the franchise hereby granted and all rights and privileges accruing hereunder forfeited and declared null and void. And in case of a forfeiture of this franchise, the Territory of Hawaii and County of Hawaii, or any political subdivision thereof, shall have the right to purchase all the property of the association within the said districts of North and South Hilo, Puna, Kau, and South Kohala, at the value thereof, such value to be determined as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That notice of such desire and intention to purchase is given to the association by the Territory of Hawaii or the County of Hawaii, or any political subdivision thereof within sixty days after the forfeiture of this franchise.'

"SEC. 5. Said act is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new section to be numbered 15-A, to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 15-A. Time of commencing work in the districts of Kau and South Kohala. That the rights hereby granted with respect to the districts of Kau and South Kohala shall cease and determine if operations hereunder in said districts are not commenced before 2 years after the approval of this act by the Congress of the United States, by beginning the construction of buildings or other works for manufacturing, transmitting, or supplying electric current for light and power, or by placing poles and wiring the same, or constructing conduits and laying wires therein, in any of the streets, roads, or other places in said districts, for the purpose of conducting electric current for light and power; and also if sufficient works are not completed and in operation to supply electric current for light and power, or if electric current for light and power be not supplied before 2 years after the approval of this act by the Congress of the United States.'

"SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on its approval by the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 26th day of April A. D. 1941.

"J. B. POINDEXTER,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing Congress concerning the tariff on tungsten and tungsten products; to the Committee on Finance. (See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr JOHNSON of California on the 16th instant, p. 5164, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of citizens physically incapacitated from earning a livelihood by reason of bodily injury or incurable disease; to the Committee on Finance. (See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. ANDREWS on the 16th instant, p. 5164, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

A resolution of the City Council of Houston, Tex., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to establish General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Memorials, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr CAPPER:

Petitions of Rev. William E. Callahan, pastor of the First Methodist Church, and sundry citizens of Coldwater, and sundry citizens of Hazelton and Kiowa, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by the Lions Clubs of Munising, Escanaba, and Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

Memorials, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution of the board of governors of the Birmingham Aero Club, of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the establishment of a separate unified air force in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND PREVENTION OF VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present a number of petitions from citizens of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments.

I also present a number of memorials from citizens of Delaware, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions and memorials presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and lie on the table.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN TAX ON GASOLINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Harold A. Pontius, grand secretary of the United Commercial Travelers of America, and a resolution adopted by that organization's grand council in protest against increasing the tax on gasoline. I ask that both the letter and the resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance. I am heartily in accord with the members of this group on this matter. I am opposed to raising the gasoline tax.

I know we will have to find a way to finance our national-defense program, but I am against putting so much of the burden on those who buy gasoline. In my State, as in most other States, a great number of people—most of whom are farmers and others in the lower- and middle-income groups—depend on automobiles to help them in earning a living. To increase the gasoline tax would, in my opinion, work an unfair hardship on these people. I think we can find a way to pay for our defense program without being unduly hard on any class of people.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered referred to the Committee on Finance, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORDER OF UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
Lawrence, Kans., June 7, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We are enclosing a enclosing a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the United Commercial Travelers of America at the forty-ninth convention of the grand council, held at Wichita, Kans., on June 7, 1941.

Through C. E. Holmes, secretary of the Kansas Petroleum Industries Committee and also a member of the Kansas juridiction, we know of the good cooperation which you have consistently given your constituents in Kansas. We assure you that we appreciate all that you are doing and are grateful for your assistance.

Very truly yours,
UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
EARL T. STEELE, *Grand Counselor.*
HAROLD A. PONTIUS, *Grand Secretary.*

Whereas it is reported Congress is now considering proposals to further increase the Federal gasoline tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the forty-ninth annual convention of the grand council of the United Commercial Travelers of America, meeting in Wichita, Kans., on June 7, 1941, go on record as opposing any further increase, and respectfully submit to all Kansas Members of Congress the following reasons:

1. The Federal gasoline tax was increased 50 percent last July—higher than any other similar tax increase.

2. Gasoline is a necessity and under no circumstances should be classed with luxuries for tax or other purposes.

3. The tax in this State is largely paid by farmers, laboring people, and others with very modest incomes, and the present tax is high and burdensome.

4. The gasoline tax is paid only by one class—the motor users—and is based on automobile travel, not ability to pay or for benefits received from the Federal Government.

5. National defense should not be slowed down by excessive rates on vital and necessary highway transportation; be it further

Resolved, That our Members of Congress present our views to the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees.

UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
EARL T. STEELE, *Grand Counselor.*
HAROLD A. PONTIUS, *Grand Secretary.*
JUNE 6, 1941.

GUARDING OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE FACILITIES

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending before Congress legislation authorizing payment of funds to local communities to provide protection to power plants, factories, etc., that are important to national defense; and

Whereas there are in Milwaukee County transmitting stations, factories, and power plants that should at all times be carefully guarded against possible sabotage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County hereby requests the proper Federal authorities for funds to employ additional deputy sheriffs to guard facilities in Milwaukee County essential to national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk is hereby instructed to send certified copies of this resolution to Members of Congress representing Milwaukee County, and to Senators representing this State.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WILEY also presented a resolution of the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the development of the St. Lawrence River, which, with the letter of transmittal, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SOUTH MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
June 16, 1941.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator, State of Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am inclosing a true and exact copy of a resolution adopted by our council urging the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill now before Congress. South Milwaukee is well aware of the benefits that will be derived from this project, and urge you to do everything in your power to have the bill passed and the seaway made a reality.

Very truly yours,

H. DAEHLING,
City Clerk.

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, providing a direct outlet from the Great Lakes ports to the Atlantic Ocean, presently contemplated as an integral part of the national-defense program, is now closer to realization than at any time during the continuous struggle for its authorization; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this Common Council that the completion of the aforesaid seaway project, in addition to being of great aid to our national defense, would be of unlimited benefit, not only to the lake-shore region of Wisconsin, but to the entire State of Wisconsin as well: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, That our Representatives in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested to extend all efforts to obtain the authorization and construction of the aforesaid St. Lawrence-seaway project, and more particularly to actively support the bill presently before Congress to provide for improvement of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Basin, H. R. 4927; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senators from Wisconsin, and to the Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, Hon. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI.

Adopted June 13, 1941.
H. W. DAEHLING, *City Clerk.*
Approved June 14, 1941.
CHAS. PLOTZ, *Mayor.*

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their title and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 4. An act to provide more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 93. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to create a public corporate authority to undertake slum clearance and projects to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income and to issue bonds and other obligations of the authority for such purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1062. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to accept a gift of lands from the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1073. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 1618. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1938, extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 2308. An act to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; and

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3182 An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1939; and

H. R. 4903. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4338. An act to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Reserve; and

H. R. 4473. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4988. An act to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the calendar.

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4841. An act to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 16th instant,

The following reports of committees were filed during recess of the Senate:

On June 17, 1941:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 4839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 445);

S. 1585. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 446);

S. 1589. A bill to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty; with an amendment (Rept. No. 447); and

H. R. 4823. A bill providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat; with an amendment (Rept. No. 448).

On June 18, 1941:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4887. A bill to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for the performance of Coast Guard duties; with amendments (Rept. No. 449);

H. R. 531. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1938 (52 Stat. 201), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 450); and

H. R. 4658. A bill to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 451).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1632. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 452);

H. R. 2074. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as

amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 453);

H. R. 4224. A bill relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less; without amendment (Rept. No. 454);

H. R. 4225. An act relating to the manning of certain sail vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 455);

H. R. 4258. A bill to supplement the navigation laws and facilitate the maintenance of discipline on board vessels of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 456);

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 457); and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to provide suitable vessels for the use of certain State nautical schools, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 458).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; with amendments (Rept. No. 459).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 271. A bill authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 460);

S. 753. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 461);

H. R. 4359. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 462); and

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807); without amendment (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 294. A bill to authorize an appropriation for payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of construction costs assessed against certain lands within such district acquired by the United States for the benefit of certain Indians in the State of New Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 464).

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1480. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of public lands for use as public aviation fields," approved May 24, 1928, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 465).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 485. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 466);

S. 1116. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 467);

S. 1117. A bill authorizing a suit in the Court of Claims of the United States against the United States by certain members of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 468);

S. 1154. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 469);

S. 1625. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 470);

S. 1626. A bill to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 471);

H. R. 2308. A bill to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 472); and

S. Res. 115. Resolution authorizing the payment of $2,000 to Charles J. Kappler for compiling, annotating, and indexing volume 5, Indian Laws and Treaties (submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on May 13, 1941); without amendment (Rept. No. 473), and, under the rule, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1644. A bill to provide for a fishery experiment station to study problems of fish culture and fish management in the western part of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ADAMS (for Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 1646. A bill to limit the duties which may be performed by certain officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1647. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jeannette W. Moffett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1648. A bill for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools destroyed by fire at Parker Dam, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1650. A bill for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1651. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, by request of the War Department I ask leave to introduce a joint resolution authorizing the President to make appointments of officers of the Army, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM—MINIMUM PENSIONS

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to offer a resolution to authorize the appointment by the President of the Senate of a special committee of seven Senators to investigate the old-age pension system and legislation to secure minimum pensions thereunder. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred directly to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for its action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from California.

The resolution (S. Res. 129), was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the old-age assistance and the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (2) to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means for bringing about the early realization of a minimum pension for all who have reached the age of retirement and are not gainfully employed. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $2,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR CAPPER TO THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him in tribute to the late Senator Sheppard, at the Morris Sheppard memorial service at Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., on May 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF IDAHO AT MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, SR.

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator CLARK of Idaho at the sixteenth annual memorial services for the late Robert Marion La Follette, Sr., at Madison, Wis., June 15, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUNKER HILL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHANDLER

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

delivered by Senator CHANDLER at Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1941, on the occasion of the annual celebration of Bunker Hill Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE PIUS L. SCHWERT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on the life and services of the late Representative Pius L. Schwert, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at La Crosse, Wis., under the auspices of the Elks Lodge, on June 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S JOB—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the Central Retail Feed Association convention at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on June 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WINANT AT THE ENGLISH SPEAKING UNION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Ambassador John G. Winant at the English Speaking Union on May 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WINANT AT LUNCHEON OF THE PILGRIMS

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Ambassador John G. Winant, delivered at the luncheon of the Pilgrims on March 18, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, delivered at New York City on June 17, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Secretary Hull, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Assistant Secretary Berle, and others before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on the St. Lawrence River development, which appear in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4926, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the commitete amendments to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives was $1,191,776,000. That amount has been reduced net by the Senate committee $2,477,000. The bill is less than the Budget estimates by $33,596,522.

Affecting the Department of Labor itself there are comparatively few changes. In connection with the Wage and Hour Division the Budget estimate was restored in order to permit the Wage and Hour Division to conduct routine inspections of business throughout the United States. The committee was thoroughly convinced that that amount should be allowed.

As to the Civilian Conservation Corps, there is no enlargement in the amount appropriated by the House, but the House fixed a limitation per enrollee of $950. It was demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Senate committee that that limit was too low, and the committee recommends that it be increased to $1,060.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me whether the C. C. C. program is now specifically tied in with the national-defense program in any direct fashion?

Mr. HAYDEN. By law, no; in practice, yes. Many things are done in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps that help to train men for the Army, particularly in a mechanical way, in handling mechanical equipment. It is customary, for example, in practically all the Civilian Conservation Corps camps to have an old automobile or truck which the young men take down and put together, so that they thoroughly understand the mechanism of automotive transportation. They are taught to be good truck drivers and instructed along other lines, so that much of the work they do makes them more valuable when they go into the Army; but no military training is given in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that no military training is given; but the training to which the Senator refers has been proceeding ever since the system was established. There is nothing new about that. What I am inquiring is whether any definitive program is under way to make the C. C. C. camps more definitely a part of national-defense preparation at the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. While there has been coordination in the sense that contacts have been maintained between those engaged in the national defense and the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, the view of the Chief of Staff was that naturally the men do in the camps a great many things which are of benefit to the national defense. For instance, one of the occupations most needed in the Army is that of a good cook. Men are trained to become camp cooks in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and they become very valuable, having this training, when they go into the Army; but otherwise, there is no close coordination. In other words, the Army does not attempt to direct what shall be done in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator think that in the light of the present situation on the one hand, the increasing lack of labor, and, on the other hand, the general requirement that young men are needed in the Army or in related operations, the C. C. C. from now on should be coordinated, I do not mean as a military unit, but as a developing ground for nonmilitary activities? Why should it not be part of the coordinated problem to which presumably the whole Nation is now dedicated?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the opinion of the Chief of Staff, the C. C. C. fits in just as it is without making such a change. There is a long list of vocations, such as—as I indicated—operators of trucks and tractors, power shovels and drag lines, road-construction workers, building-construction men, telephone-line workers, operators of air hammers and air compressors, blasters and powder men, bridge builders, maintenance mechanics and mechanics' helpers, practical blacksmiths, practical welders, and so forth. Trades of that type are taught in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and the men who have gone out of the camps into the Army have obtained better ratings and have made better soldiers because of the training.

The Senator, of course, realizes that modern war is a mechanized effort. Anything that can be done to equip a man in that line ought to be done. The suggestion heretofore made was that a certain amount of infantry drill be given to the men in the Conservation Corps camps; that they be taught how to shoot a rifle, and so forth. In the opinion of the military authorities, the other things the men learn are so much more important that it is better to have it done in that way than to stress merely a certain amount of military instruction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may say so to the Senator, that is precisely the thing I have in mind. I am not talking about military training in the C. C. C. camps. I am inquiring whether they cannot be made more definitely and specifically a reservoir for the mechanized efficiency which the Senator very correctly defines as so essential to the modern defense movement.

Mr. HAYDEN. The answer is that they are already that. The present Chief of Staff, General Marshall, was formerly in command in the Northwest, and had jurisdiction over a large number of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps as a corps-area commander. He knew all about them. His advice to us is that they are very valuable in that respect, and he could see no advantage in changing the system as it now exists.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the average age in one of the camps today?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot state the average. The great bulk of the young men are about 18 to 23.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any difficulty in the present circumstances in keeping up the enrollment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; and that is the reason why the appropriation is reduced.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean that we have to drum up customers for the camps?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but it was disclosed at the hearing before the House committee that the camps had been unable to fill their enrollment, and for that reason the House reduced the appropriation below the amount estimated for in the Budget. The Senate committee did not disturb that sum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does the sum compare with the previous total appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total appropriation for 1941 was $279,944,000. The Budget estimate was $270,000,000, and the amount allowed in the bill is $246,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does that compare with the previous annual appropriations for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer that question. I have not the record before me; but I imagine that prior appropriations are approximately $275,000,000. This is a reduction of $23,040,000 over last year's appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I notice that the committee has reported a reduction in the appropriation for part-time youth work and student aid of $10,984,000. Will not the Senator explain why the appropriation was reduced? The National Youth Administration in my State is doing excellent work, especially among the coal-mine workers and other mine workers, and indeed, all over the State. I regret exceedingly the committee has seen fit to reduce the appropriation. I should like to see the amount restored, and I hope the Senate will restore it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that was a matter I intended to mention next. The amount for the purpose mentioned carried in the bill as it passed the House has been reduced by the committee $10,984,000. The sum total made available to the National Youth Administration by the bill as it passed the House was $85,984,000.

It was the considered judgment of the committee that the opportunities for employment being such as they are throughout the United States, due to the defense program, it was not necessary to appropriate so great a sum of money for this purpose as the House had provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I note the Senator says that it was the considered judgment of the committee that the reduction should be made. It is my understanding that no hearings were held upon this matter, and that no opportunity was taken by the committee to determine the need for the fund, or why there should be any reduction. I have been unable to find any record in the Senate committee hearings of any testimony upon this point at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I question the use of the phrase "considered judgment."

Mr. HAYDEN. It was the judgment the committee reached, and I think the committee had a right to take into consideration what is going on throughout the United States which is creating a scarcity of labor and affording the opportunity for employment.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the division in the committee? Was the report unanimous, or was the committee divided?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a division; but I am sure the Senator would not want me to tell tales out of school.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I would not want the Senator to do that; I merely wanted to bring out the fact that there was a difference of opinion in the committee itself. As I understand, whatever reductions were justified were made by the House, and I think a reduction of $10,984,000 is very severe and unwarranted. I hope that when we reach the item in the bill the Senate will restore the appropriation, and not agree to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was struck by what the Senator in charge of the bill said, that because of the needs of the defense program there are opportunities for work of various kinds. I thought we were trying to save some money. Are we to take in everything, the youth movement, and social security, and everything else? All we have to do hereafter will be just fold our hands and say to the administration, "Now, please do this, with no effort on our part."

This kind of thing has gone on until we have become so accustomed to the administration doing everything that we are doing nothing; and that suits us exactly? I think in some places the youth movement does good; of course, it does; but in doing the youth good how much harm is done to the general spirit of the American people, taxing the whole taxpaying population hundreds of millions of dollars, and pouring the money out to benefit those whom heretofore we never heard of. I think it is time for us to lay aside what may do me some good in the mining sections of the mountains. It is a serious matter, when we come to consider the fact that every kind of project is taken over by the Federal Government. We are centralized enough now. For God's sake, let us try to indicate some tendency to be Americans again.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There seems to be a misapprehension as to what the N. Y. A. does. On the one hand, of course, it does help young men in need, but, on the other hand, it contributes very largely to the defense program. There are at present some 5,500 schools in which boys are trained in trades which are necessary in connection with the national-defense program. For 2 weeks they are given training in regular school work for which they receive no pay whatever. Then they are put to work in the factories or workshops provided by the Government, where they learn actual production. They learn how to manage machines; they learn all the minutiae of manufacturing. They learn how to get along with their fellow workers. The National Youth Administration is training boys for the very work which they should do in the defense program, and it relieves all private industry, at least to a considerable extent, from doing that very thing.

There are at least 1,500 shops where training is given, and some hundreds of thousands of boys are being trained. They relieve men from doing elementary work, so that the men are available for the defense program, and the work of National Youth Administration relieves private industry from the necessity of training the boys.

We all know there is a lack of skilled workers. It is one of the most serious deficiencies in our national-defense program, and it seems to me that, purely from the point of view of national defense, the National Youth Administration program should be sustained.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word concerning the reduction in the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee. It is somewhat out of order at this time, but since the matter is under discussion, it is appropriate for me to say what I think about the matter.

The chairman of the committee said—and probably that is the explanation of the reduction, or one of the explanations—that, in view of the defense program, it ought to be comparatively easy for the young people of the country to find employment.

Mr. President, without desiring to raise any issues which ought not to be raised, I wish to call attention very earnestly to the fact that expenditure for defense has not been uniformly distributed throughout the country, indeed, I do not think it could be because the primary purpose is to promote the national defense, but of some 15 billion dollars contracted for by the Government up to and through May of this year, less than 7 percent of that amount has been contracted for expenditure in the seven Southeastern States consisting of North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. Less than 7 percent of the entire total contracted to be spent in national defense industries of all kinds has been placed in those Southeastern States. In the Southeastern States we have a youth problem that is more severe than in any other part of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to the fact that by the end of last May, or the first of the present month of June, there were 377,000 youths on the eligible list certified for employment on N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects. Nearly 100,000 of the 377,000 were in the seven Southeastern States, or to be exact, 97,000-plus of the youth of the country who had been found eligible and had been certified were in the seven Southeastern States where less

than 7 percent of all expenditure for national defense is being made.

In the South we have a large farm population. Compared with the average for the country as a whole. The seven Southeastern States have more than twice as many persons on the farms. The youth of the South have been dammed up during the depression years. They have been held back on the farm. They have not been able to find employment. There has been no increase in employment among them. I wish to supplement the figures which I have given by the statement that in the Southeastern States there are now presently employed on N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects 70,536 youths. In the same area 97,237 youths have been certified as eligible.

I am advised, and believe it to be true, because I have tried to go into the situation, that if the proposed reduction in the appropriation is made, some 15,000 young people in this area will be put off of the N. Y. A. out-of-school work projects, which would make a total of 112,000 young people certified in this particular area who could not be employed, who could not be put to work, who could not acquire an experience in line with the mechanical requirements of the national defense and of the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the reduction which is recommended by the committee will compel the dropping of about 30,000 young men in the out-of-school work. These training centers have capacity for 30,000, with 3 turn-over periods a year, which means, if this amendment is not rejected, that during the next fiscal year 90,000 young men who would otherwise be trained in very necessary trades, machine trades and electrical trades, for example, will be denied that opportunity. The proposed action, far from being any assistance in this juncture, will be quite the reverse.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I was confining my statement to the number that must necessarily be eliminated in the section of the country where this work is most needed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Gladly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may call the Senator's attention to the fact that in his own State about 17,000 young people who are eligible for training would not receive any training if the bill were to be passed as reported. In my State the number is not quite so large but is approximately 10,000. In the State of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] my recollection is that about 11,000 are eligible but would not have a chance for any training under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, no one doubts that if the money is furnished and the opportunity afforded, there will be plenty of eligibles. Such a thing never happened before.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I think it ought to happen this time.

Mr. SMITH. What I want to know is: Are we going to run everything from Washington, national youth movements, social security, and others, until finally we are out of means to run anything? The tax bill which is soon coming before the Senate for consideration will give some Senators pause. Why should not Georgia and South Carolina and Tennessee and the other States take care of their youth as they have done in the past? If I were to go out on the Capitol lawn and scatter grain on it, the pigeons, of course, would come and eat it. They are now making a living for themselves on the outside, but whenever I go out and begin to throw grain on the ground they will gather and eat it. Do not worry; we could get twice the number of young people out of school if the Government were to furnish them the wherewithal to be trained in the manner proposed. The States used to do it, but we do not have States any more. I do not believe in this centralization, and I am going to fight it so long as I am here.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not quarreling about the question of centralization, but we face facts.

Mr. SMITH. And that is one of the facts.

Mr. GEORGE. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I know the Senator has the floor, and he is welcome to it.

Mr. GEORGE. Of the 377,000 youths who are now certified as eligible, nearly 100,000 live in the Southeastern States. In the Southeastern States the 97,000-plus, together with the number presently employed on N. Y. A. projects, make a total of 167,733.

I wish to call attention to the fact that that figure by no means exhausts the number of young persons affected. That is simply the figure representing those who have thus far qualified and are now eligible. It represents only a small proportion of the youth in the seven Southeastern States who cannot obtain this training, and who particularly will be affected by even this slight reduction in the appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I shall be pleased to answer if I can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator, in addition to the statistics he has presented, tell me what the age bracket is of the youths to whom he refers?

Mr. GEORGE. My information is that it is between 18 and 23 years. I do not know what the average is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it approximately the same age bracket as of those in the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it is approximately the same age bracket. I may be incorrect in that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Sixty-seven percent of them are under 21 years of age.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not have those figures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there any coordination between the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.?

Mr. GEORGE. I know of no direct coordination. There is a coordination between vocational training and the N. Y. A. Most Senators know that I have sponsored and initiated in this body most if not all the vocational education measures which have been approved in the past 10 years. I strongly favor vocational education, both agricultural and mechanical. Under the bills which I have sponsored we have expanded and extended vocational training; but the vocational schools cannot begin to meet the demands, especially in the Southeastern States, and I dare say in other sections of the country as well. In Georgia, the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body, there has been the finest cooperation between the vocational education group and the N. Y. A. Of course, they do somewhat the same work, but it is not identically the same work throughout.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to answer if I can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Apparently the average cost of an enrollee in a C. C. C. camp is approximately $1,000 a year. Can the Senator tell me what the average cost of an N. Y. A. enrollee is?

Mr. GEORGE. I am unable to give the exact figure, but it is considerably less.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the figure is between $750 and $800, or about $60 a month for each boy.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I have the impression that in the States with which I am familiar the figure is perhaps less than $200 a year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator inquiring about the high-school and college projects, or the out-of-school projects?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am interested in knowing the average expenditure per person.

Mr. PEPPER. As I recall, in high schools the cost is about $3 a month. In colleges it is from $10 to $12 a month; and for the out-of-school work I think the figure is between $16 and $24.

Mr. GEORGE. So the cost is less than $200 a year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is referring to the educational aid, and not to the training programs. When boys are in residence, of course the residence centers must provide board and lodging for them as well as education. I think the cost is approximately $60 a month for the boys in residence.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not familiar with the cost throughout the country; but in the southeastern States it is certainly less than the amount indicated by the able Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What challenged my attention was the fact that the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was describing the educational advantages in the C. C. C. camps, which produce mechanics, cooks, and others who in time become eligible for military service. The able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was pointing to precisely the same net result from the N. Y. A. centers. One apparently costs $1,000 a year, and the other $600 or $700 a year. It strikes me that if we are engaged in an all-out, unified, national-defense program there ought to be some sort of coordination of all the various efforts to provide a fundamental, helpful training for young men and women.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with much that the Senator from Michigan says. It will be recalled that at one time in this body I very strenuously advocated a system of voluntary primary military training in the C. C. C. camps; but in the wisdom of the Senate that effort on my part was defeated. However, we were told at that time that a system of training such as the Senator from Arizona has detailed was being instituted in the camps; and my information is that the system has worked very well, and that it has the approval of the Chief of Staff.

For a long time I have been interested in vocational education and the extension and expansion of vocational training; and I have been pleased to note that at least in my State the vocational education forces have worked in the closest cooperation and harmony with the National Youth Administration. Speaking from my own knowledge, I know that I am substantially correct when I say that the maximum contribution made by the N. Y. A. while the student is in junior college or college is approximately $15 a month. I am unable to say what the contribution is for the out-of-school work projects, but it is not very high. In Georgia the National Youth Administration made a constructive survey of one of the cities of the State, even before the defense program was well under way, and ascertained what the demands were in that community and within a reasonable radius thereof for skilled or semiskilled men in various mechanical lines. It undertook to establish, and did establish, a training school, and brought in young men who could readily be employed within that radius, not taking them from the C. C. C. camps or out of the vocational schools, but from those who were unemployed, who desired employment, and who could not find it in our area. That particular training has been most valuable, not only for that city, but also for the State; and I am advised and believe that it has served a very useful purpose in the expansion of the National Youth Administration program throughout the country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to correct the figure which I gave a moment ago. I have just called Mr. Aubrey Williams to ascertain definitely and accurately the amounts paid to N. Y. A. beneficiaries. For high-school students, those receiving student aid in the high schools, the contribution is from $3 to $6 a month. Mr. Williams says that the average is $4 a month. In colleges the contribution may run as high as $15 a month, but the average is $11 a month. In the case of students receiving out-of-school aid, but not in residence in camps, it runs from $4 to $18 a month. Those who are in residence in camps receive their subsistence and $10 a month.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator for the figures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that the age span in the C. C. C. camps is from 18 to 23 or 24, and that the age span in the N. Y. A. is from 18 to 23 or 24. Half of that span is also covered by the Draft Act. I ask the Senator whether or not the application of the draft to at least half of the age span which has heretofore been served by the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. would normally substantially reduce the necessity for appropriations, and equivalently reduce the activities of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C.?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has not done so, has it?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has already called attention to the fact that 67 percent of the youths receiving benefits from the National Youth Administration are under the age of 21. So in the case of the youths being served by the N. Y. A., a much larger percentage is under 21 years of age than is the case in the C. C. C. camps.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the basis of the Senator's own figures, that leaves 33 percent of the males who are within the draft age.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Forty percent of them are girls.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; finally we get to the point where I think we should be able substantially to reduce the appropriation not only for N. Y. A. but for C. C. C. In view of the draft's application to the men within this age span, I do not see why we have to keep on at the maximum in respect to all persons within the span.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In making his statement, of course, the Senator from Michigan assumes that the maximum number of possible enrollees or trainees is being handled; but the Senator from Georgia has already pointed out that on the 1st of May there were at least 382,000 young persons who desired to enroll, but who could not enroll because the funds had not been provided. Moreover, it is also true that it would easily be possible to enroll twice that number if the facilities were provided.

The situation is that even if this reduction is not made we shall not be able to take on the 382,000 who are not enrolled; we shall merely prevent the cutting off of 30,000. That is to say, we shall thereby reduce the capacity from, as I recall, 325,000 to 295,000; and that will mean, in the entire year, a reduction by 90,000 of the number of persons who may be trained.

What should be said to the Senator from Michigan, it seems to me, is that the C. C. C. work was undertaken at a time when there was no opportunity whatever for employment in private industry. The C. C. C. work was a stopgap; and under the program which was followed, there were created throughout the country work projects to which the young men who were enrolled in the C. C. C. were assigned. But ever since the beginning of the defense effort, the reduction in enrollment to which the Senator from Michigan refers has been proceeding quite naturally; and the appropriation which is brought in here is a reduction.

The N. Y. A. program is not, like the C. C. C., a work program. It is what the Senator from Georgia has described, essentially a vocational educational training program. The young men and young women who enroll under it are in for only a short time, and are being trained for private industry. The justification of the N. Y. A. program is to be found in the fact that the record shows that enrollees are passing from N. Y. A. into private industry, particularly into the mechanical trades, at the rate of from 12,000 to 16,000 boys and girls a month; so it is building up opportunities for work.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to say that I think the Senator has understated the figure. The figure is about 40,000 per month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Rhode Island is referring to the entire program. I was talking particularly about the mechanical trades, and I had in mind particularly the figure with reference to national-defense efforts.

Mr. GREEN. That is what I had reference to. The figure is about 40,000 a month. In my own State of Rhode Island, in the month of April—the last for which I have figures—there were 521 who went into private industry.

I rather resent the statement made on the floor that these young men are seeking to avoid their duties and to live on the country. They are seeking to get education whereby they can earn their living, and at the same time they are contributing to the development of the industries of the country for the purpose of national defense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield? I do not wish to make a speech.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I shall be very glad to yield the floor. I took advantage of the opportunity, by the indulgence of

the Senator in charge of the bill, to say what I desired to say at this time with reference to this particular appropriation.

Mr. HILL. I merely desire to say, in connection with what has been said about the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., and the selective service that the Bureau of Labor Statistics advises me that at the present time there are between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 unemployed young people in this country who are registered with offices of the Employment Service who have had no training of any kind, who have had no technical experience, and who, therefore, are not able to get jobs. The Department of Agriculture advises me that there are about 1,500,000 young people on our farms who are not needed for farm work, who have no training, who have no experience, and who, therefore, are practically without anything to do.

So far as the N. Y. A. and the selective service are concerned, I look upon the N. Y. A. in large measure as complementary to the selective service. When we consider the question of national defense today, we have to realize that we are living in a time of modern technocracy, a time of gigantic machines of all kinds. What we need is men who are trained as artisans, men who are trained as mechanics and technicians, such as are being trained today in the N. Y. A., to go into our industries to produce the gigantic machines which we must have for our national defense, and also to have this training when they go in under the selective service, so that they may be prepared to operate the great machines which we must have for our national defense.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In response to what the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan said, I desire to say that my approach to this matter is not from the standpoint of aid to youth, although that is the way it originated. From the standpoint of national defense we need 300,000 shipyard workers within the next year; we need 500,000 aeronautical mechanics; and there is substantially no other source. In the past 20 years the apprentice system has broken down, and if it were not for the assistance furnished by the youth-training program this country would be in a very serious condition.

I have watched this training program in operation. I have seen hundreds of boys trained in the N. Y. A. shops going immediately into employment all through the industrial Northeast. I think nothing could be more unfortunate than to cripple or hamper in any degree the program at this time as a primary matter of national defense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am gratified to hear the statement of the Senator from Maine, because it confirms what I tried to express. We hear much about bottlenecks today. The truth is that the greatest and most impeding bottleneck we have is the bottleneck due to a lack of trained artisans and mechanics and technicians, and the one place today where we can train and turn out the artisans and mechanics we need is the N. Y. A. So the N. Y. A. is merely complementary and necessary to the national defense, as is the selective service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the discussion, of course, is general. The only way to get to this amendment is to consider in their order the amendments to the bill. I ask that the clerk proceed to read the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 9, after the word "services", to strike out "$850,000" and insert "$494,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Chair's pardon; I desire to wait until the amendment last under discussion is before the Senate. Is that the next amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; Mr. President, the amendment which we have been talking about is on page 59 of the bill, and we shall have to proceed through the bill and have the committee amendments stated.

Mr. PEPPER. The reduction in the N. Y. A. appropriation is not now up for consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It will be reached in due order. We have just had a general discussion; but in order to reach the amendment pertaining to the N. Y. A. I have asked that the committee amendments be read. They are now being read.

Mr. PEPPER. I will postpone my remarks until the amendment pertaining to the N. Y. A. is reached.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 23, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspaper clippings not to exceed $1,400"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he will accept a slight amendment which the Secretary of Labor has just asked that I present. It refers to the word "newspapers" on line 2, page 3; to "newspapers" again on page 5, line 11; and to "newspapers" again on page 8, line 25.

Mr. HAYDEN. Similar amendments are made throughout the bill. What is the proposal the Senator has?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The proposal is merely to restore the word "newspapers." The Department does not in any sense object to the amendment on page 2, line 23, striking out the words "newspaper clippings not to exceed $1,400," and that amendment has been agreed to. The point is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics for several years has subscribed to certain newspapers, and in order to maintain the continuity of their studies they will have to have the newspapers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Are the newspapers in question published by labor organizations? For instance, in Arizona we have the Arizona Labor Journal. In some places similar publications are published weekly; sometimes they are published monthly; and I imagine that, like the newspaper entitled "Labor" which is published in this city and with which we are all so familiar——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The newspapers they are interested in are merely three, namely, the New York Times, the New York Times Index, and the Journal of Commerce, three newspapers that deal with statistics of various kinds which the Department has been following in making up statistical reports.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator could accomplish the purpose in this particular instance by having the amendment rejected.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I, therefore, suggest that the Senate reject the amendment on line 2, page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, striking out the word "newspapers."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will call attention to the other amendments when they are reached in the reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, to increase the total for contingent expenses from $215,500 to $219,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the world "field", to strike out "$1,538,000", and insert "$1,749,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "industry", to strike out "$595,000" and insert "$608,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "offices", to strike out "newspapers,".

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that the Senate reject the amendment on page 5, line 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 8, line 25, before the word "books", to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 1, after the word "reference" and the comma, to strike out "periodicals,

and press clippings" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maternal and Child Welfare", on page 9, line 12, after the word "equipment" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 12, after the word "reference", to strike out "periodicals, and press clippings" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division", on page 12, line 2, after the word "For", to strike out "all" and insert "the Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and other"; in line 7, after the word "rendered", to strike out "$4,697,700" and insert "$5,406,800", and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000", and insert "$1,035,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 19, after the word "reports", to strike out "newspapers and press clippings."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move to amend the amendment so as to leave in the bill the word "newspapers" and to strike out the words "and press clippings."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 14, line 9, after the word "reference" and the comma, to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, subhead "Civilian Conservation Corps", on page 17, line 9, after the word "reference", to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers", and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$950" and insert "$1,060", and on page 20, line 1, after the word "enrollees", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That such limit of $950 may be exceeded if the actual enrollee strength falls below 232,500 enrollees, but in no event shall the total expenditures from the appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps be in excess of the amount that could be expended under the operation of the limitation of $950 cost per enrollee on the basis herein established.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Vocational Education", on page 24, after line 20, to insert:

Payments to States, and so forth (National Youth Administration): For payment to States, subdivisions thereof, or other public agencies operating public educational facilities, for the cost of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction provided by such agencies for young people employed on work projects of the National Youth Administration, such courses and instruction to be provided pursuant to plans submitted by such agencies and approved by the Commissioner, $10,000,000, payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office: *Provided*, That the amount allotted to any agency shall be available for expenditure for purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space found by the Commissioner to be necessary for carrying out the approved plan: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $125,000 of the above sum shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a perfecting amendment, on page 25, line 18, after the word "available", to insert "to the Office of Education"; otherwise the language would not be clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 25, line 18, after the word "available", it is proposed to insert "to the Office of Education", so as to read:

Provided further, That not to exceed $125,000 of the above sum shall be available to the Office of Education for administrative expenses.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education and Training, Defense Workers (National Defense)", on page 28, line 9, after the word "Code", to strike out "colleges," and insert "colleges and"; in line 10, after the word "universities", to strike out "and hospitals,"; in line 18, after the word "college", to insert "or"; and in line 19, after the word "university", to strike out the comma and "or hospital."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 25, after the word "schools", to insert "including vocational schools exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) For the cost of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction provided by such agencies for young people employed on work projects of the National Youth Administration, such courses and instruction to be provided pursuant to plan submitted by such agencies and approved by the Commissioner, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount allotted to any agency shall be available for expenditure for purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space found by the Commissioner to be necessary for carrying out the approved plan: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $125,000 of the above sum shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal Security Administrator" and insert "Commissioner", and in line 13, after the figures "$100", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Commissioner shall transmit to Congress quarterly during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, a report of the defense training programs and training programs for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects covering such educational programs which operate under his administration, as provided for in this act, such reports to show the distribution of Federal funds and activities by States, types of programs and numbers of persons trained.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 24, after the word "established", to strike out "and where the cost of training any worker not classed as a youth is not disproportionate to the productive benefits to be obtained from such training, preference in selection for training shall be given to nonyouth applicants therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 22, to insert:

The Commissioner may delegate to any officer in the Office of Education any of his powers or duties hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration", on page 34, line 9, before the word "exchange", to strike out "periodicals and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital", on page 38, line 10, after the word "books", to strike out "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals", and on page 39, line 1, after the words "Provided further", to strike out:

That the cost of maintaining and treating patients who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be chargeable to the District of Columbia and paid in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid.

And insert:

That 65 percentum of each of the foregoing appropriations for the Freedmen's Hospital shall be chargeable to the District of Columbia and paid in like manner as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid, subject, however, to adjustments from time to time to be made during and at the end of the fiscal year so that the portion of each of these appropriations charged to the District of Columbia shall bear the same ratio to the total of each appropriation as the number of hospital days of service to persons who have resided in the District of Columbia for over 1 year on the day of admission bears to the total number of hospital days of service performed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 40, line 19, after the name "Surgeon

General", to strike out "newspaper clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 22, after "$380,000", to strike out the comma and the words "including the purchase of newspapers and clippings from newspapers containing information relating to the prevalence of disease and the public health."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers, and periodicals", and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "work", to strike out "$1,615,000" and insert "$1,665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "such agencies" and insert "public agencies operating public educational facilities"; and in line 19, after "$1,200,000", to insert a comma and the words "payment thereof to be made through certification from time to time in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and approved by the President, by said Surgeon General to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of such agency or hospital to whom payment is to be made, and the amount to be paid, such payment to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 53, line 9, after the word "equipment" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers, press clippings (not to exceed $1,500), and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 17, after the word "amended", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$78,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Youth Administration", on page 59, line 4, after the word "persons", to strike out "$85,984,000" and insert "$75,000,000 "

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the amendment we have been discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that amendment be rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this, as has already been indicated by the Senator in charge of the bill, is the amendment concerning which we spent so much time earlier in the day, assessing the various factors. It is probably not necessary to go into it at length now; I think the Members of the Senate understand the problem very clearly. I do wish to say, however, that the factor which should be of the utmost importance, it seems to me, in the consideration of this amendment is that it relates to the national defense.

The Chairman of the Maritime Commission called me only this morning to invite attention to the fact, which has already been alluded to by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], that there is a great need of workers in the shipbuilding industry. The Maritime Commission is anxious to take advantage of the training facilities of the National Youth Administration; the War Department is anxious to take advantage of them; the Office of Production Management is anxious to take advantage of them; and if the Committee on Appropriations had held any hearings upon this matter, if it had undertaken to find out what the facts are with respect to the manner in which this fund is being expended, a substantial showing would have been made to support the retention of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I wish to call attention to the fact that, according to the figures available to me, at least 1,409,000 persons are needed at this moment in various mechanical activities necessary in the national defense; 324,000 in shipbuilding, 408,000 in the construction and building of planes, 292,000 in machine shops, and 385,000 in related industries.

The National Youth Administration is providing the training facilities for this demand; and if we cut it off we shall be acting only to deprive essential industries of securing the necessary labor, which they cannot now secure because, as has already been pointed out, the apprentice system in this country has been practically abandoned.

During the month of April, according to the report of the N. Y. A., which I have in my hands, 155,697 youths were employed in workshop production projects of various types. These projects provide training in sheet-metal work, in welding, in foundry work, in automobile maintenance and repair, in aviation service, in farm-implement service, in machine-shop service, in electrical work, in radio work, in woodworking, drafting, map making, and blueprinting, and, for the girls, sewing and other production. Every one of these items is obviously an essential activity in the preparation for the national defense; and it is necessary only to state the facts, it seems to me, to indicate the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, would it interfere with the Senator if I should interrupt him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. While the Senator was speaking about national defense a few minutes ago I took occasion to say that I felt that the N. Y. A. work was complementary to the selective-service training, and that it was just as necessary to the national defense as is the selective-service training.

In that connection I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some excerpts from a letter written by the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, to the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] on the 12th day of this month.

At the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the bill providing for the deferment of persons between the ages of 28 and 36 it developed that the Army is rejecting registrants under the Selective Service Act on account of illiteracy. The committee was most interested to know why these men were being rejected because of illiteracy, and General Marshall wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee in which he said:

> During World War 1 it was not necessary to place a literacy qualification on selective-service men. Today, tactical units, with their much greater degree of motorization, require a higher average of intelligence to absorb the necessary training. The current troop basis contains a minimum of labor units to which illiterates and morons can be assigned.
>
> Early in the spring of 1941 replacement training centers and tactical organizations were commencing the training of selectees in large numbers. At that time the War Department began to receive numerous complaints from the commanders of these organizations concerning illiteracy. The number received among selectees was far in excess of the number that could be successfully utilized without seriously impeding the progress of other fully qualified selectees, and, in fact, of the organizations themselves. Immediate and positive action was necessary to prevent the diversion of our relatively few expert training personnel as well as our limited housing facilities for the extensive training necessary to make this type of selectee even an acceptable soldier. The only solution appeared to be the establishment of a literacy-test regulation.

And the War Department adopted a literacy test.

Mr. President, this letter shows how necessary it is that the work of the N. Y. A. be carried on, that we may continue to train and to educate as many as possible of these young men, that we may do all possible to remove illiteracy in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for that contribution to the consideration of the subject.

I was pointing out that the chairman of the Maritime Commission this morning telephoned my office to say that this type of training is very greatly needed in the shipbuilding industry. I have before me a letter which Admiral Land wrote to Mr. Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the O. P. M., on May 13, in which he said:

> I think it is unlikely that enough mechanics can be supplied on time unless the training job is attacked directly and expeditiously by everyone concerned.

I have a copy of a letter which was written by Secretary of War Stimson to the F. S. A. Administrator in which he pointed out the great need at this time of training in radio. He said:

> In time of an emergency the Army will need a large number of radio operators. It is requested that the N. Y. A. program for the training of radio operators be expanded to 5,000 youths, if practicable within the limitation of available funds.

In April 1941, according to the figures I have just read to the Senate, only 3,233 young persons were enrolled for radio training. The Army would like to see 5,000 enrolled.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be perfectly clear that this is a reduction which certainly should not be made at this time.

I have some other interesting figures.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I desire, first, to commend the Senator from Wyoming for the attitude he has taken on this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the commendation of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I trust his very creditable performance on the Senate floor will bear fruit when the final vote is cast.

I desire to say to my distinguished colleagues that I have made quite a study of N. Y. A. projects in my State. We realize, as the Senator has well said, that trainees are available in greater number than this humble effort attempts to care for. Not only are trainees available, but the Army and the Navy, as the Senator has stated, are clamoring for trained men; and we read in the newspapers last evening that England is looking for thousands and thousands of men trained in the radio and in other crafts here in this country. We recognize also that private enterprise in America is stalemated in its effort because of inadequacy of the supply of trained mechanics.

Mr. President, this program reaches a class that is not included in the selective-service draft. It goes down to those 17 and 18 years of age. It prepares them for a particular work which will be helpful to national defense; and, in addition to that, I point out that it aids a class unable to carry on an educational program of their own in private or public vocational or technical schools.

It gives to them part-time training and part-time work, so that they may in this manner achieve an education which would otherwise be denied them, under their economic circumstances. So, since it reaches down below the years of those included in the Selective Service, and prepares them for national defense, and, in view of the added fact that it rescues those who have given up perhaps all thought of a superior education and gives to them an opportunity to rise above the grade of, we will say, the ordinary laborer. I think it is a very fine program, and should be encouraged.

The youth problem is the greatest problem confronting any country in the world. We have only scratched the surface here. Think of it. Over a million boys and over a million girls become of working age each year in this country, and there are certainly many opportunities for them which will be fulfilled only if we reject the amendment proposed by the committee.

As I stated in the beginning, we have scratched the surface only. The youth problem is the biggest problem in this Nation. Training our boys along technical lines supplies the most valuable asset for our national defense, and a nation which has the personnel well trained, technically trained, will be the predominant nation at the close of the present crisis. I understand that a technically trained army of less than a quarter of a million men was all that was employed by Germany in its invasion of France. Even though that army faced an army of nearly 5,000,000 men, but men who lacked the machinery and the technical training, the smaller army——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Six divisions overcame France.

Mr. MEAD. The smaller army, by reason of the superior technical training of its members, caused France to surrender.

I wish to leave the impression that this committee amendment strikes at the very heart and center of the problem, and it should be unanimously rejected. Again I commend the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator has made these remarks. They suggest to my mind that the enrollees under the N. Y. A. program all come from families in the lowest income strata. They come from families having incomes of less than $1,200, and, of course, we know that there are very large numbers of families in this country now receiving less than $500 annually. This program offers opportunity for training, and, as I shall show in a moment, the experience indicates that, having received this training, they have been going in increasing numbers into private industry.

I am happy the Senator from New York has made reference to the importance of the youth problem in this country. I know that it was for that purpose that the Senator from West Virginia rose to interrupt me, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, I wish to add merely a word of testimony in connection with this problem, one which is intensely interesting to me, because I have helped to administer the N. Y. A. funds in my State, and I know something about the help those funds have given to students in our colleges and high schools.

The expense compared with the result is very modest. The amount allowed for a student does not pay all his expenses; it is a sort of spark plug which induces him and his parents to get him into high school and into college.

Just one thought about its lowering self-respect. There is absolutely nothing in that argument. The aid given to high school and college students does not lower the self-respect of any young person. The college campus for a hundred years has been familiar with the campus job and the campus scholarship; those things are a part of our college and university life. The young people who receive this aid are encouraged and inspired to go ahead and make the best possible out of themselves, and they experience no loss of self-respect whatever.

I think that the Government receives a finer return from this investment than from any other investment I know of which it makes, and I speak from personal observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for the statement he has made.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There is one point the Senator from Wyoming made in his admirable presentation of this matter which it appears to me should be amplified; that is, the need of the families who are helped by this form of aid. I know that some Senators are under the erroneous impression that the standard of need has been abandoned by the N. Y. A., but such is not the fact. I should like to read that part of the regulations which relates to this very matter. In the regulations which were formulated about a year ago appears section 13, which was not a new section then, but which was reissued at that time. I read:

> Certification of need: Youth employees should be certified as in need. The State youth administrator may request public-relief agencies to certify eligible youth known to such agencies, and direct applications to the National Youth Administration by eligible youth shall also be accepted for certification. For the purpose of certification a youth shall be considered as needy if he is—
>
> A. A member of a family whose income is insufficient to provide the basic requirements of all members of the family, including the youth member, regardless of whether the family is receiving or eligible for any form of public assistance; or
>
> B. Without family connections and his income is insufficient to provide his basic requirements.

As a result of the administration of the regulation I have just read, it appears that in this out-of-school work program some of the youth—a larger portion of them—are certified by the local relief agencies, but all the others are, without exception, investigated by the N. Y. A. officials, who make certain of the needs of the youth and his family before he is assigned to work.

In the N. Y. A. student work program the average annual income of the families of the students is $645. One-fifth of the families earn less than $300 a year, and over two-thirds of the families have incomes under $900 a year.

I think that disposes effectively of the argument that this has ceased to be a means of reducing the needs of the poor families. However, I still believe that the main argument for increasing the appropriation which is now proposed is that it would assist in the development of our industries, and especially those producing articles used in the national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not take any more time to discuss this matter, because it seems to me it is very clearly understood; but I wish to put into the RECORD the figures to which I was referring when the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] interrupted me a moment ago.

I was discussing the number of young trainees who go from the N. Y. A. centers into private industry. In July 1940, 14,500 young persons went from these centers into private industry; in August the number was 13,490; in September, 17,093; in October, 18,234; in November, 16,844; in December, 16,026. In January 1941, when the defense movement was gaining impetus, the number was 22,442; in February it was 31,582; in March, 38,853; and in April, 40,902.

Thus month by month the graduates of this youth training are going into the factories and the shops which are engaged in

national defense. I can think of very few greater contributions to the strengthening of the morale of our young people than is to be found in this study.

Mention was made earlier in the day by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] of the fact that the States are not taking care of this problem. The States cannot take care of it. That is the unfortunate fact of our present situation. States and local communities have actually lost their economic independence, as it were. They are not able to provide the work which the rising generation requires. That is the heart of our whole problem. No one pretends to believe that this is a final solution. It is not a final solution. But under the N. Y. A. there is being provided an opportunity for training and for employment in industry of hundreds of thousands of young men and young women who otherwise would have no opportunity at all.

Mr. President, I think this is certainly not the place to reduce an appropriation. Particularly is that true when it must be acknowledged that no hearings were held upon this matter by the Senate committee and that no evidence was taken. This Bureau of the Budget made a recommendation to Congress at the beginning of the session that $100,000,000 be appropriated for this purpose. Ten million dollars was taken away and given to the Bureau of Education for vocational training. Five million dollars is required for the administrative expenses, leaving approvimately $85,000,000 for the work. The Senate committee has reduced that to $75,000,000. If the reduction stands, I think it will be a serious undermining of a very necessary program, and I hope the Senate will not support the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point a letter from Admiral Land to Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General, Office of Production Management; a letter from Secretary of War Stimson to the F. S. A. Administrator; and a list showing the number of those who are registered for enrollment and who have not been enrolled, divided according to the States, so that Members of the Senate who are interested in knowing how many young persons there are in their particular States who are awaiting enrollment in this program may have that information by consulting this list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters and list are as follows:

UNITED STATES
MARITIME COMMISSION,
May 13, 1941.

SIDNEY HILLMAN,
Associate Director General,
Office of Production Management,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HILLMAN: The Maritime Commission is vitally concerned, as you know, with the Labor Division's work of recruiting and training manpower for defense industries. In order to accelerate the construction of ships, which defense requires and the President has requested, a very large number of shipyard mechanics must be trained in a very short time. Most of the yards have already instituted training programs of their own, but I am somewhat fearful that the demand for more and faster production will call for trained labor faster than it can be supplied by individual shipyard action. Estimates prepared for us, which we believe are conservative, indicate that all shipbuilding, including both Navy and Maritime, will require 374,000 additional shipbuilding workers by September, 1942, than are now engaged in the industry. Of this number 287,000 will be skilled, semiskilled, and supervisory workers. I think it unlikely that enough mechanics can be supplied on time unless the training job is attacked directly and expeditiously by everyone concerned.

Representatives of this Commission have held several discussions with representatives of the Office of Production Management and the Federal training and employment agencies associated in defense training. These discussions have been helpful in clearing the ground, and I am now anxious to see the blueprint of a specific program.

We shall probably need the assistance of all of the various Federal agencies now coordinated by the Division of Labor Supply and Training, including the Employment Service, the Training-Within-Industry Division, the vocational and apprentice training groups, the National Youth Administration, and such other State and Federal agencies as are engaged in this work. While it will, of course, be necessary to coordinate the work which these agencies may do for us through the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management, I assume that you have no objection to representatives of this Commission going direct to any of the individual agencies to secure advice and assistance in the preparation of training projects.

Prompt action is required and I shall appreciate it, therefore, if you will arrange to have representatives of the various agencies now coordinated by the Division of Labor Supply and Training establish direct contact with this Commission through Commissioner H. L. Vickery to work out a program which I can submit to the full Commission for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1940.

The Honorable ADMINISTRATOR, F. S. A.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I have been informed that the N. Y. A. is engaged in training radio operators at certain work projects. Further, I have been informed that the Administrator of the N. Y. A. is agreeable to expanding this type of training, if it is of benefit to the military service. Such training as will qualify enrollees in the N. Y. A. as amateur radio operators will be of direct benefit to our national defense.

In time of an emergency, the Army will need a large number of radio operators. It is requested that the N. Y. A. program for the training of radio operators be expanded to 5,000 youth, if practicable, within the limitation of available funds.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration

YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, MAY 1941

Grand total	377,002
State or Territory:	
Alabama	16,161
Arizona	275
Arkansas	19,774
California	5,143
Colorado	6,580
Connecticut	32
Delaware	124
District of Columbia	254
Florida	9,547
Georgia	17,438
Idaho	805
Illinois	6,571
Indiana	5,744
Iowa	5,551
Kansas	4,345
Kentucky	16,903
Louisiana	4,680
Maine	1,537
Maryland	611
Massachusetts	4,827
Michigan	3,458
Minnesota	5,012
Mississippi	14,150
Missouri	9,233
Montana	1,324
Nebraska	1,918
Nevada	54
New Hampshire	147
New Jersey	809
New Mexico	1,868
New York City and Long Island	10,823
New York (excluding New York City and Long Island)	2,039
North Carolina	13,705
North Dakota	2,806
Ohio	10,895
Oklahoma	11,771
Oregon	907
Pennsylvania	23,016
Rhode Island	------
South Carolina	11,184
South Dakota	1,774
Tennessee	15,052
Texas	38,864
Utah	2,514
Vermont	378
Virginia	11,438
Washington	654
West Virginia	11,350
Wisconsin	4,394
Wyoming	274
Alaska	50
Puerto Rico	38,097
Virgin Islands	142

Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration—Continued

Source: Reports of State youth administrators on N. Y. A. Form 510.

DIVISION OF FINANCE AND STATISTICS.
June 17, 1941.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the last few months we have heard much, not only in the Senate but elsewhere throughout the country, about the national defense. There have been contradictions in sentiment as to the methods by which the country could best be served. There have been some who thought the best way to defend democracy was to aid in stopping Hitler, who threatens freedom everywhere. But here and elsewhere Senators and spokesmen have eloquently said that the best way to protect and preserve democracy was to do it here at home in the United States. Today, Mr. President, we have before us a bill the purpose of which is to provide part-time employment for needy young persons in schools, colleges, and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, and to provide employment for unemployed young persons on subsequently enumerated public projects.

Mr. President, how can anyone not support proposals of that character? How can anyone deny to a boy or a girl trying to go to high school a chance to work to earn an average of $4 a month? How can anyone deny an American boy or girl a chance to make an average of $11 a month by working in a college or a university in America? How can anyone deny to a boy or girl an average of

between $14 and $18 a month compensation for his or her labor when he or she is trying to learn a vocation that will serve the national defense? How can anyone deny to a boy or girl an opportunity to earn by his or her labor subsistence and $10 in a resident N. Y. A. camp in the United States of America? How can anyone deny those privileges to work, Mr. President, and yet say they believe in strengthening democracy here at home?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator not also think it is important that the selectees who are now in training, who have had this work before they went to the Army, shall when they return have the same opportunity to work and make their way through school?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator think the Government owes them the duty to afford them the same opportunity which they had before they entered the military service?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly do. I am glad the Senator made the contribution by that suggestion.

Mr. President, I happen to recall that in 1937 I obtained figures, and presented them to the Senate, which showed that at that time we had in the United States 3,670,000 illiterates. Do they aid the national defense? Then we had but 2,000,000 college graduates. A great democracy, the greatest democracy in the world, the hope of democracy everywhere, had more illiterates than college graduates. How can those illiterates deal with the complexities of a technological civilization? How can they even operate the complicated instruments of war which perhaps alone can defend democracy in the world?

At that time we had only 32,000,000 in the whole citizenry of America who had the advantage of even an elementary-school education, a grammar-school education. Only 32,000,000 of America's 130,000,000 had had any elementary-school education. Only 14,000,000 had graduated from elementary school. Only 5,000,000 had had a high-school education, and, as I have already said, only 2,000,000 had had a college education.

Mr. President, surely nobody would think that democracy could be strengthened by denying to a boy or girl a chance to work to obtain an education. I am proud to say that I am one Member of the Senate—and perhaps there are many others—who had to work his way through college. If I had not had a job I could not have obtained a college education, and I should have been one of the millions who are handicapped in the struggle for existence in a great democracy, because fortune had not smiled upon me or my family?

Mr. President, in Florida in the month of April 5,562 youths were employed on the out-of-school program; but 15,257 are still awaiting assignment—assignment to what? To a chance to work in a great democracy.

We talk about strengthening the sinews and fibers of democratic institutions, and then thrust the deserving boy or girl back into the oblivion of sorrow and unemployment. The hand of a mighty nation that stands for human liberty against its worst assault should not be turned against the boy or girl who offers his services for its defense. I cannot believe that those who have said that what we need to do is to strengthen our democracy from within will not on this occasion rush to the defense of a proposal which offers to open the windows of the human mind and soul to those who would otherwise have to experience for the remainder of their lives the sadness of intellectual and spiritual darkness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am interested in the work of the National Youth Administration, not only because of its importance at this particular time in connection with the national-defense program but also because I believe that the activities which it has been carrying on are essential to the strengthening and functioning of democracy in time of peace as well as in time of national emergency. I think the Senate should bear in mind that at no time has the appropriation been adequate to meet the needs of eligible youths for this program. Last year about $101,000,000 was provided for this purpose; and yet on the 1st of April 1941 less than one-half of the eligible youths had an opportunity to participate in the N. Y. A. program.

The House of Representatives has already cut the appropriation for this program $10,000,000 below what was provided for last year, by giving $10,000,000 to the Office of Education. In the past fiscal year the Office of Education received $7,500,000 of direct appropriations to carry on its activities in relation to training for national defense; and instead of providing such an appropriation this year the House of Representatives has taken $10,000,000 out of the Budget recommendation for the National Youth Administration and has given it to the Office of Education. So, instead of having a program equivalent to the one which we had last year, even if this amendment should be defeated and the Senate should rest content with the House figure, we should be cutting the program of the National Youth Administration by as much as $10,000,000 for this year. Of course, if by any chance the Senate committee amendment should prevail we should be cutting it more than $20,000,000 as compared with the amount provided last year.

Mr. President, last week the Senate was in a hysterical state of mind over strikes and interruptions to defense preparation. I agree with every word that has been said here by other Senators to the effect that the real bottleneck which will ultimately develop and which will be more detrimental to the national-defense program than the bottlenecks in aluminum, steel, the transportation system, or anything else, will be a lack of skilled workers who are trained to manipulate the instruments of production in our modern industrial society.

In view of these facts, I hope that the Senate will reject the committee amendment. I myself would prefer to be fighting for an amendment which would give us at least the equivalent of last year's program, because I think that, even if we should reject the amendment and rest upon what the House has provided, a few months from now, we should find, much to our sorrow, that we had not taken the necessary steps to provide an adequate appropriation for this program.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am very hopeful—although not optimistic—that the committee amendment will prevail. It is true that we have not provided as much money this year as we had in the appropriation of last year; but I hope the Senators will not overlook the fact that in the interim we have appropriated many billion dollars which will go far toward providing work for the young men and women for whom the N. Y. A. program was originally created.

Recently we were invited—or perhaps challenged—by the chief financial officer of our Government to cut nondefense expenditures one billion dollars. I had hoped that the Congress would meet the challenge, but as a result of what has transpired since that time I must confess that my hopes have waned to a very great extent.

In the eloquent statements by the opponents of the amendment much is made of the fact that cutting the appropriation by $10,000,000 would jeopardize the defense program under the National Youth Administration. Such is not the case. In another part of the bill a separate fund, amounting to $56,972,000, is specifically set apart to enable the National Youth Administration to carry out its national-defense work.

Mr. President, I was in the Congress when the National Youth Administration was created, and when the Civilian Conservation Corps and other relief agencies came into existence; and I clearly remember that the only reason then advanced for the creation of such agencies was that of a need to provide work for men and women, and boys and girls, who otherwise could not obtain employment, and who otherwise could not find the means to support themselves or provide for their education. During those days of economic darkness I was among the Members of Congress greatly concerned with the appropriation of a sufficient amount of money for that needed work. I have never voted to reduce a W. P. A. appropriation as it came from the Bureau of the Budget. On occasion I have voted to increase the appropriation. Nor have I ever voted to decrease an appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps. I have also and always been among those who were anxious to provide sufficient money for the National Youth Administration. But the day of reckoning is certain to come; and while it has been pointed out that this program, without enough money, could be a bottleneck and that the neglect of our young people might be harmful to our preservation of democratic principles, I fear that our financial condition may one day be democracy's bottleneck. I feel that one of our great dangers may

be our inability to appreciate the financial dangers which lie ahead.

If we are ever to cut out or curtail the relief agencies of another day, the time to do so is now. There is not now the need that there has been for jobs and positions for those who would be taken care of under this bill. Every Senator knows that the National Youth Administration has been conducting a canvass for young men and young women to work under this program. There is not now the need for those young men, because as our defense program has expanded during these past many months, many manufacturing plants have been constructed and expanded, and millions of people have gone back to work, and many more are constantly being employed.

In my own State there is at the moment a crying need for thousands of persons to work in our agricultural industry. There is a hope that they can be obtained in other States. At the same time, in the name of national defense, an effort is now being made to build up agencies which were created solely for purposes of relief. Agencies which in the last 8 years caused the expenditure of billions of dollars to give work to men, now are sought to be continued, under the plea that their existence is necessary in order to find people for employers. Agencies created to make jobs now are sought to be continued, under the argument that they are needed as agencies to go out and find people to take jobs.

As I said, Mr. President, I am not optimistic, but I promised myself, as one of those who was for liberal expenditures during the days of distress, that I would endeavor to meet the invitation or challenge of the chief financial officers and the crying need of our country, that we endeavor to cut down nondefense expenditures. I do not pick out the N. Y. A. I should be willing to make a further reduction in the W. P. A. and in the C. C. C., just as I was among those active in the effort to cut down an appropriation of a considerable amount recently sought for a branch of the Department of Justice.

I shall try to act in the immediate future with the realization that there may be great danger to democracy in the day of financial reckoning, which may not be far off. Congress will in a little while awaken to this situation. The awakening will come when a broadened tax base, with a tremendously heavy tax burden, reaches out and touches many more of our people and very forcibly some of those who have been crying loudly for increased appropriations under such measures as this.

Of course, as has been noted, the appropriation is not so large as last year's, but there is now no such need, Mr. President. Billions upon billions of dollars, let me reiterate, have been and are being spent under the national-defense program, thus creating jobs for the people of our country. Our employment situation has never, in our generation, been more promising than it is now, and I think that if we are going to turn in the other direction, if we are going to do our part—and we have the responsibility here—of protecting the great numbers of our people from excessive, probably unbearable, tax burdens, the Congress had better start right now.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from Connecticut. It is all very well for the Senator from Connecticut to talk about the billions of dollars which have been poured out for defense contracts, and about the employment created thereby; and I have no doubt, in following the report of the allocation of contracts, and in noticing the large number of contracts which have been allocated to States along the Atlantic seaboard, especially in New England, that there has been a terrific pick-up in job opportunities.

But unfortunately, Mr. President, because of the geographical location of our peacetime industries, and because of apparent lack of understanding of the economic headache which they will ultimately create, contracts have been allocated in the normal manufacturing States, with some few exceptions—my own State included. But it must be remembered that these defense contracts are not distributed on a population basis, that many of the States in the South and in the West have not received any direct benefits from the allocation of defense contracts. That is the first point I wish to make in reply to the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? Would a brief remark by me interrupt the development of the Senator's points?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. In connection with what the Senator has said, let me say that I secured some figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, because I felt that the argument would be made that there is no longer any unemployment.

The answer is that there are a few places in this country where there is no unemployment, or certainly very little unemployment, so far as young people are concerned; and one place mentioned as having no unemployment happened to be Hartford, Conn. Of course, we know that Hartford, Conn., is right in the center of a great industrial-producing area. On the other hand, as the able Senator from Wisconsin has so well said, there are millions of young men out of employment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics advises me that today there are between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 young people in this country who are registered with employment offices, but who cannot get any employment. They have had no training; they have had no preparation; they have nothing today to offer. They are out of jobs.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Alabama has touched upon the second point I wish to make, namely, that many of the youths of this country have received no training. I am sorry to say that during all these years when we have been providing hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for W. P. A. and for other activities, we have not had any comprehensive program. Outside the regular George-Dean program, for vocational training, we have not had any broad, large-scale, national program to train people in order that they may acquire skill. Therefore, many youths, although jobs actually may be available in their communities, are not sufficiently trained so that they can obtain those jobs and hold them.

We have already had testimony, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, on a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada, providing that some of the C. C. C. camps should be turned into vocational schools. At the committee hearings manufacturers have appeared and urged the adoption of that measure, because, they say, they are not equipped, they do not have the facilities, to train the men under the so-called apprentice system, because all their facilities are now under pressure from the O. P. M., the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and all other agencies interested in production of instrumentalities of national defense, urging them to push their plants to their utmost capacity, and therefore it is necessary for them to abandon, or certainly not to enlarge, the apprentice training programs which they have had in the past.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Wisconsin well says, today our industries have not provided the facilities to carry on an apprentice program, and in the days before the present national emergency, in the days of the 1937 recession, and in the days immediately prior thereto, during the depression, industry then did not carry on the apprentice program, because there was a terrible lag, as we know, in industrial production, in the marketing and sale of industrial goods; industry tried to economize, and it did cut down its expenses, by cutting out the apprentice program. So, for a period of years before the emergency we had no apprentice program; and now we do not have any apprentice program, because of the lack of facilities for such a program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to make one further point, Mr. President, and then I shall conclude. The Senator from Connecticut referred to the fact that the defense program of the National Youth Administration will not be affected by this amendment; and technically that is a correct statement. But only 1,000 of the 5,500 workshops of the National Youth Administration are designated as defense-training centers. The reason why they are designated as defense-training centers is that those are all the centers which they could so designate which would be training men for the so-called key-defense industries.

However, in the other 4,500 workshops, under what might be termed the regular activities of the National Youth Administration, young men are being given basic training in the use of machinery and tools. Although this training is not shaped directly toward the aviation industry or some other particular industry which might be designated as a key defense industry, nevertheless, it will give them a basic training which will provide

them with skill so that they may obtain work in other industries, and thus in general assist the national-defense program.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to make the point that the National Youth Administration at no time has been able, nor would it be able even under a larger appropriation than would be provided if the committee amendment were rejected, to accept all the youths who have been certified as qualified in every respect to participate in the program.

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say at this point in the RECORD that I want to repudiate the inference that my statement or action on this bill is motivated by sectional partisanship. Although I had never expected to hear that particular charge made against me, the Senator from Alabama has pointed to a situation prevailing in Hartford, Conn., which, it seems to me, makes the reference pretty personal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. Not at the moment. During the several years I have been a Member of Congress I have voted for every farm bill, with the exception of one which was set aside by the Supreme Court. Parity payments have no special appeal to my constituency, nor have parity loans or conservation measures, excepting as a matter of fairness, but I never have been, and I pray I never shall be, guided in my actions here by sectional feeling.

I wish to point out, partially in answer to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, that it is true that the eastern section of the country has profited, if it is profit, to a greater extent than some other sections of the country as a result of the industrial advancement under the national-defense program; but I want the RECORD to show that the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the other Federal relief agencies, or what were heretofore relief agencies, operate on the basis of need, and I know that if there is a cut in this appropriation, or in other relief appropriations, the cuts made within the States and the sections will be on the basis of existing conditions in those areas. I do not expect, if a cut is made, that my State will maintain its proportion of employees as that proportion has heretofore existed. I know that there will be greater cuts in the areas where the employment situation is better. I know that the cut will be deepest in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England, and I believe that it should be that way. I think it is entirely unfair for Senators to point out in debate, as has been pointed out in this debate, that a Senator might have a personal interest because he feels in conscience that the time has come to cut nondefense Federal expenditures.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that there was nothing further from my mind than to make any personal reference so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned. I state frankly and sincerely that I think no Member of the Senate tries more honestly or more diligently to look at all the matters that come before this body from a national standpoint; I think there is no Member of the Senate who is affected less by a sectional viewpoint. The Senator from Connecticut has demonstrated the truth of this statement time and time again on this floor. But, naturally, all of us have our viewpoints somewhat shaped and somewhat determined by the situation as we see it best, and, naturally, the situation which we see best and which perhaps gives us our best guide or our best insight into conditions is the situation back home, for it is the situation back home which we see most of and with which we are most familiar.

The Senator from Connecticut always tries to consider matters from a national point of view, but, like myself, I cannot imagine that at times he may not necessarily be influenced somewhat in the light of facts as those facts come to him from home. It is home where we get most of our information; it is home where we have most of our contacts; it is home where we are present most of the time when we are not here in the Senate.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it has always been my purpose to vote with the committees of the Senate unless by so doing I violate a conscientious conviction. The committee proposes to reduce the amount appropriated for the National Youth Administration from $85,984,000 to $75,000,000.

In my judgment, no agencies ever created by Congress are entitled to greater commendation, praise, and approval than is the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. The boys and girls whom this particular appropriation will most benefit are those who otherwise might not have a chance. If it is not the purpose of the Congress to try to improve and make the future brighter and better for the less fortunate and underprivileged boys and girls who must ultimately take our places, then we have not very much excuse for having lived at all.

I have gone to the trouble to visit C. C. C. camps and see what they are doing. I recently visited one near Tampa, Fla. I found there approximately 200 boys. That camp, constructed a long time ago, is not one of the best equipped, but I found there food prepared and cooked by enrollees there being trained nearly as good as can be obtained in the Senate Restaurant. I also found there boys who were being trained in various vocations, and doing their work in an excellent manner. Some of the boys there have been trained in a few weeks actually to make bearings and steel bolts and pins which were needed for the machinery with which to build MacDill air field at Tampa, and which had not been furnished by reason of the strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. Such materials were being produced by C. C. C. boys in their shop at their steel-turning lathes.

I was very much impressed with one incident, and there were many just like it. Some of the boys who were there were underprivileged. They came from homes of the poor. Some of them thumbed their way several hundred miles. They came not only from Florida but from other States in the South. Some of them gained as much as 15 pounds in weight within 2 months, and were able to be received into the Army and the Navy by reason thereof.

One boy to whom my attention was particularly called had St. Vitus' dance. I do not know how he ever got to the camp, but he finally arrived there, and on four occasions he was turned down. His head could not be steadied on his shoulders, his hand was not steady, and the authorities wondered what they could do with him; but he begged to be allowed to stay, and he stayed. I went to his steel-turning lathe, and I saw that boy turn out some bearings and threaded steel pins that it would require a very highly trained man to do properly. He did it, and I went out of that camp believing that we could not do better than to provide ample appropriations to continue that kind of training and work. You heard in the debate today that over 40,000 boys and girls a month are going out from this training to a useful and happier life which they hardly could have experienced under other circumstances if it had not been for that fact.

I am therefore opposed to a reduction of this appropriation. Let us try to do something for these future citizens of this country who would not otherwise have had a chance. Let us try to make of them men and women who can face the future with some hope.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] a moment ago made a statement to which I wish to advert. He indicated his belief—and I regret to say it is pretty generally shared—that the expenditure of money upon educational purposes is an extravagance—a waste of money.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me remove that thought from the Senator's mind. I said nothing like that; I implied nothing like that; and most certainly I do not think anything like that.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me say to the Senator that I am sorry I so poorly interpreted what he said. At least I understood the Senator to say that he did not think the purpose for which this appropriation is designated was justified, and I judged him to mean by that that we did not get more than a dollar of value for a dollar spent.

Mr. MALONEY. No; I did not say anything like that. If the Senator will further yield, the purposes of the bill are

completely justifiable. I have always supported the appropriations for this agency. I said the need now was not so great as it had been.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I know, but obviously the Senator will have to conclude that he is thinking the expenditure is not justified, or he would favor it. In other words, if he thought the national income would be increased by the money spent, that the country would get back more than it put out, I am sure he would not make the argument of economy against this appropriation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, then he may interrupt me further, or perhaps I shall be able to make the point.

I therefore sent for Who's Who, and I have, on page 2871, figures showing an analysis of the personalities carried in Who's Who for 1934 and 1935—in number, 29,389—submitting statements of their educational qualifications. There were educated in the common or public schools 7.17 percent, or 2,110. There were educated in academies, seminaries, high schools, and business colleges 6.27 percent of the total number, or 1,842. There were attending college—that is, those who attended colleges but did not graduate—11.83 percent, or 3,476. Those who attended and graduated from college were 74.73 percent, or 21,961.

What I meant to say, Mr. President, was that there is the living proof that money spent on educating boys and girls is a good investment and yields a profitable return; and if we should appropriate in this Congress enough money to give the education appropriate to their mentality and personality to every boy and girl in America it would be an economy and a profitable investment, and not an extravagance.

Mr. President, I regret to say that I very frequently hear in the Senate, when an appropriation is proposed for public health, the statement that "We have not the money." We necessarily mean, when we make a statement of that kind, that human health is not worth buying, that human life is sometimes not worth saving at the price of a few million dollars. Right here in the Senate I have seen amendments turned down upon which the Senate had the advantage of the testimony of the best physicians in the country, including the Chief of the Public Health Service, Dr. Parran—than whom there is no more eminent man in America in the field of public health—that an appropriation of $3,000,000 would save 20,000 lives a year in the United States. Senators perhaps were not aware of it, but when they turned down amendments of that kind they were making a decision that 20,000 lives were not worth $3,000,000, else they could not have brought their consciences or their judgments to oppose the appropriations.

A little later we shall have the W. P. A. bill before the Senate, and there will be a cut in that bill on the ground of economy. I believe anybody can show that the national income has had a direct relationship to the amount of money spent upon public employment. Such an expenditure is not an extravagance. It is an investment. It is like seed thrown into the ground; it comes back at the harvest manyfold. It is a short-sighted view of economy, therefore, when one says that it is extravagant to spend money intelligently for public education in common schools, high schools, colleges, and technical schools, for vocational education to train the minds and hands of boys and girls to create, to construct, to build, to carry on this great economic machine, to save the health and the lives of children, of babies, of mothers, of adults.

The other day a Senator occupying the seat in front of me, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], read to the Senate a statement that disease had interrupted the defense productivity of the country more than had strikes. I am not in favor of strikes, and I voted against strikes; but when a bill comes before us which says, "Let us make America healthy," too often we hear the cry, "We cannot afford that. We have not the money. It will add to the national debt." What is valuable in America but the people of America?

I hope the Senator from Connecticut will excuse me for taking advantage of some remarks I understood him to make to express my sentiments on that subject. I am sure the Senate is interested in the larger economy of America.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I merely wish to correct the Senator's very erroneous impression. He would have the Senate believe that I was opposed to the features of the bill which provide for the continuation of the education of these young men and women. I want completely to clear his mind by saying that I had no such thought, and the committee amendment would not bring about any such result.

I sometimes almost wonder, under the spell of the eloquence from Florida, how the country became powerful and great without the National Youth Administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, in my opinion the Federal program, generally speaking, is loaded up with too many alphabetical activities. However, the N. Y. A. is not one of which I would complain. I have watched the work of that administration closely ever since it was organized, and I think it has been of great help to the youth of our country. It is sound and practical, and should be continued. The work of the N. Y. A. in Kansas is commended by all classes of people. I hope the amendment reducing the appropriation will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on line 4, page 59.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the word "employment", to strike out "and training", so as to make the paragraph read:

(b) To provide employment for unemployed young persons on public projects of the following types.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a feeling that this amendment is allied with the amendment which has just been rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me assure the Senator that such is not the case. There is no connection whatever between the proposal to strike out the words "and training" and the amount of money carried in the bill. This amendment is suggested on the recommendation of the National Education Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation, who sent letters to the subcommittee pointing out that what we did last year is not entirely accomplished unless these words are removed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator, before he explains the position of the committe, because I want him to understand how the matter appears to me, that the Senate has now expressed its opinion that the full amount passed by the House of Representatives for the training of young men in these various projects should be appropriated. It seems logical that if we now strike out the words "and training" we are saying in the second breath that, though we want to appropriate the money, we do not want to train the young men. Is there any basis for that?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. The training provisions are in another part of the bill, and other amounts of money are appropriated. This provision reads:

To provide employment and training for unemployed young persons on public projects.

This means employment. If incident to that employment some training comes about, that is all right, but the training program is provided for elsewhere.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will glance at the bill, I will explain what is in my mind. On page 58, beginning with line 25, we find language reading as follows:

PAR. 1. Part-time youth work and student aid: To enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1942, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Agency, to engage in the following types of programs for assistance to needy young persons, $85,984,000, namely.

Now we come to list the types of program for which we have just appropriated $85,984,000. One of those, under paragraph (b), is:

To provide employment and training for unemployed young persons on public projects of the following type.

Will the elimination of the words "and training" prevent the N. Y. A. from training young enrollees upon this type of project?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The matter was submitted to Mr. Williams himself, and I shall read what he says about it, indicating that it is not a matter of any great importance. He says:

When this matter was being considered by the House Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Labor Security Act the opinion was expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee that our work experience constituted "training" on the job and, therefore, the use of the word was not incon-

sistent with the purposes of the administration. I agreed with the position taken by the chairman, feeling that this was a more realistic attitude toward the objectives of our program.

Mr. Williams would like to stress the training feature rather than the employment on public works. The paragraph just before the one in question provides:

To provide part-time employment for needy young persons in schools, colleges, and universities to enable such persons to continue their education.

That is another function. In the opinion of the American Education Association and the Farm Bureau Federation, when we simply provide for employment we draw the line, so that where there is an educational matter to be undertaken it shall be under the control of the education authorities.

As I started to say awhile ago, the Senator will remember that last year we had to draw the line very carefully, and required Mr. Williams, when the Youth Administration was undertaking any educational program whatsoever, to have it done subject to the education authorities, so that he would not set up an independent department of his own.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is that all taken care of in other parts of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. In the judgment of those who represent great educational organizations in the United States, it is desirable to keep the camel's nose out from under the tent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator when the phrase "and training" appeared. Was it in the law last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, under those circumstances, I really feel that that phrase should not come out of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is for the judgment of the Senate. We are acting under the advice I have given, and the committee thought it had substantial reason for the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the circumstances, and in view of the action which has already been taken by the Senate, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no connection between the two things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 59, line 8.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for a division.

Mr. RUSSELL. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 8, after the word "employment", it is proposed to strike out the words "and training."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 13, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "newspapers, and press clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 16, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "18" and insert "19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 8, after the word "paragraph", to strike "18 of the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1941" and insert "19 hereof", and in line 18, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "18" and insert "19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 11, after the word "to", to strike out "22" and insert "23."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 73, line 20, after the word "books", to strike out the comma and "periodicals, and newspapers" and insert "and periodicals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board", on page 79, line 6, to strike out "$2,173,600" and insert "$2,045,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment just stated. This is an amendment to reduce the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board by $128,600 below the figure set by the House of Representatives. The House had already reduced the appropriation from the estimates of the Budget Bureau by $126,560.

As we know, at one time there was considerable criticism of the administration of the National Labor Relations Board—so much so, in fact, that the House of Representatives set up a special committee, known as the Smith committee, to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. That committee conducted a very extensive hearing into the operations of the Board.

The House Committee on Appropriations went into the matter of the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board much more thoroughly than did the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In fact, the hearings before the Senate committee were very meager, indeed.

After going into this matter of the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board thoroughly, the House Committee on Appropriations, with all the background of the House Smith committee before it, made its report, in which it said:

Since the committee had occasion during the past fiscal year to deal with the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, the Board has undergone a reorganization, and it appears from the evidence given the committee that there is a genuine cooperative spirit now existing in the Board, and that the future holds promise for an effective, fair, and impartial administration of the National Labor Relations Act.

In other words, the House Committee on Appropriations now finds that all goes well with the National Labor Relations Board, and believes it is going to do a good, efficient, and effective job of administering the National Labor Relations Act. The Committee goes further and states that, although the number of cases before the National Labor Relations Board was falling off in the previous fiscal year, during the past fiscal year there has been an increase of some 40 percent in the number of cases before the Board. The House committee points out that, instead of a majority of the cases being cases dealing with unfair labor practices, they are cases dealing with the question of representation, evidencing, as the House committee says, that both labor and industry, under the guidance and administration of the Board, are now abiding by the mandate of the law respecting unfair labor practices.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can state the situation very briefly. The action taken by the Committee on Appropriations was based upon the amount of money made available for that purpose this year, with the thought that the item would be taken to conference.

Mr. HILL. Yes, of course; the item would be taken to conference. That means that the House might have to compromise with the Senate. The amount of money wanted might not be obtained. I do not wish it to go to conference. I wish to have the Senate approve the same amount as that fixed by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is we did allow the exact amount appropriated for this agency for the current fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but, whereas the committee may have allowed the same amount as appropriated for this current year, there has been an increase in the number of cases before the Board by some 40 percent since the current amount was fixed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's line of argument, but I should like to point out, if it is agreeable to him, that the cases involving the determination of collective-bargaining units and the designation of representation of employees are, many of them, occurring in defense industries. It is a well-known fact that the defense industries are not highly organized. As a matter of fact, only about 40 percent of them, at a conservative estimate, have any collective bargaining at all.

It has been contended here that we want to do all we can to avoid strikes, and it is a fact that the National Labor Relations Board, in conducting elections, and in conducting them speedily, is helping to prevent strikes, or is helping to bring them to a conclusion. In connection with the Ford strike, for example, which finally resulted in an election, 200 employees of the Board were required to conduct that election. Instead of hamstringing the Board by reducing its appropriation we ought to give it the money it needs for its administration, so we can speed up the settlement of the problems that occur under it, and thereby help to increase the production of national-defense materials.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution, and state that he has

said what I had in mind to say, but I am sure he said it better and more forcefully than I could have said it. As the Senator so well said, many of the cases the Board is now handling are in national-defense industries. In fact, more than 50 percent of them are in national-defense industries. So many of them are in defense industries that the Civil Service Commission now lists the National Labor Relations Board as a defense agency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Vote!

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arizona, who is in charge of the bill and the amendment, calls for a vote. If that means that he is willing to have the amendment rejected, I am willing to stop talking.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee is the servant of the Senate and will bow to the will of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in view of the very fine and splendid attitude of the Senator from Arizona, I hope the Senate will proceed to vote down this committee amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator yields the floor may I express my approbation of the position taken by him, and likewise the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. President, in view of the greatly increased work necessary to be done by the National Labor Relations Board, by reason of the increasing industrial productivity, I believe that the committee has made a mistake of judgment in reducing the amount allowed by the House, and I therefore join with the Senator who now has the floor in asking that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. I simply wish to say that if we want to do our part, if we want to make our contribution to industrial peace, and toward preventing the stoppage of work which impedes the national-defense program, the thing for us to do is to join with the House of Representatives, which has gone into this matter thoroughly, which has analyzed it thoroughly and investigated it thoroughly, and give to this Board the amount which the House of Representatives proposes. Let us vote down the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am very reluctant to take up the time of the Senate on this amendment, but, due to the fact that I served on the Smith committee of the House which investigated the National Labor Relations Board for over a year, I should feel very derelict if I did not supplement to some extent the statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I did not join with the majority of the Smith committee in the recommendations it made to the House of Representatives. I am still of the opinion that the minority report of the Smith committee is the correct report, and I am satisfied that a few years hence the majority of the people of the United States will agree with me.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the National Labor Relations Board, notwithstanding all the criticisms which have been directed against it, has made the greatest record in the Supreme Court of the United States of any administrative agency of the Government.

Now, when we come to the item which is in question here, Mr. President, what do we find? We find, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has pointed out, that it was not even considered during the hearings before the Senate committee. The only thing that was considered before the Senate subcommittee on this particular item of appropriation was whether or not the sum of $128,420 should be added to the amount appropriated by the House. But instead of acting at all on that item, we find the Senate committee recommending a reduction of $126,000, as I recall the amount, under the amount appropriated by the House. Not only did the Bureau of the Budget recommend the amount which the House passed, but after a series of conferences between the National Labor Relations Board and the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget recommended an additional amount of $128,420 to enable the Board to carry out its reorganization and classification according to the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

Even granting, for the sake of argument, that the majority of the Smith committee was correct in its recommendations to the House, if we follow those recommendations how can we consistently refuse to allow the National Labor Relations Board to go ahead with its reorganization and classification to conform to the recommendations of the majority of the Smith committee? That is all that was attempted. As I understand, all the Board is asking Congress to allow it to do is to carry out what the majority of the Smith committee recommended in the way of reorganization and classification of employees.

Last week we were considering the effect of strikes on the national-defense program. A bill was passed providing for the seizure and operation of plants by the Government. It is my opinion that if Congress had spent more time on the machinery of mediation and conciliation, and on the machinery set up under the National Labor Relations Board to make a proper approach to the labor question, we could have done a far more constructive job than we did by the passage of the bill which was passed last week.

As stated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the National Labor Relations Board is a defense agency. Its work has already increased by 40 percent over that of the past fiscal year. As shown in the House report, it is asking for 22 additional employees to perform the work which has piled up on it as a result of the national-defense program. The House voted, without any question, to grant the increase, and complimented the Board on the work it was doing. Without taking one scintilla of evidence on that question the Senate committee struck out the increase.

Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Alabama in requesting the Senate to reinstate the appropriation as it came from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 79, line 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 12, after the word "reference" and the semicolon, to strike out "newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board", on page 79, line 25, after the word "for", to strike out "newspapers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Railroad Adjustment Board", on page 80, line 25, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$207,780"; on page 81, line 1, after the word "which", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$50,000", and in line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$111,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Railroad Retirement Board", on page 82, line 10, after the word "reference", to strike out "newspapers, press clippings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—General Provisions", on page 84, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 702. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary of any person appointed to a non-civil-service position, under the appropriations in the respective titles in this act, if the effect of such appointment is to increase the number of non-civil-service employees from the State of residence of any such non-civil-service appointee beyond the number of non-civil-service employees to which such State is entitled, under the appropriations in the respective titles of this act, on a basis of population: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any position, the appointment of which is made by the President: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to positions in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Conciliation Service, the Public Health Service outside the District of Columbia, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustwent Board, or Railroad Retirement Board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 9, to change the section number from "703" to "702."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 14, to change the section number from "704" to "703."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 1, to change the section number from "705" to "704."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 20, to change the section number from "706" to "705."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 5, after the figure "3" it is proposed to strike out "4, and 5" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer a further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That such portion of this appropriation as may be necessary shall be available to the Social Security Board for all necessary expenses incurred by the Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in connection with the operation of employment-office facilities and services essential to expediting the national-defense program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment is recommended by the Office of Production Management, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Secretary of Labor, and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer a further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

The paragraphs herein under the National Youth Administration may be cited as the National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that concludes the amendments offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I offer a number of amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 11, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "workers" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

workers and for the preservice education and training of persons liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, with a view to qualifying them for specialists' ratings upon induction into the land or naval forces.

On page 29, line 5, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "and."

On page 29, line 7, after the word "registers", it is proposed to insert:

and preservice courses for persons certified by local draft boards to be liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, designed to qualify such persons for specialists' ratings upon induction into the land or naval forces.

On page 31, line 24, after the word "defense", it is proposed to strike out "workers" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

workers and persons liable for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

On page 33, line 14, before the period, it is proposed to insert:

and upon the existing and anticipated need of the land and naval forces for persons qualified to hold specialists' ratings.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have examined the text of these amendments. They are recommended by the educational authorities. They do not add to the sums in the bill. They merely provide a different way of accomplishing the desired result. On behalf of the committee, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendments and take them to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the Work Projects Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is similar to the provision included in the relief bill, and I see no objection to taking it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 21, after the word "binding," it is proposed to strike out "$176,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$276,500."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the President's Budget message to Congress of May 13, 1941, included an item of $353,000 to intensify and implement the existing voluntary safety promotion program operating under the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries.

This amount was cut in half by the House Appropriations Committee to $176,500. The Bureau of the Budget, in collaboration with the Division of Labor Standards, had already reduced to the absolute minimum the amount needed to effectively bolster the Nation-wide voluntary safety program. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate has been asked to reinstate the balance.

The accident rate in defense industries is increasing alarmingly. In 1940 work injuries caused a loss of over 25,000,000 man-days. This was an increase of 10 percent over 1939, concurrent with a rise of only 6 percent in employment.

In 1940, 17,000 industrial workers were killed on job accidents, 93,000 received permanent crippling injuries, and 1,250,000 received injuries which caused loss of time from their jobs for an average of 20 days each.

There are today labor shortages in over 100 essential defense occupations. In 16 defense occupations there is not a single person registered in any employment office in the United States. Almost frantic effort is being made to replenish our supply of trained industrial workers through intensive training programs. The Federal Government has already made available approximately $180,000,000 for the training of workers, but up to this time there has been no appropriation for saving the lives and limbs of workers already trained. It is not believed that any amount less than $350,000 will be adequate to obtain the necessary results.

The National Safety Council has just announced that the accident rate in defense industries is up another 7 percent for the first 5 months of 1941. If this present rate of accidents continues, by the end of 1941 a half million of the total of 6,859,000 defense workers will be either permanently or temporarily disabled. Unless funds and personnel can be immediately available for stimulating safety programs in defense industries, this production leakage will seriously affect the delivery of defense material.

Every effort will be made to continue the volunteer program of the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in Defense Industries, and the approximately 325 special agents serving at $1 a year in the capacity of accident-prevention experts will be urged to continue contacting industries having defense contracts and stimulating safety programs to cut down accident casualties among industrial workers. Already, however, the demands of conducting the safety programs in their own plants have greatly curtailed the amount of time which these volunteers can donate, and in some of the heavy industrial districts it has been impossible to secure enough unpaid safety specialists to handle the work effectively.

Approximately 40 safety engineers are needed immediately to place in the field to devote full time to contacting plants, and a Washington staff of 6 safety experts and hygiene engineers are needed to service both the full-time and the voluntary organization. Travel expense, printing of bulletins for distribution to the management and workers of defense industries, and stenographic help are essential. It will not be possible to do

an effective job unless twice the amount appropriated by the House—the $353,000 originally asked for—is made available.

It should be pointed out that the $353,000 asked for only means an expenditure of approximately 7 cents per defense worker for a program which will bring about safer and more healthful working conditions and information on accident causes and the development of safe work practices.

It has been estimated that the contribution being made by some of the larger plants of the country in loaning their safety specialists for part-time work with defense contractors represents a donation of approximately $500,000. It is to effectively utilize this contribution in time, knowledge, and energy that Congress is being asked for funds to mechanize the program.

There are tried and tested techniques for the prevention of industrial accidents and disease. What is needed at this time is not new information and research on industrial health and safety but a wider application of existing knowledge in those defense plants which are rapidly expanding, and which have not previously instituted accident-control programs. The $353,000 asked for is the least amount necessary to do this job effectively and well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether or not the amount which he suggests is within the Budget estimate?

Mr. MEAD. It is less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. If so, I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MEAD. I am satisfied with that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 79, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$2,173,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,302,020."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, when I previously had the floor I mentioned this item. The proposed increase would amount to $128,420. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and was approved by the Budget Bureau only after long conferences between the Civil Service Commission and the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of carrying out a classification and reorganization of the personnel of the Board.

I know what the attitude of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations has been toward the National Labor Relations Board.

I know that last year they struck out, as I recall, the entire item which financed the Economics Division of the National Labor Relations Board. If any Senator will take the time to read the hearings before the House committee and then read the statement of Dr. Leiserson, a member of the Board, who appeared before the Senate committee, he cannot help come to the conclusion that the information before the House committee and also before the Senate committee was misconstrued. As I understand, the House committee felt the item was justified but that it should be asked for in the form of a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President; if the Senator will yield, this is the statement in the House report:

> The balance of the increase sought was designed to apply to positions which have been reclassified by the Civil Service Commission, acting in an advisory capacity only. Since there is no legal obligation upon the Government to appropriate for this increased charge, the estimate has been disapproved. If and when the employees of the National Labor Relations Board become a part of the regular civil-service establishment of the Government by the terms of the President's Executive order, and when such reclassification has been approved officially by the Civil Service Commission, then it will be proper to present to the deficiency committee a request for the amount of funds required to make the reclassification effective.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answer to the Senator, let me state that, due to that statement in the report of the House committee, Dr. Leiserson appeared before the Senate committee for the very purpose of correcting the House report. He pointed out that the Civil Service Commission had approved the reorganization and classification of the employees, and that if the reorganization and classification were correct, the Board was entitled to the additional amount. The Bureau of the Budget approved it and sent up a supplemental estimate.

The present Chairman of the Board was drafted to come in and take over the administration of the National Labor Relations Act. We asked that great American to come in and do the kind of job we wanted done. Then, following the recommendations of the Smith committee of the House, reorganization of the personnel was had and classification was made by the Civil Service Commission. Under all those circumstances, is it not incumbent upon us, if we are acting in good faith, to go along on this item which makes possible that reorganization? What harm can be done by the inclusion in the bill of this item, if following its adoption by the Senate the bill is taken to conference, and then the recommendation of Dr. Leiserson is carefully gone over? If the conferees of the two Houses then find that the item is not needed, that it is not a proper appropriation, it can be stricken out.

But I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to agree that at least we may have this item taken to conference, and then, if it is not justified, strike it out there, rather than not to have it before the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a summary of N. Y. A. operations.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF N. Y. A. OPERATIONS

During the fiscal year 1941 the National Youth Administration received a regular appropriation of $102,000,000 and in addition two supplementary appropriations totalling $55,000,000 for the operation of its out-of-school work program and student work program. With these funds the National Youth Administration has developed a defense-training program having in it 5,500 shops with a total of over 90,000 work stations. These shops are located in all parts of the country.

In the proposed N. Y. A. appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 the funds have been divided into two parts, one for defense and one for the regular program. However, the defense program will account for only about 30,000 of the work stations in the N. Y. A. shops. The balance of the stations will come under the regular program. Accordingly, any reduction in the appropriation for the regular program will have the effect of cutting down the shop program.

During April of this year, there were approximately 405,000 youth employed on out-of-school work program projects, of whom 157,000 were employed on shop projects. In New York State, including New York City, shop employment accounted for over 14,000 of the total employment of 33,569. Of particular significance in connection with the operation of defense industries is the rather large numbers of youth who are receiving training in machine-shop, sheet-metal, welding, foundry, radio and electrical work, and in woodworking and other shop fields.

The placement record of the out-of-school work program of the National Youth Administration provides evidence as to the success with which the program has provided youth with work experience qualifying for employment in private industry. During the 11 months of the fiscal year through May approximately 278,000 youth from the out-of-school work program have obtained employment in private industry. Of this total, over 27,000 were residents of New York State. These youth have obtained jobs in a variety of defense industries, such as metal working plants, machinery- and equipment-production plants, chemical and explosives plants, as well as many other plants which have had defense orders.

The National Youth Administration shops and other work projects have the capacity for employing many more youth than their budget will allow At the end of May of this year there were over 377,000 youth who were certified as eligible for employment on the out-of-school work program but for whom jobs were not available because of insufficient funds. This total is approximately the same as the number of youth employed during May and probably represents only a small fraction of the youth who are eligible for N. Y. A. employment. The N. Y. A. budget as originally submitted to Congress for 1942 provided for a total of $101,821,000 for the regular programs under the National Youth Administration and $60,000,000 for the youth work-defense program. This budget would have provided for an average employment of 322,000 youth on the out-of-school work program including the work-defense program and an employment of 446,000 youth on the student-work program. However, $10,000,000 of this total was transferred in the House from the National Youth Administration to the appropriations for the Office of Education. The purpose of this transfer was to pay local schools for providing related classroom instruction to youth employed on the out-of-school work program.

The further reduction of $10,984 proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee will result in a reduction of 37,000 youth from the out-of-school work-program average. Fol-

lowing is a summary of the employment which would be possible under the original budget and also under the budget reduced by $21,984,000.

	Estimated employment for 1942		
	Original budget	Reduced budget	Reduction
Total	768,000	633,000	135,000
Out-of-school, total	322,000	267,000	55,000
Regular	230,000	175,000	55,000
Youth work, defense	92,000	92,000	
Student work	446,000	366,000	80,000

SUMMARY OF CURRENT OPERATIONS—NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM IN STATE OF NEW YORK

I. EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
All programs, total	31,618	14,465	17,153
Out-of-school work program, total	14,777	6,439	8,338
Student work program, total	16,841	8,026	8,815
School work program	12,475	5,272	7,203
College and graduate work program	4,366	2,754	1,612

II. FUNDS EXPENDED, 1936 THROUGH APR. 30, 1941

Fiscal year	Amount		
	Total	Student work program	Out-of-school work program
1936	$1,432,971	$922,385	$510,586
1937	3,235,281	1,000,560	2,234,721
1938	2,586,207	712,760	1,873,447
1939	3,640,595	882,698	2,757,897
1940	3,968,774	1,090,229	2,878,545
1941 (encumbrances through Apr. 30, 1941)	4,779,880	761,273	4,018,607
Total, all years	19,643,708	5,369,905	14,273,803

Out-of-school work program

III–A. EMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF PROJECT, APRIL 1941

Type of project	Number of youth employed		
	Total	Male	Female
Total	14,777	6,439	8,338
Resident projects	979	811	168
Workshop production	6,130	3,349	2,781
Construction, total	1,542	1,505	37
Roads, streets, and bridges	178	176	2
Improvement of grounds	79	79	
Building construction, repair	507	494	13
Recreational facilities other than buildings	554	537	17
Conservation, irrigation, and flood control	190	185	5
Water and sanitation	34	34	
Professional-clerical, total	6,126	774	5,352
Clerical assistance	3,024	386	2,638
Public health and hospital assistance	1,285	71	1,214
Library service	324	51	273
Arts and crafts	161	59	102
Recreational assistance	436	184	252
Nursery school assistance	224	7	217
School lunch and food preparation	672	16	656

III–B. EMPLOYMENT ON WORKSHOP PRODUCTION PROJECTS BY TYPES OF PRODUCTION, APRIL 1941

Type of production	Number of youth employed			
	Total	Male	Female	Number of units
Total	6,795	3,907	2,888	305
Sheet metal	419	407	12	12
Welding	114	114		7
Foundry	23	23		2
Auto maintenance and repair	247	244	3	37
Aviation service	132	132		3
Farm implements and equipment	35	35		3
Machine shop	219	209	10	16
Electrical	114	100	14	10
Radio	109	106	3	4
Potteryware	58	12	46	1
Woodworking	2,149	1,810	339	58
Drafting, map-making, blueprinting	32	21	11	9
Sewing	2,241	30	2,211	55
Other production	903	664	239	88

III–C. EMPLOYMENT IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS, APRIL 1941

Type of military establishment	Number of youth employed	Number of establishments
Total	322	33
Navy	3	1
Army	292	22
Selective Service Boards	27	10

III–D. TERMINATIONS FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT, JULY 1940 THROUGH APRIL 1941

1940	*Number of youth*
July	875
August	605
September	693
October	512
November	636
December	514
1941	
January	859
February	1,140
March	1,900
April	2,291
Total	10,025

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941

	Number of youth
Private employment, total	4,413
Manufacturing industries, total	1,826
Food and kindred products, and tobacco	42
Textile and textile products	334
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products	69
Paper and allied products	71
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	55
Rayon and allied products	1
Chemical products (excluding rayon and allied products)	56
Rubber products	16
Leather and leather products	162
Stone, clay, and glass products	41
Iron and steel and their products (excluding machinery)	236
Nonferrous metals and their products (excluding machinery)	31
Electrical machinery and equipment	147
Agricultural machinery and equipment	6
Metal-working machinery and equipment	19
Other machinery and equipment	80
Aircraft and parts	102
Automobiles and automobile equipment	84
Ship and boat building and repairing	3
Railroad and other transportation equipment	37
Other manufacturing industries	234
Nonmanufacturing industries, total	1,646
Agriculture, forestry, (excluding logging), and fishing	64
Construction	97
Air transportation and service	1
Railroads (interstate)	40
Other transportation and services	46
Telephone, telegraph, and related services	28

III–E. PLACEMENTS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY, DECEMBER 1940 THROUGH MARCH 1941—continued

	Number of youth
Nonmanufacturing industries—Continued.	
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities	7
Wholesale and retail trade	553
Finance, insurance, and real estate	61
Service industries (excluding domestic service)	561
Domestic service	120
Other nonmanufacturing industries	68
Unknown industry	941

III–F. CERTIFIED YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT, APRIL 1941

Total	3,247
Male	1,040
Female	2,207

III–G. VOCATIONAL BUILDINGS AND FARM SHOP CONSTRUCTION, JULY 1940 THROUGH FEB. 28, 1941

Type of work	Total	Completed	In progress
Total	13	5	8
New	12	4	8
Repair	1	1	

IV. STUDENT WORK PROGRAM, APRIL 1941

Program	Number of youth			Number of institutions	Average earnings
	Total	Male	Female		
Total	16,841	8,026	8,815	[1]868	$7.13
School	12,475	5,272	7,203	816	4.85
College	4,271	2,686	1,585	51	13.52
Graduate	95	68	27	10	19.38

[1] This total represents the number of institutions reported on line 2 plus the unduplicated number of colleges and universities for which entries appear on lines 3 and 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4926) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

REGULATION OF WATER-BORNE COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the administration of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws it has been found that the free movement of water-borne commerce is being hampered because of the restrictive provisions of some of these laws. They are in general

designed to promote safety at sea and to regulate water-borne commerce. Their structure is such that they are and should be strictly enforced during normal times. During this emergency, however, the priority of national security and national defense must be recognized.

It is impossible to foretell what emergency may arise from day to day and to what extent the navigation or vessel-inspection laws may have to be waived to meet the situation. I am convinced, after consultation with the heads of interested departments and agencies of the Government, that it is vital to the national defense that a statutory authority should be provided to waive compliance with any of those laws if the need should arise. This authority should be sufficiently broad in its scope to allow the waiver to be made promptly to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as may be deemed necessary for the national defense. The Secretary of Commerce now administers these laws, and I believe that he should be vested with this further authority to waive compliance with them upon direction of the President, or upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Office for Emergency Management.

I attach as of possible assistance to the Congress a draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 17, 1941.*

MR. AND MRS. T. EARL RODGERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 829, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers.

The bill would provide for the payment of $2,500 to Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers, of Huntington, W. Va., as compensation for the death of their daughter, Allura Jean Rodgers, as a result of her being struck by a United States mail truck.

It appears that Allura Jean Rodgers, a little girl of 8 years of age, sent on an errand by her mother, started diagonally across the street from behind a parked car; that the mail truck was coming from the other direction at a moderate rate of speed; that the driver of the truck made every effort to avoid an accident, to the extent of driving over the curb and crashing into a tree; but that she was, nevertheless, hit by the truck and died as a result of the accident.

An investigation of the accident by the postmaster at Huntington and by a post-office inspector exonerated the driver of the truck from any blame and upon the driver's arrest, the grand jury declined to return any indictment.

It is apparent, therefore, that there was no negligence on the part of the driver of the Government vehicle, and no basis for a recovery even if the Government were to waive its immunity to suit in tort. It was an unfortunate accident for which the Government was neither legally nor morally responsible and cannot justly be expected to make compensation.

Under these circumstances, I find it necessary, in spite of my sympathy for the bereaved parents of the little girl, to withhold my approval of this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1941.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 178) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded rom its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 43 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and to further amend the amended joint resolution approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Major R. Lee;

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Roche, Connell & Laub Construction Co.;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Matie Freeman;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie;

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y. Upham;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds;

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

This joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) to amend further the amended joint resolution, approved August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 668), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the New York World's Fair, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and to further amend the amended joint resolution approved May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 187), concerning the importation of articles for exhibition at the Golden Gate International Exposition, to permit transfer of liability for duty on articles so imported, and for other purposes, was

read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1942.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 193, which is the emergency relief bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193), making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the joint resolution which is now the unfinished business makes appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The joint resolution contains the same amount appropriated by the House of Representatives; there is no change in the relief appropriations from those made by the House, though there are some differences in the way in which the money may be used. There has been recommended by the Senate committee a $50,000,000 item for the Surplus Marketing Administration.

Now, Madam, President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency", subhead "Work Projects Administration", on page 5, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$40,000,000", and insert "$50,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$35,466,000" and insert "$38,900,000"; in line 19, after the word "salaries" to strike out "$29,016,000" and insert "$32,240,000"; in line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$600,000"; and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$2,800,000" and insert "$2,910,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 8, after the word "Works", to strike out "Administrator" and insert "Administrator,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 11, line 3, after the word "Commissioner", to insert "with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$8,500,000"; and in line 12, after the word "operation", to insert:

Provided, That $3,500,000 of such amount shall be allocated to the Department of Agriculture for the continuation during the calendar year 1941 of existing projects now under the jurisdiction of such Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$540,000" and insert "$576,000"; and on page 12, line 3, after the word "projects", to strike out "within the jurisdiction of such agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 15, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 10. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be determined, as far as practicable, on the basis of relative needs and shall, where the relative needs are found to be the same, be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection) and unmarried widows of such veterans and the wives of such veterans as are unemployable who are in need and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need: *Provided*, That if the monthly income of any such employable veteran from all sources is less than the monthly earnings such veteran would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran shall be certified as in need of Work Projects Administration employment but shall not be permitted to earn in any month an amount in excess of the difference between the amount of his other monthly income and the Work Projects Administration monthly earnings as a project worker.

And insert:

SEC. 10 (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be given to veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection), and unmarried widows of any such veterans, and the wives of any such veterans who are unemployable, who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify: *Provided*, That if the total monthly income from all sources of any such veteran or of the unmarried widow of any such veteran, or if the total combined monthly income from all sources of any such unemployable veteran and his wife, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, is less than the monthly earnings the veteran, unmarried widow, or wife would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran, unmarried widow, or wife, as the case may be, shall be certified as in need of such employment, and when assigned to such employment he or she shall be employed for such period as will permit the total monthly income of such veteran or unmarried widow, or the total combined monthly income of such unemployable veteran and his wife, to be at least equal to the amount which would be obtainable by full-time employment on any such project. Thereafter preference in such employment shall be given on the basis of relative needs, as far as practicable, to other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) Employable persons who have been certified as in need of employment for a period of 3 months or more, and who have not in that period been given employment on work projects, shall have preference in employment over persons who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10 (a), page 18, line 13, after the word "section", to insert "10 (a) or in section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 16 (a), page 23, line 13, after the word "laws", to insert "; except that this limitation shall not apply in the case of any person who is employed by another agency of the Government on the date of enactment of this joint resolution and who is thereafter assigned or detailed to the Work Projects Administration."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, since the committee adopted that amendment and recommended it to the Senate, I find there was a misapprehension of the facts. The text assumes that a person paid out of W. P. A. funds is assigned to the Work Projects Administration. As a matter of fact, the reference is to the regular employees of the departments and money enough to pay them is transferred, for example, from the W. P. A. over to the Department of Agriculture or to the Department of the Treasury for accountants, and so on. So the amendment as reported will not do what the committee intended.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that if we strike out the words "assigned or detailed to the" and replace them with the words "employed on work of the", I think it would meet the situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that would do it. We can take it to conference, in any event.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask that that amendment be made; that is, in the committee amendment, in line 16, strike out the words "assigned or detailed to the" and insert in lieu thereof the words "employed on work of the."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 22, page 26, line 21, after the word "affiliations", to strike out "except as provided in section 10 (f) and section 12 (b)" and insert "except as may be authorized or required by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 24, page 28, line 8, to strike out "Except as may be required by the provisions of section 10 (f), section 12 (b), and section 25 hereof," and insert "Except as may be authorized or required by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 33. No part of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended for undertaking or prosecuting, in whole or in part, any non-Federal project if all or a substantial part of the funds contributed by the sponsor of such project for the purpose of financing its share of the cost thereof have been or are to be paid to such sponsor, or are to be reimbursed to such sponsor, by or on behalf of any person who owns or was the former owner of any part of the real property included within such project, or of any real property adjacent thereto, or who, in the opinion of the Commissioner, would receive a direct and substantial financial benefit as a result of the prosecution of such project: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the prosecution of any non-Federal project if the contribution made by the sponsor of such project toward its share of the cost thereof is to be financed primarily by means of assessments against the owners of real property adjacent to such project or by any other bona fide method customarily used by municipalities and improvement districts to aid in financing local improvement projects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 17, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 34. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1942, the sum of $50,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, such sum to be in addition to any funds appropriated by such section 32 and to be subject to all the provisions of law relating to the expenditure of such funds.

Mr. BILBO and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has the floor. Is the Senator from Oklahoma opposing the amendment just stated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I desire the floor after the amendment is disposed of.

Mr. ADAMS. I understand the Senator from Mississippi desires to speak on the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in support of the wise action of the Appropriations Committee in reporting this amendment I desire to make a few remarks as to the advisability of spending $50,000,000 for the purposes set forth.

As I offered the amendment it provided an appropriation of $100,000,000. The committee was fair enough to meet me half way and to provide $50,000,000. In the course of my remarks I shall refer to statements by the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Surplus Marketing Administration, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics advocating this proposal. I think the country ought to have the opportunity of reading the argument and reasons set forth by these leaders in the agricultural life of our Nation.

The amendment would make an additional $50,000,000 available to the Surplus Marketing Administration to extend its excellent work. The Surplus Marketing Administration helps farmers dispose of their surplus crops by making those crops available through its various programs to needy families throughout the country. These programs—the food-stamp plan, the cotton-stamp plan, the school-lunch program, the direct distribution of surplus commodities to needy families, the program of research to develop new uses for surplus products, the low-cost-milk programs—have made and are making important contribution to American agriculture and to the health defenses of the Nation. Only $197,000,000 has been made available in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for all these surplus-removal programs. That sum is $38,000,000 less than is available this year and is far from adequate for the expansion which I believe these programs merit. After careful study the Department of Agriculture originally asked the Budget Bureau for $310,000,000 to carry on this work.

The food-stamp plan is a resourceful and sensible way to move surplus foods from the farms and bulging warehouses through the normal trade channels to the men, women, and children who need them most. Operating now in about 400 areas throughout the Nation in which there are about 7,500,000 in relief families, the plan has been requested by officials in 1,300 other areas. It has been outstandingly successful in operation and has received the enthusiastic support of farmer, business, labor, and consumer groups all over the country. I think the food-stamp plan should be expanded to all of the United States and the increased appropriation which is under consideration would permit that, I believe, if the expansion were staggered over the first 6 or 8 months of the new fiscal year.

This plan helps farmers by broadening their market. It helps business and labor by moving foodstuffs through the normal channels of trade. It improves the health of millions of our people by making it possible for them to buy with stamps more of the protective foods they need for health.

The Nation is suddenly becoming nutrition conscious. The shockingly high percentage of draft rejections for medical reasons is partly responsible for this. When approximately 40 percent of our young men called for military service are rejected by the Army as physically unfit it should be obvious to all of us that we have been neglecting our duties on the home health front. Underfed people on our farms and in our cities are not ready for the tremendous tasks which lie immediately ahead.

Millions of men, women, and children in this country do not get enough to eat. Some 45,000,000 persons here live below the danger line of adequate nutrition. The Surplus Marketing Administration programs are giving only about a half of the 16,000,000 needy people in relief families a chance to eat part of the farmers' surplus. Its excellent school-lunch program is now giving over 4,000,000 undernourished children an opportunity to eat some of the fine, nutritious foods our farmers grow in such abundance. But that is less than half of the undernourished children in the country who are eligible for this assistance. The school-lunch program should be expanded.

Our low-income groups in cities and on farms need more food and our farmers need more income. On the basis of Federal studies, we now know that the Nation's food bill would have been increased by $2,000,000,000 a year if food purchases of all the families making less than $100 a month before defense spending began equaled those of families which did make $100 a month. An area about as large as the State of Iowa would have been required to produce that extra amount of food needed to satisfy such an increased demand. Furthermore, the production of crops that will do the job best in overcoming malnutrition—the dairy production, fruits, and vegetables—will result in less loss of soil fertility than in the case of a number of crops which we have been producing for an export market that is now sharply curtailed by a world situation beyond our control.

The large future market for our farmers is among the low-income groups in our own Nation. They make up nearly two-thirds of the population. During the present year the food stamp plan is moving millions of pounds of surplus fruits, vegetables, dairy and poultry products to adults and children who badly need them. The children of today who are learning to eat these protective foods so vital to health, will be future customers for them.

A critical situation faces us. If the Surplus Marketing Administration has only $197,000,000 available to it for the coming fiscal year, it will be obliged to immediately discharge about 17 percent of its present employees. This organization is run as economically as any in the Federal Government. Its total administrative expenses are limited by law to 3 percent of the funds available to it. Unless its appropriation is increased above $197,000,000 by this amendment, the discharge of competent people in its field organization will materially hamper the important services it has been rendering our farmers. This would be a tragedy for American agriculture, particularly for the producers of our nonbasic crops.

I want to read from a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard on American Farm Bureau Federation suggestions which he made to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 25, 1941. He said in part:

The functions necessary to get food from the farmer to the consumer are about identical whether the foods pass through normal trade channels or whether government undertakes to do this work itself. In either event, food must be bought from the farmer, packed, processed, shipped, unloaded, stored, and dis-

tributed to individual families. Unless the Government intends to operate food stores on a basis similar in efficiency to the way it now runs post offices—establishing modern markets with refrigeration facilities to prevent spoilage, etc.—it is the opinion of the Department that this work can be done more economically through the existing private distribution system.

The mechanism of the food-stamp program provides protection to farm income by using two stamps, an orange-colored stamp and a blue-colored stamp. The orange-colored stamps are bought by needy families in amounts equal to their normal food purchases; the blue-colored stamps represent the assistance by the Federal Government. Through the orange-colored stamp purchases, assurance is given that all of the Federal aid will benefit agriculture since the orange-stamp purchase makes certain that regular expenditures will be continued and that the blue-stamp funds will represent additional demand for those surplus products in the worst price position from a farmer's point of view. Where surplus foods are given away directly to individual families there is no assurance that any net increase in consumption takes place, and the farmer therefore has no guaranty of a broader home market. Under the stamp plan he does have such a guaranty. The use of two colored stamps assures a net increase in the amount of surplus foods bought and eaten. This is the reason that so many farm groups have given the food-stamp plan such wholehearted support. In addition to countless resolutions of approval by State and local farm organizations, the National Grange, the Farmers Union, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives have passed commendatory resolutions regarding the food-stamp plan. The stamp program is the only device yet worked out which makes certain that all of the Federal subsidy goes directly toward enlarging the domestic market for farm products.

In addition to the surplus commodities moved through the medium of the surplus-food stamps, substantial additional quantities of those commodities are marketed to consumers other than the relief families who have the stamps. This increased movement of surplus commodities comes as a direct result of the aggressive merchandising methods, displays, and advertising of retail grocers who, in competing for the blue-stamp business, concentrate their sales efforts on surplus commodities.

The farmer does not sell to a marketing system. He sells through it to 130,000,000 people in this country, and the buying power of those people is one of the most important measures of the farmers' prosperity. Blue stamps put increased food-purchasing power in the hands of millions who previously had too little to eat. The level of farm prices is lifted by this greater demand and a new and permanent market for agricultural products is created. In distributing what the farmer produces through normal channels of trade rather than through Government-financed food depots the farmers get still another value. The advantage of sales drives on surplus products is well established. Such drives tied in with the food-stamp plan, and the resultant cooperation between Government, farmers, and business will mean the movement of far greater additional quantities of surplus foods to all consumers.

The Department has no intention, however, of abandoning the direct purchase and distribution programs. The most effective method of assisting producers of some surplus products is through direct purchase. For commodities so purchased the school-lunch program provides an excellent distribution outlet and this program is, therefore, being expanded.

The food-stamp program will be in operation by the end of this fiscal year in areas which will probably require an annual expenditure of about $125,000,000. Based on experience during 1940, the proportion of the funds spent for each commodity or commodity group, and the dollar value of foodstuffs moving into consumption through blue-stamp expenditure alone is estimated as follows:

Commodity group	Percent of total expenditure	Dollar expenditures
Butter	14.9	$18,600,000
Eggs	14.0	17,500,000
Cereals	17.3	21,600,000
Vegetables, including potatoes	9.7	12,100,000
Fresh deciduous fruits	4.1	5,200,000
Dried fruits	2.6	3,300,000
Oranges and grapefruit	6.3	7,800,000
Pork	25.3	31,700,000
Lard	5.8	7,200,000
Total	100.0	125,000,000

Nearly every farm in America produces one or more of the above products. All agriculture is benefited by their increased consumption.

The food-stamp plan is an assurance to the American farmer that an actual increase in consumption is taking place. In administering the Federal farm program, it is one of the methods used to bring about an improvement in farm income.

Since this statement was made, butter has been removed from the surplus list in order to get more dairy products to Britain. That simply means that for next year more of the new blue-stamp purchasing power will go to producers of other surplus crops who are in greater need of aid through this program.

Obviously, the Department of Agriculture has set up the stamp plan so as to benefit our farmers. I want now to read from an October 1940 report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They made an elaborate and objective study of the food-stamp plan as it affected farm income. This was before the defense program got under way and the relief rolls began declining. At that time they said in summarizing their findings:

The study here reported shows that farmers, low-income consumers, and food dealers would all benefit substantially from an expansion of the food-stamp plan. If the plan were made available to all relief and Work Projects Administration families in the United States, the cost to the Federal Treasury would be about $400,000,000 a year. A plan of this size would be very effective in moving surplus foods into consumption and in improving the diets of low-income families. The authors believe that a $400,000,000 annual subsidy for a national food-stamp plan could increase the income of farmers by at least the amount of the subsidy and possibly somewhat more.

Because of the rise in employment, a national food-stamp plan for persons getting public aid could be run today for about $250,000,000 instead of $400,000,000. By a year from now the cost probably would be a little under $200,000,000. Families who have recently stopped buying their food with stamps and have gotten jobs are, of course, better customers for the farmer than they were before, since they can now afford to buy more of what he produces.

Help for the producers of our nonbasic crops is equally as important as help for the producers of our five basic commodities. Because of the perishable nature of their commodities, the producers of our nonbasic crops look largely to the Surplus Marketing Administration for Federal assistance. In this connection, I want to read from the testimony of Milo Perkins, Administrator, Surplus Marketing Administration, given on May 29, 1941, before the House Banking and Currency Committee. He said:

An entirely different approach is required to raise farm income for perishable crops than that which will work for nonperishable crops. Some crops, like cotton, can be stored indefinitely, whereas others, particularly the nonbasic crops, cannot. In the case of perishable and semiperishable foods, it is essential to move them into consumption, since they cannot be stored indefinitely. Price-pegging loans which will support farm income for the five basic crops, therefore, cannot have the same economic effect for most of the nonbasic crops. Agricultural products such as fresh fruits and vegetables must be used; they cannot be locked in storage without spoilage.

In other words, higher farm income can be achieved by a higher loan rate on commodities which can be stored for relatively long periods of time, but to get the same effect on perishable and semiperishable crops, greater purchase funds must be available to move these crops into consumption, just as greater loan funds are required to maintain farm income on crops that can be stored for longer periods. It takes money to achieve either result.

Obviously, prices on the five basic commodities could not be maintained at 85 percent of parity for the entire production without having enough money available to lend on the full portion of the crop offered for the loan. Similarly, parity prices or even 85-percent parity prices for nonbasic commodities could not be maintained without very sizable increases in the amount of purchase funds available so that all of the crops offered for sale at less than such prices could be bought. Nonbasic crops account for roughly 75 percent of total farm income. If it is desired to bring them above current price levels, money obviously must be appropriated for that purpose just as it is appropriated to maintain 85-percent loans on the five basic crops.

If mandatory legislation were passed directing the Department of Agriculture to buy nonbasic crops at a fixed price considerably above the commercial market, and if greatly increased appropriations for the purchases of such products were not made, two bad results for the American farmer would ensue:

A. Only a very limited amount of increased income by way of higher unit prices would go to the few farmers who were able to sell to the Government, and the majority of farmers would be very much dissatisfied.

B. After that limited amount of money was spent—and even if it were prorated among farmers selling the Government, which would be a costly administrative procedure—there would be no further support available for agricultural prices and farmers would be at the mercy of commercial buyers in a glutted market. The total quantity moved by purchases, rather than the unit prices received on the relatively small amount of Government purchases, is the determining factor in total farm income as it is affected by Government acquisition programs.

If mandatory legislation were passed directing the Department of Agriculture to buy at parity, a wholly untenable situation would result so far as unjust enrichment of processors is concerned. A great many processed

farm products, such as meats, canned tomatoes, flour, cheese, dried eggs, and evaporated milk are now being bought, largely for Britain. If these purchases were made at parity, when processors are not paying parity prices to farmers, the taxpayers' money would be thrown away paying unwarranted prices to certain business groups.

Flour bought at 100 percent of parity, for example, certainly would be absurd in the face of an 85-percent wheat loan. Mandatory legislation requiring the Department to buy at parity would wreck the British purchase program as it is now operated through the partial use of $90,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation money as a revolving fund. The use of these funds in the last 2 months has added hundreds of millions of dollars to farm income rather than to the profits of speculators. This would not have been possible if lease-lend funds had been used exclusively. It will not be possible to achieve similar results unless they are so used in the future, although this is not as vitally important now as it was in the beginning of the food-for-defense program.

Parity, as figured by the current formula, is certainly too high for a great many specialty crops. Doubling or trebling the prices of some of these crops would increase production, curtail regular consumption, exhaust limited Government funds available for their purchase, and then leave farmers at the mercy of distressed market conditions. Farmers producing such crops would be injured by this action.

More important than this, however, is the principle involved in dealing with perishable and semiperishable crops as opposed to dealing with nonperishable crops, which can be stored under Government loans for long periods of time. The loan approach in the latter case gives a guarantied kind of support to farm income. The only way to get similar results in the case of the nonbasic crops is to have adequate money available for moving perishable and semiperishable crops into consumption before they spoil.

In order to do this in a way to get the maximum effect upon farm income, Government purchasing power can be used to lead a market upward from any given level, but limited purchases—much above the level of commercial prices—would not improve total farm income as much as moving a larger quantity, even at a somewhat lesser price, in the event that increased purchasing funds were not available in an amount adequate to achieve full parity.

The greater the amount of money available for moving perishable or semiperishable crops into consumption, of course, the higher the level of prices it is possible to achieve. The sky is virtually the limit, although the Government would tend to become the farmer's chief customer if such a program were pushed to extremes.

Of fundamental importance in this connection is the problem of providing for the long-range protection of farm income through the continuance of both the purchase and loan programs. Any such programs could, of course, be swamped in the absence of adequate production adjustment by the greatly excessive supplies that would be called forth by parity prices for several crops. It should be emphasized that adequate production adjustment is difficult to obtain in the case of certain specialty crops, such as fresh fruits and vegetables and nuts and even poultry products, which are widely produced by a large number of small farmers.

Producers of nonbasic crops have, for the most part, several factors now operating in the direction of better income. These factors are:

A. A sharp rise in consumer purchasing power due to increased pay rolls. This particularly affects the price level of the nonbasic crops of which there are acute nutritional deficiencies among low-income families.

B. A broader total market occasioned by Government purchases for:

(1) Britain and other democracies resisting aggression.

(2) Red Cross.

(3) Domestic distribution to relief families.

(4) School lunches.

(5) Army and Navy requirements.

The Department of Agriculture is using and intends to continue using whatever purchase funds are available to it in such a fashion as to get the maximum possible effect upon total farm income. It cannot achieve a greater effect without a greater appropriation for this purpose, however, any more than it could maintain 85 percent of parity prices for the five basic crops without increased loan funds.

Mr. President, I consider that the food-stamp plan will be vitally important in the post-war period. We must preserve this program and continue its gradual expansion. I should like to quote from a statement by Milo Perkins, Administrator of the Surplus Marketing Administration, on this point:

> Unfortunately, the administrative machinery of the stamp plan cannot be set up efficiently overnight. Once it is carefully established, however, it works on an accordion basis. In times of full employment, it can be contracted to serve as a business-like way of getting food to the handicapped and the unemployables. That keeps the program in existence at a minimum cost for times of depression when food must be gotten quickly to millions of people who have lost their jobs through no incompetence of their own. Times of heavy unemployment are times of heavy farm surpluses, and they require immediate as well as effective action.
>
> The food-stamp plan therefore is national insurance against hunger in every area where the plan is operating. As part of the national farm program, it is additional insurance against collapse in farm income. That kind of insurance is particularly important in the present world situation. It will continue to be important until international trade is restored and we can find permanent ways here at home of providing useful work at good wages for all of our people all of the time. Meanwhile it is generally agreed that the sensible thing to do with farm surpluses is to give the undernourished a chance to eat them, so far as that is possible. Only a healthy people can meet the challenge of total defense that now faces us

We have within the last year authorized some $40,000,000,000 for national defense. My original amendment would amount to only one-fourth of 1 percent of that huge sum, and the committee has reduced by half what I proposed. It will enable the Surplus Marketing Administration to increase farm income, and it will help to carry out the program of the National Nutrition Conference which was recently called by the President. This Nation cannot make a wiser investment in the general welfare of our country than by using this $50,000,000 for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 33, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I desire to offer an amendment. There are some Senators interested in the amendment who are not on the floor, and when I offer the amendment I desire to have them present, if they wish to be present. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Barbour	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Herring	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smathers
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Bulow	Houston	Stewart
Bunker	Hughes	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	La Follette	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	White
Davis	Murray	Wiley
Downey	Norris	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the administration of the W. P. A. set-up the Government has maintained, and now maintains, in each State a number of officials in the procurement department, in the auditing department, and in the accounting department of the Treasury Department. In each State capital we now have a number of employees representing these various departments of the Government. Last year, in making up the appropriation bill which included the W. P. A., it was proposed to take those employees from the State capitals and center them in regional offices. When that fact was discovered an amendment was submitted to the Senate providing that such employees in the States should remain where they were; in other words, the amendment was to prevent the centralization of certain officials and employees in regional offices located in the larger cities of the country.

When that amendment was presented upon a roll call the amendment carried by 67 to 7. A year ago only seven Members of this body were in favor of centralizing those officials and employees now located in the several State capitals in regional offices to be located in the larger cities of the Nation. In this joint resolution it is proposed to renew the policy suggested last year but not to go quite so far. In this joint resolution it is proposed to remove the auditing and accounting officers and employees from the several State capitals to certain regions not definitely mentioned in the joint resolution.

It will cost a little more money to keep these officials and employees in the respective State capitals where they are now, where they can be of immediate service in the State in the administra-

tion of the W. P. A. funds. If the joint resolution goes through as it is now pending before the Senate, a number of officials and employees of the Government in each State capital will have to be either discharged or removed to some central or regional office. The difference in cost is some $485,000. If the matter stands in the joint resolution as it is now proposed, central or regional agencies will be established in perhaps the larger cities to perform in such regional offices the work which is now performed in the several State capitals.

I have not accurate estimates of the amount of money it will take to perform these particular and respective duties in the central or regional offices, but it must be more than a millio ndollars. So it will cost a large sum to administer this clerical work in the regions, but perhaps not quite as much as it will cost to perform the same service in the several State capitals.

If the provisions of the joint resolution are not amended a number of officials and employees will lose their positions or be forced to move. Of course, they cannot all move, because there will not be jobs for all of them in the regional offices.

So, Mr. President, in order to test the sentiment of the Senate, I propose an amendment increasing the amount in three places sufficiently to keep the setups in the respective States exactly as they are today. My amendment is similar to the one I offered a year ago. If it prevails, there will be no change in the procurement, in the auditing, or in the accounting offices now located and maintained in the several State capitals. They will be retained exactly as they are at the present time.

If the amendment does not prevail, the accounting and the auditing divisions will certainly be centralized in the various regions, and the procurement divisions would be retained in the States where they are now. But this is an entering wedge, and if this amendment is not adopted today, then next year we shall have a still further provision for centralization of these agencies, and no doubt we will have the procurement office taken to the regional office, as was proposed a year ago. With this statement, I submit the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,250,000"; on page 8, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$2,025,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,360,000"; on page 8, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$6,005,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$6,490,000"; on page 8, line 22, immediately preceding the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to defray the expenses of transferring or maintaining the performance of any of the functions appropriated for in (a), (b), and (c) of subdivision (2) of this section at points other than in the States where any of such functions are now performed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Upon my amendment, I shall ask for a yea and nay vote at the proper time.

Mr. ADAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to offer an amendment along the line of that offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. It is different from his amendment, but I want it to lie on the table, to be acted on. I send it to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add, at the proper place, the following:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit and administrative employees in each State shall be chosen from among residents of the State where employed

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would not be in order, I think as a substitute for the amendment now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware was merely read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HUGHES. It is an independent amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma presents a very clear, simple question, whether the Senate wishes to spend $485,000 of the taxpayer's money in order to maintain some bookkeepers in some of the States. The bill as it comes before the Senate contemplates that there will be a consolidation of bookkeeping and disbursing agencies, and those only. No consolidation of procurement offices is proposed. The reduction in expense which will develop from this consolidation will be $485,000. There will be no decrease in the efficiency of the service.

The objection made is that if we consolidate as is suggested, we will reduce the number of offices in which accounts are kept and from which checks are sent, from 50 to approximately 25. It means that some employees will be moved from some States to other States, and probably as many States will have a slight increase as will have a decrease. To illustrate, in one State in the West there is an office where eight persons are employed, and the proposal would result in the removal of four. That would be the extent of the effect of the provision as it comes from the House, and as it was approved by the Senate committee. So that it is merely a question whether the Senate proposes to spend, in fact, to waste, $485,000 of the taxpayers' money, in order to keep some bookkeepers and check writers in certain States, rather than have them go to other States in order to increase efficiency in administration, and reduce overhead. The members of the Senate committee felt that they could not, and I cannot, as an individual Senator, vote to waste, or to spend $485,000 to keep some bookkeepers and check writers in any Senator's State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask for yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained. He has a pair on this question with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I also announce the general pair of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator

from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Hill	Rosier
Bailey	Hughes	Shipstead
Bulow	Kilgore	Smathers
Bunker	La Follette	Smith
Capper	McFarland	Stewart
Caraway	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Murray	Truman
Green	Norris	Tunnell
Gurney	O'Mahoney	
Hayden	Pepper	

NAYS—26

Adams	Ellender	Reynolds
Ball	George	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Byrd	McNary	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Overton	Wiley
Danaher	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—39

Aiken	Davis	McCarran
Austin	Gillette	McKellar
Bankhead	Glass	Nye
Barkley	Guffey	Reed
Bilbo	Harrison	Schwartz
Bone	Hatch	Spencer
Bridges	Herring	Tobey
Brooks	Houston	Wagner
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Wallgren
Butler	Langer	Walsh
Chandler	Lee	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	White
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Willis

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I shall read. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I know that in essence it is sound. If not in the best of shape, I believe it can be reframed in conference. The amendment reads as follows:

No part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used by the Works Progress Administration to pay for labor furnished on any project for the production and manufacture of construction material, such as sand, gravel, and crushed stone, where such material can be purchased from any commercial producer of or dealer in such material delivered at the site of the proposed work for less than could otherwise be obtained.

In most of the W. P. A. work the men are employed in mending roads or building roads, which is proper, but they have opened up a number of quarries in which W. P. A. workers are engaged in the business of quarrying stone. The amendment provides that they shall not be permitted to manufacture the building material unless they can provide it more cheaply, all things considered, than the same material can be bought from private sources. The effect of the amendment would not be to cut down the amount of work. In my opinion, it would make more work in the building of roads. However, I believe that the quarrymen are among the groups with which the Government has competed most sharply. I ask that the Senate agree to the amendment, and that when it goes to conference, if for any reason it is found to be impractical, the conferees are at liberty to drop it. I do believe, however, that this small group of men are, out of W. P. A. funds, subjected to greater competition by the Government than any other group and that they are entitled to consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reason more money is spent by the W. P. A. on road work is that we require 25-percent sponsor contribution, and the cities, towns, and counties which desire better roads are willing to sponsor that kind of work. The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to make it more difficult for the cities, counties, and towns to sponsor such work.

Mr. TYDINGS. This provision would apply only to the use of W. P. A. labor to quarry the material.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but that is included in the whole job.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Arizona what I said to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill. Perhaps this may be an impractical matter. I do not think it is. If the committee will take the item to conference, and consider it with the W. P. A. officials, if it is found not to be practical and the conferees desire to drop it, I shall not make any point on the conference committee report when it comes back to the floor.

We all know that the quarrying is one business which has greater Government competition as the result of W. P. A. undertakings than any other business in America. The essence of W. P. A. is road work in most of the communities of the Nation, and I believe an honest attempt should be made to give the quarrymen as much protection as can be given them without interfering with the purpose of the program. That was the thought back of the amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

I say again that, when it is taken to conference, if for any reason it is found not to be feasible or practicable, I shall make no point on the floor if the conferees decide that the provision should be eliminated. I think that is perfectly fair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Maryland as to his attitude toward the handling of the amendment in conference is very fair. However, if the House conferees were to decide to embrace the amendment without affording the Senate an opportunity to recede, in my opinion, they would absolutely disrupt about three-quarters of all the W. P. A. projects throughout the United States. I do not like to oppose the Senator's amendment, but——

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that would happen, but if the House is overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment I am quite sure it ought to stay in the bill. If that contingency should happen I cannot imagine any better recommendation with respect to the amendment than to have the conferees of the House say that they want to accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. But we have committees of the Senate and of the House whose function it is to conduct hearings on matters of this kind. The Senator from Maryland is an able and outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment was handed to me only this afternoon. To my certain knowledge the men who handed it to me have had the matter up with the W. P. A. for 2 years, with the help of my office. They have tried to find a formula which would be universally satisfactory. I asked for a list of all the quarries which the W. P. A. was operating in the five States surrounding Maryland. W. P. A. material was being taken out of the ground at more than a hundred quarries. In the western section of the State of Maryland the situation is very much aggravated. There is more quarrying going on by W. P. A. in that section than in any similar section of the country. Private operators have tried in every way they can to prevent their bread and butter being taken away from them through a welfare program. I think they are entitled to protest. I do not think the Government ought to use welfare funds to take legitimate business away from a private operator who has invested all he has in a quarry, who has built up a trade, and who through the years has been furnishing the State and county with material. I do not think that the welfare program ought to be used for that purpose.

In my amendment I have provided that such materials must be bought from private sources only when they can be furnished more cheaply from private sources than from a W. P. A. quarry. I am trying to be perfectly candid about the matter. If the amendment had come to me earlier I should have been before the committee and should have offered it. However, for the past 2 years. I have had this question up with W. P. A. officials, who recognized the evil but have not given us any solution. I have a stack of correspondence at least 2 inches thick on the subject. The private operators have been patient. I am anxious to have the matter considered in this bill, and to have the W. P. A. people called before the conferees to see if any formula can be worked out. If no formula can be worked out, I shall make no point of insisting upon the amendment. I hope the Senator will go along with us in this respect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question of competition with private industry arises in connection with any conceivable project which might be inaugurated under the Work Projects Administration. Those who are in the business of manufacturing clothing always complain very bitterly, and with some merit and justice, when a W. P. A. sewing room is opened. The cotton mattress program has caused the manufacturers of cotton mattresses to register strong protests in Washington against the Federal Government going into the business of making mattresses. Many counties have already leased gravel pits, granite quarries, and lime-rock quarries, and have paid public funds for deposits of stone, granite, or lime rock in anticipation of W. P. A. projects which are

now under way, having in view the use of W. P. A. labor to mine the granite, gravel, lime rock, or other substance which goes into the paving of roads or the surfacing of airfields.

This amendment is presented on the floor. I have no figures before me, but, in my opinion, the amendment would affect a great many projects under construction by the W. P. A. I dislike to disagree with my friend from Maryland, but I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, if the gravel could be produced more cheaply by the W. P. A., under my amendment, it would have the right to continue to operate the quarries.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the one part of the Senator's amendment which I am afraid of. It is very hastily drawn. I could not draw a proper amendment on the floor of the Senate. Who is to determine whether or not it is cheaper? What factors would enter into the determination? Would the amount paid by the county for the gravel pit or the granite quarry be considered in the ultimate cost of the material? What factors would be considered?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there would be any great difficulty over that question. I think that all the factors which enter into the cost of the gravel would be considered on the one side, and all the factors which enter into the cost of the gravel on the W. P. A. side would be considered. Certainly the Government itself would be the judge as to which of the two agencies could furnish the material more cheaply. The civil-service laws provide that the prevailing wage in communities shall apply. The Government itself determines what the prevailing wage is. It varies in different communities; but the Government is arbiter of the matter, just as it would be in this case.

Let me ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Suppose he owned a quarry. Suppose he had invested $10,000 or $12,000 in crushing machinery, quarrying machinery, delivery trucks, and what not, and over a period of 10 or 15 or 20 years had built up a small business, from which he was making a legitimate living, furnishing stone to a municipality, county, or State. Then suppose that business were suddenly thrown completely out of gear, through no fault of the operator, but through the intervention of a governmental program, and the business were almost completely destroyed. Certainly the owner of a legitimate business would have the right to complain. The quarrying and gravel business is not a big trust. It is carried on by a great number of small operators. A man would have a legitimate complaint if his Government should take away from him his means of livelihood.

What are the private operators saying? They are saying, "If you can produce gravel for welfare purposes at a figure less than what we can produce and sell it for, then go ahead and produce it; but if we can furnish it more cheaply you ought to use the welfare funds for more labor. You ought not to use them in the production of the actual material. You ought to use the employment incident to the quarrying of the material in laying the material."

It seems to me that if the Senator owned a quarry he would feel just as the private operators feel, and in my opinion rightly so. The Government should not exercise its power to compete with them to the extent of taking their business from them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have the utmost sympathy with the objective which the Senator has in mind. This problem has not been confined to the State of Maryland. It so happens that in my own State a number of granite quarries are operating. Three of four of them are in the vicinity of Stone Mountain, the largest solid body of rock in the world. The operators have been to see me and have discussed the problem with me. I have also had the question up with the Work Projects Administration, and have regretted that some formula has not been evolved; but I think we should be acting very hastily if we should undertake to solve the question in this shotgun manner on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator ought to introduce a bill in the regular way and have hearings before a committee to work out the problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not think we can quite take the Senator's argument as we might otherwise take it. He says that the question has been under consideration for 2 years. He himself has had numerous conferences with representatives of the administration, and has had correspondence in an effort to solve the question. The question has been open for 2 years, and he has no solution. After 2 years of effort on the part of the Senator, myself, and many others similarly situated, all I am asking is that we make an effort to solve the problem.

The problem is not confined to Maryland. I know that in West Virginia particularly there has been much complaint about W. P. A. quarries. There has been complaint in Pennsylvania. In the entire State of Pennsylvania, one of the largest States in the Union, there are only 20 W. P. A. quarries. Complaint was made to the Representatives in Congress, and the W. P. A. closed quarries in Pennsylvania. I do not know why. But why keep 20 quarries in one little section of Maryland when in all the State of Pennsylvania only 20 quarries are open? I think we ought to make either fish or fowl of this thing. We ought to have a policy. I do not think the present policy is just, in view of the very facts which have been presented to me by the W. P. A. officials. I did not bring the papers with me; but only a week ago I was sent a list of all the quarries in West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. It was astounding to me to find that in proportion to the area more W. P. A. quarries were located in the little area about which I am talking than in any similar area in the great State of Pennsylvania, with its mountain ranges, where protest after protest had been made by the representatives of the people of that State and the number of quarries had been reduced to the irreducible minimum.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to inquire whether or not the adoption of this amendment would result in laying down a principle which would arise to plague us in connection with other industries. For instance, would we be laying down a principle to the effect that if a product can be commercially procured for less than the cost of producing it by W. P. A. operations, it shall be commercially purchased?

The next question might be whether work can be done more cheaply by commercial means. For instance, all over the United States airports are being constructed. W. P. A. labor is being used on many of them. We differ as to the result of W. P. A. labor. There is a very sharp divergence of opinion. Some insist that W. P. A. labor is far more expensive than normal contract labor, and we have such instances brought to our attention. In the last day or two Mr. Hunter insisted before our committee that W. P. A. labor is, if anything, more efficient than the other. In other words, the question of fact is raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer him?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the very purpose of the bill is to make work for those who are unemployed; and I cannot imagine that the rule mentioned by the Senator from Colorado would result in making it impossible for those who are unemployed to get work. I shall not discuss that fundamental at all. Under my amendment there would be just as much work for the W. P. A. as there would be without the amendment. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, under my amendment there would be more work for the W. P. A. than there would be without it, for the simple reason that according to the formula adopted the materials would cost less than they now cost, with the result that that much money would be left to be utilized for spreading and utilizing materials rather than producing them.

But in order that I may discharge my duty on the floor let me say, that I believe that we all understand what is involved. I should be glad to submit this matter to a voice vote; and if the majority of Senators present do not agree with the contention I have attempted to make, we shall have to abide by their vote. However, I desire to have the W. P. A. officials begin to learn that they cannot further temporize with this problem, and that if they do not do something between now and the next bill, a real fight will be made on this floor to see that equal and exact justice is applied to all persons. All I am asking is that we have a vote on the question.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. What I desire to say is neither in support of nor in opposition to

the argument of the Senator from Maryland. The W. P. A. provides employment for a class of workers who now are not eligible for work in the defense industries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. That class is comprised of persons between 45 and 65 or 70 years of age. They are really outlawed. Industry will not employ them. Social Security will not pension them. So there must be some agency to provide for the utilization of their services. Otherwise, they would be a relief cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is entirely correct; and that is the reason we have this very bill.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland. (Putting the question.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I call for a division. I do not insist on the yeas and nays.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "$875,000,000" and insert the figures "$1,250,000,000."

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long in discussing this amendment. I realize full well that there is a general feeling in the country that the national-defense program is providing or will provide employment for those who are on W. P. A. rolls. The defense program will provide employment for some; but our experience under the program, insofar as it has progressed, clearly indicates that large numbers of persons on W. P. A. will not under any circumstances secure employment as a result of the national-defense program. This is due to numerous factors. I shall mention only a few of them.

In the first place, when employment rises and when there is an increased demand for labor, those persons on W. P. A. who have sufficient skill to be employed are usually drawn off; and usually they are drawn from the younger age groups.

I am informed that the average age of the persons receiving employment on W. P. A. now is 43. This means, of course, that many of them are much older than 43. Senators are familiar with the fact that industry is reluctant to employ, if not adamant in refusing to employ, workers who have passed the peak of their physical and mental prowess. As a matter of fact, modern industry has become such a high-speed, technical operation that only those who are fortunate enough to be young and vigorous can function in mass production and highly technological industries.

What are the facts? During the present year the Work Projects Administration has received a total of $1,350,650,000, and has provided employment for an average of 1,700,000 persons. It is a fact that it provided work for less than one-fourth of the unemployed persons in the United States.

As of April 30, 1941, when the W. P. A. rolls carried 1,610,000 persons, there was an additional number of 1,264,000 persons who were eligible for W. P. A. employment, but who could not be hired because of the inadequacy of funds.

At present estimates of unemployment vary from 7,000,000 to 9,000,000 persons. None of the estimates of average employment properly reflects the actual number of persons unemployed from day to day. The best estimates at present indicate that the present level of unemployment will not decrease by more than 2,800,000 during the next fiscal year. That will still leave from 4,200,000—if we wish to take the most conservative estimate—to 7,000,000 persons unemployed in the United States. This unemployment will prevail even though the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production will be at an all-time high.

There will not be a proportionate decrease in W. P. A. eligibles. The present number of eligibles will decrease a maximum of 374,000 to a level of 2,500,000 net. An appropriation of $875,000,000 will provide for an average of only 1,000,000. Thus, under the proposed appropriation of $875,000,000, less than 40 percent of those eligible to W. P. A. employment, will be given an opportunity to work. About 56 percent of the eligibles are being taken care of at the present time.

In other words, Mr. President, we are now providing employment for 56 percent of those persons in the United States who are in all respects qualified and eligible for W. P. A.; but if this appropriation is left at the figure passed by the House of Representatives and now recommended by the Senate committee it will take care of only 40 percent of those who are eligible. An appropriation of $1,250,000,000, $375,000,000 more than proposed in the joint resolution as passed by the House and as recommended by the Senate committee, would provide work for approximately the same percentage of eligibles in the next fiscal year as we have been able to take care of under W. P. A. in the fiscal year now drawing to a close.

Mr. President, as mentioned some little time ago, the defense program even insofar as it provides employment for those who are on W. P. A. is not, and, I admit, cannot be, distributed in the United States according to population. I wish to quote from the report of the House Committee on Appropriations on this point:

> A very potent factor militating against the general absorption of unemployed workers eligible for W. P. A. in defense industry is the lack of distribution of the defense contracts. Due to the speed of the program, it has been necessary to place contracts where facilities were already available or could be made speedily available taking into consideration such factors as available labor, power supply, transportation facilities, etc.

I interpolate at this point, Mr. President, a statement of my own. I think there has been a shocking lack of appreciation upon the part of those responsible for the allocation of defense contracts and defense plants of the intensification of the economic headache which the entire defense program will inevitably bring because of the overconcentration and expansion of defense employment.

I return to the House report:

> As of March 31, 1941, 20 industrial areas had received 69 percent of all defense orders, yet these areas had only 28 percent of the population and 24 percent of the W. P. A. workers. Only 761 counties out of the 3,073 in the United States had received defense contracts. This statement is indicative of the spotty nature of the distribution but not entirely significant of the effect of the contracts, because under many of them subcontracts will extend to other regions and the materials for fulfillment of the contracts will fan out much more generally. A factor against the migration of persons eligible for W. P. A. to the places where defense contracts have been placed is the disinclination and inability of this group with dependents and home ties to transport themselves to places of employment.

To interpolate again, I am sure Senators realize full well that those who have been forced to accept W. P. A. as the only means of subsistence have not been in a position to save money by which they could transport either themselves or their families to points where defense work might be available, assuming that they were qualified therefor.

> The average age of persons on W. P. A. is nearly 43, and the number of dependents is estimated at 3.5 for each head of family.

I wish to show at this point how the situation affects my own State, merely as a typical example. Wisconsin has not fared very well so far as total value of defense contracts are concerned, despite the fact that it is the tenth State of the Union in the added value of manufactures.

How much effect has the national-defense program had on unemployment conditions in Wisconsin? Except in 4 counties, it has had little or no effect, and we have 72 counties in that State. About 85 percent of all defense contracts in Wisconsin are concentrated in four counties—Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Racine, and Rock. In 37 counties there are no defense contracts, while in 21 counties there are next to none. In only 7 counties—Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Racine, Rock, Dane, Douglas, and Winnebago—do defense contracts exceed the $5,000,000 mark.

Mr. President, I point to another aspect of the situation: Technological processes have displaced jobs, and the young people who have come into the labor market have acquired jobs that the present W. P. A. workers might normally have performed in past years. I wish to quote again from the House report:

> Technological processes account for the failure of employment to keep pace with increased expenditures and accelerated volume of production. A comparison with 1929 is illustrative of what has taken place in this respect. Industrial production in March 1941, according to the index of the Federal Reserve Board, stood at 143, which is 25 percent above the 1929 high point. Despite this peak of production the number of unemployed workers is estimated at between 7,000,000 and 9,000,000. This production has

been arrived at by not using anything like the Nation's available manpower. The worker has been caught between the squeeze of a rapidly increasing labor force and the accelerated mechanical productivity of the industrial plant.

In other words, the workers upon W. P. A. have been caught in-between two factors—an increase that normally comes in the age group eligible for employment, the younger workers, and the constant march of science and invention and technological improvements in industrial processes.

Using the factor of net increase of 600,000 in the labor force each year, there has been an increase in the labor force in the country of about 7,000,000 workers as compared with 1929. The peak of total employment in the calendar year 1929 was 50,000,000, which was reached in September, and the average for the entire year was 47,733,000. Comparable figures for the calendar year 1941 will not be available until the year closes, but it does not seem probable that either total high employment or total average employment for 1941 will reach the levels of 1929.

The following comparison with 1929 is of interest:

1. Total employment (46,559,000) in March 1941 was only 578,000 more than the total employment (45,981,000) in March 1929.

2. Nonagricultural employment (37,218,000) in March 1941 was only 1,541,000 more than such employment (35,677,000) in March 1929.

And yet I again digress to say that the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production is at the all-time high, and is many points above the high of 1929. In other words, Mr. President, what has happened? Because of technological advance in industry, because of the use of automatic and semiautomatic machinery, because of the utilization of mass production and continuous-belt conveyor assembly-line design of our factories, we are today producing in this country a great deal more of industrial products than we were producing in 1929, and yet we are producing them with less men.

The House report continues:

3. Agriculture employment (9,341,000) in March 1941 was 963,000 less than such employment (10,304,000) in March 1929.

Similarly in agriculture, the march of science and invention, the application of the power-age techniques, has likewise resulted in a diminution of the opportunities for employment in our agricultural pursuits.

The House report says:

Only in recent months has factory employment reached the level attained in 1920 (21 years ago), although manufacturing production in 1940 averaged 66 percent higher than in 1920.

The significant fact is that industry has produced and is producing more goods with much less labor. This is the condition that makes it impossible to expect that employment will be furnished in the coming fiscal year under the defense program for all that may want jobs or that unemployment under that program will completely disappear.

Mr. President, I desire now to call attention to just what will be the immediate effect of this appropriation if it is all that is obtained. I refer to that passed by the House and recommended by the Senate committee.

In the present month, June of 1941—which, of course, was adjusted to the last Budget, and was also adjusted to the employment conditions—an average of 1,413,500 persons will be employed on W. P. A.; but next month that number will have to be cut to 1,000,000 individuals. In other words, in the coming month 413,500 persons will have to be cut off from W. P. A.

Let us take a few States, to give typical examples. Take the case of region 1, which is New England, and which, as I said before in connection with another amendment and another bill, has received a very substantial increase in its normal economic activity as a result of the huge contracts and contract authorizations which have gone to that region of the country. Nevertheless, Mr. President, in June of 1941, this month, there are 8,000 persons on W. P. A. in Connecticut. Next month there can be only 4,000 persons, or a cut of 4,000 individuals in the coming month. In Maine, 3,500 will be employed in July, as against 5,000 persons on the rolls for the month of June.

Massachusetts has 58,700 persons on the W. P. A. rolls. Next month, if we accept the committee's recommendation and the action of the House, there can be only 34,000 persons employed on the W. P. A. in Massachusetts, a reduction of 24,700 individuals. Even if Senators do not share my apprehension that increased employment is not going to absorb W. P. A. workers, is there any Senator so optimistic as to believe that between this month and next month 24,700 persons can be absorbed by private employment in the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator give me the figures for the State of California?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are on the rolls in California in June of 1941, a total of 57,950 persons. This number will be cut to 39,000 persons next month.

I wish to mention in passing that in my own State in this month there are 31,900 persons on W. P. A., and next month there will be 21,400 persons. It is just out of the question; there is not any possible dumping of defense contracts into the State of Wisconsin which could possibly provide employment for the more than 10,500 persons who will find themselves severed from the W. P. A. rolls next month if this appropriation stands at $875,000,000.

Of course, Senators are aware of the fact that we are now entering, even in the Northern States, the months when there is the lowest demand each year so far as W. P. A. employment is concerned. I venture the prediction that if this amendment is rejected, such a situation will be created in the various States of the Union, as a result of this drastic curtailment of W. P. A. and the failure of private industry to absorb persons now on the rolls, that we shall be confronted when we meet again in January—or, if we are still in session, we shall be confronted in the winter months—with the necessity of passing a supplemental appropriation, a deficiency appropriation. In the meantime, Mr. President, who will have suffered? The people who will be cut off from W. P. A., who will be unable to find employment in their communities, and who will be forced to fall back on the already inadequate resources of their various communities so far as direct relief is concerned.

Let me emphasize that there are many areas in which no amount of defense activity could under any circumstances take care of the situation. So I plead with the Senate to consider this amendment and to support it.

In conclusion let me say that we are seeking national unity in this country; we are seeking to build up the morale not only of those who have been drawn into the armed forces but of those citizens who remain at home and who must be responsible for production and for the functioning of our economy.

Do Senators think it will increase the morale of our armed forces for a soldier to learn that a dependent father and his family have been severed from W. P. A. and are unable to find adequate relief provided from the locality where the family resides? Will such a soldier, drawing $21 a month, be able to meet that situation and to assist his family in any measurable degree? We all know that he will not.

Mr. President, will it help the morale in the various communities, cities, counties, States, and townships of this country, to have perfectly worthy individuals severed from W. P. A. and thrown back upon inadequate local resources for a few grocery orders?

I say that if we are to obtain morale, if we are to obtain national unity, one of the ways to do it is to avoid drastic and unjustified cuts in those agencies which are providing for the underprivileged segment of our communities, their only opportunity to keep themselves in some fashion from the humiliation and undernourishment of direct relief.

Mr. President, I wish to obtain a record vote on the amendment, and at the appropriate time I shall seek to secure recognition from the Chair in order to make the request.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin seeks to increase the basic appropriation from $875,000,000 to $1,250,000,000. The amount which the committee recommends is the full amount that was recommended by the President of the United States, the full amount recommended by the subcommittee of the House, the full amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the full amount passed by the House, the full amount recommended by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations itself.

Naturally, Members of the Senate and members of the committee do not have detailed information on matters coming before us; we are forced to rely upon the information which comes to us. I do

not think anyone can say that the President of the United States has been niggardly in recommending the expenditure of public funds for various forms of relief. I do not have the President's exact language in mind, but he points out the very obvious and very appropriate fact that today the United States is, by reason of the defense activities and other industrial improvements, in such a condition that employment is greater than it has been at any time since 1929, with every indication that employment will increase. We are today considering, in the subcommittee presided over by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], a bill providing an additional defense appropriation of $10,000,000,000, all of which will ultimately go into the employment of labor. If we trace the dollar back, with few exceptions we will find that it goes into employment.

The President, in his recommendation, and the House of Representatives, have fixed the appropriation recommended upon the basis of 1,000,000 men. At the end of the current month of June the number on the W. P. A. rolls will be 1,150,000. The bill before us will require, not a reduction of 400,000, but a reduction of 150,000. If the tremendous program upon which we have entered cannot absorb even a greater proportion of the unemployed than is contemplated in the appropriation, what are we to look forward to when there will be a slackening in employment and in Government expenditures?

It seemed to the committee that the President was putting the figures high, rather than low. It has never been the policy of the Congress to provide employment for every man out of employment. We know that there have always been more men out of employment than were upon the W. P. A. rolls. There is a difference in theories. There are some who think very earnestly that the Government is obligated to provide a job for every unemployed man, regardless of his financial situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am sure the Senator does not mean to leave the impression that the amount which I am asking to have appropriated would provide employment for all those who are eligible. All the pending amendment would provide for would be the same percentage of eligibles as has been provided for in the last fiscal year, namely, 56 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know about the percentage, and I am willing to accept the Senator's statement as correct; but that is a thing which we should not anticipate. Surely our condition should be better during the coming fiscal year than it was during the past. Surely, with the enormous expenditures we are making, which are running from $20,000,000,000 to $26,000,000,000, and which will mean employment beyond what this country has ever seen, much of the unemployment should be taken care of. Earlier in the day the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], in arguing for the necessity of training young men, detailed a list of 2,683,000 jobs available for men.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. Gladly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do not want the Senator to get the impression from anything I have said that I do not hope that some of these people will be employed on the defense program, but the program has been in progress for some time, and in this month, June, there are 17,400 persons employed on W. P. A. in the Senator's own State. In July, this coming month, there will be 11,000.

Mr. ADAMS. There will be 11,000 who will be unemployed, or who will be on W. P. A.?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; on W. P. A. There will be a reduction of 6,400 persons. Does the Senator think there is any kind of program that can come along in July, or for the next 6 months, or for the next year, that will provide those people with employment?

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the Senator I think his figures are quite erroneous, with all due regard to the source from which he obtained them, because in the whole United States we are reducing W. P. A. employment from the end of June to the first of July by 150,000. In other words, in my State, which represents practically 1 percent of the total population of the United States, the maximum reduction would be 1,500.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am talking about the average number of persons who are on W. P. A.

Mr. ADAMS. So am I.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And My information is that we will cut 413,000 persons off of W. P. A. next month.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is wrong. We will cut off 150,000, according to a statement which Mr. Hunter made before our committee within 4 days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator mean that is the total number who will be cut off as the result of reducing the appropriation to $875,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am certain there must be some conflict of information or understanding.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I are perhaps 30 days or more apart. We are stepping from the close of the current fiscal year to the beginning of the next fiscal year. Mr. Hunter said to us that at the close of this year on June 30 he would have 1,150,000 on the W. P. A., and that the average for the next year would be 1,000,000. He was asked, "Your drop then in July will be 150,000?" He said, "Yes." I am merely giving to the Senator the statement made by Mr. Hunter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That certainly does not square with the information which I have, Mr. President, because the indications are, according to the table which I have before me, that there are authorized to be employed in the month of June 1941, in the continental United States an average of 1,376,000 persons, and that in July 1941, in the continental United States, the authorization for employment will be 970,500.

Mr. ADAMS. I am merely relating to the Senator the figures as they were given to us.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not speaking about the employment on a particular day. I am speaking about the average employment for the month of June 1941, as compared with the average employment——

Mr. ADAMS. That is a different figure. If the Senator is taking the average for the current fiscal year he begins with 1,700,000. The Senator might just as well go back to that figure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but if we take the average for June and compare it with the average for July, we ascertain the average cut which will be made between June and July.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. That is a different story. I am talking about what the actual cut is going to be from this fiscal year to the next, from one appropriation under which we are living, to the appropriation we have under consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is talking about 2 successive days, June 30 and July 1.

Mr. ADAMS. About 2 fiscal years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the fact remains that taking the Senator's suggestion as an example, the average employment in Colorado was 17,400 for the current month of June, and for the month of July the average employment will be 11,000. So far as the persons who are dropped from W. P. A. are concerned, they will not be so much interested in our difference of statistical figures, but they will be interested in the fact that they have been dropped from W. P. A. and are not able to find employment anywhere else.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, averages are fine things, but what we are dealing with is facts. The question in my State is how many persons are going to be dropped from W. P. A. when this new appropriation goes into effect; not how many have been dropped off under the present appropriation. There has been a decline, as the Senator has explained, in my State. I will go down closer and speak of my county. In my county 4,000 persons were on the relief rolls at one time. Nine hundred and fifty persons are on the relief rolls now. According to last accounts, there were only 31 persons seeking to get on the relief rolls. It is an industrial community, but it is representative of hundreds of other communities where demands on W. P. A. have been reduced. It is true there are other communities where the reduction has not been made, but there have not been increases. The reduction in the industrial communities will be spread over into the other communities.

The same amount of money is not required in the State of Colorado, because of the reduction which was made in my county and in other counties. In industrial communities men are being sought. We were told in the Appropriations Committee not long ago that we were forced to build shipyards in some southern areas because if they were constructed in the northern and northeastern areas there would not be enough men available for employment in the

shipyards; therefore we had to build yards where there were employable persons. There is a community near where I live which is complaining—because of what? Because men are leaving the community, where they cannot obtain employment, and are going to other communities where they can obtain employment. That is, there is a constant and continuous increase in employment, and a consequent reduction in the W. P. A. requirement.

I come back finally to the fact that we have a definite finding by the executive in charge of the information services, who tells us that $875,000,000 is adequate; and the House of Representatives, which goes much more thoroughly into these matters than we do in the Senate, says that $875,000,000 is adequate. It seems to me that unless we are literally going to repudiate the idea that conditions are better, that increased employment is here, we should not go back, as the Senator from Wisconsin would have us go back—where? To the same amount of money that was expended for these purposes in the present fiscal year; that is, in substance, that we would maintain a continuous W. P. A. appropriation, abandoning the hope of betterment; disregarding the betterment of conditions which now exist. Of course, it is up to the Senate to exercise its judgment. As a member of the Appropriation Committee I have followed those whose judgments were founded upon investigation, who were as interested as could possibly be in the question. As a member of the committee I am interested in avoidance of waste of public funds, and at the same time I am interested in seeing the Government perform its obligations to its citizens.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendment provides, as I understand, about $100,000,000 less than last year.

Mr. ADAMS. I think that statement is accurate. I think that last year the amount for the full year was $1,350,000,000. I was accepting the Senator's statement to the effect that his proposal would maintain the W. P. A. at approximately the level of the current year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; if the Senator will pardon me, what I said was that if the proposed cut should go into effect the W. P. A. would be able to take only 40 percent of those eligible, whereas at present 56 percent of those eligible are given an opportunity on W. P. A. My amendment would make it possible for at least 56 percent of those eligible to obtain employment on W. P. A.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator and I perhaps do not agree as to the extent to which employment will be furnished during the current year. I am merely reporting these things to the Senate for its action, and saying that the committee's judgment is represented in the amount shown in the bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I have figures and statistics with reference to the application of the appropriation and the amendment to my State.

I merely wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the efficiency and effectiveness of the W. P. A. in connection with our national-defense program. If we go back to the very beginning of W. P. A. and try to visualize in our minds the magnificent contribution of W. P. A. to our national defense, including its contribution in the construction of highways and its effort in the construction of airports and military training grounds, we realize that W. P. A. is a very useful agency and that instead of curtailing it in the midst of a vastly expanding military program we ought to be considering expanding it. At least we should not restrict it to the degree recommended by the committee.

I disagree with the statement that all the various agencies of government have unanimously agreed upon the figure in the bill. Although the figure in the bill has the approval of the Budget Bureau, a very substantial minority in the House indicated a desire to arrive at the figure recommended by the Senator from Wisconsin.

To go back to the national defense, I believe it will be agreed that prior to the time when we appropriated large sums of money for the Army and Navy the W. P. A. was the one bright contributing spot in the whole defense picture.

Another point I wish to make is that W. P. A. is the last refuge of the older worker. It is the only place where a man between the ages of 40 and 65 can find a job. Our failure to adopt the pending amendment would either condemn a great number of them to idleness or consign them to relief.

There are 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men and women between the ages of 40 and 65—wage earners with dependents—who must look to W. P. A. for employment opportunities. We find no Navy recruiting officer interested in their services. They are not provided for by the N. Y. A., the C. C. C., or any other agency about which we have been talking. Their only opportunity for employment is in the expanding defense program, for which we can provide by the adoption of the pending amendment.

I believe that we shall need more projects in the future than we have needed in the past. As explained by the Senator from Wisconsin, the upsurge in prosperity is of necessity spotty. Defense contracts are highly concentrated in a comparatively small area of the country. Also, by reason of our restricted priority arrangements, nondefense industries will in some cases be actually closed up.

In addition, our cities and communities find it necessary to do a great deal of work as a result of national-defense activities, in the immediate neighborhood. I believe we ought to put men to work. There is no economic advantage for the Nation in consigning three or four million men to idleness. If we think the problem through, the result is either idleness and a diminished morale, with a depressing number on the relief rolls, or greater unity, greater contribution to our national defense, and the privilege for men and women to enjoy some of the expanding economy and prosperity about which we talk. I believe that these workers should be utilized, that national defense should be improved, and that if we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin we shall make a mighty contribution to the well-being of the Nation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I think perhaps Florida is in a little different situation from that of most of the other States. In the past decade the population of Florida has increased by nearly half a million. It has increased more than 28 percent. With few exceptions those who have gone there have not been of the wealthy class, although some wealthy individuals have gone to Miami, Palm Beach, and a few other such places.

Many persons go to Florida in the wintertime, and they do not wish to leave when the large hotels, the citrus packing houses, and the apartment houses are closed. Many of them stay. Every summer we have a serious problem in finding work for those people. They come from nearly every State in the Union. The normal increase in population, due to births, during a period of 10 years, would not be as large as the increase I have indicated.

Another situation which has been mentioned is the preparedness program, involving contracts for ships, munitions, machinery, airplanes, and such things. New Jersey alone has more than $1,000,000,000 worth of contracts, more than have 10 Southern States together. Ohio has more contracts, and has benefited to a greater extent than have 10 Southern States together. We are unable to take care of our people, who will have to be idle if the appropriation is cut too low.

Another point to which I wish to invite attention is that, so far as Florida is concerned, the work of constructing the camps and airports which are now being constructed will soon be over. Some of the camps are completed, and a great number of persons will have to find work somewhere else. Of course, they can go to other sections of the United States, but that is not always practicable for poor people who do not want to live in a part of the country to which they are not accustomed.

We are confronted by a serious problem. At one time last winter 20,000 men were employed in the construction of Camp Blanding, which will soon be completed. Employment is dropping off. It is very small compared to what it was when the construction was begun.

The same situation applies to the great airport at Jacksonville, which is being completed a number of months ahead of time. So a great number of people will have to find work. Every Senator knows that when a man or woman more than 50 years of age tries to find a position he meets with obstructions which are very difficult to overcome.

It is almost impossible. They cannot be obtained through civil service, and they are absolutely outcasts when it comes to securing positions even with

the Federal Government. They are outcasts also when it comes to trying to secure positions in the industries, because they do not want men and women over 45 years of age. The older they get the more some of them become in need. It is up to us. It is economy for us to give these persons work, and make them happy in their last days.

The W. P. A. now is doing different work than that which it did in the first days of its operation, when it had workers cutting weeds in vacant lots and cutting grass in the parkways. The W. P. A. has been one of the greatest factors in constructing airports and camps in the State of Florida, and I am sure it has been also in other parts of the United States. Money appropriated for the W. P. A. is not money thrown away. The W. P. A. workers are doing their work. They have done a fine job in my State. Some of the work has been delicate. It has been work that required skilled persons to perform; and these men and women, who by reason of the depression had everything swept away from them almost overnight in 1929, are still struggling. Nobody has handed them anything. They have worked for what they have gotten.

I trust the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will prevail. I think it is justice, and I think it is economy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word.

I am interested in this matter especially from the standpoint of its effect in my own State of Montana. In Montana, as a result of this joint resolution, the employment on W. P. A. will be cut practically in half. Our State is one of the States of the Union which has failed to receive any benefits from the national-defense program. Not a single contract has come to our State as a result of the vast defense program which has been talked about so much.

So much has been said against W. P. A. in the past several years that it seems that no one wants to defend it. As a matter of fact, I consider W. P. A. one of the finest programs the Government has maintained throughout the period of the depression. It has built all the great Army and naval bases and air bases in the United States during the years of the depression. If it had not been for the W. P. A. we would not today have the great Army air base at Tacoma, Wash., one of the finest Army air bases in the country, or, in fact, in the world.

I could talk at some length with reference to what W. P. A. has accomplished for this country in the way of a vast program of construction during the past several years, but I do not think it is necessary. I think every one who has given any thought to the subject of the work which has been accomplished by W. P. A. will agree with me that it has been one of the finest things the Government has maintained during this period.

Why should we, then, at this time make such a drastic cut in the employment of men engaged in such worthwhile work under W. P. A., especially in my State, as I say? I think it is true there, as in the case of a great many other States, that it will create a resentment that will do more damage than anything else I can think of. I think the W. P. A. program should be continued on its present scale which is meager enough in the face of admitted facts.

Therefore I desire to say that I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] if it is contemplated to complete the consideration of this joint resolution today?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not know whether that will be possible. I understand from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that he desires to have a record vote, and I understand from the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that he will therefore suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from Wisconsin is anxious that this particular amendment be disposed of this afternoon. Then I propose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, so far as I know, this is the only amendment to be presented to the joint resolution; and I desire to occupy only a few moments, since it is now 5 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I know of two amendments that will be offered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in glancing through the Evening Star of today I find a map of the United States, together with a chart. The chart is under a heading, as follows:

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PLANT AND EQUIPMENT IN 1939 BY STATES

And then, in parentheses:

(Figures are in millions of dollars)

I find that a number of States have received a very large amount of money in the way of expenditures for the construction of plants and equipment. At the time this chart was made, the State of New York had received $125,800,000; the State of Pennsylvania had received $120,600,000; the State of South Carolina had received $33,600,000; Ohio, $112,600,000; Michigan, $114,800,000; Indiana, $72,200,000; Wisconsin, $32,500,000; Illinois, $109,200,000; Texas, $52,100,000; California, $65,200,000. Then the chart gives the figures for a number of other States, some receiving between twenty and thirty million dollars each, some between ten and twenty million dollars each, and some under $10,000,000 each.

I find that about one-half the States of the United States have received less than $10,000,000 each. Mississippi has received $6,100,000; Florida, $8,800,000; Kentucky, $9,900,000; Oklahoma, $6,000,000; Kansas, $7,900,000; North Dakota, $600,000; Montana, $3,300,000; Wyoming, $900,000; Colorado, $6,400,000; New Mexico, $1,100,000; Arizona, $1,200,000; Nevada, $300,000; Idaho, $1,900,000; Delaware, $81,600,000.

The chart shows the amount of money which had been expended in the respective States for defense establishments at the time the chart was made.

Mr. President, a number of States are getting but very little benefit from the defense program. I shall not go into that feature now. It may come up later in connection with the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, which will be before the Senate at a later date.

In connection with the consideration of this particular measure, the fact of the unequal distribution of W. P. A. funds was dwelt upon to some extent. It is true that as a rule the States have had their lists open for certification. Some of the States have had a very large certification. That means that a large number of persons were investigated by the social-service departments, and the heads of the families were found to be in want. My State was found to be in that class. At one time upward of 100,000 persons in my State had been investigated and certified as being eligible for W. P. A. work, but at no time were any considerable part of that number employed.

Mr. President, it seems to me wholly unfair for the Government to set up a program of relief, make an examination of the persons eligible for relief, and then provide funds for only a portion of that relief. To me that is governmental favoritism. What can be going through the mind of a W. P. A. worker or a man certified for W. P. A. work who never gets a job? Of course, the funds which have been appropriated have been used to the best purpose that the Administrator could provide; but I think in no State have all those who have been certified been able to get jobs.

In the consideration of this particular joint resolution, as a member of the subcommittee, I asked Mr. Hunter some questions. I desire to place in the RECORD a few of the questions, and likewise a few of the answers.

On page 59 of the hearings I asked Mr. Hunter this question:

How much money would it take to employ all those certified and those that you know are eligible for certification and should be certified if the rolls were open?

Mr. Hunter replied:

$1,750,000,000.

So, Mr. President, according to the testimony of the Commissioner, this joint resolution carries only one-half the amount of money necessary to employ those who have been investigated and certified as being eligible and in need of W. P. A. relief. If the joint resolution carries only $875,000,000 it is obvious that one-half those who have been certified as being eligible and deserving of W. P. A. work cannot get W. P. A. work. Those who get it will be the favored few. Those who do not get the W. P. A. benefits will have to live in some way, but no doubt they

themselves do not know how they are to exist during the next few months.

The next question I asked Mr. Hunter was this:

I am asking this question: Should the Congress make that much money available for your organization?

Mr. Hunter had previously said it would take $1,750,000,000 to do the job. Then I asked him if the Congress should appropriate that much money. Mr. Hunter replied as follows:

Senator, I am supporting the Budget Bureau and the President's request for the money.

Of course, I knew that unless the bars were let down Mr. Hunter could not go any stronger than the Budget recommendation. So, in reply to that suggestion, I said to Mr. Hunter:

I am asking you that question. You are relieved of the responsibility.

And before I finished my question, Mr. Hunter replied:

Yes—

The question was:

Should the Congress make that much money available for your organization?

That is, "Should the Congress appropriate $1,750,000,000?" When pressed for a reply, Mr. Hunter said:

Yes—

With the following qualification:

I think I would say this, and this is a personal opinion: I think it is probably more important now to employ a substantial number of the unemployed than it was even 2 or 3 years ago, because my personal feeling is that to establish a real national unity in this country on a total all-out defense program, one of the most important things is to have total employment, and until people can get it, I think there is a sound reason for their having some chance to work. I think that also applies to health and housing, as well as to employment.

Further on in the hearings I submitted some other questions to Mr. Hunter. I shall refer to only a few of them.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that in the defense establishments only real young men have a chance to secure employment. The defense establishments prefer men either under 21 years of age or scarcely over 21 years of age. When a man reaches the age of 25 he is somewhat passé. When he gets a little over that age he is turned down without even an examination. So I asked Mr. Hunter this question:

Is it not a fact that in these defense industries the rule is that the men they employ are men just coming of age and under 25 years of age?

Mr. HUNTER. In the majority of the strictly defense industries, such as aircraft and plane manufacture, they do employ people pretty strictly under an age limit. What that age limit is in specific industries, I do not know, but it is much under the average W. P. A. age.

The next question:

Is it not a fact that before any man could get a job in any established job today he must first undergo an examination almost as strict as if he were going into the Air Corps?

The answer:

That is certainly true of the defense industries; yes, sir.

The next question:

There are a lot of apparently able-bodied men and comparatively young, too, yet they cannot get a job because of some defect that does not appear on the surface, and the only way they can get a job is by doing this temporary work referred to by Senator HOLMAN—

A member of the committee—

or get a job on the W. P. A. Is not that true?

Mr. Hunter's reply was:

Yes, sir.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I will refer to one or two more questions.

Mr. Hunter stated, in reply to one of my questions, as follows:

The only recourse is local relief.

That is, for the men who are slightly above age, who have some physical defect. They cannot do a satisfactory day's work in industry as demanded by the present defense organization. Replying to a question by me, Mr. Hunter stated:

The only recourse is local relief, where it is available, or surplus commodities; just handouts. I frankly can't answer the question as to how the man who does not get any relief of any kind gets along except that statistics on public health show a terrific break-down in health in families. The poor generally find someone to take care of the neighbors who are starving to death, but they obviously do not do it very well.

Mr. President, during the past years we have heard many stories about W. P. A. workers not being efficient; we have heard jokes about W. P. A. workers, and we have seen cartoons of W. P. A. workers leaning on shovels. Mr. President, I wonder in what condition some Members of the Senate would find themselves—men, say, of 70, perhaps with some ailment that does not show on the surface; they are still able to walk around—underfed, undernourished with perhaps no breakfast or only a little breakfast, going out on a W. P. A. job with a long-handled shovel. I can readily understand why men of that type, not because they desire to do so but because they are forced to do so, spend part of their time leaning on a shovel, or leaning upon some other instrument or object to assist them to remain standing. I can thoroughly understand that.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me, and it has seemed to me from the time this program started, that if we adopt a program of relief and provide an agency to make examinations of people, when we find them eligible under the law and under the examination it is unfair, if not dishonest, to provide only a partial sum to take care of those who may be so favored as to get on the eligible list.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Norris
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gerry	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Brooks	Hayden	Rosier
Bulow	Herring	Russell
Bunker	Hill	Smathers
Burton	Holman	Smith
Byrd	Hughes	Stewart
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Van Nuys
Downey	Murray	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr President, I shall not take over 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate, because I dare say that whatever is said will not influence vitally the decision of the Senate on this item, although I wish it would. But I would not be true to my own conscience and my own judgment if I did not embrace this opportunity to say that I intend to support the amendment, and it seems to me that it should be the policy of the Senate to adopt it.

In my State we have had some pathetic instances of how women in the sewing room, and older people generally, particularly on the W. P. A. rolls, have been thrown out of employment literally by the thousands during the progress of the defense program, simply because the W. P. A. funds have been reduced. There never has been a time even when we reached our maximum appropriation for W. P. A. purposes when we have approximated employing the number of people who have been investigated and certified as eligible for W. P. A. benefits by the certifying agencies of the States. Now we are not only falling below last year's appropriation, but we are falling very materially below it, and therefore aggravating the distress.

I know that in my own State the reduced appropriation will simply mean tragedy, in some instances approaching starvation, and the extinguishment of the light of hope to thousands of people who cannot find a place in the defense program or in private enterprise, either because the jobs do not exist, or because they are not skilled so as to be able to fill the places of skilled workers.

The W. P A. is just as inevitably a product of the times as traffic lights are a product of the times. Our economy has become so complicated, the work that is to be done to maintain this economy so specialized, that in my opinion we cannot hope ever to reach a state of prosperity which will mean employment for all our people without made work, particularly applicable to the handicapped, or those who have had lesser opportunities.

The defense program will not take care of the people to whom I am referring. We just deceive ourselves when we think or say it will. It will not. This is a matter about which we have evidence as

to the facts. The W. P. A. has the evidence. The States have the evidence. This evidence shows that this proposed appropriation will not begin to take care of the certified people—the needy. What does that mean? It means that if we vote an appropriation which will not take care of them we will be deliberately turning our backs on those people. We have a right to do that, at least we have the power to do it, but we should not deceive ourselves under any mistaken conception that those people are going to find jobs in some other work, because they are not. They have not found such jobs, the W. P. A. tells us they are not going to find them, and all of our knowledge about the nature of our economy teaches us that they are not going to find them. It merely means therefore, that we will be deliberately leaving them without the one means by which they might find an opportunity to make a livelihood.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the word "certification" has been used repeatedly. The impression is conveyed that those who are certified have been certified by the Federal agencies as meeting all the requirements necessary to enable them to go on W. P. A. That is not the situation. The certification spoken of means approval by local relief agencies, and in many parts of the country any one who asks a local agency is certified. In other words, there is an effort on the part of the local authorities to pass over to the Federal rolls all those they can possibly certify. So that there is an exaggerated figure as to the need.

I merely wish to call attention to one statement the President made in his message. He said:

> After weighing all factors——
>
> Not part of the factors, but—
>
> After weighing all factors I recommend an appropriation of $886,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator advise what the net increase would be under the proposed amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. The net increase would be from $875,000,000 to $1,250,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. There would be an increase of $375,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in line with what was said by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS]. In my State there was no such attempt as that he speaks of to shift the burden from the State to the Federal Government by certification. I have made inquiry and do not believe there will be the slightest change made. Those who are not now employed will not secure employment elsewhere. Those who are taken off the rolls because of lack of funds will secure no employment anywhere else.

In connection with what has been said about defense projects, I wish to say that the other day I noticed in the newspapers some reference to Delaware having a large share in such projects through the Du Pont Co. The contracts which the Du Pont Co. has received do not help any workers in Delaware, because the contracts are not carried out in Delaware. The headquarters of the company are in Delaware. The company makes no powder, munitions or anything else in Delaware. So, the contracts received by it will give no employment to people in Delaware except in the main offices of the company.

Mr. President, I usually support the committee, but I cannot refrain from supporting the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, because we have this problem now, and we will continue to have it. In view of the fact that many persons of my State will be thrown out of employment by reason of cutting this appropriation, and that many persons who are out of employment have not been able to get on the rolls, although they have been certified, I cannot justify my vote for the cuts made by the House and by the Senate committee. I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who is absent because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is detained on important public business. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and permit my vote to stand. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia may vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator From Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is necessarily absent. He has a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on account of the death of his mother.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on account of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—22

Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Kilgore	Rosier
Caraway	La Follette	Smathers
Chavez	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Murray	Tunnell
Ellender	Norris	
Hughes	Pepper	

NAYS—31

Adams	George	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gerry	Russell
Ball	Green	Smith
Bulow	Gurney	Stewart
Bunker	Hayden	Taft
Burton	Herring	Truman
Byrd	Hill	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Holman	Van Nuys
Capper	McFarland	Wiley
Chandler	Maloney	
Connally	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—43

Aiken	Glass	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Schwartz
Bankhead	Harrison	Shipstead
Barbour	Hatch	Spencer
Barkley	Houston	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brewster	Langer	Tydings
Bridges	Lee	Wagner
Brooks	Lodge	Wallgren
Brown	Lucas	Walsh
Butler	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	White
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Willis
Davis	Nye	
Gillette	Overton	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment was rejected.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN AND PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the

Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, which were on page 2, line 9, after the word "the" to insert "average", and in line 10, to strike out "immediately" and insert "for 6 months."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Senate bill 239 was introduced by the late Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], former chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, at the request of the War Department. It relates to the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, after 20 years service. The Senate passed the bill, and it went to the House. The bill calls for 75 percent of the base pay at the time of retirement. The House saw fit, and I think properly, to insert in the bill an amendment to the effect that in order to receive 75 percent of base pay at time of retirement as the result of disability, the soldier to be retired would be obliged to show that he received the base pay for six months prior to his retirement. I think it was well that the House did so, because I understand that in some instances in which retirement is assured as a result of disability some of the men are promoted, and hold the higher office for only a week or two, in order that their pay may be increased and that they may obtain 75 percent of the increased base pay. I consulted with representatives of the War Department with regard to whether the amendment of the House was acceptable, and they said it was. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is this a conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is an amendment of the House of Representatives to a Senate bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am impressed by the fact that the Senate has been working all day upon two very important appropriation bills. I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina will consent to have this matter wait until the Senate shall have disposed of the important appropriation bill which is now pending.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me, Mr. President; but the matter was called to my attention when it was laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer. I knew it would not require much time. I thought that the present time was as good as any to dispose of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason why I make the suggestion has nothing to do with this particular bill; but I observed that as soon as the vote was announced upon an amendment, Senators all over the Chamber were rising to their feet to ask unanimous consent to insert matters in the RECORD or to act upon other bills. I merely felt that in the interest of orderly procedure it would be more desirable to dispose of the pending business than to take up irrelevant matters.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a privileged matter and may be called up at any time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I hope to have an opportunity to call it to the attention of the Senate immediately after the pending business shall have been disposed of.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in section 10 of the pending joint resolution, on page 18, subsection (f), we find the following:

(f) No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi Bund Organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi Bund Organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship, and that he is not a Communist, and not a member of any Nazi Bund Organization.

Obviously, then, the pending joint resolution applies to Americans. Obviously the amendment which we have just acted upon equally applies to Americans. It is a matter of regret to me that they cannot be brought within the provisions of the $7,000,000,000 lease-lend grant.

DEPARTURE FROM AND ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today it is my intention to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. On the calendar is House bill 4973, Calendar No. 459. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, may ask for consideration of this bill, which is very important and should be considered by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of the bill for the benefit of those of us who are not on the committee. The citation of the statute means absolutely nothing.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, this bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee from the Department of State. An identical bill was introduced in the House at the request of the State Department and passed. It is now proposed to act on the House bill.

The bill relates solely to the departure from and entry into the United States of aliens. The statute of May 22, 1918, was passed during the World War, when President Wilson was in office. The bill makes one change following the enacting clause of the act of May 22, 1918. The act of 1918 begins:

When the United States is at war—

It is proposed to amend the first paragraph of section 1, so as to read:

When the United States is at war or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or Congress, be unlawful.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as I am concerned, I am fully satisfied. I have no further objection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator says that the bill applies only to aliens. The language refers to restrictions and prohibitions imposed upon the departure of "persons" from and their entry into the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is entirely correct. It would apply to Americans; but the main objective is to reach certain elements of aliens.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the bill mean that at a busy international crossing such as that between Windsor, Ontario, and Detroit, Mich., where there are probably 10,000 passages a day, hereafter there would be a requirement for passports?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Indeed not. If the Senator from Michigan will examine the report on the bill, he will find that the rules and regulations and the administration would be largely under the Department of State. It is specifically stated that there is no desire to impede the traffic between Canada, Mexico, or the Latin American countries and the United States, because we court their friendship and nothing should be done to alienate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So the proposed law would not apply to transborder migrations as between Canada and the United States?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that there is nothing in the bill itself which would guarantee that result, but we have the guarantee of the State Department that that matter would be taken care of in the rules and regulations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the bill is proposed as permanent law. Whenever there was a war anywhere in the world, the President would be given unlimited power to prescribe restrictions and the terms on which any person might leave the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is not correct. If the Senator from Ohio will read the bill, it says:

When the United States is at war or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States requires that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this act be imposed—

And so forth.

For example, if there should be a minor war between a couple of islands in the South Seas, I doubt whether the President could find that it adversely affected the safety and best interests of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the President is not required to find that the war has any relation to the interest of the United States. He simply finds that the interests of the United States require certain restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those imposed by Congress. It seems to me this would be another statute which would give the President unlimited power, under any circumstances, to make the law of the United States and to prescribe the terms upon which any person—an American or any other person—might leave the United States. I can see possible justification for the enactment of such a law to apply to the present situation; but it seems to me that to enact a permanent statute giving the President the power to prescribe such restrictions at any time when any war exists anywhere in the world would be delegating a legislative power, which the Congress ought not to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, supplementing my colloquy with the able Senator from Indiana, I ask that the final paragraph of the committee report be printed in the RECORD. It is upon that statement that the Senator from Indiana bases his assurance to me that the purpose is not to interfere with transboundary traffic.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not contemplated, should the proposed legislation be enacted into law, to restrict or to prohibit or in any way to impede the legitimate travel of citizens of the United States or the legitimate and necessary entry into or departure from the United States of aliens. The Department of State in nowise discourages travel of American citizens to countries of the Western Hemisphere or the travel of the inhabitants of such countries to the United States. Such travel is considered advantageous not only to the United States but also to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere in drawing them together more closely in sympathy and understanding, and is encouraged rather than discouraged. It can, therefore, be anticipated that any rules or regulations issued under the proposed legislation would be drawn up in such a manner as to avoid undue inconveniences and difficulties in the matter of the departure from and entry into the United States of citizens of the United States and aliens, and that particular regard would be given to the matter of affording every convenience to American citizens who desire to enter Canada or Mexico from the United States and to the citizens of Canada and Mexico who desire to travel in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 4973?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. A point of order. There is unfinished business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take up another bill is always in order.

Mr. BYRNES. If my motion should prevail, the bill would displace the pending business, so I merely give notice that tomorrow, after the disposition of the pending appropriation bill, a motion will be made to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported by the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry surgeons, passed assistant surgeons, dental surgeons, and passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. HILL from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Coast Guard; and Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission, as provided for by law, vice Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers relieved.

DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE FOR NEBRASKA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Brig. Gen. Guy N. Henninger, Adjutant General of Nebraska, to be State director of selective service for Nebraska, and I ask for immediate consideration and confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and there being no objection the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE ARMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably sundry nominations. This is a list of routine appointments, promotions, and transfers in the Army. I ask that the reading of the names be dispensed with, and that the nominations be considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask that the President be informed forthwith of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

Theh PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank E. DeKay to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received June 19 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

To be commanders, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. Comdr. George E. McCabe
Lt. Comdr. Lee H. Baker
Lt. Comdr. Martin W. Rasmussen

To be commanders, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. Comdr. Donald C. McNeil
Lt. Comdr. Harley E. Grogan
Lt. Comdr. Harold G. Belford

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. Chester A. A. Anderson
Lt. Edward E. Hahn, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. Emanuel Desses
Lt. Wilbur C. Hogan
Lt. Kenneth P. Maley
Lt. Samuel F. Gray
Lt. Earl K. Rhodes
Lt. Leon H. Morine
Lt. Walter C. Capron

To be a lieutenant, to rank as such from December 1, 1940

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gilbert F. Schumacher

To be a lieutenant, to rank as such from March 1, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Charles Tighe

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from May 1, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Fred L. Westbrook
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Richard Baxter

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from May 25, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Oscar D. Weed, Jr.
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ralph D. Dean
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Joseph R. Scullion
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William J. Conley, Jr.
Lt. (Jr Gr.) Richard L. Mellen
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Glenn L. Rollins
Lt. (Jr Gr.) Ernest A. Cascini
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Robert F. Shunk
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Justus P. White
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William J. Lawrence

To be lieutenants, to rank as such from June 8, 1941

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Guy L. Ottinger
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Clifford S. Gerde
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edward C. Thompson, Jr.
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) James P. Stow III
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Gerald T. Applegate

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from date of appointment

Maj. Allen Wood Rigsby, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be captain with rank from June 11, 1941

First Lt. Richard Byington Carhart, Quartermaster Corps (captain, Army of the United States), subject to examination required by law.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Guy C. Williams, to be postmaster at Kensett, Ark., in place of J. H. Wiseman, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Herbert F. Kenny, to be postmaster at Balboa, Calif., in place of A. M. Hamann. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

John H. Vaughan, to be postmaster at Chico, Calif., in place of J. H. Vaughan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Mary L. Jordan to be postmaster at Fairfax, Calif., in place of M. L. Jordan. Incumbent's commisison expired March 13, 1941.

Charles M. Gorham to be postmaster at Mar Vista, Calif., in place of C. M. Gorham. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1939.

GEORGIA

Joseph M. Poston to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Ga., in place of R. G. Hudson, resigned.

IDAHO

Sheldon J. McMillan to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of J. V. Hawkins, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Joseph S. Flaherty to be postmaster at Harvey, Ill., in place of J. S. Flaherty. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Charles Paul Janes, to be postmaster at Industry, Ill., in place of G. E. Roe, resigned.

Albert G. Lucas to be postmaster at Lake Forest, Ill., in place of A. G. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Arthur M. Kloepfer to be postmaster at Winnetka, Ill., in place of A. M. Kloepfer. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

INDIANA

Robert T. Phillippe to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of R. T. Phillippe. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Harry O. Storm to be postmaster at Clay City, Ind., in place of H. O. Storm. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Robert C. Mayhall to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ind., in place of R. C. Mayhall. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1940.

Mel M. Carter to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of M. M. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

IOWA

Charles Monroe Boyer to be postmaster at Clutier, Iowa, in place of Fannie Hach. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1938.

Edith M. Johnson to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa, in place of L. S. Hill, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Clarence H. McElroy to be postmaster at Morganfield, Ky., in place of J. T. Phipps, deceased.

MAINE

Guy C. Bean to be postmaster at Freeport, Maine, in place of G. C. Bean. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

MARYLAND

M. Elizabeth Gorsuch to be postmaster at Glencoe, Md., in place of G. M. Mowell, deceased.

A. Franklin Bowers to be postmaster at Riverdale, Md., in place of M. L. Bosher, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Paul Kauppinen to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, Mass., in place of L. O. Kauppinen, deceased.

Grace Hartley Howe to be postmaster at Fall River, Mass., in place of G. H. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

MICHIGAN

Carl H. Renbarger to be postmaster at Galien, Mich., in place of C. H. Renbarger. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

William J. Barber, to be postmaster at Mason, Mich., in place of E. B. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1940.

MINNESOTA

Earl J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Brainerd, Minn., in place of H. P. Dunn, deceased.

Howard R. Terrill to be postmaster at Nopeming, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Mae M. Stewart to be postmaster at Pine River, Minn., in place of L. E. Dougherty, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam D. Hamilton to be postmaster at Tutwiler, Miss., in place of S. D. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

MISSOURI

Felix J. Schaul to be postmaster at Hannibal, Mo., in place of F. J. Schaul. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1941.

NEBRASKA

Rex Shubert to be postmaster at Fairfield, Nebr., in place of Rex Shubert. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Clive E. Lantz to be postmaster at Hildreth, Nebr., in place of F. W. Purdy, removed.

Bessie A. Freed to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of B. A. Freed. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1940.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Peter J. Hickey to be postmaster at Portsmouth, N. H., in place of P. J. Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

William P. Major to be postmaster at Bergenfield, N. J., in place of W. S. Nevins. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

NEW MEXICO

Byron F. Hughes to be postmaster at Eunice, N. Mex., in place of B. F. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

NEW YORK

Celestine Reynolds to be postmaster at Corfu, N. Y., in place of T. J. McManus, Jr., deceased.

Harry B. Hickey to be postmaster at Fredonia, N. Y., in place of H. B. Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Lorrin Eggleston to be postmaster at Westport, N. Y., in place of Lorrin Eggleston. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

Raymond B. Cooper to be postmaster at Williamson, N. Y., in place of C. K. Cooper, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fred L. Key to be postmaster at Boonville, N. C., in place of F. L. Key. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1941.

Claude W. Walston to be postmaster at Pinetops, N. C., in place of C. W. Walston. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

George C. Herritage to be postmaster at Trenton, N. C., in place of G. C. Herritage. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

NORTH DAKOTA

William C. Drake to be postmaster at Bowdon, N. Dak., in place of W. C. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Richard T. L. Noyes to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of R. T. L. Noyes. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

George Knauss to be postmaster at Hannaford, N. Dak., in place of George Knauss. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Lawrence C. Lerud to be postmaster at Hoople, N. Dak., in place of L. C. Lerud. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1941.

Joseph E. DeMers to be postmaster at St. John, N. Dak., in place of J. E. DeMers. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1941.

Sigrid Vick to be postmaster at Sheyenne, N. Dak., in place of Sigrid Vick. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Hulda E. Hezel to be postmaster at Zeeland, N. Dak., in place of H. E. Hezel. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1941.

OHIO

Verne H. Parker to be postmaster at Orwell, Ohio, in place of H. R. Shipman, deceased.

John E. Doyle to be postmaster at Youngstown, Ohio, in place of A. W. Craver, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

J. Woodrow Wright to be postmaster at Adair, Okla., in place of J. W. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Lewis E. Sloan to be postmaster at Alex, Okla., in place of L. E. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Otis E. Cox to be postmaster at Barnsdall, Okla., in place of O. E. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Thomas J. Hurst to be postmaster at Calumet, Okla., in place of T. J. Hurst. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Nettie I. McHenry to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of N. I. McHenry: Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

Esther L. Hatchett to be postmaster at Gracemont, Okla., in place of E. L. Hatchett. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Forrest Thomas, Jr., to be postmaster at Healdton, Okla., in place of Forrest Thomas, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Roy L. Knecht to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla., in place of R. L. Knecht. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Lafayette F. George to be postmaster at Henryetta, Okla., in place of L. F. George. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Ernest F. Lyon to be postmaster at Hinton, Okla., in place of E. F. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

John S. Keller to be postmaster at Lexington, Okla., in place of J. S. Keller. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Samuel M. Scholl to be postmaster at Lookeba, Okla., in place of S. M. Scholl. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Ernest B. Willis to be postmaster at Noble, Okla., in place of E. B. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Walter G. Baustert to be postmaster at Okeene, Okla., in place of W. G. Baustert. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Douglas Thomas to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of Douglas Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Robert H. Greenlee to be postmaster at Stonewall, Okla., in place of R. H. Greenlee. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

William H. Wester to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla., in place of W. H. Wester. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Floyd G. Ransbarger to be postmaster at Verden, Okla., in place of F. G. Ransbarger. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Alfred Claude Davis to be postmaster at Woodward, Okla., in place of A. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

OREGON

Kathleen M. Barrett to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of K. M. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Ivan L. Swift to be postmaster at Gresham, Oreg., in place of I. L. Swift. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Donald E. Miller to be postmaster at Maupin, Oreg., in place of B. F. Turner, removed.

Elizabeth G. Howard to be postmaster at Milton, Oreg., in place of E. G. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Florence A. Parker to be postmaster at North Powder, Oreg., in place of V. E. Lee, deceased.

Arthur H. Tifft to be postmaster at Redmond, Oreg., in place of A. H. Tifft. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Raymond A. McHale to be postmaster at Archbald, Pa., in place of R. A. McHale. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Joseph E. Burnside to be postmaster at Emporium, Pa., in place of J. E. Burnside. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Joseph R. Thurston to be postmaster at Factoryville, Pa., in place of J. R. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Willa S. Saxon to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Pa., in place of E. N. Dickey. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Frederic W. Moser to be postmaster at Greenville, Pa., in place of F. W. Moser. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Paul A. Saupp to be postmaster at Houtzdale, Pa., in place of J. E. Madigan, deceased.

John B. Cassidy to be postmaster at Shiremanstown, Pa., in place of John Cassidy. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Galen L. Brookmyer to be postmaster at Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. L. Brookmyer. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1941.

Charles S. Doyle to be postmaster at South Langhorne, Pa., in place of C. S. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Burnett W. Weber to be postmaster at Sykesville, Pa., in place of B. W. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

May E. Reisinger to be postmaster at Wrightsville, Pa., in place of M. E. Reisinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

PUERTO RICO

Joaquin Fernandez to be postmaster at Rio Piedras, P. R., in place of Antonio Godinez, retired.

Laura Molini Diaz to be postmaster at Yauco, P. R., in place of Simon Semidei, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND

Arnold Sherman Knowles, Jr., to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I., in place of A. S. Knowles, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grady R. Hogue to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of G. R. Hogue. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Carl W. Reeves to be postmaster at Gray Court, S. C., in place of C. W. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. McCaffrey to be postmaster at Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of W. C. McCaffrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

Carl L. Freiwald to be postmaster at Big Stone City, S. Dak., in place of C. L. Freiwald. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Frank Rickman to be postmaster at Chapel Hill, Tenn., in place of Frank Rickman. Incumbent's commission expired August 13, 1939.

Robert L. Woods to be postmaster at Concord, Tenn., in place of R. L. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1941.

Hugh N. Reeves to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of H. N. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Jesse S. McMurry to be postmaster at Hartsville, Tenn., in place of J. S. McMurry. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

Edward B. Weisiger to be postmaster at Hendersonville, Tenn., in place of E. B. Weisiger. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

John E. Hale to be postmaster at Liberty, Tenn., in place of J. E. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

Charles B. Stone to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of C. B. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

TEXAS

Tod E. Lawson to be postmaster at Annona, Tex., in place of T. E. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Louise W. Fisher to be postmaster at Burton, Tex., in place of L. W. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1940.

John H. Parrish to be postmaster at Denison, Tex., in place of F. B. Hughes, deceased.

Rudolph R. Kubena to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Tex., in place of R. R. Kubena. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Thomas H. McCarty to be postmaster at Lawn, Tex., in place of T. H. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Charlie L. Smith to be postmaster at Rising Star, Tex., in place of C. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Jennie L. Murphy to be postmaster at Roaring Springs, Tex., in place of J. L. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Carlos S. Baker, Sr., to be postmaster at Stockdale, Tex., in place of C. S. Baker, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

Willis Walker to be postmaster at Turkey, Tex., in place of Willis Walker. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Carlyle B. Moore to be postmaster at Van Alstyne, Tex., in place of C. B. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

John J. Dutton to be postmaster at Vanderbilt, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

VERMONT

Neal B. Smith to be postmaster at Williamstown, Vt., in place of N. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Leo A. Arthur to be postmaster at Altavista, Va., in place of L. A. Arthur. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

Charles W. Crush to be postmaster at Christiansburg, Va., in place of C. W. Crush. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1941.

William F. Cox to be postmaster at Jonesville, Va., in place of W. F. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1941.

WASHINGTON

Arthur J. Kralowec to be postmaster at Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Raymond V. Rosso to be postmaster at Black Diamond, Wash., in place of R. V. Rosso. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Harvey Lewis to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of Harvey Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Andrew Hunter to be postmaster at Puyallup, Wash., in place of Andrew Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

John E. Ober to be postmaster at Vashon, Wash., in place of J. E. Ober. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

WISCONSIN

Allen G. Wald to be postmaster at Alma, Wis., in place of A. G. Wald. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Alice S. Port to be postmaster at Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1940.

Andy J. Fogerty to be postmaster at Dresser, Wis., in place of A. J. Fogerty. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

Reinhold R. Hoffman to be postmaster at Fairchild, Wis., in place of J. D. McGaver, removed.

John Lindow to be postmaster at Manawa, Wis., in place of E. A. J. Samsow. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Ernest G. Henline to be postmaster at Medford, Wis., in place of C. E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1940.

Delia G. Guay to be postmaster at Peshtigo, Wis., in place of D. G. Guay. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

Frank E. DeKay to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Brig. Gen. Guy N. Henninger to be State director of Selective Service for Nebraska.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Lesley James McNair.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

George Good Cressey to be lieutenant colonel.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Thomas West Hammond, Jr.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Ray Olander Welch

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. William Charles Haneke

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. James Louis McGehee
First Lt. Alexander James Stuart, Jr.
First Lt. Francis Joseph McMorrow.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Loren Boyd Hillsinger

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Clarence Woodson Hardy
Robert Edward Lee
Robert Edwin Peyton
Harold Hanson Twitchell
Clement Franklin St. John

To be captains

John Austin Booth
Robert James Goldson
Robert Scurry Anderson
Arthur Thomas Jones
Charles Culmer Scamahorn

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Eugene Edward Manning

To be captains

Calvin George Hagerman
Herbert Lester Gullickson
Lawrence Carlton Radford

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Harvie Russell Ellis

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Abraham Garfinkel, Philippine Scouts.
Edward James Oliver, Infantry.
Frederic Waldo Whitney, Cavalry.
Clifford Mitchell Tuteur, Field Artillery.
Arthur Eugene Rowland, Coast Artillery Corps.
Leon R. Cole, Field Artillery.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

James R. Wick, Albion.
Martin Ferentchak, Argo.
Harold F. Mayer, Bartlett.
William W. McIntire, Belvidere.
Kenneth Henkhaus, Bethalto.
Norbert C. Knapp, Glen Ellyn.
Harry F. DuQuoin, Greenview.
Guy R. Knappenberger, Kirkland.
George A. Boeke, Lena.
Robert L. Davis, Lincoln.
Harold Vogel, Minonk.
Arthur T. Ellis, Necga.
Charlotte H. Eekhoff, Nokomis.
Bessie B. Kampmeier, Pearl City.
Peter L. Kelly, Piper City.
Monroe R. Hanneman, Silvis.
Louis L. Eubanks, Sparland.

MISSISSIPPI

Leo G. Ford, Bay St. Louis.
George Y. Banks, Columbus.
Mercer L. Gewin, De Kalb.
Nathan B. Williams, Fernwood.
Dewey W. Tullos, Mize.
Aubrey O. Hammack, Scooba.
Albert F. Zachry, Stonewall.

OHIO

Cleo M. Richter, Pickerington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O Lord, our God, that we may gratefully behold the invisible realities of life. This life is for the senses; that is for the spirit; this is for the flesh, which perisheth; that is for the immortal soul which is imperishable; this passes; that abides and good shall come at last and every winter changed to spring. While the beauty and the glory of this world is being frayed, do Thou, through its eye, see through its life, listen through its ear, O speak through its voice and suffuse it with Thy blessed spirit. Everywhere in our dear homeland, dismiss the cloud of scorn that darkens brows, the poison of hate that falls from the lips of envy and the demon of unchastity that dwells in the bosom where habit forms the direction of the soul. We pray that benevolence, the mother of virtues, that controlling law of love, which likens us unto the image of the Master, may bless us and open the understanding of those who are misled and are unsustained by the ever-living truth that this is God's world and that it can never be covered with the curtain of darkness. As the world seems to be turning the bend of history, hold us to the eternal verity that while knowledge is power, life is more than thought; we rejoice that it is the breath of our Heavenly Father in the souls of His children. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 14, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; and

H. R. 148. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874, and to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a red-letter day in the history of the House and in the life of our beloved colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. This is his natal day. He is today four score and three years old, and in the certainty of exceeding by a score of years the ancient Biblical tradition of three score years and ten.

He is the dean of the House, the only living Member of the Congress born in the decade preceding the Civil War. At the time of his birth James Buchanan was President of the United States, and James L. Orr, of South Carolina, a name once potent but now completely forgotten, was Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Chairman TAYLOR is serving his seventeenth successive term. Only 4 other Members in the history of the House of Representatives, from the administration of Washington down to the present time, have served 17 successive terms. But Chairman TAYLOR bears the added distinction of being the only man to serve 34 successive years after passing his fiftieth milestone.

Henry Harrison Bingham, of Pennsylvania, served 17 successive terms, but entered Congress at the age of 38.

Gilbert Nils Haugen, of Iowa, served 17 successive terms, but came to the House at the age of 40 years.

Edward William Pou, of North Carolina, served 17 successive terms, but was first elected at the age of 49.

ADOLPH JOSEPH SABATH, of Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, is now serving his eighteenth term, but entered Congress at the comparatively immature age of 41 years.

And EDWARD THOMAS TAYLOR, of Colorado, now serving his seventeenth term, is the only man in the history of the American Congress to achieve that distinction after passing the half-century mark. And when his service to his State is added, his total service aggregates 56 years in public life, a record unique in the annals of the Republic. Fifty-six years of unbroken service to his country—a veteran in both the Congress and the committee—and yet he today is one of the most alert men in the House; in spirit, the youngest man on the committee; and, in the Nation at large, one of the outstanding men of his day and generation.

Mr. Speaker, I felicitate our illustrious compatriot on the record of the past, on the achievements of the present, and on the outlook for the future, and I am certain I express the affection and admiration of all Members of the House without respect to party and on both sides of the aisle, when I wish for him many happy returns of the day, with continued health, happiness, and prosperity in an ever-widening field of service.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve longer upon the Appropriations Committee with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] than any other man now a member of that committee.

During all of that time the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has taken a keen interest in all of the important legislation that has come before that committee. While he has taken an especial interest in legislation relating to his own part of the country, he has perhaps more than any other man that I can remember exercised, in these trying years we have gone through, a stabilizing influence upon the committee.

With advancing years some of us learn one can accomplish very much by a careful considerate attitude and by trying to make the other fellows pull together. This has been conspicuously true of our chairman. Over a long period he has given devoted service to the country, to the Congress, and to his State. He will go down in history as one of the great chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish today to join the rest of the membership in paying tribute to him and wishing him Godspeed in the years that are to come. I am sure a man who takes as good care of himself as he does, and approaches things from as sane a standpoint as he, is going to be with us for many more years of active vigorous service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on this eighty-third anniversary of the birth of our beloved chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I am grateful for this opportunity to pay my brief but humble tribute to one whom I regard as in many respects the most extraordinary man I have known in my long career of over 40 years as a member of the Press Gallery and a Member of this body.

In many respects his public service has been unique and without a parallel in the history of our country. Who else, for instance, has ever been nominated for Congress 17 times without the slightest opposition in his own party? And who else, having been nominated 17 consecutive times, unopposed, has been elected 17 consecutive times practically without opposition? This brief statement of fact needs no embellishment to show the place Mr. TAYLOR holds in the hearts of the people of his district and the State of Colorado. In 1908 he made his first race for Congress as a candidate at large. No one on earth, except perhaps the aspiring and resourceful candidate himself, thought he had a ghost of a chance of winning in that Republican State, but he made the grade and being once established he justified the verdict of the electorate so abundantly that there never has been any doubt of his subsequent victories.

Prior to his foray into the congressional arena he had been district attorney and State senator, and today he has behind him a record of more than half a century of honorable and distinguished public life. Colorado, the "Centennial State," was admitted to the Union in 1876, and the combined service of two of its great men—Henry M. Teller and EDWARD T. TAYLOR—spans the entire life of that Commonwealth from its admission to statehood to the present hour.

During the long period of his service in Congress Mr. TAYLOR's activities have not been circumscribed by the narrow limitations of one congressional district. He has been distinctively the Representative of the West, that vast rugged expanse of our continent where, as the movie scenario says, "men are men." The Taylor Grazing Act will be a lasting monument to him and will bind him close to generations of the West yet unborn.

He has been the author of many reclamation acts and other statutes that have contributed vitally to the making of the West. His fairness and sense of righteousness have made him the favorite arbiter of disputes and he is the proud possessor of a collection of nearly 100 gavels that have been presented to him throughout the years by various bodies he has been chosen to preside over.

Mr. TAYLOR has signalized his eighty-third anniversary by another public service—the preparation of a list of sketches of the 20 former chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations. It has been my privilege to read this work of our chairman and I want to say that these sketches are more than biographies. They deal in a most entertaining, informative human-interest way with the long procession of Appropriations chairmen, many of whom take rank in history among the most illustrious citizens of the Republic, and the product of Mr. TAYLOR's brain and pen is a great human document which I hope will be printed in documentary form for general distribution.

It is my privilege to sit day by day by the side of Mr. TAYLOR on the Committee on Appropriations and, like all of our colleagues, I have learned to love him. His sole aim is the good of the country, and his honesty and forthrightness challenge universal admiration. Subjected, as one in his position always is, to subtle approaches and high pressures, I have never known a man who could say "No" with more emphasis than he can. His name will always be revered wherever worth is recognized and character is extolled. I know that I express the universal sentiment of this body when I say to you, Mr. TAYLOR, "Happy birthday, dear Chairman, happy birthday to you."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] was born the same year as Theodore Roosevelt. I did not come here to praise him, for he does not need it. I wish rather to refer to his early life which deals with my State and which is most interesting to some of us who can recall a little of the touch of the pioneering era.

Mr. TAYLOR's father came to central west Kansas in the early seventies. His father got the Governor of Kansas to make a new county by executive order, Rooks County, and his father was the first representative from that county to the State legislature. Our colleague the gentleman from Kansas has told me of the trials and tribulations of the seventies, how his father drove a herd of cattle from Concordia about 100 miles, how during the next winter they lost the entire herd because of the severity of the weather. Then in '74 the grasshoppers came and there was nothing for the livestock to live on. The family was forced to separate, the father going in one direction, the mother in another direction, and our colleague in a third, to find work to sustain life for a while. They finally came back together. Later EDWARD went to Leavenworth and lived with an uncle to attend high school. A cousin, Miss Elsie Evans, is now the city librarian in Leavenworth. Later he took his law course at Ann Arbor.

I served under his chairmanship on the first appropriation subcommittee to which I was appointed, the Interior, his first love, and it has been my pleasure to be a member of the deficiency subcommittee over which he presides as well as the whole committee.

It was my pleasure 3 years ago, and my honor, to drive to Boulder to see him take his doctor's degree conferred by the University of Colorado.

I wanted to refer to these pioneer days, because the hardships of the seventies and eighties in the prairie States are so easily forgotten and little appreciated today. My father went through them at the same time the Taylors were going through them. I also like this idea of paying tribute to a man during his lifetime rather than to eulogize him after he is gone.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I owe the Chair and I owe my friend, ED TAYLOR, an apology. Had I known he was today celebrating his eighty-third birthday I surely would have found time to prepare a fitting tribute. I was not aware it was his birthday until I entered the House Chamber a few minutes ago. I did not hear the encomium of my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I heard a part of the tribute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the well-prepared statement by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], and the most interesting remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. I do not want to restate the splendid and deserving things they have said of my old friend, ED TAYLOR, although I join most heartily in the sentiments they expressed.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is the only Member present who entered the House of Representatives in the Sixty-first Congress. I was fortunate enough to meet him and to get acquainted with him when he began his service. From that moment I have not ceased to admire him and his beloved wife. We lived in the same hotel for many years, which used to stand where the New House Office Building now stands.

In addition to ED TAYLOR being a gentleman, a modest, simple, but great statesman and a real American, he is and always has been a wonderful and lovable husband. Why should he not have been? Because of all the ladies whom it has been my honor and pleasure to meet, I never knew one more gracious, more charming, or more devoted than the beloved wife of our esteemed colleague. I feel—yes; I am positive—it is due to the splendid care she gave him that we have him with us today.

I congratulate him upon his eighty-third birthday.

ED, I hope you will remain with us for many, many, many years, that you will continue to serve your State and your country with that sincerity and devotion you have brought to your labors the last 34 years. I wish you well.

I ask a favor of you at this time. Will you please express to Mrs. Taylor the appreciation of this body for the care and devotion she has given you? I hope she will remain with you and you with us for many, many more years.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues of the House, and particularly those on the Appropriations Committee, in congratulating the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] not only on his eighty-third birthday but upon the years of splendid service he has rendered to his State and to his Nation.

We who are privileged to live in the State of Michigan, and particularly those of us who are of the alumni of the University of Michigan, are very proud of Mr. TAYLOR and point with the greatest pride to the fact he is a graduate of that institution.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] was graduated with the class of 1884, 4 years before I was born. He was in law school during the days of Thomas Cooley, the great Judge Cooley, with whom we of the legal profession are all so well acquainted. I am informed that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] took part in proofreading the last edition of Cooley's Blackstone.

I am sure that the people of the State of Michigan and particularly your fellow alumni of the University of Michigan, join me in extending to you, Mr. TAYLOR, our heartiest congratulations on this your eighty-third birthday and wish you many happy returns of the day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, you heard eulogies from New York, Missouri, Kansas, from Michigan and Indiana, and from that celebrated part of the State of Illinois known as Chicago. You will now hear from that part of the State to whom ED TAYLOR belongs, down-State Illinois.

There is a county in Illinois known as Woodford, the derivation of which I know not. There is a little village in that county named Matamora, the derivation of which I know not, but near there, in the shade of the old oaks, ED TAYLOR was born. That district today is represented by Mr. ARENDS.

It is not so long ago that from those old oaks they fashioned a gavel and presented it to ED TAYLOR. There he was born on the 19th of June 1858. That is a historic year.

That is the year in which Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas were contending on the hustings in Illinois. That is the year when the irrepressible conflict was looming over the Nation. That is the year when the great Rail Splitter and the Little Giant were debating at Freeport, Ottawa, Quincy, Galesburg, and elsewhere in Illinois. That is the year in which God ordained that ED TAYLOR should come into the world in the very heart and bosom of the great State of Illinois.

Mr. TAYLOR, I think so often of your lifetime in terms of what I call the stream of life of the Nation. Some arithmetic went through my mind a little while ago. Two lifetimes like yours laid end to end would within but a few days go back to the Liberty Bell. That is testimony of the fortitude and tenuousness of the Nation and also of your own life. What a great thing your lifetime would be in the eyes of a great mural decorator. If he could just splash it onto a great mural decoration, it would be a portrait of a great portion, of the history of the Nation, and how large you would loom in a portrait of that kind. Truly it is an inspiration for young men who come into the public service of the country.

May I with all humility pay you this testimonial as a member of the Appropriations Committee. When I first became a member of that committee, not knowing you quite so well, I thought that probably with a dour and solemn visage you would look down upon a young, humble Member from Illinois, and each day go by him, scarcely recognizing his physical entity as a member of that committee. Then I suddenly learned there was about you the finest grace and gentility. I remember it well when you put your arm around my shoulder several times, and I felt so richly and so deeply impressed. I thought of the rich, warm personality, and the human quality about you. It will be one of the most indelible things in my mind when either by the sufferance of the people or by some higher power it is ordained that I shall leave this body. I shall always remember your cordial grace, your warm personality, that fine charm and interest that you have in the young men who come to the Congress of the United States. Truly your graciousness has an all-pervading quality and on this, your eighty-third anniversary, may I wish that your gentleness will linger with us a long time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion of this kind, which is one of joy and pleasure to all of us, the important thing that the life of a simple, humble but great man conveys to us is the example, and, as the gentleman from Illinois, who preceded me, said, "the inspiration to the younger men," and not only that but the example to all of us that this friend of ours, who is 83 years young today, conveys, not only to his colleagues in the House but to the entire country. He has not only that sweet disposition that has been so ably referred to but he is possessed of a courage that has evidenced itself on every occasion when courage was necessary.

Like many of us, as a young man I came to this body; and ED TAYLOR contributed to my progress, giving to me the benefit of his years of experience, advising me on this or that matter, making this or that suggestion, which he has done to so many other young men through the many years of his membership in this body. He has contributed greatly to many Members elected to this body subsequent to his first election.

ED TAYLOR is something more than a mere Representative in Congress from a congressional district. His years of service and the character of service he has rendered has made him an active, living institution in this body. He is one of the outstanding men of the entire country, and the people of this country, while they may not know him personally, express this feeling through you and I as their Representatives in Congress of the various congressional districts of this great country of ours.

It is a pleasure for me to join with all my colleagues, those who have spoken and those who will not speak, in conveying our congratulations on this day, his eighty-third birthday—83 years old-young—to our beloved colleague; to convey to Mrs. Taylor our congratulations, and to convey to the people of his district the fact that ED TAYLOR is a national institution, he is not a mere Representative in Congress from a district, but he

occupies a position that is second to none in the national life of our country, a position which he has earned, and which he so richly deserves. I know the people of his district will evidence in the future, as they have so consistently done in the past, their regard for the precious possession they have, in continuing ED TAYLOR as their Representative in this great body.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR.]

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am so overwhelmed with the good will and kindly expressions of the House that I am scarcely able to speak at all. I cannot adequately express my gratitude and profound appreciation to the Members who have paid me so many eloquent tributes. I am especially grateful to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for his beautiful tribute to Mrs. Taylor. He is absolutely right in saying that I would not be here today had it not been for her constant guardianship for the past half century. As a man journeys along the trail down the western slope of life he is doubly inspired and encouraged by so many expressions of sincere friendship.

THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, GUARDIANS OF THE PEOPLE'S PURSE—A HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE; ITS GENESIS AND FUNCTIONS; SKETCHES OF THE DISTINGUISHED CHAIRMEN WHO HAVE GUIDED ITS DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me I want to pay a tribute to the men who have preceded me in the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to memorialize their services to our Republic.

Since the beginning of my service at the opening of the Sixty-first Congress on March 4, 1909, about 1,800 men and 32 women have served in this House. It has been a most wonderful privilege to have known and served with all those splendid men and women. No one can ever have a more instructive or inspiring experience than a membership in this body. I have always felt it is one of the greatest and most far-reaching educational and beneficial honors that can be bestowed upon any American citizen. It is often said we become good judges of human nature. Our association on this floor and in the committees with distinguished citizens from every part of the United States is the greatest possible influence for the creation of broad-minded American citizenship and for inculcating patriotism and loyalty to our Republic. It is the essence of democracy.

I presume all of us, sometime or other, look at the biographical sketches of some of our friends in the Congressional Directory. You find these sketches recite where we were born, where and how much we were educated, often mentioning to whom we were married and our children; also what offices we have held and how many terms we have been in Congress. In brief, we record what honors our constituents have conferred upon us, but there very rarely is any mention of what we have personally and actually accomplished during our official career to merit our official distinction.

Since the Appropriations Committee was created there have been 20 chairmen prior to myself. I have served with 10 of them in the House and, with 6 of them on the committee during the past 20 years. Because of my genuine admiration for the 10 chairmen with whom I have served, and my curiosity as to the other 10, about a year ago I looked over the Congressional Directory of the past 75 years and read the brief life sketches of each of those departed chairmen. I found scarcely any mention of anything they did. I personally know how efficiently and patriotically 10 of them worked, and I remember some of their very great and lasting achievements—benefits to millions of people throughout our country for all time to come.

There is a large-volume biography of President Garfield and a small biography not generally accessible of three or four of the other chairmen. Several former chairmen of the Appropriations Committee died while still serving in Congress—in the harness, as it were—and in respect to them we find that some highly commendatory eulogies were delivered on the floors of Congress, which appear in the printed volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But there is very little information available as to the important results many of the other chairmen accomplished while in Congress or before.

I am aware that it is cynically said with some degree of truth that posterity cares little about what we do here. Yet I am old-fashioned enough to believe it would be an inspiration to the youth of our respective districts if there were readily available in permanent form some of the important achievements of their Congressmen. With that thought in view, I started to investigate to the extent that I have had time the actual accomplishments of all those former chairmen of the Appropriations Committee that were worth while commemorating for posterity in general and for the Members of the House in particular.

I appreciate the help of our Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress in assembling for me many of the books and pamphlets containing much of the data, and I am profoundly grateful to Mr. Arthur Orr, one of the efficient clerks of the committee, for compiling most of the information I am presenting to the House as a symposium of the Appropriations Committee itself, and more especially a record of the more important public services of the 20 former chairmen.

I. THE PLACE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE GOVERNMENT

In emphasis of the recognition of merit implied from service as chairman of this committee, it is appropriate to consider the committee's place in the structure of our Government.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House is the instrumentality created by the House of Representatives and through which the House exercises its exclusive prerogative to originate general appropriation bills. This exclusive function was conferred upon the House by the people themselves in a specific provision in the original Constitution, which has remained unaltered to this day. The provision referred to is as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

There has been a period of dispute that the term "bills for raising revenue" includes appropriation bills as well as tax bills. Happily, that period of dispute is now far behind. Unfailingly, throughout over a century and a half of the existence of the Government, the House has asserted and successfully maintained its exclusive right in this matter. In the rare instances where the House has acquiesced in a contrary procedure there existed emergencies in the Government which impelled the House, in the public interest, to suffer an exception.

While there have been times when Members of the other body have challenged this prerogative of the House, we are indebted to a Member of the Senate, the Honorable John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, one of the ablest and most scholarly statemen who ever served in either House of Congress, for an exhaustive and authoritative document, which, in my humble opinion, resolves the issue indisputably and emphatically, for all time to come, in favor of the position which has always been maintained by this House. Any who may wish to traverse the highroads of this great controversy in the pleasant company of Mr. Williams may do so by reference to Senate Document No. 872 of the Sixty-second Congress, second session. Here it is shown that in the months immediately following the submission of the Constitution to the States for their approval many of the delegates in their correspondence with other public men of the day and in their speeches at the ratification conventions declared unequivocally that the proposed charter of Government gave to the lower House of Congress the exclusive prerogative of originating appropriation bills. As early as March 2, 1797, Mr. John Nicholas, a Member of the House from the State of Virginia, said:

The power of this House to control appropriations has been settled.

STRUGGLE IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OVER POWER TO ORIGINATE APPROPRIATION BILLS

The importance of the function of originating the general appropriation bills may with profit be considered here. When General Washington and his colleagues met in convention at Philadelphia in 1787 to work out a plan of Central Government for the several States which had but recently achieved their independence, they had the benefit of intimate knowledge of the history of the evolution of parliamentary democracy under the British Constitution, and it is generally recognized that in framing the American Constitution they were guided by the centuries of experience of the English race in the mother country in evolving the processes of free government. Among these, and of transcendent importance, was the question of levying taxes and of appropriating the funds "for carrying on his Majesty's Government" or for the executive branch. As a result of a long and determined strug-

gle, this prerogative was finally lodged exclusively in the House of Commons, that arm of the Parliament closer to the people and more responsive to the public will. The details of this great struggle and the principle of free government around which it revolved need not be gone into here. It is sufficient to quote a passage from No. 58 of the Federalist, attributed by some to Madison and by others to Hamilton:

The House of Representatives—

Says this writer —

cannot only refuse, but they alone can propose, the supplies requisite for the support of the Government. They, in a word, hold the purse, that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the people gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may in fact be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people for obtaining a redress of every grievance and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

It is apparent, therefore, that the members of the Constitutional Convention were motivated by the conviction that the freedom of the people under any form of government which might be set up could not long endure unless the people themselves, through their immediate representatives, should retain the control of the purse strings of government, and that if that control should ever be usurped by any other branch of the Government the people's liberty would continue only through the grace of the usurper.

This consideration was a vital element of the controversy which gripped the convention and all but brought to ignominious failure the efforts of Washington and his associates to bind the States into that more perfect union which they so diligently sought. The controversy referred to was the question whether the States should have equal representation in the legislative branch.

From the beginning of the deliberations of the Convention it had become more and more apparent—I quote from The Growth of the Constitution by Meigs—"that the matter uppermost in the minds of many members was the vital question of the basis of representation." On June 29, the Convention had adopted the proposal that representation in the lower House of Congress should be "according to some equitable ratio." It then took up the recommendation of its committee that representation in the Senate should be on the same basis as that in the House. Three days later—July 2—after much heated debate, in which the smaller States indicated they would not yield an inch from their demand for equal suffrage in the Senate, a substitute proposal to provide equality of suffrage in the upper House was defeated by a tie vote. At this point, says Meigs, they were probably nearer to a breaking up than at any other time.

However, the spirit of conciliation intervened, and the matter in dispute was referred to a special committee of one delegate from each of the 11 States represented in the Convention. Benjamin Franklin was a member of the committee, and it was his proposal which the committee adopted and reported to the Convention and the general principles of which, after many parliamentary maneuvers, were finally incorporated in substance in the Constitution as adopted by the Convention and submitted to the States for ratification.

The Franklin Plan.—The Franklin plan contained two propositions, which were recommended to the Convention on condition "that both shall be generally adopted," namely:

1. Representation in the lower House to be based on population and all bills for raising or appropriating money, and for fixing the salaries of the officers of the Government, to originate in said lower House and no money to be drawn from the Public Treasury except in pursuance of appropriations to be originated in the lower branch.

2. Each State to have an equal vote in the Senate.

It is revealing to note that only a few days previous, on June 30, before the question had been referred to the committee and while it was undergoing acrimonious debate, Franklin had suggested that the Senate consist of an equal number of delegates from each State, but that, on questions of fixing the salaries and allowances for public service and of appropriating money from the General Treasury, the suffrage of the Senate should be on a proportional basis. To Franklin's mind, at least, the objection to the equal representation of the States in the upper House of Congress obtained primarily in connection with the enactment of the money bills.

It will thus be seen that the very keystone of the arch of the compromise upon which the Constitution rests, and without which it is not certain the Union of the States would ever have been achieved, is the provision under which it has been held from the beginning that appropriation bills, as well as tax bills, must originate in that House of the Congress closer to the people and in which the suffrage of the States is based on their respective populations. Equally apparent is the elevated character with which any committee is invested if it be chosen by the House for the solemn responsibility of preparing the measures which involve, to such a far-reaching degree, the safety of the fundamental liberties of the people.

To him who may be ambitious to leave a name for honored service to the Republic, the chairmanship of such a committee is an ever-flowing wellspring of opportunity for the most diligent employment of the highest gifts of statesmanship and for the exercise of the most zealous ardors of patriotism. What more need be said, therefore, of any man whom it is desired to memorialize, than to say of him that, for a brief allotment of time, he served his country as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives?

Speakers Blaine and Clark on Service in the House of Representatives.—Before taking up the history of the House Committee on Appropriations, I deem it appropriate to refer to two celebrated addresses that have been quoted, probably thousands of times, and have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a great many times.

The first is the classic address of the great Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, touching upon the severity of the test of a man's ability in public life which service in the National House of Representatives involves, delivered February 27, 1882.

The second is from a memorable speech of Speaker Champ Clark, made on March 17, 1916, on the importance and power of seniority in Congress and the necessary qualifications of a useful Representative.

The first passage I refer to is quoted from the eulogy pronounced by Secretary Blaine on the life, character, and service of the martyred President, James A. Garfield, before one of the most distinguished gatherings ever assembled in this Chamber. Mr. Blaine had previously served 5 years in the Senate and 13 years in the House, during 6 years of which he occupied the Speaker's chair, and had been Secretary of State under President Garfield, and was then Secretary of State under President Arthur. He spoke from the profundity of that rich experience.

I feel confident that every Member who has served for several years in this House will attest the accuracy of Mr. Blaine's observations. The passage referred to is as follows:

There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or the failures of beginners. What a man gains in the House he gains by the sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy, and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule and where no pretense can deceive and no glamor can mislead. The real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irreversibly decreed.

The equally accurate estimate by Speaker Champ Clark of a Congressman's necessary qualifications for success and the importance of seniority, is as follows:

He said:

No man is a born Congressman. He must learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. He must be a man of at least fair capacity, honest, industrious, energetic, courageous, and sober. His usefulness and influence are made by experience and practice. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he has those qualifications and diligently exercises them, his honor, influence, and usefulness to his country and his constituents increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion with each of his additional terms in Congress A man should be elected to the House for the good of the country, and never just to gratify his ambition.

He urged all congressional districts to select a man of those qualifications and then keep him here as long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well.

Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps amazingly in doing things. Speaking especially to the new Members he said:

My advice is: Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might.

He closed with this statement:

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them.

When I entered Congress, the membership was only 391, and we all had individual desks, similar to the present arrangement in the Senate. Those seats were numbered and assigned by lot. I was fortunate in drawing a seat directly across the aisle from Champ Clark. That close association was a great educational experience and an inspiration to me which I have appreciated ever since.

II. THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

During the past 20 years, this committee has had the exclusive authority over all the general appropriation bills. That is a most arduous and exacting task. The solemn obligation upon every member of our committee constantly and courageously to protect the Federal Treasury against thousands of appeals and imperative demands for unnecessary, unwise, and excessive appropriations, makes that committee of the House and its 11 subcommittees, the hardest worked, most powerful, and in my judgment, the most important committee in Congress.

Before 1865 the subject matters now assigned to both the Appropriations Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee were under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives was created by resolution of the House on March 2, 1865, just before the close of the Civil War, with 9 members—6 Republicans and 3 Democrats. Since January 3, 1939, the membership has been 25 Democrats and 15 Republicans. The first year of the committee's existence, the total expenditures of the Government, including the extraordinary expenditures incident to the Civil War, were $536,130,254. By 1878 the annual appropriations had receded to only $291,220,477, having been above that figure in every subsequent fiscal year.

During this calendar year of 1941 the committee has up to this date, June 19, appropriated and authorized the expenditure of about $35,000,000,000, and the total amount the committee will appropriate and authorize before the end of this calendar year may be more than $50,000,000,000—approximately 170 times what it was 63 years ago. The stupendous amount of exacting work and responsibility of the committee during the past 76 years has been correspondingly increased.

The first chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania. He had previously been chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and, by reason of that fact, the titular leader of his party in the House. While on that committee, he had been directly in charge of the appropriation bills, so that he was well qualified by experience to assume the duties of chairman of the new Committee on Appropriations.

The members of the committee as first created were appointed by Speaker Schuyler Colfax, December 11, 1865, and were as follows:

Republicans: Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania; Henry J. Raymond, of New York; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; John A. Kasson, of Iowa: John F. Farnsworth, of Illinois; and William Higby, of California.

Democrats: Daniel W. Voorhees, of Indiana—unseated on February 23, 1866, as a result of a contested election and succeeded as a member of the committee by William E. Niblack, of Indiana; Rufus P. Spalding, of Ohio; and Edwin R. V. Wright, of New Jersey.

EVER-UPWARD TREND IN APPROPRIATIONS

Subsequently to 1878, the general trend of appropriations, with recessions in certain years, has been ever upward. The Spanish-American War period marked a high point, when the appropriations for the fiscal year 1899 rose to the total sum of $892,656,776, compared with the previous year's total of $528,735,878. In the fiscal year 1901 the appropriations had dropped back to $705,653,298. Thereafter there was another general upswing until, in the fiscal year 1909, appropriations, for the first time, reached an annual total of more than $1,000,000,000, the exact figure being $1,006,431,727. The annual appropriations have not since fallen below the billion-dollar line.

The World War period saw the appropriations soar to record heights, the total for the fiscal year 1918 being $18,881,940,244; while the aggregate for the fiscal year 1919 was $27,065,148,933. Thereafter, the lowest point in total annual appropriations was for the fiscal year 1925, being in the sum of $3,748,651,750, and it does not now seem likely they will ever again reach that comparatively low level. For the fiscal year 1941, the total was $19,071,991,144, of which $2,193,125,902 was payable from trust funds.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Of the 21 different men who have served as chairman of the committee, 3, Samuel J. Randall, William S. Holman, and Joseph G. Cannon, served terms of broken continuity.

Mr. Randall was first appointed chairman in 1875, resigning in 1876 upon being elected Speaker of the House to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of Speaker Kerr. In 1883 he returned to the chairmanship of the committee and served throughout the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Fiftieth Congresses.

Mr. Holman succeeded Mr. Randall in the chairmanship when the latter became Speaker, but was not a candidate for reelection to the ensuing Congress. He did not again head the committee until 1891, being appointed chairman by Speaker Crisp and serving throughout the Fifty-second Congress.

Mr. Cannon served his first term as chairman in the Fifty-first Congress—1889–91. The two following Congresses were under Democratic control, but in 1895 the Republicans regained the ascendancy and Cannon then headed the committee for an additional 8 years.

No other chairman equaled the record of 10 years of service established by Mr. Cannon. Samuel J. Randall and Martin B. Madden were each chairman for 7 years; John J. Fitzgerald and James A. Tawney, 6 years each; James A. Garfield and John D. C. Atkins, 4 years each; James P. Buchanan, a little in excess of 3 years; Thaddeus Stevens and William S. Holman, 3 years each; Henry L. Dawes, Frank Hiscock, Joseph D. Sayers, James A. Hemenway, J. Swagar Sherley, James W. Good, William R. Wood, and Joseph W. Byrns, 2 years each; and Elihu B. Washburne and Daniel R. Anthony, 1 year each.

All of the six chairmen immediately preceding me undermined their health by the terrifically hard, complicated, exacting, constant and never-ending detailed work of the chairman. They prematurely exhausted their vitality on the altar of public service and duty. Two of them died in the service and the four others passed away not long after retiring. They literally wore themselves out fighting to hold down appropriations. The untimely death of all those splendid, noble characters has always since been a sad recollection to me. I firmly believe that all of them could have prolonged their lives probably many years if they had assigned a large part of the arduous and tiresome work to the chairmen and ranking members of the 11 subcommittees.

STATES FROM WHICH CHAIRMEN CAME

Thirteen States out of the 48 in the Union have furnished the 21 chairmen of the committee. Illinois and Indiana have each supplied 3; Pennsylvania, Tennessee, New York, and Texas, 2; while each of the following States have had 1, namely: Massachusetts, Ohio, Minnesota, Kentucky, Iowa, Kansas, and Colorado.

These chairmen were: Washburne, Cannon, and Madden, of Illinois; Holman, Hemenway, and Wood, of Indiana; Stevens and Randall of Pennsylvania; Atkins and Byrns, of Tennessee; Hiscock and Fitzgerald, of New York; Sayers and Buchanan, of Texas; Dawes, of Massachusetts; Garfield, of Ohio; Tawney, of Minnesota; Sherley, of Kentucky; Good, of Iowa; Anthony, of Kansas; and Taylor, of Colorado. I have the distinction of being the only chairman from west of the Great Plains.

OTHER POSTS OCCUPIED BY CHAIRMEN

Several of the chairmen of the committee, upon the completion of their services, served their country in other important posts.

James A. Garfield became President of the United States. Three achieved the Speakership, namely, Samuel J. Randall, Joseph G. Cannon, and Joseph W. Byrns. Henry L. Dawes, Frank Hiscock, and James A. Hemenway served in the United States Senate. Elihu B. Washburn was appointed Secretary of

State by President Grant, resigning soon thereafter to accept a diplomatic mission to France. James W. Good was Secretary of War under President Hoover.

Joseph D. Sayers became Governor of the State of Texas; John D. C. Atkins served as Commissioner of Indian Affairs; James A. Tawney was appointed to the International Joint Commission. John J. Fitzgerald is now judge of the county court of Kings County, N. Y.; and J. Swagar Sherley served as the Director of Finance of the United States Railroad Administration during the period of its liquidation. William S. Holman and William R. Wood continued as Members of the House; Thaddeus Stevens, Martin B. Madden, and James P. Buchanan died in office; and Daniel R. Anthony retired from Congress upon the termination of his services as chairman.

COMMITTEE STAFF

In the 76 years of its existence the Committee on Appropriations has had 21 different men as chairman, but only 3 incumbents of the position of clerk of the committee. This fact is not only an interesting historical circumstance but also a mute commentary upon the consistent policy of the committee, irrespective of political control, of maintaining a permanent staff of employees of continuous memory of precedents, Government organizations and procedure, and familiarity with the endless detail of Federal fiscal affairs.

Only three chairmen of the committee in its entire existence have exercised the privilege of appointing a new incumbent to the position of clerk of the committee. Any one of the chairmen, with the approval of the committee, might at any time change an incumbent; there is no civil service. It is to the credit of all of my predecessors, a practice which I have followed, that they have uniformly kept in committee employ the clerk and assistant clerks of the committee of experience and judgment. Over the span of years these men have served, without reference to political considerations, the committee management by both parties. Their knowledge of the past, their expert analysis of estimates and appropriations, their familiarity with the rules and precedents of Congress, and their loyalty and integrity have rendered them invaluable to the work of the committee. I gladly and proudly pay this tribute to those who have served and to those who are serving on the committee staff.

SERVICES OF STEVENS, COURTS, AND SHEILD AS CLERKS OF THE COMMITTEE

Without minimizing the importance and splendid character of the services rendered by all of the staff, I deem it of sufficient interest and a merited recognition to mention the services of the three men who have served in the capacity of clerk of the committee. Only three chairmen have made such an original appointment. Chairman Stevens appointed Robert J. Stevens first clerk of the committee in December 1865, and he served until his resignation in January 1884 to enter the United States Foreign Service. He served successively under Chairmen Stevens, Washburne, Dawes, Garfield, Randall—first term, Holman—first term—Atkins, and Hiscock for a period of 19 years.

In 1874 Chairman Atkins had brought to Washington as a clerk in the Committee on Revision of the Laws, of which he was then chairman, a young Tennessean, James C. Courts. When General Atkins became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in 1877 he appointed Mr. Courts as an assistant clerk, in which capacity he served until 1884, when he was elevated to the clerkship by Chairman Randall to succeed to the vacancy caused by the resignation of Robert J. Stevens. Mr. Courts served as clerk continuously until his death on September 17, 1916. His service under the House of Representatives covered a period of 42 years, of which 39 years were with the committee, 7 years as assistant clerk and 32 years as clerk. Commencing with Chairman Atkins, he served under nine chairmen, Messrs. Atkins, Hiscock, Randall, Cannon, Holman, Sayers, Hemenway, Tawney, and Fitzgerald. The combined chairmanship service of four of these men, Randall, Cannon, Tawney, and Fitzgerald aggregates 27 years of the period of Mr. Courts' 32 years in the clerkship. Very few men now in Congress knew Mr. Courts, but those who did, remember with admiration and affection his radiant personality, his great capacity, and his unimpeachable integrity. His was an unassuming employment in public affairs rendered unobtrusively, effectively, intelligently, and tactfully in a position of great trust and arduous duties.

The present clerk of the committee, Marcellus C. Sheild, was first appointed from Minnesota as an assistant clerk by Chairman Tawney on January 1, 1908 and was elevated to the clerkship by Chairman Fitzgerald upon the death of Mr. Courts. Mr. Sheild has served a total of 33 years, 8 years as an assistant clerk and 25 years as clerk, under 10 chairmen, Messrs. Tawney, Fitzgerald, Shirley, Good, Madden, Anthony, Wood, Byrns, Buchanan, and the present incumbent. His long apprenticeship under James C. Courts and his natural ability and industry qualified him to maintain the high standard of service which Mr. Courts had attained in his long career. No finer tribute could be paid to any man than to say of him that his character, capacity, courtesy, and industry follow the mold of service cast by a respected predecessor over more than 40 years of admirable public service. I need enter no eulogy of the service of "Marc" Sheild. His worth is well known to the membership of Congress, public officials, the press, and to numerous persons in private life who have had occasion to go to him for information

My hope is that the committee may for many years continue to have the benefit of his valuable assistance. I gratefully include here the tribute paid to Mr. Sheild by Mr. Fitzgerald upon the occasion of the former's completion of 30 years of service with the committee:

MARCELLUS C. SHEILD

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, January 25, 1938)

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard it said that Members who have served here never lose interest in the proceedings of the House after they have departed for happier and more fertile fields. I am this morning in receipt of a letter from Hon. John J. Fitzgerald, a former Member of the House, testifying to that fact. Mr. Fitzgerald rounded out a rather remarkable career in the House. Elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress from New York, he served through the nine succeeding Congresses, resigning to return to the practice of the law in 1917 after a service of 20 years. He held high rank in the House and was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the time of his resignation. He ranks with Mann and Clark as one of the great parliamentarians of his time and his decisions as chairman of the Committee of the Whole and Speaker pro tempore are classics in the precedents of the House. He now occupies the bench as judge of the Kings County court and is one of the distinguished jurists of his State. I am certain Members will read with interest and approval his letter just received as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 24, 1937.*

The Honorable CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARENCE: I have just read in the RECORD your remarks and those of Mr. Bacon, on January 7, commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of Marc Sheild's service with the Committee on Appropriations. No public servant ever deserved more such generous tributes.

As years go by we live more in retrospect, and it is gratifying to learn that the judgments of our youth are confirmed by time. Perhaps the most valuable service which I performed while a Member of the House was my appointment of Sheild as clerk of the committee. It was unsolicited, unsuggested by anyone, done entirely of my own volition.

Mr. Bacon mentions that although a Democrat, I appointed Sheild, a Republican. Although never a member of Tammany Hall, in public opinion I was considered of the same political breed and incapable of such action.

Partisan politics, however, never controlled the selection of the committee clerk.

James C. Courts was clerk when I entered the Fifty-sixth Congress. He had been appointed by Atkins, of Tennessee. He served under Washburne, a former Minister to France, who wrote a history of the French Revolution; under Hiscock, of New York, later Senator; under Randall, of Pennsylvania, later Speaker; Holman, of Indiana; Sayres, of Texas, later Governor; Cannon, of Illinois, later Speaker; then Hemenway of Indiana, afterward Senator; Tawney, of Minnesota; and myself. He died in 1916, after 37 years' service with the committee.

Only once during his long service was an attempt made to remove him. During the eighties a Republican House was elected, and at the first meeting of the committee the chairman announced the appointment of someone other than Courts as clerk. Mr. Cannon, of Illinois, challenged the chairman's action, and a large majority of the committee supported his motion to elect Courts. On no other occasion, so far as I know, did partisan politics affect the tenure of the committee's clerk.

Sheild's appointment as an assistant clerk was due to a vacancy resulting from the transfer of Kennedy Rea to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Cleaves had been clerk of that committee for 38 years when he died in 1908. The Senate was Republican, and Senator Hale, of Maine, father of the present Senator, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Upon Cleave's death he came to the House and insisted that Rea, an Indiana Democrat appointed by Holman, go to the Senate as clerk of its Appropriations Committee. The vacancy thus created made an opening for the appointment of Sheild, a young lawyer and a Republican from Minnesota. When Courts died in

1916, Sheild had been with the committee 8 years and had demonstrated his exceptional qualifications for the place. I immediately appointed him clerk.

The story of the services of Cleaves, Courts, Rea, and Sheild, whose association with the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses approximates 150 years, is one of the most fascinating in our history. Modest, quiet, capable, loyal, and efficient, they constitute an honor corps in governmental service.

So I am glad to add my humble tribute to Marc Sheild, an efficient and faithful public servant, an unassuming gentleman, a loyal and devoted friend.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. FITZGERALD.

STATEMENT OF TERMS OF SERVICE OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

I shall insert at this point a statement showing in epitomized form the names, States, political affiliations, and periods of service of the 21 men who have served as chairmen of the Appropriations Committee.

Chairmen, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, since the creation of the committee, Mar. 2, 1865

Chairman	State	Party affiliation	Term in House	Term as chairman
Thaddeus Stevens	Pennsylvania	Whig and Republican	1849-53, 1859-68	1865-68 (39th Cong. to 40th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.).
Elihu B. Washburne	Illinois	do	1853-69	1868-69 (40th Cong., 3d sess.).
Henry L. Dawes	Massachusetts	Republican	1857-75	1869-71 (41st Cong.).
James A. Garfield	Ohio	do	1863-80	1871-75 (42d and 43d Cong.).
Samuel J. Randall	Pennsylvania	Democrat	1863-90	1875-76 (44th Cong., 1st sess.).
William S. Holman	Indiana	do	1859-65, 1867-77, 1881-95, 1897 (Mar. 4 to Apr. 22.)	1876-77 (44th Cong., 2d sess.). 1883-89 (48th to 50th Cong.). 1891-93 (52d Cong.).
John D. C. Atkins	Tennessee	do	1857-59; 1873-83	1877-81 (45th and 46th Cong.).
Frank Hiscock	New York	Republican	1877-87	1881-83 (47th Cong.).
Samuel J. Randall[1]				
Joseph G. Cannon	Illinois	Republican	1873-91, 1893-1913, 1915-23	1889-91 (51st Cong.), 1895-1903 (54th to 57th Cong.).
William S. Holman[1]				
Joseph D. Sayers	Texas	do	1885-99	1893-95 (53d Cong.).
Joseph G. Cannon[1]				
James A. Hemenway	Indiana	Republican	1895-1905	1903-05 (58th Cong.).
James A. Tawney	Minnesota	do	1893-1911	1905-11 (59th to 61st Cong.).
John J. Fitzgerald	New York	Democrat	1899-1917	1911-17 (62d Cong. to 65th Cong., 1st and part of 2d sess.).
J. Swagar Sherley	Kentucky	do	1903-19	1918-19 (65th Cong., part of 2d sess., through remainder Congress.)
James W. Good	Iowa	Republican	1909-21	1919-21 (66th Cong. and part of 1st sess. of 67th Cong.).
Martin B. Madden	Illinois	do	1905-28	1921-28 (67th Cong., part of 1st sess. to 70th Cong., 1st sess.).
Daniel R. Anthony, Jr.	Kansas	do	1907-27	1928-29 (70th Cong., 2d sess.).
William R. Wood	Indiana	do	1915-31	1929-31 (71st Cong.).
Joseph W. Byrns	Tennessee	Democrat	1909-36	1931-33 (72d Cong.).
James P. Buchanan	Texas	do	1913-37	1933-37 (73d Cong. to 75th Cong., part of 1st sess.).
Edward T. Taylor	Colorado	do	1909—	1937— (75th Cong., remainder, 1st sess. to—).

[1] Second period of chairmanship (see above).

Some informative data about the lives and public services of each of these distinguished men will, I hope, be found of general interest.

PRESENT ROSTER OF COMMITTEE

I would like to have preserved in this record the names of the present committee and the subcommittees, showing the way the committee divides the work and handles the appropriations for the various activities of our Government during this most trying period of our Nation's history.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Edward T. Taylor, Colorado, chairman; Clarence Cannon, Missouri; Clifton A. Woodrum, Virginia; Louis Ludlow, Indiana; Malcolm C. Tarver, Georgia; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; J. Buell Snyder, Pennsylvania; Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky; George W. Johnson, West Virginia; James G. Scrugham, Nevada; James M. Fitzpatrick, New York; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; David D. Terry, Arkansas; John M. Houston, Kansas; Joe Starnes, Alabama; Ross A. Collins, Mississippi; Charles H. Leavy, Washington; Joseph E. Casey, Massachusetts; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Butler B. Hare, South Carolina; Harry P. Beam, Illinois; Albert Thomas, Texas; Vincent F. Harrington, Iowa; John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; William P. Lambertson, Kansas; D. Lane Powers, New Jersey; J. William Ditter, Pennsylvania; Albert E. Carter, California; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Francis H. Case, South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Noble J. Johnson, Indiana; Robert F. Jones, Ohio.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Deficiencies

Messrs. Taylor, Woodrum, Cannon, Ludlow, Snyder, O'Neal, Johnson of West Virginia, Rabaut, Taber, Wigglesworth, Lambertson, and Ditter.

Interior

Messrs. Taylor, Johnson of Oklahoma, Scrugham, Fitzpatrick, Leavy, Sheppard, Rich, Carter, and Jones.

Agriculture

Messrs. Cannon, Tarver, Leavy, Terry, Collins, Lambertson, Dirksen, and Plumley.

Independent Offices

Messrs. Woodrum, Johnson of Oklahoma, Fitzpatrick, Houston, Starnes, Wigglesworth, Dirksen, and Case.

Treasury and Post Office

Messrs. Ludlow, O'Neal, Johnson of West Virginia, Mahon, Casey, Taber, Keefe, and Rich.

Labor-Federal Security

Messrs. Tarver, Hare, Thomas, Harrington, Engel, and Keefe.

War

Messrs. Snyder, Terry, Starnes, Collins, Kerr, Mahon, Powers, Engel, and Case.

Legislative

Messrs. O'Neal, Leavy, Hare, Powers, and Johnson of Indiana.

Navy

Messrs. Scrugham, Casey, Sheppard, Beam, Thomas, Ditter, Plemley, and Johnson of Indiana.

State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary

Messrs. Rabaut, Kerr, Hare, Houston, Beam, Harrington, Carter, Stefan, and Jones.

District of Columbia

Messrs. Mahon, Beam, Harrington, Thomas, Houston, Stefan, Case, and Lambertson.

THE CLERK AND THE ASSISTANT CLERKS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND THE RESPECTIVE DATES OF THEIR ENTRY UPON SERVICE

Marcellus C. Sheild	Jan. 1, 1908
James F. Scanlon	Feb. 16, 1918
Arthur Orr	Mar. 1, 1920
John C. Pugh	Mar. 16, 1920
William A. Duvall	Dec. 16, 1927
Jack K. McFall	Oct. 1, 1928
Robert P. Williams	Nov. 21, 1932
George Y. Harvey	Oct. 29, 1937

COMMITTEE PAGE

William J. Strachan	Feb. 14, 1939

COMMITTEE MESSENGER

Robert M. Lewis	Nov. 15, 1923

I am sure every member of the Appropriations Committee, and in reality the entire membership of the House, will appreciate a kindly expression in relation to the clerks of our committee. I do not believe any committee has ever had a more efficient or a higher class clerical personnel than the clerks of our committee. All of them are fiscal experts. They have put in many years studying all kinds of appropriations. Each one of them is required to serve two subcommittees and to make an exhaustive study of the activities and appropriations of those departments. Because of their efficiency and industry and the character of the men themselves, they are of the greatest possible help to the committee, to Congress, and in protecting the Federal Treasury. They are practically devoting their lives to this service, and the committee confidently relies

upon their work. I am proud to include their names along with the committee and to pay them this most richly deserved tribute.

HUGH V. HIGH

I wish also to say a kind word for my secretary, Mr. Hugh V. High. Soon after my first election to Congress, I appointed him as my secretary and he has continued with me from that day to this. I do not believe any Member ever had a more efficient, or more loyal, or more capable secretary than he has been all these years. He has always had a natural adaptation to our Congressional work and he is, fortunately, possessed of a most pleasing personality which has always been an important factor in retaining the good will of my constituents for more than a third of a century.

Although he is not a member of the committee staff, my own membership and chairmanship of the committee have been made possible largely because of Mr. High's unfailing reliability and wisdom in caring for the many important and frequently difficult situations which arise almost daily in my own office, as I am sure they do in the office of every Member of the House. Many, many times, because of my preoccupation with committee duties or otherwise enforced absence from my office, vitally important matters are, of necessity, disposed of upon Mr. High's own unreviewed judgment, and I have never had occasion to regret or rescind his decisions.

Second only to Mrs. Taylor, I am largely indebted to Mr. High for whatever approbation my services in Congress may deserve.

REASONS FOR DESIRING MEMBERSHIP ON THE COMMITTEE

When I came to Congress in 1909 I went on the Public Lands, the Irrigation, and the Mines and Mining Committees, the three committees in which the West was most directly interested.

I became chairman of the Irrigation Committee and ranking member and ex-officio chairman much of the time of both the other committees during the Wilson administration. But in 1921, when all the power and authority to report the general appropriation bills was taken away from all other committees and given to the Appropriations Committee I immediately realized that committee was thereafter going to be by far the most important committee in Congress, especially to the West. I resigned from all three of those committees and was elected by resolution of the House a member of the Appropriations Committee. When a Member desires to change from one committee to another he must do so by resolution of the House and go to the foot of the committee; so I went to the foot, No. 31, on the Appropriations Committee. All of the 30 men who preceded me on the committee at that time were either defeated for reelection, retired to private life, or died in the service. I was elected chairman of the committee by resolution of the House a few days after the death of Chairman Buchanan, February 22, 1937.

The chairman of this committee is ex-officio a member of all the 11 subcommittees, and he always retains and holds the chairmanship of the deficiency subcommittee and usually retains the chairmanship of the subcommittee which he theretofore held. Accordingly, I retain and hold the chairmanship of the deficiency subcommittee, as well as that of the Interior Department subcommittee, the latter of which I have held for more than 10 years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, JED JOHNSON, AND JOHN TABER

I would be ungrateful indeed if I did not especially express my most profound gratitude to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the ranking member on the deficiency subcommittee, for relieving me of the active charge of the hearings and legislative matters that come before that subcommittee and the presentation and defense of them on the floor of the House.

As you all know, that subcommittee, which is composed primarily of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the several subcommittees, is by far the hardest worked and has many more responsibilities than any of the other 10 subcommittees. Estimates for vast sums of a deficiency and supplemental character for many different activities are referred to that subcommittee, and it has been in session almost constantly all this session of Congress on national defense matters. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has managed those affairs marvelously well. The entire committee, the House of Representatives, and the country are indebted to him for the skill and persistence with which he examines the multitude of witnesses and presents to the House the myriad of items involved. I am personally indebted to him for relieving me of the burdens of this vast detail of work.

I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], the ranking member on the Interior Department Subcommittee, for relieving me of much labor in the examination of witnesses and other detail work which he has willingly and splendidly performed in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill.

I am likewise indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the Committee, for his unfailing courtesy at all times, and for his loyal and helpful cooperation, save in the exceptional cases where his conscience impels him to pursue an opposing course, in the tradition of "the loyal opposition" of the British Parliament. Such instances are of infrequent occurrence and are the fruit of sincere and patriotic impulses. They are to be expected in our boasted two-party system of government, and the House and the country are indeed fortunate to have had Mr. Taber in the important post of ranking minority member of this great Committee during the better part of one of the most critical decades of our history. He was first elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and was immediately appointed to the Appropriations Committee. At the beginning of the Seventy-second Congress he became the ranking minority Member, in which place he has since served continuously and with marked distinction. In addition to his great ability and his ripe experience, he is possessed of a multitude of lovable personal qualities which endear him to his fellow members and contribute as well to his effectiveness in his present responsible post. No higher tribute could be paid to him than was paid to me on the occasion of my 77th birthday, just six years ago today, by the late James P. Buchanan, then Chairman of the Committee. Mr. Buchanan said:

> Should anything happen to me, he [Mr. TAYLOR] would become chairman of that great committee. I unhesitatingly say to the Members of this House that if that should happen the fiscal affairs of this Government would be in safe-keeping in the hands of ED TAYLOR of Colorado.

It is, of course, entirely possible that Mr. TABER may, some day, become Chairman of the Committee, and I can unhesitatingly say that if that should ever happen the fiscal affairs of this Government would be in safe-keeping in the hands of JOHN TABER of New York.

There has always been the most hearty cooperation and good will among and between the 11 subcommittees and the entire 40 members of the committee. Our work has been harmonious and systematized teamwork, and I feel that all of the members not only realize the importance and responsibility of this committee and of each of its members, but they feel gratified in having the opportunity of being of real service to the committee, to the House, and to our country.

III. MEMORIALS TO FORMER CHAIRMEN

I shall now address myself to paying such tribute as lies within my ability to the 20 distinguished men who have preceded me in the chairmanship of this committee.

In the search for material in connection with this endeavor, the records have yielded quite a wealth of particulars with respect to the services of some of these men, while as to others there exist but very brief biographical sketches, disclosing little beyond the chronology of their terms in the House and in the chairmanship of the committee. The paucity of recorded data in these cases does not necessarily imply lack of talent or statesmanship on the part of the subjects but may indicate that they were called to this exalted service at times when no public emergencies arose, touching the functions of this committee, of sufficient gravity to bring to public attention the qualities of statesmanship which were undoubtedly latent within them.

Of these, and, in fact, of every one of the former 20 men upon whom the great responsibilities of this office have been laid, it is a sufficient memorial that they were chosen for this high position, that they loyally carried the great responsibility during their respective terms, and that there exists not the slightest evidence that at any time did any of them falter or fail to discharge effectively the

obligations implicit in their incumbency of the office.

THADDEUS STEVENS

Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania, first chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Born in Danville, Vt., April 4, 1792; died in Washington, D. C., August 11, 1868. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, December 11, 1865–August 11, 1868.

The new committee came into being in 1865, when the times were embittered as they have never been, before or since, in the history of the Republic. Its first chairman, according to McCall, was the unquestioned leader of the House from July 4, 1861, when it assembled at the call of Lincoln, until his death in 1868.

He was 73 years of age when he became chairman of the committee. However, this was not a new assignment. Previous to the creation of the new committee, the Committee on Ways and Means had had jurisdiction of appropriation bills since the beginning of the Government. Stevens had been assigned to that great committee in 1859, and had been its chairman throughout the administration of President Lincoln, a period when the raising of the revenue and the disbursement thereof through appropriation bills called for great powers of statesmanship.

At the time the new committee was established, Stevens had reduced to a routine the labors in connection with the appropriation bills. This enabled him to devote his great energies to the overshadowing problems arising from the termination of the great war, and it was as chairman of the Special Committee on Reconstruction that he made his great mark in American history. For his labors in this field his fame can but abide the judgment of history.

But of Thaddeus Stevens it can be truly said that both friend and foe acknowledged his great ability, his superb qualities of leadership, and his marvelous capacity for indefatigable labor, so unusual for one of his age.

Jeremiah S. Black, Attorney General and Secretary of State under President Buchanan, himself a great lawyer and a political foe of Stevens, said of him that, at the time of his death, he had no equal as a lawyer at the American bar.

His biographer, Samuel W. McCall, says of him:

> He was so unquestionably a leader that no man was next to him, and his industry and energy responded so fully to the demands that he was almost always upon his feet or in charge of measures before the House. The preparation of revenue and appropriation bills would alone have been a sufficient tax upon the strength of an ordinary man.

Horace Greely said of him:

> The Honorable Thaddeus Stevens is one of the ablest living statesmen, and his opinions bear the weight which is commanded by unquestioned honesty and ripe experience. He speaks with unusual freedom. His faults are those common to men conscious of supreme ability—and a tenacity which to others seems obstinacy, and a boldness in presenting and urging his own especial views, which seems to imply a contempt for all adverse conviction—qualities which advancing years are not likely to soften.

Mr. Blaine accords Stevens a place among the three great parliamentary leaders in our history, naming him with Clay and Douglas. Chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means had long been considered the position of leadership of the dominant party in the House, but of Stevens, in this connection, Blaine said:

> He needed no formal christening as leader. He was the natural leader who assumed his place by common consent.

ELIHU BENJAMIN WASHBURNE

Elihu Benjamin Washburne, Illinois, Borne in Livermore, Androscoggin County, Maine, September 23, 1816; died in Chicago, Ill., October 22, 1887. Served as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the third session of the Fortieth Congress, December 7, 1868, to March 4, 1869, finishing out the term of his predecessor, Thaddeus Stevens, who died in office.

Emigrating to Galena, Ill., in 1840, he immediately embarked upon a career in law and politics, being affiliated with the Whig Party. In 1844, he was a delegate to the Whig National Convention at Baltimore and presented Henry Clay's name as the candidate for the Presidency.

He was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress in 1848, but was elected in 1852 to the Thirty-third Congress and was reelected to the eight succeeding Congresses, resigning, however, on March 6, 1869, 2 days after the beginning of his ninth term, to accept appointment by President Grant as Secretary of State.

Although first elected as a Whig, he later joined the Republican Party and became one of its foremost leaders, not only in the House but in the Nation as well. He was an intimate of President Lincoln, being closer to him than any other Illinois Congressman. He was an early and forceful advocate of General Grant and of the latter's elevation to the supreme command of the Union forces.

He had three brothers, each of whom also distinguished himself as a Member of the House, with two of whom he served for a time contemporaneously. The brothers spelled their last names without the terminal letter "e," which Elihu had added to his own name early in his career. These brothers, together with the dates of their respective services in the House, where: Israel Washburn, Jr., of Maine, 1851–61; Cadwallader Colden Washburn, of Wisconsin, 1855–61 and 1867–71; and William Drew Washburn, of Minnesota, 1879–85 The latter also served a term in the Senate—1889–95.

Early in his congressional career, Elihu became interested in legislation affecting the commercial and financial interests of the country. His first committee service was on the Committee on Manufactures, but before the close of his second term he had been made chairman of the Committee on Commerce. In the same year he caused to be printed an important report from the State Department on foreign commerce, thus inaugurating the publications, Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Nations and the Consular Reports, which have continued to the present day—in recent years as parts of related publications of other titles—and have played an important part in the development of our foreign commerce.

When he was appointed chairman of the Appropriations Committee, upon the death of Thaddeus Stevens, he had become the "father of the House" by reason of seniority of service and had probably a greater knowledge of the Government's business than any other Member. The jealousy with which he guarded the public purse against wrongful or unnecessary and unwise expenditures earned for him the nickname of "watchdog of the Treasury," a sobriquet which has challenged the aspiration of every succeeding chairman of this great committee.

His occupancy of the chair was but of brief duration, however. On March 6, 1869, he resigned as a Member of the House to accept appointment as Secretary of State by President Grant, whose stanch friend he had been throughout the war and during the Presidential campaign which had elevated the supreme commander of the Union Armies to the Chief Magistracy of the Nation. His health soon compelled him to relinquish the place at the head of the Cabinet, whereupon he was appointed Minister to France, an office which he held for more than 8 years, a term of service at that mission never before exceeded, and but once since, by the late Myron T. Herrick. He was at this post during the siege of Paris in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 and throughout the terroristic reign of the commune which followed. During this time he was the only representative of a foreign nation remaining in Paris, all the others having withdrawn. He not only represented, during this time, the interests of the Germans, at the request of their governments, but of many other nationals, in addition to his regular duties, now of prodigious magnitude and difficulty, as the Minister from the United States.

Upon his return to the United States he was strongly urged to become a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, and it is believed he would have been the compromise selection of the convention of 1880, instead of Garfield, except for the fact his unswerving personal loyalty to Grant, whose friends were seeking a third-term nomination for him, earned for him the irreconcilable displeasure of the many delegates so bitterly opposed to the third-term candidate.

But his brilliant career in the House won for him an imperishable place in the annals of his country. James G. Blaine characterized him as—

> A man of courage, energy, and principle, constant in attendance upon sessions of the House, expert in its rules, its most watchful and most careful Member, an economist by nature, a foe to every form of corruption.

HENRY LAURENS DAWES

Henry Laurens Dawes, Massachusetts. Born in Cummington, Mass., October 30, 1816; died Pittsfield, Mass., February 5, 1903. Served as chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the Forty-first Congress (1869–71).

Served in the House for 18 years, from March 4, 1857, to March 3, 1875; followed by 18 years of service in the Senate, declining to be a candidate for a fourth senatorial term in 1893. After his service as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Dawes was transferred to

Ways and Means, of which he was chairman for two terms.

Dawes was one of that small group who, through superiority of leadership dominated the House. Garfield said of him:

> There has never been, within my experience, a greater power than his on the floor of the House.

JAMES ABRAM GARFIELD

James Abram Garfield, Ohio. Born in Orange, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, November 19, 1831; died at Elberon, N. J., September 19, 1881. Served in the House from March 4, 1863, until November 8, 1880, resigning upon being elected President. Chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the Forty-second and Forty-third Congresses (1871–75).

Born in poor circumstances, he experienced a boyhood and early youth of considerable hardship. However, he graduated from Williams College at the age of 24. Respecting the years immediately following, James G. Blaine said of him that—

> He seemed at one bound to spring into conspicuous and brilliant success. Within 6 years he was successively president of a college, State senator of Ohio, major general of the Army of the United States, and Representative-elect to the National Congress.

He joined the Union forces as the commander of a regiment. Soon thereafter he was ordered to assume command of a brigade and to operate as an independent force in eastern Kentucky. Being thus thrown upon his own initiative afforded him a splendid opportunity to display whatever military genius was latent within him. He conducted a brilliant and successful campaign which is credited with saving the State of Kentucky to the Union. Major General Buell, his superior officer, declared that Garfield's services had called into action the highest qualities of a soldier. Lincoln rewarded him with a brigadier general's commission.

I shall not dwell upon the many important and interesting details of his military career. His initial success in the eastern Kentucky campaign, coming on the heels of a long series of defeats for the Union arms, catapulted him into national fame and resulted without his seeking, in his nomination for Congress by the Republican convention in his district. Although he was elected in October of 1862, the first session of the Congress to which he had been elected did not convene until December of the following year. During the intervening 14 months he continued his services with the Union forces, and not until just before the convening of the session did he determine definitely whether to stay in the Army or accept the call to the National Legislature.

Meanwhile there had occurred the crowning event of his military career. Although the Battle of Chickamauga was a major disaster to the Union arms, Garfield won imperishable laurels for his brave and distinguished services in that epic contest; as a result of which Lincoln appointed him a major general in the Army of the United States, he being at the time not yet 33 years of age.

Eventually the time came when Garfield had to make the decision governing the future course of his life. He preferred to remain in the military service, and there is no doubt that the Army, now that he had achieved such high rank, held promise of a much more eventful career. In the Army he undoubtedly would have remained except that both Lincoln and Secretary of War Stanton advised him that he could at that time, be of especial value in the House of Representatives. Consequently on the 5th day of December 1863, he resigned his commission of major general, and 2 days later, took his seat in the House as a Representative from the State of Ohio.

His accession to the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations had not been preceded by any period of service as a member of the Committee. During his first four terms he served, respectively, as a memper of the Committee on Military Affairs, member of Ways and Means, chairman of Military Affairs, and chairman of Banking and Currency, but always with the sails of his ambition set to become chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. His predilection for this assignment was so strong that when his name was being seriously considered for the speakership in 1869 he said in a letter to a friend, "I would rather be chairman of Ways and Means than Speaker." To that end he had labored indefatigably to make himself an authority on taxation and finance.

In 1871, at the beginning of his fifth term in the House, he had high hopes of realizing, at last, his great ambition. But Speaker Blaine hesitated to appoint one with the liberal tariff views entertained by Garfield to this key post. Accordingly, Dawes, of Massachusetts, theretofore chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was shifted to Ways and Means, and Garfield, who had climbed to a position of leadership in the House through sheer, hard, and conscientious labor, was made chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Although disappointed in his failure to attain his ultimate ambition, he devoted himself to the duties of his new post, which he held for two terms. During this time he sought to discover the underlying principles by which expenditures increase and decrease; to lift the routine act of appropriating to a plane of scientific government. With painstaking care he went about preparing his first bill. Concerning his presentation of the bill to the House, he said:

> I made what they call in Parliament a budget speech, in which I gave out the philosophy of expenditures and appropriations, and forecasted, among other things, at what time in our history we could reach a peace level of expenditures after the war.

The time prophesied by him, 1876, was within 2 years of being correct. The lowest level of appropriations following the war was in 1878 and since that time, as Garfield predicted, there has been a steady increase in Government expenditures, due to the normal growth of the country.

In 1875 the control of the House passed to the Democrats and Garfield was not to occupy again the chair at the head of the committee. But a greater and more tragic destiny awaited him—the Presidency and martyrdom. However, these cannot eclipse the name he carved out for himself as a Member and outstanding leader of the House and as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I have derived a peculiar inspiration from President Garfield by reason of the fact that my home county, where I have resided for more than 55 years, was created soon after his death and named in honor of him and proudly bears his illustrious name. Above the mantel in the office of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee hangs his life-size portrait, where the great leader of former days has for nearly 40 years looked down in benediction upon the labors of the long line of his successors. I am sure that my predecessors have derived an inspiration, similar to my own, from the knowledge that our great comrade of the past seemingly continues to preside, in spirit, over the arduous labors which he learned from experience are incident to the chairmanship of this great committee.

"GOD REIGNS AND THE GOVERNMENT AT WASHINGTON STILL LIVES"

Often, as I view the noble bearing and benign countenance which his life-size painting portrays, I am reminded of the dramatic incident when, on April 15, 1865, by the force of his eloquence, he stilled the rising fury of an angry mob in the city of New York. There the news of the assassination of President Lincoln had just been reported, followed closely by rumors that a plot was on foot to kill other important leaders and thus destroy the Government. A mass meeting of citizens, gathered on the street, threatened to become a riot. Garfield, then a Member of Congress, appeared on a balcony and addressed the assembly. He concluded in these words, destined to remain immortal:

> Fellow citizens, clouds and darkness are around Him; His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of His throne; mercy and truth shall go before His face. Fellow citizens, God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives.

With these assuring words, the throng gradually dispersed. Garfield did not realize that he had but enacted the prologue of his own martyrdom which ensued a brief 16 years later.

Today, the whole world is enveloped in a mantle of darkness more impenetrable than that which hovered above our young Nation in those somber days of 1861 to 1865. We are not only warned of the possible destruction of our form of government—the Republic bought by the blood of our fathers—but the fate of civilization and the destiny of the human race on this planet is in tragic jeopardy.

With these conditions growing more crucial from day to day, we should take courage from those imperishable words of President Garfield. The thick gloom which seems about to descend upon us is, in the long sweep of history, but a transient, if tempestuous hour. The present storm will eventually run its course and subside. Our cherished Republic

will outride the gale and set its course anew, over calmer seas, to a more glorious destiny.

Fellow Members of this House, in the midst of this most appallingly tragic and critical condition that has ever confronted the world, when everything we hold dear is defiantly and brazenly challenged, we can boldly repeat what President Garfield said:

> God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives.

And also repeat the likewise immortal words of our first martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, spoken from the battlefield of Gettysburg in a dark hour of our country's history:

> That we here highly resolve that this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, shall not perish from the earth.

This excerpt from Lincoln's Gettysburg address has probably been more widely quoted in our own and other countries than any other passage in profane literature.

SAMUEL JACKSON RANDALL

Samuel Jackson Randall, Pennsylvania. Born in Philadelphia, Pa., October 10, 1828; died, Washington, D. C., April 13, 1890. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Forty-fourth Congress, first session (1875–76), and Forty-eighth to Fiftieth Congress, inclusive (1883–89).

Randall was elected to the Thirty-eighth Congress, beginning March 4, 1863, and served continuously until his death. He soon rose to a position of leadership and distinguished himself in the Forty-third Congress, when his party had scarcely more than one-third of the membership of the House, by conducting a successful filibuster against the so-called force bill. In a session of the House lasting 46 hours and 25 minutes, the roll was called 75 times. During all this time Randall did not leave the Chamber, nor his desk, except to partake of food brought to him from his home.

This achievement endeared him to his southern colleagues, and they hoped to see him made Speaker in the Forty-fourth Congress. But Michael C. Kerr, of Indiana, was chosen instead, and Randall was made chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Before the close of that Congress Speaker Kerr died, and Randall was chosen to fill the vacancy. He continued in the Speakership for the two following Congresses, being succeeded in the Forty-seventh Congress by a Republican, J. Warren Keifer, of Ohio.

In the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Fiftieth Congresses he returned to his former post as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He was the only man to serve as chairman of the committee subsequently to service in the Speaker's chair.

When Randall first became chairman of the committee in 1875, the Senate and the Executive were both under Republican control. He applied the pruning knife to the appropriation bills and reported them to the House with reductions totaling $40,000,000, or about one-eighth of what it was then costing to run the Government. The magnitude of this achievement becomes apparent in the light of the Federal Budget of today, assuming a proportionate cut were to be undertaken. Randall's program of retrenchment encountered a storm of protest from the administration, and the Republican Senate restored the original estimates. A long contest ensued between the two Houses. Most of that session, which did not adjourn until August 15, 1876, was devoted to the struggle, but Randall held firm, and came out of conference with $30,000,000 of his reductions.

On that record, the Democratic campaign of 1876 was conducted and a Democratic House was returned. Speaking of this achievement, a House Member subsequently said:

> It was Samuel J. Randall who taught the country and administrations of both parties that the power of appropriation is in Congress, that it is not in the departments.

Soon after Randall ascended to the Speaker's chair the Nation was confronted with the gravest constitutional crisis of its history, save only the Jefferson-Burr contest for the Presidency in 1801 and that which resulted from the secession of the Southern States in 1861. The Hayes-Tilden contest for the Presidency was in the lap of Congress. The Electoral Commission had been set up and provision made against dilatory proceedings in the two Houses of Congress in joint or separate sessions. The decisions of the Electoral Commission had been returned and they were all for Hayes. The Democrats felt that Tilden had rightfully been elected and there was strong talk of delaying the count of the vote until after March 4. This would have brought about an interregnum in the Presidency with no constitutional provision to meet such a contingency. After that, anything might happen. Some extra-constitutional means would have to be devised and the Democrats might, in the end, place Tilden in the White House, where they conscientiously believed he was entitled to be. It was a tempting adventure, but Randall knew that civil war and bloodshed might ensue, endangering again the very existence of the Republic. He shared the belief of his Democratic colleagues that their party was being cheated of the prize which they had rightfully won; but sheer patriotism would not permit him to endanger his country for the advantage of his party. He firmly refused to entertain any dilatory motions. The electoral vote was counted and the result proclaimed before March 4. Once more, when the Nation was in danger of destruction a patriot and a statesman was at the helm.

There has seldom been combined in one man the parliamentary skill, the masterly leadership, the wise statesmanship, the lofty patriotism, and the stainless personal honor that were exemplified in the life and public services of Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM STEELE HOLMAN

William Steele Holman, Indiana. Born near Aurora, Dearborn County, Ind., September 6, 1822; died, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1897. Chairman of Appropriations Committee, Forty-fourth Congress, second session (1876–77), and Fifty-second Congress (1891–93).

He was first elected to the Thirty-sixth Congress, beginning March 4, 1859, and thereafter served in the House, intermittently throughout 15 Congresses, dying early in his sixteenth term. There were 3 breaks in his service, covering a period of 4 Congresses, for election to any of which he was not a candidate. He stands with a group of less than a dozen men for length of service in the American Congress.

His first appointment as chairman of the Appropriations Committee in 1876 was to complete the unexpired term of Samuel J. Randall, who had been elected Speaker following the death of Speaker Kerr. Holman was not a candidate for reelection to the succeeding Congress, and he did not again head the committee until his appointment by Speaker Crisp for the period of the Fifty-second Congress, 1891–93.

Throughout his career in the House, Holman was one of the most diligent apostles of economy. During his first incumbency as chairman of the Appropriations Committee it is claimed for his credit that the expenses of the Government were reduced approximately ten millions lower than for any year since the Civil War.

He was the author of the so-called Holman rule, permitting "legislation on appropriation bills provided it is germane to the bill and specifically retrenches expenditures." This rule was adopted in 1876, since which time it has been included among the rules of the House during a total of 44 years and excluded for a total of 22 years.

The rule suffered an eclipse of 6 years in the Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses, during the first 4 years of which the House was under Democratic control; and a further eclipse of 16 years, from the Fifty-fourth to the Sixty-first Congress, all under Republican control. Beginning with the Sixty-second Congress in 1911, the Holman rule has remained in effect continuously under both parties down to the present time.

This rule, now so firmly embedded in the procedure of the House, bids fair to remain an enduring monument to its author. That the people of his congressional district should keep him in Congress for 30 years is, in itself, an eloquent eulogy. From the pen of James G. Blaine, a political foe, he drew the following laudatory comment:

> His efforts were steadily and persistently directed to the enforcement of public economy; and the country owes him a debt of gratitude for the integrity, intelligence, and simplicity with which he has illustrated a most honorable career as representative of the people.

JOHN DE WITT CLINTON ATKINS

John De Witt Clinton Atkins, Tennessee. Born near Manly's Chapel, Henry County, Tenn., June 4, 1825; died, Paris, Tenn., June 2, 1908. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses (1877–81).

Atkins was one of a very small group of those who have been chairman of the committee whose service in the House

both antedated and followed the great conflict which resulted from the secession of the Southern States. In 1857, after distinguished service in both the house and the senate of the State legislature, he was nominated for and elected to the Thirty-fifth Congress (1857–59). At the outbreak of the war he offered his services to the Confederacy and was commissioned a lieutenant colonel. He was able to serve but a very short time on account of poor health, but was elected a member of the Confederate Congress, where he served with marked distinction until the end of the struggle.

The years immediately following the war were devoted to recuperating the modest fortune which that conflict had all but destroyed, but in the election of 1872 he was elected to the Forty-third Congress, serving for 10 consecutive years (1873–83). For 8 years of this period he was a member of the Appropriations Committee and was appointed chairman by Speaker Randall, serving for 4 years (1877–81).

Before becoming chairman of the committee his leadership was attested by his selection for service on a committee of 16 Senators and Representatives, appointed by his party, which finally consented to and advised the adoption of the plan for the Electoral Commission to settle the Hayes-Tilden Presidential contest.

Two years after his voluntary retirement from Congress he took an active part in the nomination and election of Grover Cleveland, who, after his inauguration, appointed Atkins Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in which office he served until his resignation in 1888.

He then retired to private life, engaging in the agricultural pursuits which he had always preferred above all else, except the service of the people of his State and of the Nation.

FRANK HISCOCK

Frank Hiscock, New York. Born, Pompey, N. Y., September 6, 1834; died, Syracuse, N. Y., June 18, 1914. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Forty-seventh Congress 1881–83.

Hiscock entered Congress in 1877, serving in the House until March 3, 1887, when he resigned to accept election to the Senate, where he served until March 3, 1893, having been defeated for a second Senate term.

He served in the House at a time when there were many powerful leaders in both parties, yet he was in their very front ranks, and he exercised a very large influence upon legislation. In addition to being chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Forty-seventh Congress he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the two succeeding Congresses. During this period he was the acknowledged leader of his party in the House. Twice he was seriously considered for the Speakership, and in 1888 his name was prominently mentioned in connection with the Presidential nomination of his party.

At the conclusion of his term in the Senate in 1893, he retired to private life and to the practice of law in Syracuse, N. Y., where he died June 18, 1914.

JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON

Joseph Gurney Cannon, Illinois. Born, Guilford, N. C., May 7, 1836; died, Danville, Ill., November 12, 1926. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Fifty-first and Fifty-fourth to Fifty-seventh Congresses, 1889–91 and 1895–1903.

To know intimately the public life of "Uncle Joe" Cannon is to know the history of the Republic during one of its most eventful half-century periods.

He was elected to the House in 1872. Fifty years later, in his eighty-sixth year, he announced to the people of his district that he would not be a candidate for reelection. In the interim he had served continuously as a Member of the House, with the exception of two Congresses, the Fifty-second and the Sixty-third. During that time a young and struggling Republic, just recovering from the effects of a devastating Civil War, grew to the stature of a first-class world power.

"Uncle Joe," as he was affectionately known by both friend and foe, developed gradually into a great party leader and a national figure. For more than two decades his place was among the mighty in the councils of the Republic. He was in Congress at a time when the scepter of power passed back and forth frequently between the two great political parties. He knew how to be effective when his party was reduced to a minority as well as when it commanded a majority.

He was always a courageous, rough and tumble, and defiant fighter on the floor. He asked, and gave, no quarter. He was a very dangerous antagonist in debate. He had an uncanny genius for instantly using some homespun illustration that would blast his opponent off the floor.

In his last little speech that I ever recollect, when he was 87 years old and quite frail, a Member offered an amendment to an appropriation bill adding $25,000 for something in his district. "Uncle Joe" opposed it as being without any merit. The Member loudly answered, "I look at it differently." "Yes," said "Uncle Joe," "I have often noticed that some people always look at everything through their own gimlet hole." I have often noticed that trait.

But regardless of his ready wit and caustic tongue, he was universally loved and admired by both friend and foe.

When I came to Congress in 1909, "Uncle Joe" was elected Speaker for his fourth and last term, the Sixty-first Congress. I was one of the new and humble minority Members that followed the leadership of GEORGE W. NORRIS, now Senator, and stripped the speakership of the powers which it had gradually acquired in more than a century of the history of the House. At that time those powers were called "Cannonism" because Cannon was in the Speaker's chair. In a greater or lesser degree, his predecessors in office had all exercised most of these powers.

Cannon appointed all the minority Members on the committees. The time had come for the overthrow of the system. To the uninitiated, it may have seemed like a fight against Cannon, but it was not. Stripped of his powers, "Uncle Joe" continued to hold his high place in the affections of the Members of both parties.

Six years later, on the eightieth anniversary of his birth, the House laid aside its regular business to pay tribute to its great veteran Member. From both sides of the Chamber came an overwhelming flood of praise and veneration such as has seldom been witnessed on this floor.

While his service in the Speaker's chair will in itself permanently assure him an exalted place in the annals of the Republic, there were many of his contemporaries who regarded his service on the Appropriations Committee, particularly as its chairman, as the more useful and noteworthy. It was from the chairmanship of the committee he ascended to the Speaker's office. At the conclusion of his services as the presiding officer of the House he returned to the Appropriations Committee, taking his place at the foot of the class, in seniority, on the minority side. When he retired from the House in 1923 his party had again come into control of the House, and he had risen in seniority until he was within three places of again achieving the chairmanship.

Three years after retiring from Congress, in his ninety-first year, "Uncle Joe" passed permanently to the majority side after one of the most unique and romantic careers in the service of his country which has ever fallen to the lot of any man.

While his service was not consecutive—he was defeated and out of Congress twice—his 46 years' total service in this House has never been even approached during the past 152 years of our congressional history, and I predict it will not be duplicated during the next 150 years.

This being my seventeenth consecutive term, it may be pertinent or interesting to mention that there is something ominous about a seventeenth consecutive term. Only 4 other men have ever been elected to Congress 17 consecutive times. Bingham, of Pennsylvania; Pou, of North Carolina; Haugen, of Iowa; and Sabath, of Illinois. Bingham and Pou died during their seventeenth terms, and Haugen was defeated when he ran for an eighteenth term. Our present colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is the only man during the entire history of our Republic who has ever been elected to Congress 18 consecutive times.

JOSEPH DRAPER SAYERS

Joseph Draper Sayers, Texas. Born, Grenada, Miss., September, 23, 1841; died, Austin, Tex., May 15, 1929. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Fifty-third Congress (1893–95).

Sayers served in the House for 14 years, from the Forty-ninth to the Fifty-fifth Congresses, 1885–99. In his youth, before he had completed his schooling, he enlisted in the Confederate Army. At the end of the war, which left young Sayers without independent means, he engaged in teaching school, to support himself while completing his law studies.

At a comparatively early age he entered public service, being chosen to represent his district in the State Senate, where he became at once a leader. At 38 he was Lieutenant Governor and soon thereafter was elected to Congress, where he brought high honors to his State by reason of his outstanding service. It was Speaker Crisp who recognized his qualities and made him chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

In addition to his great ability, he was distinguished for his lovable personal qualities. During his congressional term one of his biographers said of him:

> To his constituents he is more than their Representative; he is at once friend and adviser as well as representative at the seat of Government. The relation between them is not cold, formal, and official, but close, warm, ardent. Every man's cause is his cause. Any man in his district may approach him with the assurance of a cordial greeting and a patient attention to what he has to say. "Joe" Sayers is their friend.

On January 16, 1899, he resigned from Congress and ascended to the Governor's chair of the great State of Texas, which he occupied for 4 years. Thereafter, he resumed the practice of law and served on numerous State boards until his death, on May 15, 1929.

JAMES ALEXANDER HEMENWAY

James Alexander Hemenway, Indiana. Born, Boonville, Ind., March 8, 1860; died, Miami, Fla., February 10, 1923. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Fifty-eighth Congress (1903–05).

Mr. Hemenway attended the common schools of the town in which he was born and, thereafter, although he reached an eminent place in the service of his country as a Member of both the House and the Senate, his education and achievements were due entirely to his own efforts and ambition.

While employed in the Boonville post office, he devoted his spare time to the study of law, being admitted to the bar in 1885. A year later, he was elected prosecuting attorney of his judicial circuit, a position which he held for 4 years. In 1894 he was elected to the Fifty-fourth Congress, serving until the close of the Fifty-eighth Congress (1895–1905). He had been reelected to the Fifty-ninth Congress but resigned at the close of the Fifty-eighth, having been elected by the Indiana Legislature to complete the unexpired term in the Senate of Vice President Charles W. Fairbanks. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection to the Senate and retired to private life at the close of the Sixtieth Congress in 1909, resuming the practice of law.

Hemenway was a member of the Appropriations Committee throughout the entire period of his service in the House. The last 2 years of that service he was chairman of the committee, succeeding "Uncle Joe" Cannon who had been elevated to the Speakership. He would undoubtedly have served a longer term as chairman, but for his election to the Senate.

In both the House and the Senate, Hemenway was recognized as one of the outstanding leaders of his party, and, no doubt, would have served much longer, except for the vicissitudes of politics in a State which is noted for frequent change of control between the two major political parties. He was defeated for reelection to the Senate by Benjamin F. Shively, a Democrat.

JAMES ALBERTUS TAWNEY

James Albertus Tawney, Minnesota: Born near Gettysburg, Pa., January 3, 1855; died, Excelsior Springs, Mo., June 12, 1919; chairman, Appropriations Committee, Fifty-ninth to Sixty-first Congress (1905–11).

Tawney was chairman of the committee when I entered this House. He helped me pass my first bill in Congress, and I always felt grateful to and had a real admiration for him. He was a very forcible character, and one of the foremost leaders of his party during the height of its power and influence, serving nine consecutive terms, from the Fifty-third to the Sixty-first Congress (1893–1911).

He was a powerful man mentally and physically. In his youth, he had followed the trade of blacksmith and machinist until he was 24, when he turned to the profession of law. Although eminently successful as a lawyer, his achievements in that profession were obscured by the greater importance of his public career.

In his second term, Speaker Reed recognized his great ability and made him a member of the Ways and Means Committee, where he served for 10 consecutive years. In his third term he was chosen Republican whip, serving in that office for 8 years. In 1905, Speaker Cannon transferred him from Ways and Means to the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee. He had already made a record for himself as a foe of public extravagance and was also noted for his opposition to the growth of militarism. However, he recognized the importance to our national defenses of the Panama Canal and during his 6 years in the chairmanship he reported out the major portion of the appropriations for the completion of that project.

In the campaign of 1910 he fell a victim to the split in the Republican Party and failed of renomination. A few days after the conclusion of his congressional service he was appointed a member of the International Joint Commission, created to adjudicate questions regarding the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, where he served until his death in 1919.

JOHN JOSEPH FITZGERALD

John Joseph Fitzgerald, New York. Born, Brooklyn, N. Y., March 10, 1872, where he still resides, and is presiding judge of the Kings County court. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Sixty-second Congress to Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, 1911–17.

He was admitted to the bar at the age of 21 and began his service in the House at the age of 27, serving from March 4, 1899, to December 31, 1917.

From the first, he took an active part in the proceedings of the House and soon came to be recognized as a leader. His leadership was buttressed by unremitting hard labor in acquiring a detailed knowledge of the operation of Government and by an uncanny knowledge of the rules of parliamentary procedure. In addition to knowing the rules themselves he knew the philosophy and the reason underlying the rules. The latter knowledge he had acquired before coming to Congress, through a profound study of the history of the rules governing the proceedings of the British Parliament.

James G. Blaine, in his memoirs, named Henry Clay, Stephen A. Douglas, and Thaddeus Stevens as the three most distinguished parliamentary leaders developed in this country up to that time. Those who knew John J. Fitzgerald during his service in the House will agree that he was one of the two outstanding parliamentary leaders of his own time, the other being the illustrious minority leader, James R. Mann, of Illinois. History will undoubtedly add these two names to the brief but imposing roster proclaimed by Mr. Blaine.

Mr. Fitzgerald was the father of Calendar Wednesday and the Unanimous Consent Calendar. These were established as a result of amendments to the rules, proposed by him in 1909. They "streamlined" the legislative processes of the House and are largely responsible for the universally recognized effectiveness of the House in considering and disposing of a vast number of bills, many of which would, otherwise, be hopelessly logjammed.

Another amendment to the rules brought about by Mr. Fitzgerald is the now firmly established right of the opponents of a measure to preferential recognition for making the motion to recommit the bill.

The benefits which have ever since flowed from the so-called "Fitzgerald amendments" to the rules are incalculable. Only through their repeal and a reversion to the chaos and inertia which often characterized the legislative processes would it be possible for the average member today to realize the great constructive value of Mr. Fitzgerald's work.

Another enduring monument to Mr. Fitzgerald's career in the House is his definition, now classic, of the term "germaneness" as used in the rules. This definition was pronounced by him from the chair, on September 22, 1914, when he was presiding over the Committee of the Whole House. It is a masterpiece of clarity, and has achieved a renown almost as celebrated as that of the rule itself.

Mr. Fitzgerald was assigned to the Committee on Appropriations in 1905, becoming its chairman in 1911. Mr. Gillett, of Massachusetts, who subsequently became Speaker, said of Fitzgerald at the time the latter had announced his intention to retire from Congress that—

> He showed such knowledge of the subjects he discussed, such assurance of his parliamentary rights, and such determination to assert and defend them, that before long he convinced the leaders that it was much better to have him inside the Committee on Appropriations defending than outside attacking.

Once on the committee, and particularly after he had become its chairman, he was the bane of bureau chiefs and department heads who were rash enough

to ask for appropriations when their requests were not fortified by unassailable reasons showing their public necessity.

In the last year of his chairmanship the United States entered the World War. Between that memorable date and the retirement from Congress of Mr. Fitzgerald, the Appropriations Committee reported out appropriations and contractual authorizations totaling, in round numbers, twenty billions of dollars, every item of which received the most careful scrutiny.

Long an exponent of the central control of appropriations in a single committee in the House, he advocated, far in advance of the establishment of the Budget system, the return of the former exclusive appropriating jurisdiction to the Committee on Appropriations. The changes in House rules, adopted in 1920, concurrently with the return of central appropriating jurisdiction to the Committtee on Appropriations, were designed to protect the legislative powers of the legislative committees and to prevent the Appropriations Committee from including general legislation on the appropriation bills. The 1920 changes while adopted by a Republican House were practically the pattern recommended by Mr. Fitzgerald a number of years previously in a House speech urging the reform. They are the rules of today governing consideration of appropriation measures.

When Mr. Fitzgerald retired from Congress, he left behind him a record of more than 18 years of distinguished and conspicuous service which few other men have ever equaled. He returned to private practice where he has enjoyed an undisputed place in the foremost ranks of the bar of the State of New York. He is at present, and has been for many years, presiding judge of the Kings County court, Brooklyn, in which office he has continued to render distinguished and fearless public service.

It was indeed fortunate that the Appropriations Committee and the House should have had the benefit of the very flower of his young manhood. Of all the former 20 chairmen, he is the only one now living.

Our country, the House of Representatives, and especially this committee, will always owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation to Judge FITZGERALD, and I am proud to pay him this tribute while he is still with us and interested in our work.

Clarence Cannon and Other Contributors to Development of Effective House Procedure.—The rules and procedure of the House have been a matter of evolution during a century and a half. A great many Members have taken a creditable part in that development.

Our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking Democratic member next to me on the Appropriations Committee, and who presides over the committee whenever I am absent, has undoubtedly given more study and written more standard works on the rules and procedure of the House of Representatives than any other Member. Some of these are Cannon's Manual and Digest of the House of Representatives, A Synopsis of the Procedure of the House of Representatives, Cannon's Procedure, Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, and other treatises on parliamentary law. He spent years of earnest labor on these works. He was the parliamentarian of each of the last six Democratic National Conventions. He is the highest living authority today on the rules and procedure of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Robert Luce, of Massachusetts, our former colleague, has written a five-volume textbook on the History and Practice of Legislative Proceedings.

There is one innovation that only four other Members of this House might remember, namely, the Speaker, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. SABATH and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.

I trust it may be interesting to mention for this record the fact that prior to the Sixty-third Congress Members could each have three or four committee assignments, and some 65 of the older Members in the Sixty-second Congress had 3 or 4 of those assignments, and they practically monopolized the entire membership of all the important committees. The Sixty-second Congress had 391 Members. It was then changed from 391 to 435 in the Sixty-third Congress.

The important committees at that time all had 21 or 22 members, usually 14 or 15 majority members and 7 or 8 minority members. The result was that the new Democratic Members had a very slim chance to be assigned to any of those important committees. But the worst feature of it was that no man having that many committee assignments could possibly give all of them the attention, the time, and study that the important committees deserved. They sometimes considered bills without a quorum. That meant a lack of the careful consideration that important measures should have.

When the Democratic caucus met on March 5, 1913, to consider party matters for the approaching session I introduced in the caucus a resolution as follows:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR, OF COLORADO, MARCH 5, 1913

Resolved, That no member of either of the Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, Banking and Currency, District of Columbia, Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, the Post Office and Post Roads, or Rivers and Harbors shall be placed upon any other standing committee of the House.

Mr. Smith, of New York, offered the following amendment to the resolution offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

That it is the sense of this caucus that the chairman of the standing committee shall not hold membership on any other committee of the House.

[Rejected.]

The question being now upon the resolution offered by Mr. TAYLOR, of Colorado, the ayes appeared to have it and the resolution was adopted.

The old Members put up a vehement fight against it, but the new Members and some of the others who had long felt the practice was unwise and inimical to the proper consideration of important legislation outvoted the older ones and adopted the resolution, and it has been followed by the Democratic membership of the House ever since.

When the Republicans have had a majority of the House they have followed the same rule, and to some extent when they were in the minority. Of course, when a minority is as small as the present one, some deviation from that rule is to be expected, but there are very few Republicans now on more than one of those important committees.

A large number of old Members had to give up two or three of their assignments and were thus enabled to devote much more attention to the committee they retained. The Members on those committees have attended more regularly the meetings of their only committee, and all measures have ever since been very much more thoroughly considered.

There is no way of estimating the value and importance of that change in the interest of sound, orderly, and better legislation.

J. SWAGAR SHERLEY

J. Swagar Sherley, Kentucky. Born, Louisville, Ky., November 28, 1871; died in the city of his birth, February 13, 1941. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Sixty-fifth Congress, second and third sessions, 1918–19.

Mr. Sherley attended the public schools of his native city, completing high school in 1889. He graduated from the law department of the University of Virginia in 1891 and immediately entered upon the practice of law in Louisville.

He served as a Member of the House over a continuous period of 16 years, 1903–19, being elected, at the age of 31, to the Fifty-eighth Congress.

At the beginning of the Sixtieth Congress, 1907, Mr. Sherley was appointed to the Committee on Appropriations, being assigned to the subcommittee for the sundry civil bill. This was considered a prize post, attested by the fact that John J. Fitzgerald, of New York, was at the time the ranking minority member of that subcommittee.

In January 1918, upon the retirement from Congress of Mr. Fitzgerald, Sherley succeeded to the chairmanship of the committee, serving throughout both regular sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress, with the exception of but a few weeks. He was defeated for reelection to the ensuing Congress, which brought to an end a long and honored career in the House and as a member and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

He was an early and persistent advocate of a budget system for the Federal Government, and of a plan of having all appropriation totals controlled or fixed by a central House committee. Although he was no longer a Member of the House when these reforms were instituted, he played a most influential part in the consideration and discussion which preceded their consummation. I was a member of the Select Committee on the Budget and I distinctly recall his appearance as a witness before our committee and of the many valuable suggestions and wise counsel presented by him and of their helpfulness in formulating our final recommendations to the House.

His services as chairman of the Appropriations Committee covered the concluding year of the World War and the

session of the Congress immediately following the armistice. Thus, his responsibilities embraced those incident to the year when the expenses of the war were at their peak as well as those entailed in bringing Government expenses back to peacetime operations after the struggle was over. While his services in connection with financing the Nation's effort in the final year of the war were such as to distinguish him for all the future, even greater statesmanship, it is believed by many, characterized his work in effecting an immediate about face in Government expenditures when that great conflict came to an end. How he recaptured and returned to the Treasury more than 15 billions of dollars appropriated for great military outlays but not obligated on the date of the armistice is most ably recited by my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] in a recent address to the House, delivered soon after Mr. Sherley's passing. I shall not attempt to repeat Mr. LUDLOW's account in my own words but shall avail myself of the privilege of embodying an appropriate excerpt from his remarks on that occasion:

Said Mr. LUDLOW:

Mr. Sherley did one thing which the annals of Congress will record as the biggest and finest appropriation job ever accomplished in the history of America. Early in 1918 when the World War was at its height, he became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. As soon as the armistice had been signed he realized the necessity of recouping to the Treasury the vast unexpended appropriations and unexecuted contract authorizations which could be recovered. It was a task for a giant and Mr. Sherley proved to be exactly the giant who was needed. It was one of the most peculiar tasks ever undertaken—a task not of appropriating but of unappropriating, as it were, colossal sums already appropriated. It was not a spectacular job that had to be done, but one of infinite grueling details that required a keen analytical mind, a courageous determination, and an inflexible patriotic purpose. The unexpended balances in the hands of department heads, bureau chiefs, and various independent activities when the war ended amounted in sum total to the total property values of many sovereign States.

Naturally Chairman Sherley's recovery efforts met with strong and even bitter resistance. Bureau chiefs had their clutches on the money Congress had appropriated, and in many instances they did not propose to release it without a fight. Mr. Sherley set aside all other work and called before his subcommittee on deficiencies every department head and bureau chief of the Government to inquire into the amount of money each activity had on hand and the amount that could be turned back into the Federal Treasury. Serving with Mr. Sherley on that subcommittee were John J. Eagan, of New Jersey, and Thomas U. Sisson, of Mississippi, Democrats, and "Uncle Joe" Cannon of Illinois, and William S. Vare, of Pennsylvania, Republicans. The hearings, which were very animated and which lasted for weeks, are contained in a volume of over 1,200 pages of printed testimony. The bill providing for these recoveries was enacted on February 25, 1919. The total recoveries brought about by Mr. Sherley's efforts amounted to $15,411,000,000, including $7,190,000,000 of appropriations and $8,221,000,000 contract authorizations.

Mr. Sherley was a great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He brought to the task a natural talent which few men possess—the ability of keen, quick, and sound analysis. This attribute, coupled with experience and training, integrity, patriotism, courage, lofty ideals, and industry, produced an unusual personal equipment for the office that was constantly reflected in the conduct of his work. He was a master of logic and the dissection of argument. Applicants for appropriations who thought they were capable of jousting with him across the committee table frequently found dents in their armor and cuts in their funds. Those who came lacking confidence in their ability to contest with him found a fair interrogator who quickly and accurately drew forth from them the salient facts and who, in turn, to their relief, would concisely and logically restate a summary of the information he had elicited. His attitude toward the granting of public funds was exacting yet tempered with a fine judicial sense of the requirements of the public service.

His public career did not end when he left the House in 1919. He returned to the practice of law in Washington and Louisville, but was later persuaded by the Director General of Railroads to assume the difficult post of Director of Finance to assist in the adjudication of the vast amount of claims that had arisen under the Federal control of the rail transportation systems during the war period. Here he served with distinction, exhibiting in his defense of the interests of the Government those fine qualities and the training that had been so outstanding in his conduct of the post of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. With the completion of this task, he returned to his private practice, not again holding public office, though often called for counsel and advice in Government matters by those who knew and valued greatly the soundness of his opinions and judgments.

JAMES WILLIAM GOOD

James William Good, Iowa. Born near Cedar Rapids, Iowa, September 24, 1866; died, Washington, D. C., November 18, 1929. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Sixty-sixth Congress and Sixty-seventh Congress, first session (1919–21).

He graduated in law at the University of Michigan and began practicing at Indianapolis, Ind., but later moved to Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Here he served as city attorney from 1906 to 1908 and was then elected to the Sixty-first Congress, serving continuously from March 4, 1909, until his resignation, June 15, 1921.

Mr. Good served on the Appropriations Committee from and after 1911, through the chairmanships of Mr. Fitzgerald, of New York, and Mr. Sherley, of Kentucky. The former chairman, "Uncle Joe" Cannon, and six men destined to become chairmen of the committee were some of Mr. Good's contemporaries on the committee.

Thus, although eminently fitted by his own natural abilities, Mr. Good enjoyed, through association, unexcelled preparation for the responsibilities of the chairmanship. He occupied that position at one of the most difficult periods. The country had just emerged from the World War and the Federal Budget was still enormously swollen and in need of further reduction to peacetime requirements. The departments vigorously resisted retrenchment, as was natural, and the fact that the Congress and the Executive were under diverse political control was not calculated to simplify the task.

However, when Mr. Good resigned from Congress and from the committee, after presiding over the appropriations for 2 consecutive fiscal years, the committee was credited, under his chairmanship, with a reduction of $4,000,000,000 below the departmental estimates.

Undoubtedly the greatest, most rightly deserved and enduring monument to Mr. Good's years of service in the House is his coauthorship of the Budget system, the Accounting Act, and his persistent and determined service in centralizing all appropriations in the Appropriations Committee.

A practical budget plan for the Federal Government was, as early as the days of Garfield, regarded by leaders and thinkers both in and out of Congress, as absolutely essential to the prevention of a continuously mounting, wasteful, and extravagant public expenditure.

Both of the immediately preceding committee chairmen, Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Sherley, had been diligent in their advocacy of the reform; but it fell to the lot of "Jim" Good to be in the logical position of leadership when the time had fully ripened for the consummation of this far-reaching evolution in one of the most vital functions of government. He secured the passage of a resolution July 31, 1919, authorizing the Speaker to appoint a select committee on the Budget. Pursuant to that resolution the following were appointed to the committee:

James W. Good, chairman; Phillip P. Campbell, Kansas; Martin B. Madden, Illinois; Willis C. Hawley, Oregon; Henry W. Temple, Pennsylvania; George Holden Tinkham, Massachusetts; Fred S. Purnell, Indiana; Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee; Claud Kitchin, North Carolina; John N. Garner, Texas; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado; Everett B. Howard, Oklahoma.

Mr. Good then introduced a bill setting up a Budget plan which was referred to the select committee. The committee worked diligently for many months. We held long and extended hearings, at which appeared scores of witnesses, many of national repute. Among these were John J. Fitzgerald and Swagar Sherley, former chairmen of the Appropriations Committee; Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy; former President William Howard Taft; and Carter Glass, then Secretary of the Treasury.

The bill finally passed Congress and was sent to the President, May 29, 1920. Three days later, on June 1, Good called up his resolution centralizing all appropriation bills in the Appropriations Committee and secured its adoption, in spite of long and very vigorous opposition.

President Wilson was whole-heartedly in favor of the Budget bill, but on June 4 he vetoed the measure on the constitutional ground that, after creating the offices of Comptroller General and Assistant Comptroller General and providing for their appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, the bill provided for their removal by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, for incapacity, inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, or for any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. Wilson contended that the power of the President to appoint officers of the kind in question, expressly granted by the Constitution, carried with it as a necessary incident the power of removal. He believed this power to be exclusive in the Executive, for lack of any provision in the Constitution, express or implied, vesting such removal power in any one else except by impeachment by Congress.

It was not until a year later, and in the succeeding Congress, that the bill was again passed, amended to provide for removal of the officers in question by a joint resolution of the Congress, instead of a concurrent resolution, the only difference being that a joint resolution, to be effective, requires the approval of the President, or repassage over his veto by a two-thirds vote of each House; while a concurrent resolution becomes effective upon approval by a majority vote of each House.

The modification, of course, did not meet the objection raised by Wilson, since it left the President powerless to remove the officers appointed by him except through an action initiated by and consented to by Congress, while it placed in the hands of the legislative branch the power, by a two-thirds vote, to remove these officers over the objection of the Executive. However, President Harding was then in the White House and, although he indicated his accord with the position of President Wilson on the constitutional question, he, nevertheless, signed the measure rather than to delay further or jeopardize the initiation of this sorely needed reform in the national fiscal operations.

That one clause resulted in our very great and vitally important present Budget system being enacted during the Harding instead of the Wilson administration.

I was a very active supporter of Chairman Good on that committee which, after a long and hard fight, brought about the adoption of our Budget system and the centralization of all appropriations in this one committee.

Immediately thereafter, Good resigned from Congress and returned to the practice of law, but this time in the city of Chicago. In 1928, he was active in securing the nomination and election of President Hoover, who offered him a place in the Cabinet as Secretary of War. Good accepted the appointment, but after a service of a little less than 1 year, in which he distinguished himself anew in the service of the public, he suffered a fatal illness and departed this life November 18, 1929.

Mr. Good was chairman when I was appointed to that committee. The committee then had 31 members and I was number 31.

I had a great admiration for him. He was a grand, manly, courageous, and public-spirited character. It was an inspiration to work with him. He rendered really a great and enduring service to our country.

MARTIN BARNABY MADDEN

Martin Barnaby Madden, Illinois. Born, Darlington, England, March 20, 1855; died, Washington, D. C., April 27, 1928. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Sixty-seventh Congress to Seventieth Congress, first session, 1921–28. Served in the House from the Fifty-ninth Congress, 1905, until his death, 1928.

Mr. Madden is the only one of the committee chairmen not born in this country; but at the early age of 5 he emigrated with his parents to Chicago, Ill., where he was educated, grew to manhood, and lived the balance of his life.

When he came to Congress in 1905 there was indelibly stamped upon him the qualities which had made Chicago and its middle western environs one of the mightiest inland empires of all time. The spirit of the generation which had builded a mighty metropolis from the ashes of the great fire of 1870 was of his very bone and sinew, because he had been part and parcel of it.

Graduating as an engineer, he took a prominent part in the reconstruction of the great city. At different times he was president of the Quarry Owners' Association of the United States, vice president and director of the Builders and Traders' Exchange of Chicago, member and presiding officer of the Chicago City Council, and director of the Metropolitan Trust & Savings Bank of Chicago.

Early in his service in the House he attained a position of party leadership, which he held unchallenged to the very end. His leadership was founded not only upon his recognized great ability as a businessman, administrator, and legislator, but upon his capacity for making friends and upon the absolute confidence which his colleagues entertained in his patriotism and integrity.

As an illustration of his rare, patriotic loyalty to his duties as chairman of the committee, I shall recite briefly an incident in connection with the Panama Canal.

The committee had been advised that the normal flow of the Chagres River, which supplies water for Gatun Lake, was approaching a point where it was likely not to provide sufficient water in that lake, due to the increased use of water in locking vessels. The traffic was increasing and an additional reserve water supply was thought to be necessary to insure the continuous operation of the Canal. Mr. Madden, in company with Canal officials, inspected proposed reservoir sites and the site for the dam, which would impound the flood waters of that river and thus insure the uninterrupted operation of the Canal. His official interest in the problem and his long practical experience in construction and engineering projects were primarily responsible for the expedition with which the funds were provided and the work begun. He had been also a member of the committee during the early days of construction of the Canal and had made many visits and inspections during that period. He had an intimate knowledge of the engineering problems then and a foresight as to what might be encountered as traffic grew.

Some years later, when the dam was about half completed, I visited the Canal and the dam on behalf of the committee. My sense of the appropriate was affronted by the discovery that the dam had been named the Alhajuela Dam, after a little band of jungle Indians somewhere up in the swamp. Promptly upon my return I had inserted in the first appropriation bill for the War Department a provision naming the dam, lake, plant, and road for Mr. Madden. The provision referred to appears in the War Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1930, Forty-five Statutes at Large, page 1386, and is as follows:

> That in recognition of the exceptionally distinguished services in Congress for nearly 24 years of Hon. Martin B. Madden, the late chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and in appreciation of his active and efficient interest in the Panama Canal throughout its entire construction and operation, and in recently causing the commencement of the construction of said dam across the Chagres River, at or near Alhajuela, the said dam and the lake created thereby and the entire plant and the road leading thereto shall hereafter be known and designated on the public records as the Madden Dam, Lake, Plant, and Road.

The late Speaker Byrns, who was the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee at the time Mr. Madden was its chairman, said of him, after his passing:

> He was a leader in whom his colleagues had confidence and whom the Congress trusted. His service in the House of Representatives did not consist alone in the service he rendered as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He stood in the forefront in all matters of legislation which came before the House.

In the all-around, many, mature, and efficient qualifications that the chairman of this great and most exacting committee should have for success I do not believe Martin Madden has ever been surpassed.

DANIEL READ ANTHONY, JR.

Daniel Read Anthony, Jr., Kansas. Born at Leavenworth, Kans., August 22, 1870; died August 4, 1931, in the city of his birth. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Seventieth Congress, second session, 1928–29.

He was the son of Col. Daniel R. Anthony, who was prominent in the early history of the State from the sanguinary days immediately preceding and during the Civil War. Although he studied law and was admitted to the bar, he did not engage in active practice but followed the newspaper profession, in which he occupied a prominent place in the State of Kansas for a quarter of a century. Upon the death of his father in 1904, he succeeded the latter as editor and manager of the Leavenworth Times. He was mayor of Leavenworth from 1903 to 1905, and in 1907 he succeeded to the seat in the House of the late Vice President, Charls C. Curtis, upon the latter's election to the Senate.

From the start of his congressional career he specialized in legislation relating to the Army. He was placed on the Committee on Military Affairs and in

time became the ranking Republican member.

During the World War he gave intense study to his work on this committee. Recognizing the personal magnetism and natural leadership of the then former President Theodore Roosevelt, he introduced a bill to permit the latter to raise a division of volunteers to serve in France. The bill passed both Houses of Congress but was vetoed by President Wilson.

After the war Mr. Anthony devoted much time to the study of our Military Establishment and how best to reduce it to a peacetime basis with the least dislocation to efficiency and morale. The National Defense Act of 1920 was written by him and piloted through the House under his guidance.

He always took a leading interest in the military post located near his home city of Leavenworth, Kans. As a result of legislation and appropriations which he was largely influential in having passed through the House, Fort Leavenworth has become one of the most important Army posts in the country.

His transfer to the Appropriations Committee and his assignment to the subcommittee in charge of the War Department bill was in recognition of his preeminence in the field of military legislation.

Upon the death of Chairman Madden, Mr. Anthony was in line for the chairmanship. At that time, however, he was in Arizona for the benefit of his health. He had already declined to run for reelection, after having served for 11 consecutive terms.

Faced with the question of whether to stay in Arizona and be absent from the last session of his career in Congress, or whether to accept the chairmanship of the committee and thereby attain his ambition of many years, Mr. Anthony chose the latter. He left his sickbed in Arizona shortly before the Congress convened in December of 1929, and saw the job through until the end of the session. He was one of the strong leaders of his party in the House, and there are many in this body today who recall with me his many noble and lovable personal attributes.

He did not long survive his retirement from Congress. A summons which could not be deferred called him on August 4, 1931, from a life distinguished by long and honorable service.

Leavenworth, Kans., the place where Mr. Anthony was born and lived and died, holds a high place in my affection for the reason it was my own home for a substantial period of my early youth. It is the well-spring of some of my fondest recollections. It was there I graduated from high school—the same school from which some years later, "Dan" Anthony stepped forth for the rendezvous with life. It is undoubtedly the only high school in the country which numbers among its alumni two chairmen of the Appropriations Committee of the National House of Representatives.

For many years he and I had adjoining rooms in the old House Office Building and he seemed almost as dear to me as a brother. He was a noble character.

WILLIAM ROBERT WOOD

William Robert Wood, Indiana. Born, Oxford, Ind., January 5, 1861; died, New York City, March 7, 1933. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Seventy-first Congress, 1929–31.

Mr. Wood was the son of a harnessmaker, and at the age of 14 began learning the trade in his father's shop. This soon proved, however, to be at variance with his star of destiny and he turned his attention to preparation for the law. He graduated from the University of Michigan Law School at the age of 21, and immediately began practice in Lafayette, Ind., which he maintained as his residence until his death. At the age of 29 he was elected prosecuting attorney of the judicial circuit in which he resided, serving in that office with such distinction and credit that, near the end of his term, he came within 5 ballots of receiving the nomination for Congress by the convention of his party. Although destined to serve in that body, it was not to be for another 21 years. During that time he served in the State senate for 18 consecutive years, during 8 of which he was the president pro tempore.

It was in 1915 that Mr. Wood first entered Congress, serving from that time until March 4, 1933, retiring from the House only 3 days before his death. In the Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, he became a member of the Appropriations Committee, being assigned to the lowest-ranking minority post on the District of Columbia Subcommittee, verily the foot of the class. He served with great distinction as a member of the committee until his final retirement from Congress, and during the Seventy-first Congress—1929–31—he occupied the post of chairman.

Familiarly known by his associates as "Will" Wood, his great abilities were recognized by all; and, although a strong partisan and a lover of a rousing good fight, he occupied a very strong place in the affections of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He was of the "Uncle Joe" Cannon school of statesmen, one of the last of that type to serve in the House.

JOSEPH WELLINGTON BYRNS

Joseph Wellington Byrns, Tennessee. Born near Cedar Hill, Tenn., July 20, 1869; died, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1936. Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Seventy-second Congress, 1931–33.

Mr. Byrns completed his law course and was admitted to the bar at the age of 21, entering the practice of law in Nashville, which remained his home. At the age of 26 he was elected to the State house of representatives where he served three terms, being speaker of that body in his final term. He then served a term in the State senate.

He was elected to the National House of Representatives for the Sixty-first Congress, where he served continuously until his death, 1909–36. At the time of his passing, but one other Member of the House had to his credit a longer continuous service. At the beginning of his second term in the House, he was assigned to the Appropriations Committee, where he served continuously for 22 years, being the ranking minority member for 12 years, from 1919 to 1931. Upon the passing of the control of the House to the Democratic Party, Mr. Byrns was chairman of the committee during the Seventy-second Congress, 1931–33. He then left the committee for one term as the majority leader, followed by his accession to the Speakership in the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The years in which Mr. Byrns occupied the several exalted stations to which he had ascended after long and arduous service are too close for those of us in the House today to assess their true value with any proper degree of accuracy. History and the generations yet to come will undoubtedly assign him a place among the very highest of those who have served their country in the halls of Congress since the birth of the Republic. But for ourselves, even after the lapse of 5 years, we are still so overwhelmed by the suddenness of his taking away that we can think of little else than the irretrievable loss of a true and faithful friend whose personal qualities were beyond definition.

Immediately following his passing, there followed such a flood of eulogy and tribute from a large part of the Membership of the House as has seldom heretofore been equaled. All recognized that a great statesman and leader had passed from among us, but the eulogies to "Joe" Byrns, with which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for a year following his death is replete, were the outpourings of the grief-stricken hearts of men who were bereft of a great friend.

It is fitting to glean from the words of his successor, a few of the lovable and noble personal attributes ascribed to Mr. Byrns by the late Speaker Bankhead:

> Dignity, grace, unfailing patience, and generosity all marked his service in the House and in the Speaker's chair. He was without vanity—without littleness. He was humble and contrite in heart.

He and I and 84 other Members, entered Congress together on March 4, 1909; and for several years prior to his death, he and I were the only remaining Members of that class of 1909.

I have never known a Member who was more sincerely loved by every Member of the House during his long career.

JAMES PAUL BUCHANAN

James Paul Buchanan, Texas. Born, Midway, S. C., April 30, 1867; died, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1937; Chairman, Appropriations Committee, Seventy-third to Seventy-fifth Congress, 1933–37.

In the year of his birth he emigrated, with his parents, to Texas. His father had suffered the loss of his wealth as a result of the Civil War, so that as a boy young Buchanan was forced to help pick cotton in the fields.

Later he resumed his education, receiving a law degree. He served successively as justice of the peace, county prosecuting attorney, prosecuting attorney of the twenty-first judicial district, member of the State house of representatives, and was elected to the Sixty-third Congress, where he served continuously until his death—1913–37.

Very early in his congressional service he was assigned to the Appropriations Committee. His primary interest was that of agriculture, and he served on the subcommittee handling the Agriculture Department appropriation bill from the time that bill was returned to the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee until he became chairman of the full committee. For 2 years preceding the latter event he had been the chairman of the agriculture subcommittee.

While a minority member of the subcommittee referred to, he became impressed with the reports of the soil scientists in the Department, pointing out the staggering annual losses of topsoil through erosion, and was responsible for having inserted in the appropriation bill the initial fund for soil-erosion studies. This appropriation was continued from year to year, and the present far-reaching national program of soil conservation is a direct outgrowth of the soil-erosion investigations first provided for by Mr. Buchanan. Not many know of this achievement, but those engaged in the soil-conservation work speak of him affectionately as the "father of soil conservation."

Although agriculture was his chief interest, he evidenced from the beginning a very keen interest in the operation of the entire Government establishment His long years of service as a member of the deficiency subcommittee afforded him the opportunity to acquaint himself thoroughly with all branches of the service. This knowledge was invaluable to him when he became chairman of the full committee.

He was a thoroughgoing economist and upheld the tradition that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is the "watchdog of the Treasury."

Subsequently to Mr. Buchanan's passing the Dallas Times Herald, under date of February 23, 1937, said of him that:

> His greatest pride was in the final approval several years ago of the Colorado River Basin development program.

Largely through the efforts of Mr. Buchanan, the legislature of the State of Texas established the Lower Colorado River Authority. He was also instrumental in obtaining the necessary allotments from the Public Works Administration for the development of the project.

This undertaking consists of a series of four dams. The uppermost of these, which is said to be the longest masonry dam in the world, and the resulting lake, covering 23,000 acres, have been named the Buchanan Dam and the Buchanan Lake, respectively, in honor of its original sponsor.

The series of dams will be useful for flood control, irrigation, power, domestic water supply, and recreation. The estimated total cost, including the vast network of transmission and distribution systems, is $60,000,000. Flood damages, affecting many hundreds of thousands of people, which will be largely abated as a result of the building of these dams, have heretofore inflicted an average annual loss of $4,000,000.

The ultimate power capacity is 127,000 kilovolt-amperes. Already, 69 Texas cities and communities throughout a region about twice the size of the State of Massachusetts are being served with electric energy generated and distributed by the Authority, at reductions, since the Authority began operations on September 1, 1939, of 37 percent in residential rates and 20 percent in commercial rates.

While some may be disposed to minimize the value of recreational facilities and to criticize the expenditure of public funds for their creation, the very fact that hundreds of thousands of people from all over the State of Texas, as well as from outside its borders, have traveled from hundreds of miles away in order to enjoy the boating and fishing which would not otherwise be available to them, reflects, in my mind, untold human values immeasurable in dollars and cents.

While the Buchanan Dam will always be a worthy and appropriate monument to the late chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a far more enduring and imperishable memorial is that of the pride and appreciation which will ever dwell within the hearts of Texans for generations to come for the invaluable benefits which will flow perennially from the lower Colorado River Authority, sponsored by this distinguished son of that great State.

Like his predecessor in the chair, the late Speaker Byrns, Mr. Buchanan died, as was his wish, in harness. In his seventieth year, at the end of 40 years of public service, 24 years of which were in Congress, he was gathered to his fathers. One of his colleagues, the Honorable LUTHER A. JOHNSON, said of him afterward:

> He was a man of strong convictions, candid and courageous. He was genuine. Sham and hypocrisy were no part of his nature and there was nothing artificial about him. He was scrupulously honest, his word was his bond, and was true at all times to every trust confided to him.

In other words, he kept the faith, as did all his predecessors.

PORTRAITS OF THE CHAIRMEN

For the permanent preservation and official recognition of the oil and crayon portraits, photographs, and engravings of the chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, and to give them an official status in the United States Capitol Building, the Joint Committee on the Library, on November 18, 1940, passed the following:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Resolved, That under the authority of section 1831 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (17 Stat. 362), the 20 oil and crayon portraits and photographs and engravings of the following chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, presented to the committee as gifts, are hereby accepted on behalf of Congress by the Joint Committee on the Library and shall hang in the rooms of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in the United States Capitol:

Elihu B. Washburne, Illinois; Henry L. Dawes, Massachusetts; James A. Garfield, Ohio; Samuel J. Randall, Pennsylvania; William S. Holman, Indiana; John DeW. C. Atkins, Tennessee; Frank Hiscock, New York; Joseph G. Cannon, Illinois; Joseph D. Sayers, Texas; James A. Hemenway, Indiana; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; John J. Fitzgerald, New York; J. Swagar Sherley, Kentucky; James W. Good, Iowa; Martin B. Madden, Illinois; Daniel R. Anthony, Kansas; William R. Wood, Indiana; Joseph W. Byrns, Tennessee; James P. Buchanan, Texas; Edward T. Taylor, Colorado.

Adopted November 18, 1940.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Library.

IV. PERPETUATING THE TRADITIONS OF THE REPUBLIC

The chairmen of the Appropriations Committee comprising this long list of illustrious men, together with those who served under them as members, have faithfully kept and transmitted all the worthy traditions which have grown out of the exercise of this most important prerogative of the House, that of the initial preparation of the appropriation bills. In such fashion are all the sacred traditions of the Republic perpetuated and transmitted unsullied from generation to generation.

It is now 167 years, a century and two-thirds, since the Continental Congress first met in the year 1774. And yet, measured in terms of the number of generations which have served in Congress from that early beginning down to the present day, the Continental Congress is only a few yesterdays in the past.

If I may be permitted to speak of myself, the overlapping services of but four other men, in addition to my own, constitute a living chain which joins those early colonial days of the Continental Congress with those of the Seventy-seventh Congress of the year 1941.

When I first came to the House, in 1909, "Uncle Joe" Cannon was the Speaker, with 14 years still remaining to him of his long and honored career. When "Uncle Joe" first entered Congress, in 1873, Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, was a Member of the House, and continued as such until 1882. Stephens first entered upon his service in the House in 1843. Henry Clay was not in Congress at that particular moment, but he had been, and in 1849 he reentered Congress as a Member of the Senate, where he served until his death, in 1852. So that Clay and Stephens were contemporaries during a period of 3 years. Clay first entered Congress in 1806 as a Member of the Senate, where Abraham Baldwin was sitting as a Senator from the State of Georgia. Baldwin was a Member of the Continental Congress. He participated in that body's action in calling the Constitutional Convention, and was himself a delegate to the Convention and one of the signers of the Constitution.

Thus has the torch of free government, lighted in those early colonial days, passed through the hands of but five men, from the days of the Continental Congress down to the present time—from Baldwin to Clay, from Clay to Stephens, from Stephens to Cannon, and from Cannon to him who now addresses you—five men whose overlapping services form an unbroken span from the prenatal period of the Republic down to the present moment.

It is the exalted duty of each generation as it enters the halls of this great

body to receive the priceless treasure of free government from the hands of the generation passing off the scene, to guard it zealously and faithfully and, leaving the scene, to transmit it, unsullied and unharmed, to the new generation coming on.

I see before me the youngest Member of this House, Mr. WILLIAM G. STRATTON, the gentleman from the great State of Illinois, the third largest State of our Union in population and the State that has furnished two Presidents of the United States, Lincoln and Grant; two Speakers, Cannon and Rainey; and three former chairmen of this committee, and the State in which I was born and spent my early childhood days.

With his permission, I shall indulge in a bit of symbolism, which I am fain to believe will be helpful in inspiring every Member of the House with a realization of our sacred duty to the past and our solemn obligation to the future. I wish to use my young friend as the symbol of the oncoming generation while I shall stand for the generation of older Members which must, sooner or later, answer the last roll call and join the congress of the hereafter.

In fancy, I have just woven a chain of five living links, connecting the days of our national genesis with those of the present. In that chain, I have taken the liberty to include myself. Others could weave a similar chain, using other names. But, after all, it is naught but a symbol. And, continuing the symbol which I have begun, let us think of Abraham Baldwin, of Georgia, Member of the Continental Congress and signer of the Constitution, as having caught up and lighted the torch of free government and passed it on to Clay. Clay, the most eloquent and popular man of his time, threw the torch to Stephens, and Stephens placed it, undimmed, in the hands of Uncle Joe Cannon, who, in turn, entrusted it to me.

To you, my young friend, as the representative of a new generation, I pass it on. "Be yours to hold it high." Dark days lie ahead, days which may try men's souls and cause them to wonder whether free government can survive. But, however the darkness may deepen over the face of the earth, I charge you and your comrades to keep the blaze of this torch burning with undimmed radiance and never to let it fall to the ground, that it may continue, in the future as it has ever been in the past, the beacon of hope to all mankind.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE LOYAL COOPERATION OF MY FELLOW-COMMITTEE MEMBERS

As the successor to the 20 great Americans who preceded me in the chairmanship, I want to first express to all of the members of the committee my sincere gratitude and appreciation of their uniformly kind and very considerate treatment. I would not otherwise have been at all able to carry the multitude of burdens that are necessarily heaped upon the chairman.

Having in mind the sad memory of the tragic break-down and untimely deaths of five or six former chairmen by their overwork on this committee, and being the dean of the House in age and the oldest man ever to attain this position, I determined at the outset to assign most of the detail hard work to the younger Members, and I have done so during the past 4½ years. Otherwise I would not be here today. But the chairman must always be captain of the ship; he is the responsible head of the committee. He must retain the control and personally see that all the subcommittees work harmoniously and that the annual appropriations for the various departments and all the hundreds or more bureaus, commissions, boards, and countless other activities of the Government are duly considered and move along in a systematic, orderly, and expeditious way. I am this year, for the first time, making a monthly report to Congress and to the country of all the appropriations and authorizations of expenditures and the fiscal condition of the Government.

Fortunately, the younger Members have not only been perfectly willing to carry the arduous and tedious burdens but they have done so better than I could have done, and I am most grateful to them. They have rendered a great service to the committee, to the House, and to the country.

During the past few years the Appropriations Committee has had a very much wider range of requirements and far more arduous responsibilities and larger appropriations than ever before in the history of our country. I have tried not to lower the standard or surrender any of the prerogatives of this very great and responsible position. Whether or not I have measured up to the average of my predecessors I necessarily leave to others to determine. I hope my nearly 60 years of official public service may be of lasting benefit to our glorious country—the hope of civilization on this planet—to the reclamation and conservation of the West, and to the development of my beloved centennial State. I trust this tribute to my distinguished predecessors may be worthy of preservation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this, my eighty-third birthday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the history of a nation is the history of its great men. Chairman TAYLOR has just rendered a distinct service to history by making available the salient events in the biographies of the 20 men who have preceded him in his distinguished office. From Thaddeus Stevens, who resigned the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means to accept the chairmanship of the newly created Committee on Appropriations, each of them has written a notable chapter in the history of the American Commonwealth. But the record would not be complete without a chronicle of some of the more important events of his own career.

I therefore include as a brief résumé of his life his official biography from the current number of the Congressional Directory:

EDWARD THOMAS TAYLOR, Democrat, of Glenwood Springs, was born on a farm in Woodford County, Ill., June 19, 1858; son of Henry R. and Anna (Evans) Taylor, spent his early life on farm in Illinois and cattle ranch in northwestern Kansas; graduated from Leavenworth (Kans.) High School in 1881; moved to Leadville, Colo., and during the school year of 1881–82 was the first principal of the first high school in Leadville; that fall entered the law department of the University of Michigan; was president of his class and graduated in 1884, receiving the degree of LL. B.; returned to Leadville and began the practice of law; in the fall of 1884 was elected county superintendent of schools of that (Lake) county; in 1885–86 was deputy district attorney; in 1887 moved to Glenwood Springs, where he has ever since resided; was elected district attorney of northwestern Colorado, 1887–89 and during that time he also adjudicated and established the irrigation water rights of a large part of northwestern Colorado; he served 2 terms as county attorney and 5 terms as city attorney of his home county and town; in 1896 was elected State senator and reelected in 1900 and 1904; was president pro tempore of the Senate 1 term, and was the sole author of 40 general statutes and 5 constitutional amendments, by which the annual State election system was changed to the present biennial election system, the supreme court was increased from 3 to 7 members and their term of office increased from 9 to 10 years, the court of appeals was abolished, and the term of office of al. district attorneys, county judges, and county commissioners was extended from 3 to 4 years; he is the author of over a hundred Federal laws, two of the most important of which are the Taylor Grazing Act, and the 640-acre stock-raising homestead law, by which 32 million acres of nearly barren land have gone into private ownership and beneficial use, two of the greatest conservation laws ever enacted; he is a Scottish Rite Mason, a Mystic Shriner, and an Elk; in 1892 was married to Mrs. Durfee, formerly Miss Etta Taber, of Council Bluffs, Iowa; has three children—Edward T., Jr., and Joseph E., both practicing attorneys, and Mrs. Irving M. Baker; was chairman of Democratic caucus during the Seventy-fourth Congress and acting majority leader of the House during the year 1935; received the honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL. D.) from both the University of Colorado and the Western State College of Colorado; has been elected to Congress 17 successive times (1909–43), the Sixty-first to Seventy-seventh Congresses, inclusive; he has achieved several official distinctions, none of which has ever been duplicated by anyone else during our congressional history: *First*, his successive elections to the State senate 12 years and to Congress 34 years, January 1897 to January 1943, consecutive service, 6 years as Congressman at Large and 28 years from the Fourth District; *second*, besides holding many appointive positions, he has run for office at 22 general elections and has never had any opposition for any nomination and has never been defeated; *third*, all of his congressional service has been after he was 50 years of age; no one else has ever been so honored, in fact, of the about 8,300 Members of the House of Representatives since the first session of the First Congress on March 4, 1789, only 4 others have ever been elected 17 successive times—Bingham, of Pennsylvania, Pou, of North Carolina, Haugen, of Iowa, and Sabath of Illinois; all of whom entered Congress much younger, and only Haugen had 4 years' prior service in his State legisuature; *fourth*, he has been the author of more State laws and constitutional amendments and Federal laws combined than anyone else; *fifth*, he is dean of the House in age and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

And as an indication of the regard in which he is held in his own beloved State of Colorado, I append an address de-

livered this month by his colleague and friend, Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS:

TELLER AND TAYLOR—DECEMBER 4, 1876, TO JUNE 4, 1941

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the Territory of Colorado was admitted into the Union as a State on the 1st day of August 1876. The State elected a legislature that fall, and on November 14, 1876, that legislature elected our first two United States Senators—Henry M. Teller, for whom Teller County was named; and Jerome B. Chaffee, for whom Chaffee County was named. The legislature elected Teller for both a short and a long term, and Chaffee for the short term which ended March 3, 1879. Congress that year met on December 4, 1876. Both of those men were sworn in and officially took their seats at that time.

After the death of President Garfield on September 19, 1881, Vice President Arthur became President, and on April 17, 1882, he appointed Senator Teller as Secretary of the Interior. Senator Teller then resigned from the Senate, took that appointment, and served as Secretary of the Interior until the end of that Presidential term, March 4, 1885. He had then been again elected to the United States Senate and resumed his seat in that body on March 4, 1885, and served until March 4, 1909, when he voluntarily retired to private life.

At the Presidential election of 1908, EDWARD T. TAYLOR was elected Congressman at Large for Colorado and took his seat in the House on March 4, 1909, the day Senator Teller retired from the Senate. He served 6 years as Congressman at Large and, notwithstanding the vicissitudes of politics in Colorado, he has served ever since as the Representative from the Fourth District of Colorado.

Senator Teller's total official service in Washington from our State was 32 years and 8 months. On the 4th day of June this year, Mr. TAYLOR has served in the House 32 years and 3 months. That makes a record of two equal immediately successive services totaling 64 years and 6 months, extending from the year in which our Centennial State was born to this hour.

Teller was Colorado's grand old man—TAYLOR is Colorado's grand old man. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that long before he came to Congress, Chairman TAYLOR had distinguished himself in his home and State. He had graduated with honor from the great law school of the University of Michigan, serving as president of his class. It is interesting to note that while working under Judge Cooley, the eminent teacher and jurist, he proofread that famous work, so familiar to all lawyers, Cooley's last edition of Blackstone, one of the landmarks in English jurisprudence.

It was shortly after his return to Colorado for the practice of the law that he began his remarkable political career, serving for 12 years in the Colorado Senate, the latter years of that time as speaker pro tempore. Although he has been a militant member of the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Roosevelt from his youth up, he has been so ardently supported by members of all parties without regard to political affiliation, that he has a record of unbroken victories in every election, State and national.

It was but a step from the State senate to the National House of Representatives, and notwithstanding the fact that the State of Colorado has been perhaps the most variable State politically in the Union, Mr. TAYLOR has been 17 times elected from a district traditionally Republican. Throughout the campaign of 1940 he remained at his post of duty in the Nation's capital, and, although Colorado went overwhelmingly Republican on both State and national tickets he was reelected by nearly 15,000 majority.

During his 12 years of service as State Senator, he was the author of more than 40 statutes, including 5 constitutional amendments adopted by popular vote of the people. Since his election to the House of Representatives, he has sponsored more than 100 enactments, a total number of laws said to be the largest number of major enactments procured by any one legislator.

Here in the House, ED. TAYLOR, as he is affectionately known, has been favored with every honor within the gift of his colleagues. He has served as chairman of the Democratic caucus. He served as majority leader in the Seventy-fourth Congress. And he has presided as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the largest committee of either House or Senate, through three Congresses. In this connection it should be noted that under his chairmanship in this Congress more than $30,000,000,000 in appropriations have passed over his desk, the largest amount ever appropriated in a similar period by this or any other Nation in the history of the world.

While as chairman he has served the Nation as a whole with unflagging zeal and devotion, he is credited with having rendered a particularly valuable service to that vast expanse of country known as the great West.

In keeping with this service to the West is his title of "Father of Western Water Legislation," which was conferred on him early in his career through his adjudication and establishment of water rights in a large part of western Colorado in 1887 and 1889. So ably has he supplemented this important work in his congressional career that the National Reclamation Association, 50 years later—in 1939—presented him with a parchment scroll signed by the conservation representatives of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington, expressing profound gratitude and appreciation for his invaluable contribution to their welfare and progress of these and their sister States as follows:

Worthy son of western America in the pioneer days; sturdy builder among the strong men who founded the State of Colorado; educated in the law; diligent in all the duties of citizenship; interested through the earlier years in the lawmaking of the new Centennial State; father of the statute creating the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado; public servant in legislative halls at home and in the Capitol of the Nation for half a century of time; constant supporter of reclamation as a vitalizing national policy; author of the Taylor Grazing Act; on and on, up to the great chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; never turning away from the best in government through a long and useful life; patient and tireless in all the work he has undertaken; unfaltering in courage to uphold every conviction; wise as a counselor, supporting whatsoever is good, right, and just in public life. This salutation from a multitude of friends who live in fifteen States is presented in grateful appreciation—a personal tribute to EDWARD T. TAYLOR, a true friend of the Great West.

One of the laws typical of the many contributed by Chairman TAYLOR to the upbuilding and prosperity of the West is the celebrated Taylor Grazing Act, which ended forever the bitter and bloody vendetta between contending sheep and cattlemen, which had challenged law and order throughout the range country for more than 75 years. It provided for Federal regulation of the public domain and became immediately a major force in national conservation, affecting the economic well-being of this western empire. It not only brought peace, order, and security to a vast industry but it protected from destructive erosion millions of acres of the public domain, and is known as the Magna Carta of the conservation of the West.

Time does not permit a full discussion of the many notable accomplishments and services of this useful servant of the people, but in closing, permit me to quote the following two paragraphs from a birthday greeting presented to him today, signed by Newton B. Drury, the Director of the National Park Service, all the Park Service officials in Washington, and the superintendents and rangers and other officials in the field to the number of 164 names:

On this date, June nineteenth, nineteen hundred and forty-one, the eighty-third birthday of EDWARD THOMAS TAYLOR, Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fourth District of Colorado, we, the undersigned employees of the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, do hereby extend to him our sincere congratulations on his unequalled record as a servant of his people, our warmest good wishes for continued success and longer life, and our deep appreciation of his strong support of the policies and high concepts of the proper uses of land and resources on which the National Park Service is founded.

During his years in the Congress, EDWARD THOMAS TAYLOR has maintained an active interest in the affairs of the National Park Service since its establishment in nineteen hundred and sixteen and has, through sound judgment and high regard for the policies of that organization, made inestimable contributions to its program for the preservation of superlative natural and historic areas for the enjoyment of all the people.

Since becoming chairman he has been presented with nearly a hundred beautiful and artistic gavels, tokens of good will from nearly everywhere under the American Flag. It would require a small volume to describe them adequately. They all represent and are emblematic of something historic or the activities of some department, bureau, or development or worth-while activity. They all have a real meaning or signification of something commendable. They are a very unique and wonderful collection and reflection a widespread esteem and affection of which anyone would be supremely proud.

Colorado is by geological survey the highest State in the Union. The highest part of the main range of the Rocky Mountains runs north and south through the central part of the State in his Congressional District; he claims the distinction of representing "The Top of the World" in Congress, and proudly told the House that the sun sets reluctantly every evening as it bids goodnight to that sublimely gorgeous 300-mile chain of glistening snow-capped peaks across his Congressional District in the glorious "Centennial State"—"The Summer Play Ground of the Nation."

The History of Colorado published in 1926 gives a 10-page enumeration of his official accomplishments up to that time. During the past 15 years he has rendered probably not more in number, but more really great services to the country than he did during the prior nearly 45 years of his marvelously useful public career. His really greatest national accomplishments that will be of incalculable benefit to countless millions for generations to come, are his constant, persistent, and wonderfully effective work for the past third of a century in Congress in behalf of the reclamation, conservation, and development of the West. His whole life for 60 years has been devoted to public service. Mr. TAYLOR has predicted that Uncle Joe Cannon's career will not be equaled during the next hundred and fifty years. His own State and congressional career has never been equaled and I confidently predict it will not be during the next hundred and fifty years; and further that his name will go down in history as one of the great upbuilders and benefactors of the West.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 239.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript containing a history of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, its genesis and functions, together with biographical sketches of the chairmen who have guided its deliberations, be printed as a House document; and that twenty-five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken this morning on the distinguished services of Chairman TAYLOR may have permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS (H. DOC. NO. 282)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the administration of the navigation and vessel inspection laws it has been found that the free movement of water-borne commerce is being hampered because of the restrictive provisions of some of these laws. They are in general designed to promote safety at sea and to regulate water-borne commerce. Their structure is such that they are, and should be, strictly enforced during normal times. During this emergency, however, the priority of national security and national defense must be recognized.

It is impossible to foretell what emergency may arise from day to day and to what extent the navigation or vessel inspection laws may have to be waived to meet the situation. I am convinced, after consultation with the heads of interested departments and agencies of the Government, that it is vital to the national defense that a statutory authority should be provided to waive compliance with any of those laws if need should arise. This authority should be sufficiently broad in its scope to allow the waiver to be made promptly to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as may be deemed necessary for the national defense. The Secretary of Commerce now administers these laws, and I believe that he should be vested with this further authority to waive compliance with them upon direction of the President, or upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the United States Maritime Commission, or the Office for Emergency Management.

I attach as of possible assistance to the Congress a draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 17, 1941.*

ACQUISITION AND EQUIPMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS MADE NECESSARY BY THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments,

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "useful or."

Page 2, line 10, after "life," insert "substantially expanded by the national-defense program."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "works for the treatment and purification of water."

Page 2, line 13, after "facilities," where it appears the second time, insert "works for the treatment and purification of water."

Page 2, line 22, after "needed," insert "or could not be provided without the imposition of an increased excessive tax burden or an unusual or excessive increase in the debt limit of the taxing or borrowing authority in which such shortage exists,".

Page 3, line 1, after "General," insert "if necessary."

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, after "General" insert "if necessary."

Page 4, strike out line 5.

Page 4, line 6, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 4, line 11, after "interest," insert "As used in this paragraph, the term 'private agency' means any private agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Page 5, line 2, strike out "title." and insert "title;".

Page 5, after line 2, insert:

"'(4) public works shall be provided on the basis of need and in determining need no discrimination shall be made on account of race, creed, or color."

Page 6, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 301. When the President shall have declared that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist (a) the authority contained in sections 1 and 202 hereof shall terminate except with respect to contracts on projects previously entered into or undertaken and court proceedings then pending, and (b) property acquired or constructed under this act (including schools and hospitals) shall be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest.'"

Page 6, line 6, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "(b)."

Page 6, line 6, strike out "4."

Page 6, line 8, strike out "'301.'"

Page 6, line 11, strike out all after "States." down to and including "hereof'.", in line 14.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so with a great deal of reluctance, for I have been greatly interested in this bill, but there is one provision which I think will fail to accomplish the purposes of the bill, and I shall be constrained to object.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the the gentleman reserve his objection for just a moment?

Mr. BLAND. I shall be delighted to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for the information of the House that this is the bill that has to do with public works, usually called community facilities, in congested national-defense areas.

I am familiar with the purposes the gentleman has in mind with reference to the one amendment to which he refers, and that is Senate amendment No. 10, on page 4, which reads as follows:

As used in this paragraph, the term "private agency" means any private agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

My understanding of the situation to which the gentleman from Virginia refers is that with reference to one or two hospitals in the State of Virginia, and perhaps some in other States, to which additions can be made that would obviate the necessity of building new hospitals in those areas. There is a possibility that they could qualify under the terms of this amendment because it is a very difficult matter to find today any hospital of any considerable size which is blessed with

net earnings; otherwise, I know of no controversy or dissension with reference to this measure. It has not been changed in its substantial terms and provisions by the Senate amendments. If my friend from Virginia insists upon his objection, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. HOLMES. Is it not true that in our consideration of this legislation there was some question in mind whether or not we made an error in the original bill in not incorporating the same language that the Senate has inserted, for the simple reason that where you utilize private agencies in connection with defense areas and where there are no public hospitals this bill will allow money to be appropriated or allotted to build additions to help out the community through these private institutions?

I do not know of any of them that have made, or are now making, any money. I do not know of any that have investors who are getting any profit. They usually represent a contribution on the part of public-spirited citizens of the community in furnishing hospital facilities and the question of profit does not enter into the proposition; and under this legislation the Government is given an opportunity, in a community which may have a medium-sized or small hospital, to make such necessary additions to that institution or provide it with funds necessary to take care of defense needs and at the same time leave the operation of the hospital to the management and the personnel to be operated under the same conditions under which it is serving the community at the present time.

I may say that after some time spent in deliberation of these amendments in our committee yesterday we were unanimous in our action. There was not a dissenting vote, and we went over the amendments very carefully. We all agreed unanimously to report out this legislation and to ask unanimous consent that it might be enacted into law today because there is a crying need today for these improvements. People are clamoring for help and assistance, not only in the way of hospitals, schools, and road facilities, but also sewage and purification plants and water systems. Thousands and thousands of people are being dumped into these areas where they have no such facilities now. This is an urgent matter, and I am sorry that the gentleman from Virginia is going to object to the consideration of this measure because I have been in the gentleman's district myself. I have been all through the Hampton Roads area with the distinguished chairman and other members of our committee, and it was largely on account of the conditions we found in Hampton Roads that our committee was so unanimous in recommending this legislation, and I am sorry this is happening here today.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. I have been interested in this legislation. I understand the bill now is about the same as when it passed the House. However, I am wondering, in view of what the gentleman said a moment ago about providing for the construction of hospitals, schools, sewage facilities, water treatment, and so forth, whether under the provisions of the bill the administrator may also make an appropriation or a grant to a community to purchase fire-fighting facilities to fight fires in defense plants.

Mr. LANHAM. That matter was brought up when the bill was before the House originally, and in the debate it was stated that that would be included, and I recall that the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, who used to serve in this body, and was a member of this very committee, recommended the inclusion of the word "equipment" to cover that very point, and that word was inserted in the bill.

Mr. BEITER. Of course, in the city of New York there is a paid fire department. I am referring more particularly to small volunteer fire companies in the outlying districts, where probably a little fire district has been created. They have a little motor truck or some kind of equipment, and it will be necessary to purchase larger engines, because these are huge plants that are being erected, and the small fire truck they now have would not be large enough to combat any catastrophe that might occur at these larger plants.

Mr. LANHAM. The enumeration of facilities in this bill is not exclusive, and it is contemplated that whatever may be needed from the standpoint of safety or health or education in these various congested areas will be afforded. Mayor LaGuardia appeared as chairman of the council of mayors and not with particular reference to New York.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. EATON. I wonder if the gentleman has anything to tell us about access roads.

Mr. LANHAM. I think I can inform the distinguished gentleman in that regard. The access roads provided for in this particular bill refer to the roads which will get the workers from their places of residence to their places of employment. For instance, a great many defense-housing projects have been constructed under this measure. Some of those are quite near the plants where the men labor, but there are no access roads by which they may reach the places of employment. There is pending before the Committee on Public Roads a measure with reference to general strategic access roads. The provision in this bill has to do rather with those workers living in proximity to their plants but who have no suitable opportunity to reach the plants and these would not be access roads of very great length.

Mr. EATON. May I state a single instance and ask the gentleman's opinion how far the bill goes in that direction? Picatinny Arsenal is in Morris County, in my district. They are employing there some 8,000 men, and this number will certainly increase. There is one highway approaching that plant which is located 5 miles from the city of Dover. It takes the workers over 1 hour going and 1 hour coming from that congested area in and near Dover. This one roadway is dangerous for the entire distance, and unless something is done soon, something serious may result. This access road is as much a part of the arsenal as the arsenal itself, because the arsenal would not be of any use unless the workers could get there safely and in a reasonable time. I am anxious to know whether in this particular bill there is any chance for improvement in this serious situation.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that with reference to the case he has cited and to other places in the country that have a similar situation, that is the very purpose of having the provision for access roads. It is so that these men may be able to get to the places where they are employed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan and Mr. GREEN rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels he should call for the regular order. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object, but in view of the castigation which I received from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], I would like the opportunity of explaining my position in a little detail. I am not able to follow the distinguished gentleman and the other men for whom I have the profoundest admiration. I ask unanimous consent on that reservation of objection, if necessary, that I may proceed for not more than 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman in his reservation of the right to object and he may proceed.

Mr. BLAND. I have no desire to object, if I could rely upon the interpretation given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. I might then be willing to forego my objection, but I have heard interpretations made on this floor, and afterward I have seen the bills go to the departments and have seen constructions entirely at variance with the statements made here on the floor. The language can be clarified. I do not base my objection entirely upon that amendment. I wish to study any other amendment, but that is the primary objection.

I will give one instance. What the gentleman says about my city is true. It is terribly congested. We have there a Negro hospital, owned by a Negro, and they need an addition to that to meet congestion due to defense. We have white hospitals similarly situated that are owned by individuals. I am not asking for a dollar for the doctors, but I am asking for facilities to take care of the health of the community that would be endangered by reason of the congestion that has come in.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I make this suggestion to my good friend from Virginia, for whom I have the most affectionate regard, that in view of the urgent necessity for this legislation with reference to many of its features, schools in particular, because they must be constructed in time for the fall session, that at this time he withdraw his objection and then if the interpretation given to the particular amendment he has in mind is not, after consultation with the authorities, what it is assumed to be, then an amendment could be offered to the act in that regard which would not in any way delay the other facilities to be supplied in these congested areas over the country.

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could do so, but I would rather have written into law the interpretation that is going to be given to it. Therefore I must object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, and Mr. HOLMES.

COMMUNISM IN INDUSTRY

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by the distinguished columnist, Jay G. Hayden.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a letter to Gen. Russell Maxwell on the temporary oil shortage in the East.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include as a part of those remarks two short articles in the Christian Herald under the caption Shall We Feed Europe? by Hon. Herbert Hoover and Dorothy Canfield Fisher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two brief articles by W. C. McGinnis, superintendent of schools, Perth Amboy, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLANNAGAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks with reference to the work done in behalf of woman's suffrage 30 years ago by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a tribute to the flag by Mr. J. A. Hilliard, one of the leading farmers of my county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to advance my thought, I am referring specifically to the Department of the Interior appropiration bill, which will undoubtedly be considered today.

The conference report on that bill indicates that the Senate receded in 10 instances and the House receded on 89 amendments. There are in disagreement 38 amendments. The conference report and statement explain the amendments that have been agreed to. After the House has disposed of the amendments that have been agreed to en bloc we will then take up individually the amendments in disagreement. The conference report simply states that those amendments are in disagreement, but upon investigation I have determined that in many instances a majority of the conferees have already agreed that when those amendments are reached a motion will be made to recede and concur with an amendment. Naturally amendments in disagreement taking them as a whole are most important. I feel that the conferees not only on appropriation bills, but on all other bills where amendments are in disagreement and a motion is to be made to recede and concur, with an amendment that has already been agreed to by the conferees, then that motion should be printed in the conference report, so that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to intelligently examine the amendment and take such action as they deem advisable when it is reached.

I am not asking for an immediate decision but I respectfully request, if the Chair is not prepared, that he examine the present rules of the House in reference to conference committees and see if we are in position under existing rules to require conferees to publish motions they propose to make in reference to amendments that are in disagreement in the conference report. I feel that the membership of the House is entitled to such information. There are 38 amendments in disagreement to be considered today and we do not know what the compromise amendments contain nor will we know until they are submitted by the chairman in charge of the bill. I think if my suggestion is followed it would be as valuable as the Ramsayer rule proved to be.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] called this matter to the attention of the Chair earlier in the session today.

The Chair knows of no rule on this matter, except that found in rule XXVIII which reads, as follows:

> And there shall accompany every such report a detailed statement sufficiently explicit to inform the House what effect such amendments or propositions will have upon the measure to which they relate.

The Chair knows of no ruling of any Speaker or of anything in the rules or precedents of the House, that would require a conference committee to file more than what they considered to be a detailed statement of agreements made in the conference. Explanatory statements are made in the statement accompanying a conference report, but it is, so far as the Chair knows, entirely within the hands of the managers as to what they will include in the statement. The Chair cannot see how, under the rules of the House, members of a conference committee can be forced to include something in their statement that they do not want to include; and that would be the position of the Chair upon this matter at this time.

It occurs to the Chair, however, that the managers certainly under the rules would have the power to include in the statement accompanying a conference report the additional information suggested by the gentleman from Missouri in his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Chair for his interpretation of the rule which, of course, I accept without reservation. The conferees are, of course, simply agents of the House, but they should, I feel, be perfectly willing to give to the House complete information in advance of calling up a report as to just what they propose to do. That is only fair, and in the end will result in better legislation. I hope the conferees in the future will be more explicit than they have been in the past. It seems, by general cooperation, my objective could be accomplished.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. YOUNG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of war involvement and to include a poem by Cardinal John Henry Newman entitled "England," which is a prophecy of the downfall of the British Empire.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. TREADWAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today after the conclusion of the legislative program for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. HENDRICKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I hope those in this body will not be too greatly excited over the strange behavior by one who is a hero still, Mr. Charles Lindbergh, until they consider the value given to him by those who know him best. Do you see this picture? I hold in my hand on the front page of the Birmingham Post, a reputable Alabama newspaper. This is a picture of Augustus Lindbergh, of Birmingham, Ala., first cousin of Charles A. Lindbergh. Their fathers were brothers. Their grandfather was the same individual. Incidentally, Augustus Lindbergh is now the law partner of a man who previously was my law partner. Augustus Lindbergh is a capable, upright, courageous Christian gentleman, beloved by the people of Alabama. He says that Charles Augustus Lindbergh should be placed in a concentration camp. I do not go quite that far, but I shall point out a few things this first cousin said about him.

This first cousin—and I do not quote him because he is a cousin but because he knows the hero, national-affairs expert, flyer-politician—says of him:

First. He ought to be placed in a concentration camp.

Second. He is talking his isolationism through his lust for power.

Third. He should be made to shut up.

Fourth. In a democracy one should learn to subordinate his feelings to the will of the majority. I do not think my cousin is capable of that.

Our Alabama Lindbergh speaks his own feelings. He says:

This world has become too small to contain in peace two great countries with such extremely opposite philosophies as the United States and Germany—

And I may add that the Congressman from his district feels about it the same way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Shelter Belt program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter I received from Madam Perkins with respect to certain remarks in the RECORD which I made, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

MADAM PERKINS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Madam Perkins taking exception to some of the remarks I put in the RECORD. I am filing that in the RECORD and I am also filing my answer thereto. In my letter to Madam Perkins I say that in my opinion all this activity of the subversive interests in labor causing these many strikes is squarely placed on her. I again ask for her resignation and I hope those of you who are interested will read this letter because I think it is a very important matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter by Gen. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for Coordination of Defense Measures, on the neutrality of Ireland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California, Mr. WELCH?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on our national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. PIERCE?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two topics, and in one extension to include an article from W. S. Weeks, dealing with pensions in the State of Washington, and in the other extension to include a statement made by Secretary Harold Ickes to the Truman defense committee of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DIMOND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

WE SHOULD NOT GET INVOLVED IN THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything this morning but when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], gets up here and quotes what one cousin states about another I think I am justified in commenting. I do not know how many first cousins there are who take stock in what other first cousins may say. It seems to me that when some people try to get this country into war and are doing everything they can to that end—and you can call me an appeaser or not—those people ought to be shown up to the American people. As far as I am concerned, I want to keep this country out of war, and I am going to do everything I can toward that end and I do not care what any of my first cousins say about it. I do hope that any person who wants to keep us out of war should speak now or forever hereafter hold their peace. We want no war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1

minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SWEENEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial entitled "We Will Not Surrender."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5031, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered over station WWDC.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the conference report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 28, 34, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 41, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,724,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$600,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$15,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$990,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$520,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,729,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,968,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,279,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,424,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which at least $100,000 shall be available exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5 and 43.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the

action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

State Department

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,724,440 for salaries in the office of the Secretary of State, instead of $2,716,300 as provided by the House and $2,728,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Corrects an appropriation caption.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $150,000 for certain defense activities, instead of $53,000 as provided by the House and $156,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $338,500 for cost of living allowances for the foreign service, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $318,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Approves language, inserted by the Senate, reappropriating unexpended balances of funds to the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

Amendment No. 7: Action agreed upon eliminates words, as proposed by the Senate, that would have required completion of the Rio Grande canalization project under the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, within the limits of the appropriation of $440,000 therefor contained in the bill.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $6,500 for the construction of a boundary fence on Cordova Island (El Paso) Tex., as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $25,000 for fence construction on the international boundary with Mexico, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $600,300 for the program of cooperation with the American republics, instead of $545,000 as proposed by the House and $653,840 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $50,000 for expenditure on the program by the Department of Agriculture, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Within the total appropriated in amendment No. 10, provides $15,000 for expenditure on the program by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, instead of $10,000 as proposed by the House and $20,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $12,500 for expenditure on the program by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, as proposed the House, instead of $17,500 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $15,300 for expenditure by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior on the program, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $25,000 for expenditure by the Travel Bureau of the Department of Interior on the program, as provided by the Senate, instead of $20,000 proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $15,000 for expenditure by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor on the program, as provided by the House, instead of $30,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Action agreed upon eliminates an appropriation of $10,000 proposed by the Senate within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, for expenditure by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor on the program.

Amendment No. 18: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $35,000 for expenditure by the Library of Congress on the program, as proposed by the House, instead of $43,840 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10, provides $56,500 for expenditure by the Smithsonian Institution on the program, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $41,500 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Action agreed upon eliminates an appropriation of $5,000 proposed by the Senate within the total appropriation in amendment No. 10 for expenditure by the Tariff Commission on the program.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $990,000 for general administration in the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, instead of $975,000 as proposed by the House and $999,674 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Limits the amount that may be expended for purchase of airplanes to $90,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Incorporates in the bill language inserted by the Senate making the appropriation for maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities available for purchase, operation, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of aircraft power plants, propellers, etc.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $11,400,000 for maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, instead of $14,000,000 as proposed by the House and $14,486,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $520,000 for technical development under the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $525,752 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $2,740,000 for enforcement of safety regulations, office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, instead of $2,712,000 as proposed by the House and $2,750,360 provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $6,450,000 for the establishment of air-navigation facilities, office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,700,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $290,000 for the maintenance and operation of the Washington National Airport, office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Provides for the continuation of the program of developing landing areas, office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of for the completion of such program as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Provides for the construction and development of 399 landing areas, office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of for the development of 250 such areas as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $94,977,750 for the continuation of the program of developing landing areas, office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $28,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Within the limits of the appropriation agreed upon in amendment No. 31, makes available $4,500,000 for administrative and engineering expenses of the program of developing landing areas, office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Corrects a total to conform with the action taken on amendment No. 31.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $73,900 for magnetic and seismological work, Coast and Geodetic Survey, as proposed by the House, instead of $87,860 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,729,200 for salaries in the Patent Office, instead of $3,725,000 as propcsed by the House and $3,733,400 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Inserts a semicolon as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $230,000 for constructing and equipping a station for broadcasting standard frequencies, National Bureau of Standards, instead of $220,000 as proposed by the House and $240,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Corrects a total to correspond with action taken on amendment No. 37.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $7,279,150 for observations, warnings, and general weather service, Weather Bureau, instead of $7,203,000 as proposed by the House and $7,302,650 as provided by the Senate. The effect of this action is to eliminate that portion of the Senate increase designed to afford additional weather reporting facilities at Seattle, Wash., and to eliminate the sum proposed for the Mount Whiteface Observatory.

Amendment No. 40: Corrects a total to correspond with the action taken on amendment No. 39.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 41: Eliminates the language, as proposed by the Senate, which would have made the appropriation for contingent expenses, office of the Attorney General, available, for the purchase of press clippings.

Amendment No. 42: Reinserts in the bill language, which the Senate proposed to delete, which will make at least $100,000 of the appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Investigation available exclusively to investigate Federal employees who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 44: Incorporates in the bill language, proposed by the Senate, which will require the confirmation by the Senate of all persons paid in excess of $7,500 per year from the funds appropriated for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws.

Amendment No. 45: Eliminates language, proposed to be inserted by the Senate, to make $200,000 of the funds appropriated to the Lands Division immediately available.

Amendment No. 46: Incorporates in the bill language, proposed by the Senate, which will require confirmation of by Senate of all persons paid in excess of $7,500 per year from the funds appropriated for the salaries and expenses of special attorneys.

Amendment No. 47: Makes available in the appropriation for penitentiaries and reformatories, Bureau of Prisons, $4,320,000 for salaries and wages of all officers and employees, instead of $4,270,000 as proposed by the House and $4,325,800 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates $7,485,000 for maintenance and operation of penitentiaries and reformatories, Bureau of Prisons, instead of $7,435,000 as proposed by the House and $7,490,800 as provided by the Senate.

The Judiciary

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $69,627 for structural and mechanical care of the United States Supreme Court building and grounds, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $67,300 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $14,000 for repairs and improvements, District Court

of the United States for the District of Columbia, instead of $8,300 as proposed by the House and $20,424 as provided by the Senate. The effect of this action is to make available funds for plumbing repairs and for installation of steam risers.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $131,410 for salaries, United States Court of Claims, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $131,400 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $866,200 for miscellaneous salaries of judicial employees, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $862,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Eliminates language inserted by the House and approves language proposed by the Senate fixing the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to district judges.

Amendment No. 54: Incorporates language in the bill, as proposed by the Senate, concerning the salaries of judges, district attorneys, marshals, etc.

Amendments No. 5 and 43 are reported as being in disagreement.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this conference report follows the general pattern of most conference reports on appropriation bills. There were 54 amendments made by the Senate to the bill and in conference the House managers have receded on many of the amendments, the Senate likewise receded from its position on several amendments and again we have compromised some of the amendments arriving at appropriations somewhere between the House and the Senate figures. The statement of the managers on the part of the House gives a very detailed explanation of the action taken on each amendment and as this report has been printed and available for the consideration of the Members of the House for several days, unless there are some questions concerning the report I will not detain the House in giving a detailed account of the conference action.

I will call the attention of the House, however, to the action of the Senate in increasing the appropriation for development of airport landing areas by approximately $66,500,000 in order to provide for construction of 149 additional airports to meet the needs of national defense. The House managers have concurred in the Senate action on this item which was covered by a Budget estimate and it now appears possible that even additional sums will be needed to further this program at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the chief difference between the bill as it is now and as it passed the House is in reference to amendment 31 in regard to the continuation of the program for developing landing areas. The appropriation for the office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as he stated, was increased by $66,500,000, to provide for 149 additional air fields. Very substantial reasons were presented for this increase. In fact, at the time the House subcommittee considered the bill, we had a very lengthy argument as to whether we should not put in several million dollars more than was finally agreed upon by the House subcommittee, so the House conferees did agree to this larger amount, believing that not alone for national defense but for the general upbuilding of the air-travel industry these additional fields are necessary.

Most of the other items are minor, and I believe there is no argument on them whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is only because of the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority appears in this bill that I trespass upon the indulgence of the House and take a little time.

As you all know, the Civil Aeronautics Authority was created in 1938, in the face of a growing aviation industry, for the purpose of consolidating our efforts in that field in order to give them direction. It was not in existence for long until the President requested of the Congress authority to reorganize certain agencies in the executive branch, and it was my good fortune or misfortune to serve on the special committee of the House which dealt with reorganization.

Among the other proposals that came up in Reorganization Plan No. IV was the proposal to divest the Civil Aeronautics Authority of its independent character and put it back in the Department of Commerce. It was very shortly afterward that the country was greeted with a lot of major air accidents which resulted in some fatalities. There was, for instance, the accident at Lovettsville, W. Va., on the 31st of August, 1940, which resulted in the loss of 25 lives, including that of Senator Ernest Lundeen. There was the accident at Centerville, Utah, on the 4th of November 1940, in which 10 lives were lost. There was the accident on the 4th of December in Chicago, in which 10 lives were lost. And there was the accident at Atlanta, Ga., on the 26th of February, in which 8 lives were lost, including the life of one Member of this House.

It was at that time that both in Congress and out and in the press there was a tendency to believe that the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority was wholly or partly responsible for this trend toward major fatal accidents. I am afraid that at that time I was one of those who was disposed to believe that.

It was in pursuance of these accidents that the House finally created a select committee of five persons, including myself, to investigate air accidents, and that committee has been functioning now for some time. It has held investigations in Cincinnati, in St. Louis, in Atlanta, Ga., in Charles Town, W. Va., in Vero Beach, Fla., and in Chicago, and on Saturday of this week it will go to Salt Lake City, Utah, in order to investigate the crash that took place there on the 4th of November 1940.

I want to say a few words about this whole matter, and particularly about the work of the committee. First, I wish to pay testimony to Chairman NICHOLS, of the Select Committee. I am very happy to report to the House that, in my judgment, the gentleman from Oklahoma, JACK NICHOLS, has done a very estimable and eminent job in his capacity as chairman of that committee. He has an excellent flying background. He has served with distinction as chairman of the committee. I believe, as time goes on and the preliminary, intermediate, and final reports of that committee are rendered to the Congress, the Congress and the country will owe him a profound debt of gratitude.

May I say a word also about the growth of air traffic. I doubt very much whether the Congress has an adequate appreciation of how the air industry has been growing. In 1930 only 417,000 passengers traveled by air. In 1935 this had multiplied by two and increased to 860,000. In 1940 that had multiplied by three, and 2,900,000 passengers traveled by air. It is estimated that by 1945 this will jump to 11,000,000, and that by 1950, 22,000,000 will travel by air. Obviously so large a number of passengers indicate the tremendous responsibility of the Congress in the field of air safety.

In the field of express in 1931, a little over 1,151,000 pounds of express matter was carried by air. In 1940 this had jumped to 14,385,000 pounds, which is multiplied by 11.

In 1940 the aggregate of mail matter carried by air was 33,566,000 pounds.

The total number of aircraft in 1940 was 18,878, of which 322 was scheduled aircraft carriers.

Passenger revenues in 1940 was $52,724,000 and the passenger fare was 5 cents per mile and the average trip per passenger was 388 miles.

There are today in the country 1,857 airports, of which 5 are class 4, 31 are class 3, 245 are class 2, and 1,576 are class 1.

To show the enormousness of the air industry, scheduled planes consumed more than 74,000,000 gallons of gasoline in 1940.

There are today 28,745 miles of lighted airways.

Now, more particularly, a few more words about problems, and I am going to address myself particularly to a flier who is on the floor, namely, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FRED BRADLEY, because if I can discuss it personally, FRED, I think I can get down to facts.

You know I have always felt, somehow, or other, you could classify air problems under four general categories: First, structures, and by structures I mean airplanes; secondly, the personnel factors or the pilots; third, the navigational aids from the ground; and fourth, airports.

I think you will agree that under the general classification of structures we have made tremendous progress in the last few years, particularly, when they developed the so-called DC3 planes under which air carriers can really make a profit.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I presume the gentleman also takes into account the remarkable strides in engine performance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, very definitely.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. And the gentleman includes that in his structures classifications?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I include, of course, engine and engine performance in structures, but I think the gentleman, as a flier, will agree that we have made tremendous progress in the field of structures in the last few years, so that as time goes on we are getting to the point where so far as air fatalities and air difficulties are concerned, they offer no real obstacle, because most of our planes for scheduled air-carrier purposes will be twin motored and it is almost inconceivable that both motors will fail at one time. Concern in this field is therefore rapidly diminishing.

The second category, of course, will be pilots. And when you look at the course of training that is given by the air carriers, in addition to the requirements they have before they will take an application from a copilot, obviously, in that field we have made tremendous strides and we do not have much to fear from that source. Flight has become something of an exact science and pilots equipped with good instruments have reduced hazards to a minimum.

In the third field, of course, we have also made tremendous progress. I just pointed out a moment ago that we have today 28,745 miles of lighted airways. It is only a question of a little while and in proportion as the Congress provides the money, that we will have lighted airways in almost every center of reasonable size in the United States of America. We will also have them equipped with teletype service so that those who are in flight will be equipped with navigational aids. They will be furnished with weather information of all kinds and from that standpoint, obviously, we are making a tremendous contribution to safety. The airways equipped with the radio beam have truly reduced the air to proverbial skyways which are to planes what roadways are to motor cars.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman would also include in future appropriations from the Congress adequate appropriations to provide for blind-landing equipment, which is a field in which they are making remarkable strides right now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say that I was saving that for the last category, and I put that particularly in the same field as the airports. We get the plane off of the ground first or off of the runway first and then, of course, our navigational aids come into effect. We have the pilot in the cockpit and then we have to map his course of flight and then comes the final job of getting the plane down on the landing strip, and that brings us to the fourth category—namely, the landing strip of the airport at the point of destination—and I think there is the point at which we have a lot of work to do. We now certify, of course, the men who operate the airport controls, and while we are doing that it is rather singular to me that we have no formal training for those men. I believe one of the recommendations which the committee is going to make is some kind of project providing for such training. In that respect they have been a good deal like Topsy—they just "growed." These men have been radio operators and they have been working around airports and have picked up control-tower work in some way, but at the same time it is one of the most important factors in air safety, and sooner or later there must be formal training provided for air-control operators, for it is a very responsible proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I have another 5 minutes?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have only 2 minutes left. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must ask to be excused, as I have only 2 minutes. The second thing that must become necessary is the federalization of the navigable air space over the country. That involves great questions of jurisdiction. Air activities must be zoned and placed under Federal control if maximum safety is to be achieved. In this connection it must be remembered that today we have Army planes, Navy planes, scheduled air carriers, private itinerant planes, and training planes in the air and only through unified control and zoning of air activities can safety be achieved.

Next is the matter of zoning of the areas adjacent to airports. Take as an example the new $15,000,000 Washington Airport. Why should any person be permitted to erect a stack, tower, or building of such height to imperil the take-off or landing of a plane? Yet it is doubtful whether that area is properly protected by zoning restrictions today. Precisely the same situation obtains in most areas today, and this is a problem to which State legislatures must give immediate attention if the huge airport investments of the country are not to be imperiled and safety jeopardized.

Then comes the matter of standardized lighting. There is no uniformity of lighting among the Nation's airports today, and the marvel is that pilots who operate night flights do so with so few mishaps. Only when we have a uniform system of lighting throughout the Nation and require certain minimum standards for various classes of airports, can we say that we have moved in the direction of flight safety for night flying.

Ice has been described as public enemy No. 1 in the field of aviation because its effect upon the surfaces of a plane is still so unpredictable. Like all other problems which have at one time or another confronted the industry, this, too, can be surmounted, but it will require study and research, and the Federal Government should be unsparing in bringing money and technical skill together to combat the problem of ice because the results will redound not only to the benefit of the commercial air carriers but to our Army and Navy flyers as well.

These are but a few of the problems to which the select committee has given attention as it has moved about the land investigating recent crashes, and I for one deem it a privilege to serve on that committee because it has presented an expanded opportunity to serve the people and the cause of national defense.

In a few years the air industry will be numbered among the major industries of the Nation, and the pattern which we now design and the direction which we now give will be of incalculable value. To have had but a small part in giving that direction is a privilege indeed.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 5: Page 16, after line 9, insert:

"During the period of the existing state of emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, American citizens holding positions in the Foreign Service of the United States and who on account of emergent conditions abroad are unable properly to serve the United States at their regular posts of duty may be assigned to the Department of State to perform temporary services in that Department or to be detailed for temporary services of comparable importance, difficulty, responsibility, and value in any other department or agency of the United States, in cases where there is found to be a need of services for the performance of which such persons have the requisite qualifications. The salaries of such persons shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to be paid during the periods of such assignments from the appropriations under the caption "Foreign intercourse" in the Department of State Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 43: Page 74, after line 18, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation may be expended for the employment of personnel, exclusive of attorneys, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please explain the need for that?

Mr. RABAUT. The need here is to provide a force of employees that will supply a greater understanding upon the part of those people who come here and enter the country in accordance with the immigration laws.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will that include attorneys only?

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, no; it includes investigators. For instance, there will be investigators in different areas, perhaps, where there is a strong domination of a particular nationality and someone of that nationality, who is an outstanding American citizen, will be appointed to that position.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me very unwise to do away with the civil service.

Mr. RABAUT. The idea is to provide some elasticity in administration so that outstanding types of investigators can be employed to deal with our immigrant population in an intelligent manner.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is a very important appropriation bill. It was brought to our attention this morning by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that there are some points on which he thought there should be debate. It seems to me in view of the importance of the bill that we ought to have the membership of the House present to hear the discussion. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Andrews	Eberharter	Kilburn
Arends	Fish	Kopplemann
Buck	Flaherty	McArdle
Buckler, Minn.	Flannery	McGranery
Buckley, N. Y.	Haines	McIntyre
Camp	Hall,	Maciejewski
Celler	Edwin Arthur	Magnuson
Chenoweth	Healey	Marcantonio
Clevenger	Hess	Mills, Ark.
Cluett	Hobbs	Mitchell
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Myers, Pa.
Collins	Hook	Nelson
Copeland	Hope	Nichols
Costello	Jenks, N. H.	O'Day
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	O'Leary
Cox	Johnson,	Oliver
Culkin	Lyndon B.	Plauché
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Reed, Ill.
Dies	Kennedy,	Richards
Domengeaux	Martin J.	Rivers
Dondero	Kennedy,	Rutherford
Douglas	Michael J.	Sauthoff
Downs	Keogh	Scanlon
Schaefer, Ill.	Stevenson	Wheat
Scrugham	Thill	Wilson
Sheridan	Tolan	Winter
Short	Traynor	Wolcott
Sikes	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Smith, Ohio	Wadsworth	Wolverton, N. J.
Starnes, Ala.	Wasielewski	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 345 Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] be allowed to address the House for 35 minutes on tomorrow, after the legislative program and any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL 1942

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the statement may be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 28, 44, 45, 80, 90, 91, 122, 125, and 126.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 123, 124, 127, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 148, 149, 150, and 151, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$247,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$265,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$107,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$484,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$949,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 119, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 132, 141, 144, 145, 147, 152, and 153.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $247,500 for the Petroleum Conservation Division, instead of $240,000, as proposed by the House, and $255,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $3,200,000 for the Bituminous Coal Division, instead of $3,029,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $2,178,700 for Soil and Moisture Conservation Operations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,125,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $22,858,500 for the Bonneville Power Administration, as proposed by the House, instead of $22,988,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $2,600 for the purchase on an automobile for the High Commissioner, Philippine Islands, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 10, and 11: Appropriates $170,000 for salaries and expenses of land offices, General Land Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $154,560, as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $585,370 for salaries, Office of the Commissioner, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $564,090, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $49,000 for general expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $45,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $265,340, for maintaining law and order on reservations, instead of $255,340, as proposed by the House, and $270,340, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriates $70,000, of which $17,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, for organizing Indian chartered corporations, instead of $74,540, as proposed by the Senate and $60,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $107,500 for purchase of land for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House, and $130,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $705,000 for agriculture and stockraising, instead of $693,600, as proposed by the House, and $710,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Appropriates $250,000 to the revolving loan fund for Indians, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $246,800, as proposed by the House, of which $25,700 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $22,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26: Provides $16,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000, as proposed by the House, in connection with Indian arts and crafts.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $110,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, for the development of water supply.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate providing $100,000 for the control of noxious weeds.

Amendments Nos. 29, 30, 31, and 32, relating to construction, Indian irrigation systems: These amendments appropriate $560,000 for the Colorado River project, Arizona; $40,000 for the Wind River project, Wyoming; correct the title of the Southern Ute project, Colorado; and correct the total; all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $2,615,720, for general administration of Indian property, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,611,320, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 35, 36, 37, and 38, relating to relief and rehabilitation of Indians: Appropriates $1,150,000 for such purpose, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,300,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $57,500 for administrative expenses, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $65,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $42,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; and provides that $50,000 "earmarked" in the report of the House on the bill for domestic and stock-water purposes in western Oklahoma, shall also be available in said area for general rehabilitation purposes.

Amendments Nos. 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46, relating to the support of Indians from tribal funds: These amendments appropriate $2,000 for construction of a church, northern Idaho; continue an unexpended balance for reconstruction of a community house, Seminole Indians; and provide $5,480 for the Colville Indians, Washington, all as proposed by the Senate; provide $110,000 for the Klamath, Oregon, Indians, instead of $95,760, as proposed by the House and $113,760, as proposed by the Senate; provide $77,900 for the Keshena, Wisconsin, Indians, as proposed by the House, instead of $83,100, as proposed by the Senate; and correct the total of the foregoing items.

Amendment No. 47: Provides that an unexpended balance remaining available to the Shoshone Indians, Wyoming, shall be available for expenditure under section 3 (c) of the Act of July 27, 1939, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Provides $10,000 for an attorney for the Red Lake Indians, Minnesota, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $35,000 from tribal funds for travel expenses of tribal councils, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the House, and $40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $2,450,000 for road construction on Indian reservations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,100,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, 55, 56, and 57, relating to the construction and repair of Indian schools, hospitals, etc.: Appropriates $25,000 for repairs, Carson, Nev.; $75,000 for a dormitory and quarters, Jones Academy, Oklahoma; $75,000 for dormitory facilities and quarters at the Fort Sill School, and $75,000 for the same purpose at the Riverside School, both at Kiowa, Okla.; and provides $800,000 for a sanatorium at Tacoma, Wash.; all as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Reclamation

Amendments Nos. 61 and 69, relating to the proposed appropriation of $500,000 for construction of the Gila project, Arizona; amendments Nos 62 and 92, relating to the proposed appropriation of $3,000,000 for construction on the Colorado Big Thompson project, Colorado; amendments Nos. 69 and 94, relating to the proposed appropriation of $450,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico; amendments Nos 70 and 95, relating to the proposed appropriation of $350,000 for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma; amendments Nos. 74 and 96, relating to the proposed appropriation of $1,250,000 for the Provo River project, Utah; and amendments Nos. 75 and 98, relating to the proposed appropriation of $500,000 for the Yakima project, Roza division, Washington: The effect of the recommendation in connection with the foregoing projects is to provide that funds for carrying on the construction of these projects shall come from the general fund of the Treasury, as proposed by the Senate, instead of from the reclamation fund, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, and 84, relating to appropriations for construction of reclamation projects, payable from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $600,000 for the Paonia project, Colorado, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation in the House bill providing $750,000 for the Arrowrock division, Boise project, Idaho, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,500,000 for the Payette division, Boise project, Idaho, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $100,000 for the Sun River project, Montana, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $100,000 for the Carlsbad project, New Mexico, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, for the Deschutes project, Oregon; appropriates $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, for the Owyhee project, Oregon; appropriates $500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House, for the Klamath project, Oregon-California; appropriates $265,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House, for the Kendrick project, Wyoming; appropriates $100,000 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $350,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, for the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone project, Wyoming; appropriates $57,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the House, for the Willwood division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming; allows $90,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $575,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $725,000, as proposed by the House, for administrative expenses; corrects the total of the construction items from the reclamation fund; provides that an unobligated balance of $25,000 from the Emergency Relief Act, 1935, shall be available for work on the Vale project, Oregon; and corrects the total for all reclamation fund appropriations.

Amendments 85 and 86, relating to the Boulder Canyon project: Makes funds available for recreation grounds in Boulder City, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 88, 90, 91, 97, 100, 101, and 104, relating to the construction of reclamation and water utility projects payable from the general fund of the Treasury: (Action recommended on amendments 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, and 98, is explained under the first paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation" in this statement.) Appropriates $4,000,000 for the Bullshead project, Arizona-Nevada, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $34,750,000, as proposed by the House, for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $31,750,000, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate authorizing contractual authorization for procurement of materials and supplies for transmission lines in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000; appropriates $11,000,000 for the Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $845,000 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $695,000, as proposed by the House, of which $220,000 is made available for personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $5,000,000 for water conservation projects, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendments Nos. 109, 110, 111, 112, and 114, relating to topographic surveys: Appropriates $185,000, as proposed by the Senate,

instead of $160,000, as proposed by the House, the additional amount to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia for topographic survey work; and provides $1,962,500 for such work, including $300,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $975,000 and $250,000, respectively, as proposed by the House; makes such funds available for use in Alaska, and Puerto Rico, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total for the Geological Survey.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 115: Appropriates $262,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $232,000, as proposed by the House, for testing fuel.

Amendments Nos. 116 and 117: Appropriates $466,880, of which $276,940 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $456,880, and $275,500, respectively, as proposed by the House, for inquiries concerning economics of mineral industries.

Amendment No. 118: Strikes out the proposal of the House reappropriating unexpended balance of 1941 appropriation for manganese beneficiation and investigations.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 122: Appropriates $358,425, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $374,575, as proposed by the House, for national monuments.

Amendments Nos. 123 and 124, relating to national historical parks and monuments: Provides that the total expenditures for maintenance of the Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site during the fiscal year 1943, shall not exceed the admission fees collected during the fiscal year 1942.

Amendments Nos. 125 and 126, relating to national military parks, battlefields, etc.: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing $25,000 for construction of the museum authorized by the act of August 10, 1939.

Amendment No. 127: Corrects a title.

Amendment No. 131: Provides that not to exceed $4,500,000 of the 1941 contract authorization of $6,000,000 for the Blue Ridge-Natchez Trace Parkway, shall be available for payment of obligations incurred during the fiscal year 1941, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House bill providing that fees shall not be charged for admission to the "house where Lincoln died."

Amendment No. 134: Appropriates $75,000 for a travel bureau, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 135: Appropriates $27,000 for a survey of the recreational resources of the Denison Dam and Reservoir project, Texas and Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 136 and 137: Provides $20,000 for a first-aid station, park police lodge, etc., in West Potomac Park, as proposed by the Senate.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 138: Appropriates $1,069,555, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,055,230, as proposed by the House, for the propagation of food fishes.

Amendment No. 139: Appropriates $545,475, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $476,475, as proposed by the House, for inquiry respecting food fishes.

Amendment No. 140: Appropriates $196,940, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $186,940, as proposed by the House, for fishery industries.

Amendment No. 142: Appropriates $255,800, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $233,800, as proposed by the House, for biological investigations.

Amendment No. 143: Appropriates $949,300 for control of predatory animals, instead of $849,300, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 146: Appropriates $2,750,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 148: Provides $933,180, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $919,120, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the District of Columbia for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Territory of Alaska

Amendment No. 149: Appropriates $684,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $634,500, as proposed by the House, for the construction and repair of roads in Alaska.

Amendment No. 150: Strikes out the provision of the House prohibiting the use of funds in the bill for the salary of Dr. Ruth Gruber, as proposed by the Senate.

Miscellaneous

Amendment No. 151: Makes available $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000, as proposed by the House, for travel in attendance at meetings by employees of the Bureau of Mines.

Amendments in disagreement

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments:

Amendment No. 1, relating to the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to use of contingent expense fund for production of alumina from bauxite, alunite, etc.

Amendment No. 17, relating to purchase of land, Mescalero Indians, New Mexico.

Amendment No. 18, relating to payment of judgment in the case of Luis M. Sanchez and others.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20, relating to contract authorization for the purchase of land for Indians.

Amendment No. 25, relating to disposition of interest from loans under the Indian "revolving loan fund."

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Hulah Dam and reservoir project, Oklahoma and Kansas.

Amendment No. 50, relating to per capita payment to members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians, Oklahoma.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 58, relating to construction of hospital and quarters for Indians in Alaska, and the total appropriation for construction projects.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60, relating to the use of reclamation funds for distribution and broadcasting of information, and the establishment of a branch office at Denver, Colo.

Amendment No. 66, relating to distribution of storage water and cost thereof, of the Cascade Reservoir, Boise project, Idaho.

Amendments Nos. 87 and 99, relating to appropriations for general investigations.

Amendment No. 93, relating to the appropriation for the Anderson Ranch, Boise project, Idaho.

Amendment No. 102, relating contract authorizations for several reclamation projects.

Amendment No. 103, correcting a total.

Amendment No. 105, relating to the Fort Peck project, Montana

Amendment No. 106, relating to the valley gravity canal and storage project, Texas.

Amendments Nos. 107 and 108, relating to the protection of reclamation project works.

Amendment No. 113, relating to the funds available for topographic mapping of strategic areas.

Amendment No. 119, relating to production of alumina from bauxite and alunite.

Amendment No. 120, correcting a total.

Amendment No. 121, relating to employment by the National Park Service of employees of the Mammoth Cave Operating Committee.

Amendments Nos. 128 and 129, relating to recording of titles and the payment of admission fees, National Park Service.

Amendment No. 130, relating to a contract authorization for the construction of National Park roads and trails.

Amendment No. 132, relating to a contract authorization for construction of the Blue-Ridge-Natchez Trace Parkway

Amendments Nos. 141, 144, 145, and 147, relating to an Alaska crab investigation, the sale of migratory bird hunting stamps by philatelic agencies, and the correction of totals.

Amendment No. 152, relating to acquisition of lands in the State of Arizona by the Secretary of the Interior.

Amendment No. 153, correcting a section number.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not ask for this quorum because I wanted to have you listen to me. I thought the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] would take the floor and explain the conference report. I do not want to do anything that is detrimental to any of the individual conferees on this committee; but the people of my district have elected me to come to Congress to try to do a good, sound business job. It is my duty this afternoon to call to the attention of the House just what the conferees have done in the report we now submit to you for your consideration.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] and I did not sign the conference report because we could not do it, and we had our reasons. I am going to give you five reasons why we could not sign it.

First, the President of the United States and Mr. Morgenthau and other high officials said that the regular operating expenses of the Government should be reduced by $1,000,000,000. If the majority of the House and the President want to insist on that they certainly ought to do it, and we should cut down our appropriations. What do the conferees do in this report? Let me call your attention to the second reason why I objected to it. The conference report exceeds the Senate appropriation bill by $3,206,110.

Third, the conference report exceeds the House appropriations by $11,298,845. There are two reasons why the House should say to the conferees, "You have exceeded your authority and you should not be permitted to do this."

The fourth reason is that the bill exceeds the Budget estimates by $1,829,575.

The fifth reason is that this bill exceeds the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior for 1941 by $32,775,991.

Those five reasons should cause the Members of Congress to think and cause them to act. Each of you assumes a responsibility to your Government and your constituents. It seems to me you should turn down this conference report and send it back to the conferees with instructions that they reduce the expenditures in the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1942.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us on what items those increases occur?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I will give you a great many items as we go along, but I want to give you this general statement first. If I make a misstatement I certainly want to be corrected, and I will yield to the chairman of the committee at any time to be corrected if I err, because I have tried to give you these things honestly and fairly.

You will note that the conference report shows that the Senate receded on 10 amendments. The House conferees receded on 89 amendments. There are 38 amendments in disagreement. With reference to those 38 amendments in disagreement I feel, and I say it with due respect to my conferees, that if the conferees could have prohibited them from coming in here they would have done it, but because of new legislation they were compelled to bring them back for approval. Those men are just as good men as there are in the Congress, but when there are only two of us conferees who want to put up a real fight, and the rest of them say, "We are going to go together," there is not much we can do about it. I am not censuring them. They are all interested in these items, and I do not blame them for that, but, gentlemen, it just is not right. It just is not right that the conferees have the power that they have assumed here.

In this conference report we have contract authorizations in disagreement amounting to $16,950,000 additional over and above the appropriation in the bill. I will say that they had in the Central Valley project in California a contract authorization for $10,000,000 that we struck out in conference, but which put back in this bill $4,000,000 to the appropriation. Because of the difficulties which we encountered, because the people who are interested in Central Valley thought it was best that the Senate disagree, they added the $4,000,000 to the total sum.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, walked up the aisle a few moments ago, and I said, "Mr. DOUGHTON, do you think that the Ways and Means Committee will now be able to get taxes in as fast as our Appropriations Committee is able to spend it?" Mr. DOUGHTON said, "I do not think we will ever catch up to the Appropriations Committee."

I think he is about right. The Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker, have not ingenuity enough to find ways of raising the revenue needed anywhere near to approach the spending of the Appropriations Committee. It just cannot be done. So, what do you have to do? You have got to bear down on the Appropriations Committee, and that is my duty here this afternoon. This is the job for me. I do not want it, I do not like it, I do not feel like standing here and telling the membership that this is their responsibility, but it is and they cannot dodge it, they cannot shirk it. What are you going to do about it?

Many Members came before this committee and asked them to put items into the bill benefiting their districts. That is a natural thing to do and probably one way of getting benefits for the districts, but are we as sound, sensible, sane American citizens going to permit our Nation to be bankrupted so we shall not be able to support the huge defense program that rearmament calls for? Yet, this is just the point we are approaching—national bankruptcy.

I like every member of this committee. A few weeks ago the House voted $7,000,000,000 to the President of the United States for him to dole out in war materials as he saw fit. I contended then, and I still contend, that the money should have been employed in defense of our own country. I would much rather vote to spend that amount on reclamation projects and other things vital to the welfare of our country and our people and under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department than I would to have it given away to others for war and destruction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the subcommittee is going to call attention this afternoon to the conference report and the items in controversy. We are going to take our time and try to present each one fully, so you can assume your responsibility in voting.

The Senate increased the bill $32,375,000 over and above the appropriation for the current fiscal year, and the pending bill carries contract authorization for an additional $17,000,000. Responsibility for the totals carried by the bill rests upon the membership. I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that we will call attention to these items as the amendments in disagreement come up. We do not have time to go into them now. The conference report lists the amendments in disagreement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman said we cut out $10,000,000 contract authorization and that we added $4,000,000. We did not add anything except what the Senate cut out. We went back to the figure reported by the House, and the House cut out of that appropriation $4,500,000.

Mr. RICH. I think I made that statement; I wanted to make the statement that the Senate receded and cut out the $10,000,000 authorization for contracts in the Central Valley.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; and what we added on was what was reported by the House.

Mr. RICH. I made that statement; that is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as my colleague from Pennsylvania has pointed out, has been raised to a figure greater than it carried when it left the House or when it left the Senate. I base my objection to the conference report not upon any particular item or its location, but upon the general proposition that we should support the President and the Secretary of the Treasury in their request that nondefense expenditures be reduced by $1,000,000,000. In this connection I call attention to pages 1147 and 1148 of the hearings where I asked the Secretary of the Interior what portion of the entire amount carried by the bill could be considered as national-defense items. I believe the First Assistant Secretary, Mr. Burlew, put the information in the hearings.

The total amount of the Budget estimate, as I recollect, was $183,344,348. The way the bill comes to us now from the committee of conference it carries $188,325,923.

The entire amount for national-defense items in the House bill was around $38,432,900. The balance of $177,027,078, House bill, represents that portion of the bill which deals with nondefense expenditures which could well be cut to make up a portion of the $1,000,000,000 reduction. In my opinion, the amount the bill carried as it left the House was too high, and the Senate amendments even raised that amount.

We have not tightened up our belts commensurate with the needs of national defense. We ought to have the courage to say in respect of these nondefense appropriation items that we are going to cut them down if they are not needed. For instance, Great Britain does not purchase apples from this country, I understand, because they are not even considered as food. Great Britain, with her back to the wall, has found she could do without many of the things desirable in normal times. Why can we not learn that lesson and apply it to our own necessities? Why do we not learn that these enormous nondefense expenditures cannot go higher every year? The time is fast approaching when we must meet this problem face to face and tell the people of our districts and our States that these nondefense items must be cut. The time is coming when we are going to have to do this, regardless of the consequences to ourselves and our political future.

One of the nondefense items that could be cut that comes to my attention amounts to $6,000,000 and could well be deferred to some future time. The item I refer to is $3,000,000 in contract authorizations and $3,000,000 appropriations for roads and trails in national parks. Of course, we need roads for national defense that will connect the great arteries of the East, West, North, and

South. Certainly we could put aside this $3,000,000 at the present time and save it for some future time. The sad irony about it is that in this same bill where we propose to spend $3,000,000 this year for roads and trails in the national parkway for the pleasure of our people there is also included a million dollars to be set aside for investigations to figure out new projects when and if the crash comes as a result of the end of the war, at which time our people have to get back to normalcy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did not the Senate in every case increase every item when an amendment applies over and above that in the House bill?

Mr. JONES. That is not exactly true. In the case of the Central Valley project in California the amount was cut $3,000,000, then $10,000,000 was allowed for contract authorizations which will be spent over a period of several years, but by and large the final result is that somewhere between the House and Senate we have inserted larger items, so that the bill is larger now than when the House passed it, or when the Senate passed it.

It seems shameful to me that we cannot face the facts presented by the world crisis, button up our belt, tighten up these expenditures, and accept the lower figure that is presented by either the House or Senate. In each case let us take the lower figure.

If you are interested in helping to cut a billion dollars from nondefense items, I wish to show you that as the bill comes back from conference it carries $188,325,923. Of this amount the total claimed by the Department of the Interior itself as national defense is only $38,875,400. I include the statement of the Department of the Interior showing what this $38,875,400 consists of:

Appropriation items for national-defense projects considered for the Interior bill for 1942

Appropriation title	Budget estimate	Approved by House	Approved by Senate
GENERAL OPERATIONS			
Bureau of Reclamation: Protection of reclamation projects			$50,000
Geological Survey:			
Salaries	$25,000	(1)	25,000
Topographic surveys (mapping for military use)	987,500	(1)	987,500
Strategic and critical minerals	195,000	[2]195,000	195,000
Total, Geological Survey	1,207,500	195,000	1,207,500
Bureau of Mines:			
Mineral mining investigations (chromium studies)	100,000	100,000	100,000
Economics of mineral industries:			
(1) Scrap iron and steel statistics	[2]47,000	40,000	50,000
(2) Cooperation with other American republics in production of strategic minerals			
Investigation of domestic sources of mineral supply	425,000	425,000	425,000
Helium plants and investigations	350,000	350,000	350,000
Manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research	930,000	930,000	930,000
Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite and aluminite	[3]85,000		85,000
Total, Bureau of Mines	1,937,000	1,845,000	1,940,000
Fish and Wildlife Service: Inquiry respecting food fishes (surveys of stream pollution resulting from defense activities)	[3]35,000		35,000
Government in the Territories: Construction, operation, and maintenance of roads, Alaska	50,000		$50,000
Total, general operations	3,229,500	2,040,000	3,282,500
GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS—(CONSTRUCTION)			
Bonneville Power Administration: Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power-transmission system	18,142,900	18,142,900	18,142,900
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Reclamation fund. Kendrick project, Wyoming			200,000
General fund:			
Boulder Canyon project	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Bullshead project, Arizona-Nevada	5,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000
Parker Dam project, Arizona-California	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Central Valley project, California	11,250,000	7,250,000	[4]4,250,000
Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington	[5]6,000,000	3,000,000	6,000,000
General investigations			1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	25,250,000	18,250,000	[6]17,450,000
Total, construction	43,392,900	36,392,900	35,592,900
Grand total	46,622,400	38,432,900	38,875,400

[1] Eliminated by House committee with recommendation that necessary funds for mapping for military use be appropriated to the War Department.
[2] Includes supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate in the amount of $7,000 for statistics on scrap iron and steel (S. Doc. No. 61).
[3] Supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. No. 61).
[4] The Senate amendment reducing this item added a contract authorization in the amount of $10,000,000 for this project.
[5] Includes supplemental estimate submitted to the Senate in the amount of $3,000,000 (S. Doc. No. 61).
[6] A Senate amendment also provided contract authorizations totaling $7,450,000 for several reclamation projects, including the following amounts for projects involving power development: Colorado-Big Thompson project, $1,500,000, and Boise project, Anderson ranch, $500,000.

Senate amendments also transferred construction and administrative expense funds totaling $6,950,000 from the reclamation fund to the general fund, thus permitting construction to proceed more expeditiously on several projects involving power development which are related to the national-defense program.

All other items in this bill as reported back by the conferees can well be cut out, and I hope that motions are presented to include the Senate amount adding and increasing the bill above the House bill and above the Budget estimate, you will use this statement as a basis to cut out useless nondefense expenditures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to make an extended statement at this time, but inasmuch as statements have been made that the House conferees apparently have gone wild and have permitted a bill to be brought in here far in excess of the Budget estimates, and inasmuch as it was stated a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], that the Budget estimates were for $183,000,000 only, let me say that the Budget estimates were in excess of $186,000,000. It is true that as originally submitted to the committee the Budget estimates were for a little over $183,000,000, but after the bill left the House and went to the Senate there were many other Budget estimates, in excess of $3,000,000. I simply wish to correct that statement. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to leave the impression that the Budget estimates were only $183,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. I was referring to the statement that appears in the hearings on pages 1147 and 1148. What the gentleman says is correct. Since that hearing there were additional estimates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. For example, $3,000,000 was added after the bill left the House for additional generators at Grand Coulee. There is no Member on either side of the aisle who would vote to eliminate this $3,000,000 because it is strictly for national defense. Even with the added generators there will still be a decided shortage of power in that area because, as you know, there is an urgent national-defense situation.

In addition to that there was also added $50,000, for floodlights to protect dams and power plants. It is true there was no Budget estimate for this $50,000, but after all, this legislative body and the members of this committee are responsible for safeguarding of these dams and power plants and I am certainly willing to accept my responsibility for voting for the $50,000 to protect the various dams throughout the country in the hope of preventing further sabotage at these places.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman will find no one on this side who is going to fight that $50,000 because we think it is just as necessary as the gentleman does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. RICH. Those $50,000 items are not the items we are interested in. These

items of $1,500,000, the three-, four-, five-, and six-million dollar items that should not be in here are the ones we are going to object to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much. I am hopeful that when the gentleman receives an explanation of the items that have been added, he will agree to them.

There is another item here of $85,000 for investigations in connection with the development of aluminum for war purposes. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks that item of $85,000 is justified that the War Department and those in charge felt was very important and urgent at this time. Does the gentleman from Ohio object to that?

Mr. JONES. I have a statement here which was sent to me by the clerk of the committee under date of June 19. If the gentleman will agree to cut the amounts that are claimed by the committee to be not for the national-defense set-up, we can agree. There is a total of $38,400,000 for national defense. As approved by the House it was $38,432,900 according to this statement. The increases as claimed by the department were approximately $450,000 more in the Senate than in the House. If we can agree on cutting the outside items I certainly will not cut down national-defense items.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows, I am sure, that we cannot amend the conference report and therefore could not possibly make such an agreement; besides all these items were threshed out and, after all, there are two Houses of Congress that must consider them.

Mr. RICH. When the House conferees met some time this year, as they did last year, they said they would stand back of a lot of amendments of the Senate and disagree to them, but when they went into conference they agreed to 98 items that the Senators wanted in this bill. If we had had a little intestinal fortitude and backbone, we would not yield to the Senate conferees and we would have held this bill down ten or fifteen million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I regret that from the gentleman's viewpoint there is no one in this House except the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has any backbone. Time after time he has taken the floor to lecture Members and charge them with being Treasury raiders if it happens to be an item to which he is opposed. But if the fund requested is for a fish hatchery in the gentleman's home district at Lamar, Pa., without a Budget estimate, mind you, well, then, that is altogether different. Frankly, some of us did not have enough backbone to stand up and oppose the gentleman. We did not even accuse him of raiding the Treasury. When we were told of the great and urgent need for additional funds to greatly enlarge his fish hatchery in the great State of Pennsylvania, we accepted the gentleman's word. We knew that it must be urgent, else he would not have espoused it. Why, Mr. Speaker, we did not even ask him, "Where are you going to get the money?" [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I note that on the top of page 84 the appropriation for the Carlsbad, N. Mex., project has been increased from $50,000 to $100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. May I inquire just what this increase is for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is for the purpose of expediting the completion of a project that is already under way, a dam.

Mr. THOMASON. It is understood, then, that it is not a new dam or a new flood-control project of any kind. This appropriation is only to complete an existing project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is definitely correct.

I may add that there are many other items that were added by the other body. One was for $1,012,500 for topographic mapping of strategic areas to be determined by the Secretary of War. This is an important item. The War Department felt that it was essential, and, even though it was not in the bill as it passed the House, we thought that it was very essential and very urgent, and for that reason this $1,012,500 for national-defense mapping was allowed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it not a fact that every item that appears in this bill as being inserted by Members of the other body was put in there because, instead of going down to the committee that handles appropriations that have not been brought up in the orderly manner that is usually followed, they justified these items before the Senate committee, and the items were then added to the bill? Is it not true that that goes for every one of the items that was included?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is absolutely correct. We could have refused to accept any of these amendments, and probably could have prevented their coming here, but they would have gone to the deficiency committee, and the deficiency committee would have brought them back if that committee felt they were justified. This committee did not ask or refuse or try to escape its responsibility.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman referring to the gentleman from Ohio and me as not trying to block any of these appropriations? Time after time we made motions in the committee of conference, trying to hold down these appropriations. When we would come to the vote, all the other conferees would vote for the appropriations, and the gentleman from Ohio and I would vote against them. Where could we even express ourselves if we did not come back here on the floor and make a fight on these appropriations? This is the only place we have to fight; and if we cannot do anything here, then we have no recourse, because we could not do it when we were in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am certainly willing for the RECORD to show that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania objected and objected and still objected to everything, except for additional funds without a sign of Budget estimate for his pet fish hatchery in Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICH moves that the conference report be recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to further insist on amendments in disagreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 221, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—110

Andersen, H. Carl	Gillie	Michener
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Murray
Angell	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin	Guyer, Kans.	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne	Osmers
Baumhart	Halleck	Paddock
Bender	Hancock	Pheiffer, William T.
Bennett	Harness	Pittenger
Bishop	Heidinger	Ploeser
Blackney	Hinshaw	Plumley
Bolles	Holmes	Powers
Bolton	Jarrett	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Canfield	Jensen	Rich
Chiperfield	Johns	Robsion, Ky.
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Rockefeller
Crawford	Johnson, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Crowther	Jones	Rutherford
Cunningham	Jonkman	Scott
Day	Kean	Simpson
Dewey	Keefe	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Ditter	Knutson	Springer
Eaton	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Elston	Lambertson	Stratton
Engel	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Fellows	LeCompte	Sutphin
Fenton	McGregor	Taber
Gale	McLean	Talle
Gamble	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Gifford	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Tinkham
	Mason	Treadway
	Meyer, Md.	

Van Zandt	Wene	Wolverton, N. J.
Vorys, Ohio	Wheat	Youngdahl
Vreeland	Wigglesworth	

NAYS—221

Allen, La.	Fogarty	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Forand	O'Connor
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ford, Miss.	O'Neal
	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Toole
Arnold	Fulmer	Pace
Barnes	Gathings	Patman
Barry	Gavagan	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Gearhart	Pearson
Beam	Gehrmann	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Gerlach	Peterson, Ga.
Belter	Geyer, Calif.	Pfeifer,
Bell	Gibson	Joseph L.
Bland	Gore	Pierce
Bloom	Gossett	Poage
Boggs	Granger	Priest
Boland	Grant, Ala.	Rabaut
Bonner	Green	Ramsay
Boren	Gregory	Ramspeck
Boykin	Hall,	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Leonard W.	Rankin, Miss.
Brooks	Hare	Rankin, Mont.
Brown, Ga.	Harrington	Rizley
Bryson	Harris, Va.	Robertson,
Buck	Harter	N. Dak.
Buckler, Minn.	Hébert	Robertson, Va.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Hendricks	Rogers, Mass.
Burgin	Hill, Wash.	Rogers, Okla.
Butler	Holbrock	Rolph
Byrne	Houston	Russell
Byron	Hull	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Hunter	Sanders
Cannon, Mo.	Imhoff	Satterfield
Capozzoli	Izac	Schulte
Carlson	Jackson	Secrest
Carter	Jarman	Shafer, Mich.
Cartwright	Johnson,	Shanley
Case, S. Dak.	Luther A.	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Okla.	Sheppard
Chapman	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Conn.
Chenoweth	Kee	Smith, Pa.
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Claypool	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Wash.
Cochran	Kelly, Ill.	Snyder
Coffee, Nebr.	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
Coffee, Wash.	Kilday	South
Cole, Md.	Kirwan	Sparkman
Colmer	Kleberg	Spence
Connery	Kocialkowski	Steagall
Cooley	Kramer	Stefan
Cooper	Lanham	Sullivan
Cravens	Larrabee	Sumners, Tex.
Creal	Lea	Tarver
Crosser	Leavy	Taylor
Culkin	Lesinski	Tenerowicz
Cullen	Lewis	Terry
Curtis	Ludlow	Thom
D'Alesandro	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Ohio	McCormack	Thomason
Davis, Tenn.	McGehee	Vincent, Ky.
Dickstein	McKeough	Walter
Doughton	McLaughlin	Weaver
Doxey	McMillan	Welch
Drewry	Maciora	West
Duncan	Mahon	Whelchel
Durham	Mansfield	White
Dworshak	May	Whittington
Eberharter	Merritt	Wickersham
Edmiston	Mills, La.	Williams
Eliot, Mass.	Monroney	Woodrum, Va.
Elliott, Calif.	Mott	Worley
Ellis	Mundt	Wright
Englebright	Murdock	Young
Faddis	Nichols	Zimmerman
Fitzpatrick	Norrell	
Flannagan	Norton	

NOT VOTING—100

Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Jacobsen
Andrews	Douglas	Jenks, N. H.
Arends	Downs	Johnson, Ind.
Barden	Fish	Johnson,
Boehne	Fitzgerald	Lyndon B.
Buckley, N. Y.	Flaherty	Kennedy,
Burch	Flannery	Martin J.
Camp	Ford, Leland M.	Kennedy,
Celler	Haines	Michael J.
Clevenger	Hall,	Keogh
Cluett	Edwin Arthur	Kilburn
Cole, N. Y.	Harris, Ark.	Kopplemann
Collins	Hart	McArdle
Copeland	Hartley	McGranery
Costello	Healey	McIntyre
Courtney	Hess	Maciejewski
Cox	Hill, Colo.	Magnuson
Delaney	Hobbs	Marcantonio
Dies	Hoffman	Mills, Ark.
Dingell	Hook	Mitchell
Disney	Hope	Moser
Domengeaux	Howell	Myers, Pa.
Nelson	Scanlon	Traynor
O'Day	Schaefer, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.
O'Leary	Schuetz	Voorhis, Calif.
Oliver	Scrugham	Wadsworth
Patton	Sheridan	Ward
Plauché	Short	Wasielewski
Reed, Ill.	Sikes	Weiss
Richards	Smith, W. Va.	Wilson
Rivers	Starnes, Ala.	Winter
Romjue	Stevenson	Wolcott
Sacks	Sweeney	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sasscer	Thill	Woodruff, Mich.
Sauthoff	Tolan	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Patton against.

Mr. Thill for, with Mr. Romjue against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy against.

Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Traynor against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Johnson of Indiana for, with Mr. Hill of Colorado against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Buckley of New York against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Schuetz against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Mills of Arkansas against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Martin J. Kennedy against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Burch against.

Mr. Cluett for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

General pairs:

Mr. Collins with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Sauthoff.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Downs with Mr. McArdle.

Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Ward.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Disney.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Hook.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Kopplemann.

Mr. Haines with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Scanlon with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Moser with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 1, at the end of line 11, insert "including a special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements, at a salary of not to exceed $5,000, $924,570."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: On page 9, line 25, after "operations" insert "production of alumina from low-grade bauxite and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the House that amendments 5, 6, and 118 go together in connection with the appropriation of $85,000 for the investigation of these strategic materials. For the national defense, it may be well that this $85,000 be spent for that purpose. I am sure that we on this side of the House have no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not know whether or not the members of the committee can answer this question, but we have read recently in the papers that the Army is selling 6,000 pounds or tons of aluminum, at a time when we understand we are making great efforts to acquire aluminum. The item appears in the magazine PM. Has the committee heard of any sale of aluminum being made by the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee has no such information, I may say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: Page 11, line 23, after the word "operations", insert "production of alumina from low-grade bauxite and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its

disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 24, at the end of the paragraph in line 24, insert:

"Purchase of land, Mescalero Indians, New Mexico (tribal funds): For the purchase of land, or interest therein and improvements thereon for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation of New Mexico, $14,000, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That title to any land and improvements so purchased shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for said Indians: *Provided further*, That no expenditure shall be made hereunder without the consent of the Mescalero tribal business committee."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 25, following the amendment just adopted, insert:

"Payment of judgment in the case of Luis M. Sanchez, and others, against United States (tribal funds): There is hereby appropriated from the tribal funds of the Indians of the Isleta Pueblo, N. Mex., so much as may be necessary to satisfy the judgment obtained by the plaintiff in the suit entitled Luis M. Sanchez, and others, against the United States, No. 135 civil, in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico: *Provided*, That title to the land and improvements thereon involved in said suit shall be vested in the United States in trust for the Pueblo of Isleta: *Provided further*, That use of the money for such purpose shall receive the approval of the governing authorities of the pueblo as required in section 5 of the act of May 1, 1933 (48 Stat. 108)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 26, line 3, after the word "Provided," insert: "That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations, and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land, not exceeding a total of $600,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 19, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$325,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that we are giving power to the Indian Bureau to make contract authorizations amounting to $325,000 additional. We have been carrying on this practice for years and it seems to me that under present conditions if we want an opportunity to save $325,000 of Federal funds we should vote down this amendment and permit this matter to go along for a year or so before making any additional contract authorizations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this amount, $325,000, is exactly the same as the contract authorization that was provided in the bill last year. In view of the fact that there are thousands of landless and needy Indians and that the Department has been investigating some lands that will be of great value to the Indians, the committee felt it was justified in continuing this program for at least another year on the same basis as last year.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 70, noes 32.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 26, line 14, after the word "appropriated", insert "Or this contract authorization."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 34, line 25, after the word "binding", insert "*Provided*, That interest or other charges heretofore or hereafter collected on loans shall be credited to said revolving fund and shall be available for the purposes of this paragraph."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment that may be very far reaching and I question whether the membership of the House wishes to take money that now goes into the Federal Treasury and permit it to be paid into a revolving fund for the benefit of these Indians. This may not mean a great deal to the Members right now, but this fund will increase, and you permit them, not only to take the principal, but all the interest that accumulates, and then you hear the statement made that a lot of these projects under the Reclamation Bureau will be able to reimburse the Government for the expenditures made. I do not see how in the world this statement can be made and be consistent with any effort being made to assist the Treasury in paying these debts. I think this motion should be voted down.

Mr. COCHRAN. This amendment provides that interest or other charges heretofore or hereafter collected shall be credited to said revolving fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. This act has been in existence since 1934?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. How much has heretofore been collected which you are going to get out of the Treasury and add to this revolving fund? Why should you have in the word "heretofore," and not confine it simply to hereafter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, they have been depositing this in the revolving fund. It does not belong to the Treasury. It was not contemplated that it should go into the Treasury, but under a recent ruling of the Comptroller General it was held that the funds would have to go into the Treasury. This money should remain in the revolving loan fund. It never was intended that any part of it should go back into the Treasury. That was not the intent of the Congress. It belongs to the Indians, and should remain in the revolving fund.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, the money is in the revolving fund and this is to make it legal?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. To get over the decision of the Comptroller General?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman says that this money belongs to the Indians. Do I understand the gentleman to say that these are Indian funds which are being allocated for the purpose of establishing these corporations and providing sawmill operations so as to give industrial employment to the Indians?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It might be used for that purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reading the language in the last paragraph on page 34, and going back to the original act, was it an appropriation out of the general fund of the Treasury in the first place or were they Indian funds which were allocated for this purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Wheeler-Howard Act authorized a revolving fund of $10,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that $10,000,000 came out of the general fund of the Treasury or out of Indian funds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That part of it which has been appropriated came out of the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that when the gentleman remarked to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to the effect that these funds belong to the Indians he meant to say that those funds originally came out of the Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Under the Wheeler-Howard Act that money belongs to the Indians just the same as if it had been from the sale of Indian lands.

I still maintain that it belongs to the Indians. It was set up as a permanent fund for these needy and landless Indians and I repeat it does not belong to the Treasury and it was not contemplated that the money should go into the Treasury, and this proviso is for the purpose of straightening out the situation due to the decision of the Comptroller.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly—and I think I am in favor of the motion that he has offered—what I am trying to get clear is from what source was the original $10,000,000 taken. Was that taken from the general funds of the Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course it was taken from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States as provided in the Wheeler-Howard Act. However, I might remind the gentleman that at one time the whole country belonged to the Indians.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is now getting a little bit facetious. I am seeking information for this reason. We have a situation which is partially involved in this bill, which pertains to Puerto Rico. A bill is now before one of the committees of the House asking that something like from $3,000,000 to $20,000,000 be thrown into a revolving fund. If we go ahead and act on this in like manner, it provides a precedent on which the Department of the Interior can come in a little later and insist that we turn over $3,000,000 in cash and $18,000,000 in property in connection with Puerto Rican operations. My approach is from that standpoint, because in this particular situation, this may amount to just a few dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot agree with the gentleman in his conclusions. I think it is true that some other group is asking for something, but the difference is that Congress has acted in this matter. Congress has spoken. Congress passed the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act. In my judgment, that is considerably different from some group coming in and saying, "Well, you did this for the Indians and you should do something for us."

Mr. CRAWFORD. If by the Wheeler-Howard Act, which I think was a good act, this money was actually turned over and these receipts coming in are a part of the revolving fund, I think perhaps it is proper to go along with this motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is the situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But I want to establish in the RECORD that that is the situation, so that this cannot be used as an excuse or a precedent a few weeks later to come in and pick up $21,000,000 in one item in a revolving fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 72, noes 24.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: On page 46, after line 2, insert "In aid of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project on the Caney River, Oklahoma and Kansas, authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1571), as amended, for the control of floods in the Vedigris River Valley, the Osage Tribal Council be and it hereby is authorized, upon payment of just compensation therefor, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to release and relinquish to the United States of America such right, interest, and control in and over the minerals reserved to the Osage Tribe by the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, as may be found by the Secretary of War to be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said Hulah Dam and Reservoir project. Construction of said project may be undertaken when the amount of money to be paid to the Osage Tribe as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized has been agreed upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Osage Tribal Council. The amount agreed upon as just compensation for the release and relinquishment herein authorized shall be paid by the Secretary of War out of appropriations made for flood control, general, to the Secretary of the Interior for disbursement in the manner provided by section 4 of the act of June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539), as amended, for the disbursement of royalties received from the leasing of minerals owned by the Osage Tribe."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If this amendment is adopted, as I understand it, the land that was given to the Indians is now going to be used for flood-control purposes. It is going to be necessary for the Federal Government, if there are any minerals under the land that is flooded, to pay these Indians or settle their claims. It is going to be very difficult to do that. It seems to me we should have arrived at a conclusion as to what this amount should be before this amendment is adopted. I think that would have been the wise policy, and I think the House ought to give consideration to that particular phase of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is an attempt to put into this bill the same amendment that was offered by the Senate to the flood-control bill, the civil-functions bill for the War Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, I believe.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that case the conferees saw fit not to agree. The bill has come up on the Consent Calendar. It has been postponed and objected to on the Consent Calendar. I doubt very much if the House should agree to this amendment without having somewhere in the record some agreement as to what the limit of cost should be. I would like the Members of the House to understand that this language mandatorily takes out of the limited money for new flood-control projects, whatever amount may be agreed upon as the value of the minerals that may be covered by the water impounded by this dam. During the discussion the other day when this came up on the Consent Calendar it was brought out that it is estimated, under one theory of reckoning, that the cost of this would be something like a million dollars. That theory of reckoning, I think, was based upon some estimate of the value of oil that might be under the land. It was also brought out that in the consideration of this proposal in general legislation before the Indian Affairs Committee a proper theory of reckoning would be to estimate the difference in cost of recovering this oil if they had to go down through the impounded water; but the effect of this language is to say that out of the 10 percent of flood-control money that was appropriated and earmarked for new projects by your subcommittee dealing with the civil functions of the War Department, out of that 10 percent which at the most will not amount to over six or seven million dollars for starting flood-control projects all over the country, $1,000,000 may be earmarked for one specific purpose. There is nothing to show how much this will amount to other than that incidental testimony that came up when we were considering it on the Consent Calendar the other day. Whatever they agree upon the Secretary of War must pay out of the flood-control appropriation. If the House thoroughly understood what was involved in this legislation I doubt whether it would consent to taking that money out of the flood-control appropriation in that way.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When we discussed this with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] the Government agreed to permit drilling for oil on this land. If there would be 50 or 60 feet of water over the land the Government would have to pay for the cost of going down through the water and the cost of casings and the expense that may be incurred, and no one would know what the cost of such an operation would be.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if this mineral land is flooded, no doubt the Indians should be compensated for the depreciation of their mineral rights. There is no question about that, but there seems to be in the record nothing that anybody can go upon or any guaranty as to what the cost will be. Whatever the cost may be by this language will come out of the money available for new flood-control projects. Every Member of the House who is interested in protecting the small sum of money that is available for the initiation of new flood-control projects should be interested in the language of this amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this not in the same category that any other project of this character would be in automatically? No one can foresee what the eventual cost of a condition of this character would be.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman assumes something that is not necessarily so. There could be some

agreement. During the consideration of this matter the other day on the Consent Calendar it developed that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] was under the impression that the compensation would be based on the theory of the increased cost of recovering the oil, but he said that in his estimation that was the wrong basis for an estimate.

That was one basis, but the estimate that has been proposed tries to figure out the value of this oil even before it has been recovered. This is purely a theoretical proposition. The estimate was upward of $1,000,000. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] said this was too much.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only basis for the agreement before us at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is this based on the theory of adverse possession?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe so.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. You are taking over a settlement after it is made.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me point out, as was stated by the gentleman from South Dakota, this will impair the flood-control funds a great deal. As I read this amendment it would be entirely possible that this sum would be paid out a month or even years before the Army engineers get around to constructing this dam or other flood-control works on the Verdigris River for the establishment of priority for that river in the expenditure of funds this year, this being before the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that in the first place this applies to one project in northeast Oklahoma. It is not in or near my district. It has been authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936. The gentleman will find on page 4678 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 3 that the Secretary of War wrote a letter to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] urging that such legislation be enacted to permit this very thing to be done.

If this paragraph is agreed to it will simply permit the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior to work out an agreement providing an equitable payment to these Indians. It seems to be fair and I do not believe that either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Interior would agree to anything that might be exorbitant.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know what the cost is estimated to be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman, I take it, is familiar with the figure of $1,000,000 which was mentioned when the bill was called for consideration on the Consent Calendar last Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that figure has been suggested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the gentleman knows there is only about $6,000,000 available for construction costs. This one item would take $1,000,000 from that fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I believe that is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISH) there were—ayes 52, noes 29.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 117, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—192

Allen, La.	Gathings	O'Leary
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gavagan	O'Toole
Arnold	Gearhart	Patman
Barnes	Gehrmann	Patrick
Barry	Gibson	Patton
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Pearson
Beam	Granger	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Beiter	Green	Pierce
Bell	Gregory	Pittenger
Bland	Hare	Priest
Bloom	Harrington	Rabaut
Boggs	Harris, Ark.	Ramsay
Boland	Harris, Va.	Ramspeck
Bonner	Hart	Randolph
Boren	Harter	Rankin, Miss.
Boykin	Hébert	Rizley
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brooks	Hendricks	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ga	Hill, Wash.	Rogers, Okla.
Bryson	Holbrock	Rolph
Buck	Houston	Russell
Buckler, Minn.	Hull	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Hunter	Sanders
Burgin	Imhoff	Satterfield
Byron	Jackson	Schulte
Cannon, Mo.	Jarman	Secrest
Capozzoli	Johnson, Luther A.	Shanley
Carter	Johnson, Okla.	Shannon
Cartwright	Kee	Sheppard
Casey, Mass.	Kefauver	Smith, Conn.
Chapman	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Wash.
Claypool	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Cochran	Kilday	Snyder
Coffee, Wash.	Kirwan	Somers N. Y.
Cole, Md.	Kleberg	South
Colmer	Kocialkowski	Sparkman
Cooley	Kramer	Spence
Cooper	Lanham	Steagall
Creal	Larrabee	Sumners, Tex.
Crosser	Lea	Tarver
Cullen	Leavy	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Lesinski	Tenerowicz
Davis, Ohio	Lewis	Terry
Dickstein	Ludlow	Thom
Dingell	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Doughton	McCormack	Thomason
Doxey	McKeough	Vincent, Ky.
Duncan	McLaughlin	Walter
Durham	McMillan	Weaver
Eberharter	Maciora	Welch
Edmiston	Mahon	Wene
Eliot, Mass.	Mansfield	West
Elliott, Calif.	May	Whelchel
Ellis	Merritt	White
Faddis	Mills, La.	Whittington
Fitzpatrick	Monroney	Wickersham
Flannagan	Murdock	Williams
Fogarty	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Forand	Norrell	Worley
Ford, Miss.	Norton	Wright
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Brien, Mich.	Young
Fulmer	O'Connor	Zimmerman

NAYS—117

Andersen, H. Carl	Angell	Bender
Andresen, August H.	Baldwin	Bennett
	Bates, Mass.	Bishop
	Baumhart	Blackney
Bolles	Hall, Leonard W.	Paddock
Bolton	Halleck	Pheiffer, William T.
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Powers
Brown, Ohio	Harness	Rankin, Mont.
Butler	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Carlson	Jarrett	Rees, Kans.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Chiperfield	Jenks, N. H.	Robsion, Ky.
Clason	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Johns	Rutherford
Crowther	Johnson, Ill.	Scott
Culkin	Jones	Shafer, Mich.
Curtis	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Day	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Dewey	Keefe	Springer
Dirksen	Kilburn	Stearns, N. H.
Ditter	Kinzer	Stefan
Dworshak	Knutson	Stratton
Eaton	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Engel	Lambertson	Taber
Englebright	Landis	Talle
Fellows	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Fenton	McGregor	Tibbott
Ford, Leland M.	McLean	Tinkham
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Treadway
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Van Zandt
Gerlach	Mason	Vorys, Ohio
Gifford	Meyer, Md.	Vreeland
Gilchrist	Michener	Wigglesworth
Gillie	Moser	Wolverton, N. J.
Gore	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Graham	Murray	Youngdahl
Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Guyer, Kans.	Osmers	
Gwynne		

NOT VOTING—122

Allen, Ill.	Hartley	Plauché
Anderson, Calif.	Healey	Ploeser
Andrews	Heidinger	Plumley
Arends	Hess	Poage
Barden	Hill, Colo.	Reed, Ill.
Boehne	Hobbs	Richards
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman	Rivers
Burch	Hook	Robertson, Va.
Burdick	Hope	Rockefeller
Byrne	Howell	Romjue
Camp	Izac	Sacks
Cannon, Fla.	Jacobsen	Sasscer
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Sauthoff
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Scanlon
Clevenger	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Johnson, W. Va.	Schuetz
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scrugham
Collins	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sheridan
Connery	Keogh	Short
Copeland	Kopplemann	Sikes
Costello	McArdle	Simpson
Courtney	McGehee	Smith, Pa.
Cox	McGranery	Starnes, Ala.
Cravens	McIntyre	Stevenson
Cunningham	Maas	Sullivan
Davis, Tenn.	Maciejewski	Sutphin
Delaney	Magnuson	Sweeney
Dies	Marcantonio	Thill
Disney	Mills, Ark.	Tolan
Domengeaux	Mitchell	Traynor
Dondero	Mott	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Myers, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
Downs	Nelson	Wadsworth
Drewry	O'Day	Ward
Elston	O'Hara	Wasielewski
Fish	Oliver	Weiss
Fitzgerald	O'Neal	Wheat
Flaherty	Pace	Wilson
Flannery	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Winter
Geyer, Calif.		Wolcott
Haines		Wolfenden, Pa.
Hall, Edwin Arthur		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Romjue for, with Mr. Thill against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Stevenson against.

Mr Traynor for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr Mills of Arkansas for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana against.

Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr Dondero against.

Mr. Schuetz for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Johnson of West Virginia for, with Mr. Hill of Colorado against.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Clevenger against.
Mr. Burch for with Mr. Douglas against.
Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Cluett against.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Ploeser against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Elston against.
Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Rockefeller against.
Mr. Connery for, with Mr. Simpson against.
Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.
Mr. Byrne for with Mr. Copeland against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Wheat against.
Mr. Cravens for, with Mr. Youngdahl against.
Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Heidinger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Collins with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Geyer of California with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Plauché with Mr Celler.
Mr. Downs with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Disney.
Mr. Flannery with Mr McIntyre.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr Hook.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Scanlon with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: After line 9, insert: "Per capita payment to members of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma (tribal funds): The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from any available funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians in Oklahoma, to make immediately therefrom a payment of not to exceed $20 to each member of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Tribes living on the date of the approval of this Act, which payment shall be credited to the individual account of each Indian to be expended in accordance with the individual Indian money regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Okahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 50, and concur in the same.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this amendment gives $20 to each member of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Indian tribes in Oklahoma. This money comes from the tribal funds of these Indians, but if we continue to permit them to withdraw their funds, how long before they will be exhausted? In a few years they will not have it because they were permitted by the Congress to spend it.

If you want to allow each of these Indians to take a joy ride on $20, that is your responsibility and you can vote accordingly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this money comes out of tribal funds belonging to three tribes of Indians, the Kiowas, Comanches, and Apaches. These Indians have met in tribal council and asked that their funds be expended in this manner. They have pointed out that there are hundreds of aged, dependent and landless Indians in their tribes who are desperately in need of help. They feel that they would prefer using their own funds than to ask for relief. They have also pointed out that there have been five successive droughts in this particular area followed by terrific and damaging floods. Some of the Indians of these tribes are in real need and this $20 per capita payment will be of real assistance to them. They have assured members of the committee that very little if any of their funds will be wasted and trust there will be no serious objection to this amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman states that this comes from the Indians' own money and he is willing to give it to them, that is his responsibility. I would point out to the gentleman, however, that for years he has been saying he wanted the Indians made responsible for their own affairs. We have increased the amount the Federal Government has been required to spend on the Indians each year. If the Indians are allowed to spend their money this way how will they ever become competent to handle their own affairs?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman this per capita payment is in a measure permitting these Indians to handle their own affairs. I am sure if the gentleman from Pennsylvania could visit some of their shabbily furnished homes, as I have done, and see some of these Indians in their dire poverty, that his big and sometimes generous heart would bleed for them, and he would not raise his voice against this item.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 69, line 23, at the end of the line insert "hospital and quarters, $250,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 71, line 20, strike out "$1,277,000" and insert "$1,877,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this simply corrects the total. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 75, line 20, strike out line 20 down to the word "prints", in line 21, and insert "$7,500 for disseminating useful information, photographing and making photographic prints, and completing and distributing material, including recordings."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. This amendment would provide $7,500 for the dissemination of information in regard to land. It seems to me it is one of those amendments that is above partisanship and could be cut out to save the country $7,500. It is a small amount, but I call attention to the fact that there is already in this bill provision for $76,530 for the same purpose. I asked a question of the Secretary of the Interior, and I wanted to find out the entire cost of the information service. I hoped by the answer I would get it. Seventy-six thousand dollars is an enormous amount of money for an information service for the Department of the Interior, but that does not represent all of the cost of the information service. In addition to that, the Department of the Interior during the fiscal year 1940 put out so much information on blank paper—I have this statement from the Office of the Government Printer—that during the fiscal year 1940, $134,368 was paid for the blank paper to furnish information on. As related to 1941, for which I do not have the figures, I have the over-all figures of the blank paper cost for all the information service of the various governmental bureaus, independent agencies, and so forth. The Public Printer tells me the blank paper cost has increased 274 percent over the fiscal year 1940.

It seems to me that with the enormous latitude that already exists and that is already being taken advantage of by the Department of the Interior, this amendment is unnecessary and should be cut out. There has not been anything offered by this side of the House which has been so far accepted, but I hope this one will be above partisanship and will be accepted by the majority on its merits.

Mr JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say for the information of the gentleman and those interested that there is only $2,500 involved here. The House carried

$5,000 which applied to photographic prints and such things as that. Commissioner Page appeared before the Senate committee, and I believe Members of this House who know Commissioner Page realize that he is a very conservative, fair, honest, capable official. He thought this was a very important item. He stated in the record, if you will read his testimony on page 446 of the hearings, that because of a ruling of the Comptroller General it will be necessary to have an item in this bill that they may put on radio broadcasts and records in disseminating information pertaining to the activities of land sharks within reclamation areas. Mr. Page thought this was important, he thought it was vital, and I do not care to discuss it further.

Mr. JONES. What is there to prevent Mr. Page from using the facilities that are already in this bill, the $76,000 that is already in this bill? Why can he not use those facilities?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is for the Secretary's office. It has no connection with what Mr. Page is trying to do here at all. It could not be used for these things, and he says so. Has the gentleman read all of the testimony?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will read his testimony, I think he will withdraw any opposition.

Mr. JONES. No. There is no limitation upon the use of the $76,000 over-all for any bureau or department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman the Comptroller will not permit any funds for the Interior Department to be used for this purpose.

Mr. RICH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that with the $75,000 they have for the dissemination of information in the Secretary's office, if they wanted to correct any statements that were wrong about reclamation the Secretary could not authorize any amount of that money to be applied for the purposes involved in this amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that the testimony of Mr. Page speaks for itself. If the gentleman will read Mr. Page's testimony on the page of the record I have cited, it answers all of his questions.

Mr. RICH. If Mr. Page asked Mr. Ickes to use part of the $75,000 you have already given him for the dissemination of this information, he certainly could use that money in the Reclamation Bureau. I cannot see why the gentleman would make the statement that he could not use this money for that purpose. This amendment just adds $2,500 to the amount for radio broadcasting.

Mr JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that the Comptroller General does not agree with what the gentleman states.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: On page 76, after the word "offices" on page 75, insert the following "for the establishment, in addition to the main office in the District of Columbia, of a branch of that office in Denver, Colo., with appropriations herein made to be available therefor, the costs and expenses thereof to be accounted for as though said branch office were in the District of Columbia."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Ickes came before the committee he told how he had increased the number of employees by 229 percent in the last 8 years. You and I know the great number of offices that have been established here in Washington and the number of additional bureaus the New Deal has begun. Now, they are crowding Washington to the point where they not only fill the Government buildings but this administration has built more office buildings than any administration ever has in the city of Washington. You have built up the number of employees to the point where you have had to move them into apartment houses, and you have rented large houses and taken over store properties and all kinds of properties and filled them with Government employees. You have got to the point where now you have nothing else left to use for offices and you want to move the bureaus out of the District and establish them in other cities. That is the kind of business the administration is doing at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman answers his own argument and makes about the best argument I have heard for doing what it is proposed to do at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We have taken in the House many times what we call steps in the right direction. This is certainly a step in the right direction, and we will take several more if we move some of these other offices farther west.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: On page 83, in line 20, after the amount, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That such part of the storage capacity of the Cascade Reservoir, and the costs thereof, shall be reserved for other irrigation or power developments in and adjacent to the Boise project, as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 87 and 99 be considered together, as they both relate to the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: On page 90, in line 3, after "for", insert "general investigations and."

Senate amendment No. 99: On page 92, after line 7, insert the following:

"General investigations: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extensions of existing projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, including Colorado River Basin investigations, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Planing Board, and the Federal Power Commission, $1,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We certainly are not getting very far in trying to save money this afternoon. With the temper of the House what it is, I do not believe we are going to save any money, but that certainly does not relieve me of the responsibility I have of trying to point out to you that here is another $1,000,000 for investigations. What are you going to investigate? You are going to investigate projects that you may want to construct in the years to come, or they may be projects on which you want to spend money immediately.

You are going to see the day come, and it will not be very far distant, when you will want to have a lot of projects through which you can make many developments, and you will say that this is the place to find out what they are, but I do not believe it is. The argument is going to be that it will be necessary, but I say that with all the projects you have started, for 10 years it will take all the money you can rake and scrape together for years to finish them because of the great number started. Now, you put in here an item of $1,000,000 to have a lot of men go out over the Midwest to try to rake up a lot of new projects. It does not seem reasonable at this time. I hope you will vote down this motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, amendment 87 does not add a dollar of money or make any great change. It is, more or less, an amendment to comply with what is likely a technical objection. Amendment No. 99, however, does add $1,000,000, and it is an amendment of tremendous importance.

As I have stated on the floor of the House repeatedly on other occasions, Members who live in the States that comprise the Mississippi Valley and those to the east do not have a full

appreciation of what reclamation means unless they have gone into the western half of the United States. In this Interior bill itself almost 50 percent of the appropriations are for reclamation. It should be so, as reclamation is the very life of that vast, rich region.

Reclamation is not only the life of the West, but reclamation of arid lands has definite limits. It can be carried only so far, and that will be the end of it. Some 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 acres of land in the western half of the United States can yet be reclaimed by careful and proper conservation and utilization of the water in that region, and then we have come to the end of it.

The Government projects to date have paid back, without interest, it is true, 98.5 percent of every dollar that Congress has appropriated, so there is no loss there, and there will be none on any of these well-engineered projects now in the course of construction.

Mr. Page, Commissioner of Reclamation, is perhaps one of the ablest engineers in America, if not in the world. Grand Coulee Dam, the greatest dam on earth, was constructed by his engineering staff, and so was Boulder, and so were many others; and in addition to the usual burdens that are thrown upon a great engineering staff, we are asking them to take these minor reclamation projects that occur in the Great Plains region in substantial numbers. Each one of them must be carefully engineered, or the Government may spend millions of dollars and have nothing to show for it. Let me illustrate. Four years ago this Congress passed an appropriation item of $750,000 to begin a $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 project, and it was virtually forced upon the Commissioner of Reclamation before the engineering could be done. He refused to spend the money, and spent 2 years in engineering work and then found that the site was an impracticable and infeasible one, and the money was never spent at that place. It will be used where the results sought can be obtained, with assurance of success. You can readily see that if we are not going to allow money enough for that great agency to carry on the investigational work, we are apt to spend millions foolishly.

The President has stated publicly upon a number of occasions that it is his desire that when this emergency is ended and millions of men are seeking employment that there be certain useful, essential domestic projects that are completely engineered and ready to go, and that fits in with this million-dollar appropriation. I urge the Members of the House to recede and concur. In the years to come this will be one of the wisest appropriations that we have ever made.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think many people do not appreciate the fact that when the West is reclaimed, as it is being reclaimed now under these reclamation projects, it will furnish a great market for all the manufactured goods from the eastern and central States, and result in a well-balanced economy, essential to a great Nation such as we must have to survive.

Mr. LEAVY. Yes. The able gentleman from Montana is correct. I only wish more Members of this Congress had the complete understanding of this important matter that he possesses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to the fact that investigation is necessary just as much to keep us from engaging upon infeasible projects as it is to authorize the starting of feasible projects, and it is to be noted that these investigations call for coordination in these studies with the great engineers of the War Department, and I believe every Member of the House has respect for the work that the War Department engineers do. It also calls for the cooperation of the National Resources Planning Board and the Federal Power Commission and studies and investigations that have been made with respect to the development of power are now bearing fruit in some of the power projects to which the country is turning at this time of emergency.

Mr. LEAVY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I trust he has been able to influence all the Members of his side of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Should we not concur in this case would we not be capitalizing ignorance?

Mr. LEAVY. That is true and in addition we would be squandering public money, foolishly.

Mr. MURDOCK. And has not ignorance been more expensive than all the improvements we have made in the West?

Mr. LEAVY. It has in some agencies, but it has never been practiced in the Reclamation Bureau. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I know what meager contribution I can make today will not prevail, but if it were within my poor power I certainly would try to delete the Senate language.

It has not been the custom in the past to permit this kind of language to creep into a bill on the House side, and you will notice from the bill that provisions for general investigations were written in by the Senate.

As you will notice by the language, it will be possible for the Secretary of the Interior to enlist the aid of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, the National Resources Planning Board, and the Federal Power Commission. I am not concerned about the funds that are obligated here, but I am interested in an over-all attempt to carry on general investigations which will submit the entire United States of America to a grandiose plan or scheme that will develop and plan and lay out almost every square mile of area in the 48 States of the Union for conservation and development projects. You will notice the general language. It provides for investigation, economic and engineering, of proposed Federal reclamation projects, of studies of water conservation, and of development plans.

The word "development" lends itself to a variety of views and a multitude of sins. I do not know what is meant. Perhaps it includes all of the Great Lakes. Perhaps it includes the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. It includes virtually everything; and I am a little alarmed at the ambitious and pretentious schemes I have seen recorded in these huge, monumental tomes which come to my desk ever so often from the prolific pens of the National Resources Planning Board. I am interested in withholding from them any more authority than is absolutely necessary, and I am alarmed by the general grant of authority that is contained in this bill today. This is going to rise one day with bitter fruit to plague the Congress, and make no mistake about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman overlooks the fact that these engineering and economic investigations are related to the proposed reclamation projects; and if the gentleman will consult the basic law, he will find it is necessary to look into the economic phases if you are going to determine whether or not a project is feasible, and certainly the gentleman does not want the Bureau of Reclamation to engage upor projects that are not feasible from an economic standpoint.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They will have about as much regard for the basic law as they will have for the fact that the Senate has twice rejected the St. Lawrence waterway and at this very moment House hearings are being held on that project.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is in error in his estimate of the investigations made by the Bureau of Reclamation. Furthermore, the work of the Bureau of Reclamation is confined to 17 States and they are without authority of law to go into the other States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But by the time they measure the watershed and find every stream that runs in the 48 States, they will include all of the 48.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 91, after line 7, insert "Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch (formerly Twin Springs Dam and Snake River pumping plant), $750,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 102: Page 93, after the amount on page 92 insert:

"In addition to the sums appropriated under the caption 'General fund, construction,' the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations and enter into contracts for construction work on the following-named projects and in not to exceed the following sums, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof:

"Gila project, Arizona, $500,000;

"Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $1,500,000;

"Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, $500,000;

"Tucumcari project, New Mexico, $1,550,000;

"Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, $1,150,000;

"Provo River project, Utah, $1,150,000;

"Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,100,000;

"In all, $7,450,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have appropriated for these projects in the bill $6,800,000. That has been already done. This amendment asks you to permit the Interior Department to go out and contract for the expenditure of funds that are enumerated here to the amount of $7,450,000. That is over and above the $33,000,000 that this bill appropriates for 1942 over 1941. Are you going to do it? In the name of our children and our children's children and your great grandchildren, who is ever going to pay for all this stuff?

Mr. MAY. Does it mean thirteen or fourteen million dollars instead of $6,000,000?

Mr. RICH. It means that you appropriate $6,800,000 in the bill for these projects, and now you want to authorize them to contract for additional expenditures of $7,450,000. I am not going to be a party to it, and I hope that we have enough men in the House who will vote "no" on this contract authorization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for these contract authorizations is due to the following reasons: First, it is essential that the Bureau of Reclamation know in advance what funds it may expect in order that it may enter contracts for the delivery of materials necessary to construction. The national-defense program, as we all know, makes it difficult to secure cement, copper, and other materials required in building a reclamation project. It is the distinct understanding that the Commissioner of Reclamation will consult with the Office of Production Management with reference to securing these materials, and unless a clearance is obtained for whatever material may be necessary to the construction of transmission lines, dams, and so forth, the contracts will not be let. If, on the other hand, he gets a clearance and proper priority from the Office of Production Management, then the work may proceed. The second reason for this authorization is that there is need for speeding up the construction of these projects, many of which will require 15 or 20 years to complete under the rate provided in previous appropriations. If this authority is given, the Bureau of Reclamation can go ahead and accelerate its speed and complete the projects much earlier, and this will also permit reimbursement to the Government at an earlier date.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen should not forget that of all of the reclamation projects which we now have in operation, and for which money has been appropriated, 98½ percent of the amount due has been paid back to the Government.

Mr. WHITE. And as a matter of fact all these projects are reimbursable and the money is returned to the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH)—ayes 70, noes 42.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 105, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—208

Allen, La.	Cartwright	Englebright
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Faddis
Anderson, N. Mex.	Casey, Mass.	Fitzgerald
	Chapman	Fitzpatrick
Angell	Clark	Flannagan
Arnold	Claypool	Fogarty
Barnes	Cochran	Ford, Leland M.
Bates, Ky.	Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Miss.
Beam	Coffee, Wash.	Ford, Thomas F.
Beckworth	Cole, Md.	Fulmer
Beiter	Collins	Gathings
Bell	Colmer	Gavagan
Bland	Cooley	Gearhart
Bloom	Cooper	Gehrmann
Boggs	Courtney	Geyer, Calif.
Boland	Cravens	Gibson
Bonner	Creal	Gore
Boykin	Crosser	Gossett
Bradley, Pa.	Curtis	Granger
Brooks	D'Alesandro	Grant, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ohio	Green
Bryson	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Buck	Dingell	Hare
Buckler, Minn.	Doughton	Harrington
Bulwinkle	Doxey	Harris, Ark.
Burch	Drewry	Harris, Va.
Burdick	Duncan	Hart
Burgin	Durham	Harter
Butler	Dworshak	Heffernan
Byron	Eberharter	Hendricks
Capozzoli	Edmiston	Hill, Wash.
Carlson	Elliott, Calif.	Holbrock
Carter	Ellis	Hunter
Izac	Norton	Smith, Conn.
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Pa.
Jarman	O'Connor	Smith, Va.
Jennings	O'Neal	Smith, Wash.
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Toole	Snyder
	Patman	Somers, N. Y.
Johnson, Okla.	Patrick	South
Kee	Patton	Sparkman
Kelley, Pa.	Pearson	Spence
Kelly, Ill.	Peterson, Fla.	Steagall
Kerr	Peterson, Ga.	Stefan
Kilday	Pierce	Sullivan
Kirwan	Pittenger	Sumners, Tex.
Kleberg	Poage	Tarver
Kocialkowski	Priest	Taylor
Kramer	Rabaut	Tenerowicz
Lanham	Ramsay	Terry
Larrabee	Ramspeck	Thom
Lea	Randolph	Thomas, Tex.
Leavy	Rankin, Miss.	Thomason
Lesinski	Rankin, Mont.	Vinson, Ga.
Lewis	Rizley	Walter
Lynch	Robertson, N. Dak.	Weaver
McCormack		Welch
McGehee	Robertson, Va.	Wene
McKeough	Robinson, Utah	West
McLaughlin	Rolph	Whelchel
McMillan	Russell	White
Maciora	Sabath	Whittington
Mahon	Sanders	Wickersham
Mansfield	Sasscer	Williams
Mills, La.	Satterfield	Woodrum, Va.
Monroney	Schulte	Worley
Mott	Secrest	Wright
Mundt	Shanley	Young
Murdock	Shannon	Zimmerman
Nichols	Sheppard	
Norrell	Sheridan	

NAYS—105

Andersen, H. Carl	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Hara
Baldwin		Osmers
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Paddock
Baumhart	Hancock	Pheiffer, William T.
Bender	Harness	
Bennett	Hartley	Ploeser
Bishop	Heidinger	Powers
Blackney	Holmes	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Reed, N. Y.
Canfield	Jarrett	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Clason	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Cluett	Johns	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Johnson, Ill.	Rutherford
Crowther	Jones	Scott
Cunningham	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Day	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Dewey	Keefe	Springer
Dirksen	Kinzer	Stearns, N. H.
Ditter	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	Kunkel	Sutphin
Eliot, Mass.	Lambertson	Taber
Elston	Landis	Talle
Engel	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Fellows	Ludlow	Tibbott
Fenton	McGregor	Tinkham
Forand	McLean	Treadway
Gale	Maas	Van Zandt
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Gerlach	Martin, Mass.	Vreeland
Gilchrist	May	Wheat
Gillie	Meyer, Md.	Wigglesworth
Graham	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
Grant, Ind.	Moser	Woodruff, Mich.
Guyer, Kans.	Murray	Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—118

Allen, Ill.	Culkin	Hope
Andresen, August H.	Cullen	Houston
	Delaney	Howell
Andrews	Dickstein	Imhoff
Arends	Dies	Jacobsen
Barden	Disney	Jenks, N. H.
Barry	Domengeaux	Johnson, Calif.
Boehne	Dondero	Johnson, Ind.
Bolles	Douglas	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bolton	Downs	
Boren	Fish	Johnson, W. Va.
Bradley, Mich.	Flaherty	Kefauver
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannery	Kennedy, Martin J.
Byrne	Gifford	
Camp	Haines	Kennedy, Michael J.
Cannon, Fla.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	
Cannon, Mo.		Keogh
Celler	Healey	Kilburn
Chenoweth	Hébert	Kopplemann
Clevenger	Hess	McArdle
Cole, N. Y.	Hill, Colo.	McGranery
Connery	Hinshaw	McIntyre
Copeland	Hobbs	Maciejewski
Costello	Hoffman	Magnuson
Cox	Hook	Marcantonio

Mason	Rockefeller	Stratton
Merritt	Rodgers, Pa.	Sweeney
Mills, Ark.	Rogers, Okla.	Thill
Mitchell	Romjue	Tolan
Myers, Pa.	Sacks	Traynor
Nelson	Sauthoff	Vincent, Ky.
O'Day	Scanlon	Voorhis, Calif.
O'Leary	Schaefer, Ill.	Wadsworth
Oliver	Schuetz	Ward
Pace	Scrugham	Wasielewski
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Shafer, Mich.	Weiss
Plauché	Short	Wilson
Plumley	Sikes	Winter
Reed, Ill.	Simpson	Wolcott
Richards	Smith, W. Va.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rivers	Starnes, Ala.	
	Stevenson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.
Mr. Romjue for, with Mr. Thill against.
Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Stevenson against.
Mr. Traynor for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Dondero against.
Mr. Schuetz for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia for, with Mrs. Bolton against.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Clevenger against.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.
Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Rockefeller against.
Mr. Connery for, with Mr. Simpson against.
Mr. Hill of Colorado for, with Mr. Culkin against.
Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Douglas against.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Haines for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.
Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Bolles against.
Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Houston for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Imhoff for, with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Shafer of Michigan against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Scanlon.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Downs with Mr. Jacobsen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 93, line 16, strike out "$54,555,000" and insert "$60,505,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$64,505,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 105: Page 94, after line 11, insert:

"Fort Peck project, Montana: For the purposes of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 18, 1936, entitled 'An act to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Fort Peck project for navigation, and for other purposes' (52 Stat. 403), the Bureau of Reclamation may enter into contracts for the procurement of materials and supplies and for the purchase of the necessary interest in lands, the total of the obligations under such contracts not to exceed $500,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. According to the statement made by Mr. Page, this money will not be needed until 1944, yet we are going to insert in the bill now a contract authorization for $500,000. It is your responsibility. Accept it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Peck power plant is being completed and will be operated under the direction of the Secretary of War. It will have an initial capacity of 50,000 kilowatts and an ultimate capacity of 85,000 kilowatts. The electrical energy generated at the plant will be disposed of by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior.

I have been advised by the Corps of Engineers that the estimated cost of the power facilities at Fort Peck is $5,845,466. The money for the construction of the power plant has been appropriated, and approximately $3,080,000 has been spent to date. Under ordinary conditions the work could be pushed to completion in a relatively short time. However, it is expected to be delayed somewhat on account of the difficulty of obtaining priorities for power equipment for the project which is not essentially for national defense.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made plans for the transmission of the electrical energy from Fort Peck to the existing and proposed commercial and irrigation pumping load centers in three regions of the Great Plains area of eastern Montana and western North Dakota. One of these regions includes the territory along the Yellowstone River in Montana, from Glendive to Miles City; another includes the territory along and north of the Missouri River in Montana and North Dakota, from Fort Peck to and approximately 40 miles east of Williston, N. Dak.; and the other the territory along the Milk River in Montana, from Fort Peck to Saco.

Irrigation projects are nearing completion along the Yellowstone River above Glendive, Mont., and on the Missouri near Williston. Another project is being started near Saco, Mont. All of these projects require power for irrigation pumping and will be completed within the next 2 years.

The Bureau advises me that it wishes to commence erection of the Fort Peck-Glendive, the Glendive-Miles City, and the Fort Peck-Williston transmission lines, and to start the erection of the Glendive and Williston substations in the fiscal year 1942, completing the work in the following fiscal year. This will require the expenditure of approximately $500,000 in 1942, and $1,280,000 in 1943. Under this plan, power would be available for use as soon as the plant was completed at Fort Peck. It is proposed to use the money made available in 1942 for the completion of location surveys, and for the purchase of transmission line and substation facilities. Due to defense needs, it is anticipated that there will be considerable delay in the delivery of the necessary equipment. Consequently, it may require more than 2 years to complete the lines. For this reason the specifications should be prepared and the contracts awarded for materials as soon as possible.

Consequently, the amendment for contractual authority for $500,000 for the purchase of materials for transmission lines and substation facilities should remain in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 106: Page 95, at the end of line 21, insert:

": *Provided further*, That of said sum, $250,000 shall, upon approval by the President of an allocation therefor, be available to the Secretary of State (acting through the American Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico) for continuing the investigations authorized by such act of August 19, 1935: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State, with the approval of the President, shall designate the features of the project which he deems international in character, and shall direct such changes in the general project plan as he deems advisable with respect to such features; and the features so designated shall be built, after consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation as to general design,

by the American section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, and shall be operated and maintained by said Commission insofar as their operation and maintenance in such manner is, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, necessary because of their international character. The construction, operation, and maintenance of such project shall be pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, except as hereinbefore provided and except that—

"(1) In addition to the nonreimbursable allocation to flood control or navigation which may be made by the Secretary of the Interior under section 9 (b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, the President, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, shall allocate such part of the total estimated cost of the project as he deems proper to the protection of American interests from drought hazards resulting from the uncontrolled and unregulated flow of the international portion of the Rio Grande below Old Fort Quitman, Tex. Provisions of law applicable with respect to allocations to flood control under section 9 (b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the foregoing provisions, be applicable in like manner with respect to any allocation made under this subparagraph; and

"(2) All revenues received by the United States in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 107: On page 97, following the amendment just adopted, insert:

"Protection of project works: For the purpose of providing protective devices such as floodlights, gates, and barricades for the protection against sabotage and other depredations of any and all dams, powerhouses, and other structures and works whatsoever, heretofore or hereafter constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, which in the opinion of the Secretary require such protection, $50,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 108: On page 97, following the amendment just adopted, insert: "*Provided*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, enter into agreements with other Federal agencies or with States, counties, irrigation, construction, or reclamation districts or other political subdivisions or water users' associations for the protection of any such works and for reimbursement from this appropriation for amounts expended by them in furnishing protection for any such works."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 113: Page 99, after line 10 insert: "*Provided further*, That not less than one-half of this appropriation shall be devoted to mapping in strategic areas in accordance with priorities to be determined by the Secretary of War."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 119: Page 114, after line 6 insert:

"Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite and alunite: For all expenses necessary to the conduct of investigations and research on processes for production of alumina from siliceous bauxites and alunite, including all necessary laboratory research; maintenance and operation of small subcommercial plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; construction and equipment of a building to house testing and subcommercial plant units; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building and plant units; purchase of supplies and equipment; travel expenses; purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriters, adding and computing machines, professional and scientific books and publications; purchase of special wearing apparel or equipment for protection of employees engaged in their work, $85,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, after the word "bauxite", insert a comma and the following: "aluminum clays",

And in line 4 of said amendment, after the word "bauxites", insert a comma and the following "aluminum clays."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 120: On page 116, line 4, strike out "$4,537,470" and insert "$4,662,470."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this is merely to correct the totals. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 121: Page 121, line 10: ": *Provided*, That employees of the Mammoth Cave Operating Committee who have had not less than two years' service with that Committee at the time of the approval of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be employed by the National Park Service, in the administration, protection, and development of said national park."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 128: Page 129, line 15:

"Hereafter appropriations made for the National Park Service shall be available for any expenses incident to the preparation and recording of title evidence covering lands to be donated to the United States for administration by the National Park Service."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 129, line 20:

"Hereafter fees incident to admission to the national parks and monuments and other areas in the national-park system, charged and collected with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be exempt from all Federal tax on admissions."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 130: Page 130, line 19:

"*Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of $3,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligation so created."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 130, and concur in the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$2,400,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to keep the record clear. This amendment calls for $2,400,000 for roads and trails in national parks. That would not be so bad, but you add an amendment granting contract authorization of $3,000,000 more. That is the "nigger in the woodpile," as it has been in so many other items. You not only appropriate money but you give contract authorization. It certainly does not seem to me to be good business practice to continue to add to the powers of the administration that of incurring contractual

obligations when you have not money enough now to pay for what you are already spending. It just does not make sense.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 132: Page 132, line 7, "*Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also approve projects, incur obligations, and enter into contracts for additional work not exceeding a total of $6,000,000 of which $2,000,000 shall be for the Natchez-Trace Parkway and shall be allotted and expended ratably between the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee according to mileage of said parkway in each respective State, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and appropriations hereafter made for the construction and maintenance of the Blue Ridge, Natchez-Trace, and George Washington Memorial Parkways shall be considered available for the purpose of discharging the obligation so created."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Once again I call attention to the fact that you have appropriated cash for the Natchez Trace and Blue Ridge Parkways. This would not be so bad, but you come along on top of that and give the Secretary authority to make contract obligations to the extent of $6,000,000 additional. That is the "nigger in the woodpile," but you go ahead and do it right along on all these items.

If you have not the money now to pay for the appropriations you are making, how are you going to pay these contract authorizations? The responsibility is yours if you vote for it. I am against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141. Page 139, line 24 "Alaska crab investigation: For all necessary expenses of the Fish and Wildlife Service in continuing and completing a technical, economic, and biological investigation of the king-crab fishery off the coast of Alaska, locating the areas of abundance, and carrying on experiments to develop improved methods of taking and canning king crabs, including the charter of vessels without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the appointment of employees without regard to the civil service and classification laws, $25,000, and not to exceed $5,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this heading in the 'Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940,' is hereby reappropriated and added to this appropriation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 144: Page 145, line 6, strike out "$5,291,175", and insert in lieu thereof "$5,582,200."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In view of the sum proposed insert "$5,531,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 145: Page 146, line 3: "*Provided*, That hereafter all such migratory-bird hunting stamps not sold at the end of the fiscal year for which issued shall be turned over to the philatelic agency and therein placed on sale until disposed of or until the Congress otherwise provides: *Provided further*, That such stamps shall be usable as migratory-bird hunting stamps only during the fiscal year for which issued."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 147: On page 146, after the word "Service" in line 18, strike out "$7,719,175" and insert "$8,582,200."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 147 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$8 281,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 152: Page 158, after line 2, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. Hereafter jurisdiction or authority over any lands in the State of Arizona shall not be acquired by or transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, except by act of Congress. This provision shall not prevent exchanges of lands heretofore authorized by law."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 152 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

'SEC. 8. No national monument or historic site shall hereafter be created, nor shall any additions be made to one heretofore created, except by act of Congress: *Provided*, That this provision shall not prevent exchanges of lands heretofore authorized by law."

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment; first, it is not germane to Senate amendment No. 152, and second, it exceeds the authority of the conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I concede the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed substitute for Senate amendment No. 152 takes in quite a lot of territory. Note that the original amendment applied only to lands in the State of Arizona and applied only to lands acquired by or transferred to the Secretary of the Interior. The substitute language, although seemingly narrower in scope, because it refers to national monuments and historic sites, can reasonably be construed to include all forms of reservations created by Executive action. It contains the words "or other similar reservation," and at first glance this might be thought to include only reservations similar to national monuments and historic sites, but I am informed by competent counsel in the Interior Department that these two terms cover all Executive-order reservations of historic or scientific interest. Of course, national parks and national historical parks are reservations. But they are not similar reservations because they are not created by Executive action; they are reservations which are established only by special acts of Congress. Obviously the substitute language is not intended to include them.

In order to give the language "or other similar reservation" some meaning, it would be quite logical to construe it as including reservations which are similar to monuments and historic sites in that they are established by Executive action. Wildlife refuges and Weeks Act and other national forests of the character established by Executive order would then be covered by the provision. It is important to remember, however, that the language is not confined to reservations under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and if it can be construed to include national forests, it may also be construed to include military and naval reservations or other reservations established for military and naval purposes.

The crippling effect of such a provision on the national-defense program of a requirement that such reservations must be established only by act of Congress should be fully realized. Many reservations for military and naval pur-

poses have been set aside by Executive action in recent months. To name only a few:

Executive Order No. 8652, dated January 28, 1941, reserved 262,200 acres of land in Utah for aerial bombing and gunnery range purposes.

Executive Order No. 8636, dated January 14, 1941, reserved 7,338 acres of land as an aviation base in Nevada.

Executive Order No. 8725, dated March 29, 1941, reserved 1,744 acres in Florida for aerial gunnery ranges.

Executive Order No. 8651, dated January 23, 1941, reserved 93,424 acres in Oregon for an aerial bombing and gunnery range.

I say we should not take any chances with our national-defense program. These reservations of public lands for military and naval purposes are vitally important to the development of our national defenses and should not be endangered in any way through needless delays. We should not casually accept an amendment as a rider to an appropriation bill which has not been carefully considered by the appropriate standing committee and which is strongly opposed by the department charged with the administration of our public lands.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have received three telegrams in reference to this matter that I wish to quote, as follows:

LEWISTOWN, MONT., *June 18, 1941.*
Hon. J. F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building:

We vigorously urge your support of amendment 152 to Interior Department appropriation bill.

CENTRAL MONTANA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
HALL CLEMENT, *Secretary.*

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 18, 1941.*
Congressman JAMES O'CONNOR,
House Office Building:

Understand effort will be made on floor of House to eliminate amendment 152 from Interior Department appropriation bill. Urge your active interest in keeping amendment intact. Regards.

HAL CHENEY.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 18, 1941.*
Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building:

We most earnestly support any efforts you make toward House approval of amendment 152 to Interior Department appropriation bill.

BILLINGS COMMERCIAL CLUB,
A. T. PETERSON, *President.*

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment 152, and the substitute amendment adopted by the conferees, which is not printed and available to the Members at this time, I am informed officially, reads as follows:

No national monument, historic site, or other similar reservation shall hereafter be created, nor shall any addition be made to one heretofore created, except by act of Congress: *Provided*, That this provision shall not prevent exchanges of land authorized by law—

which it is proposed to rule out on a point of order, goes to the disposal of the mineral on the remaining public lands, and to the birthright of the American citizen to discover, locate, and own mining claims under the public-land law, a birthright certain departmental officials assiduously seek to take away from the people of these United States, it being the declared policy of the Department of the Interior to abrogate the mining lode-location law and the laws that provide for the patent of mining claims.

This right of our citizens to prospect and locate mining claims on public domain is a settled policy of our Government that has been rigidly protected by the Congress in all legislation dealing with public lands. By one expedient or another these departments are seeking to subvert this broad constructive policy of our Government and the Congress by resorting to technicalities. First they take advantage of the Weeks law and construe terms of the act to prevent mining locations on Government land acquired under its provisions. Then they dig up the Antiquities Act and construe its provisions to authorize the wholesale withdrawal of public land from mining locations by Executive order, when, in fact, the purpose of this act was to protect objects of historical interest on unappropriated public land, the remains of the cliff dwellers, and aboriginal tribes, Indian mounds, and so forth.

We of the West, where the Government-owned mineral lands yet to be developed are located, have little to fear from a frontal attack by the introduction of legislation effectuating this plan of the bureaus, but the western Members must be vigilant that some innocent looking joker is not slipped through in passing legislation that will accomplish the purpose of the departments by authorizing the withdrawal of the public domain from mining location by Executive order, and accomplish the abrogation of one of the last remaining rights of the United States citizens to acquire anything on Government land.

Time does not permit a discussion of the effects of the proposed bureaucratic policy; we know the results of our broad, liberal legislative policy in fostering the development of land and mineral resources, which makes this country the envy of the eyes of the rest of the world, particularly when contrasting the results we have achieved with those of Russia when the mineral in public land was the property of the Czar, and any mines the Russians found were left covered up and undeveloped. If we seek to Russianize this country, the policy these departments seek to impose on our people by stripping our citizens of their remaining birthright, is a good way to go about it.

We must be vigilant, and see to it that our laws protecting our rights are not repealed or nullified.

Under permission given by the House, I insert two telegrams and my replies thereto on this vitally important legislation:

WALLACE, IDAHO, *June 18, 1941.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.:

Wallace Board of Trade earnestly requests you to support conferees' amendment 152 to Interior Department appropriation bill, which amendment requires congressional approval of establishment or extension of national parks and national monuments.

WALLACE BOARD OF TRADE,
By H. J. HULL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 19, 1941.*
H. J. HULL,
Board of Trade, Wallace, Idaho:

Re telegram will absolutely support the amendment 152 protect mining development and birthright of American citizens to locate and secure title to mining claims on public land. Appreciate support of your board. Heartening to find western people in accord our program.

COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.

BOISE, IDAHO, *June 18, 1941.*
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE:

Understand conference committee has agreed on amendment calling for congressional approval to withdraw any public lands from grazing use for any special-privilege areas. We highly approve this legislation and solicit your active support in favor of this amendment..

IDAHO WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 19, 1941.*
WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Boise, Idaho:

Re telegram, will absolutely support amendment 152, protect congressional control of public domain. Appreciate support of your association. Heartening to find western people in accord with our program.

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was to be expected under the circumstances, and yet nevertheless regrettable, that the Senate amendment No. 152 to the Interior appropriation bill reached just now, would not be agreed to, but instead ruled out on a point of order. At this late hour of the day, when we have been struggling so long with this vital and complicated bill with its many puzzling disagreements in the conference report, it is understandable that the Members are in no mood to listen to a discussion of the merits of this proposal just now ruled out. Under the rules it should, no doubt, be expected to be ruled out on a point of order, but the principle of this matter ought to be incorporated into the law. It may be that some good will result from the offering of this amendment by the Senate, even though it is rejected at this time; however, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call attention to certain reasons for the Senate proposal which has just been rejected.

The Senator from my State, who offered this amendment, undoubtedly offered it in all seriousness, hoping to bring about a change in the present law, or in a public-land policy and practice which we have found to be in need of change. This desirable change could be brought about by different administrative action, but we have long looked for such different administrative action and have been disappointed. Instead, we notice a growing tendency on the part of the Interior Department to want to transfer great areas of the public domain—areas far in excess of the real need for the worthy purpose which they have in mind—in creating national parks and monuments.

I think there has always been a tendency to include too much area by Executive order in such withdrawals of the public domain for such specific purposes. The history of Arizona affords some interesting examples, of which I wish to speak later. Of late years, however, that tendency to include too much

has been noticeably growing, and we have seen withdrawals made, or attempts at withdrawals made, from the public domain for national monuments by Executive order where the area was vastly more than needed for the purpose. Usually that was done without consulting the representatives of the people of the State and without regard to the wishes of the people of the State. It really amounts to an abuse of power, which, if not corrected by the Federal agencies concerned, must surely be corrected by law.

One reason we have so much difficulty on the Interior Department appropriation bill in getting suitable appropriations for proper development of our great landed estate of Uncle Sam's in the Far West, is that so many members are unacquainted with the western portion of our country, and do not understand the crying need for wise investments in the new and partially developed portions of the Nation. The same thing is true with regard to correcting abuses of administrative power in withdrawing too much of an area, or locking up too much potential wealth in the public domain to create a national monument. The same thing is true with regard to Indian reservations, national parks, and national forests. Many citizens in the East, dimly understanding the real nature of the object and not knowing the proper amount of area that should be included, will oppose the very thing that is really for the best interest of the locality and of the whole country. Let me instance a few in the State of Arizona alone, as proof of what I have said.

Half a dozen decades ago a noted missionary came into the Salt River Valley in Arizona Territory only a few miles from the site of the present capital—Phoenix. This religious worker made a settlement of whites along that river, and, being a friend of all Indians, he invited Pima Indians to come up from the Pima villages, or from Sacaton, and make their homes near him. This Christian leader, having considerable influence with the then President of the United States, succeeded in getting an Executive order setting up an Indian reservation, including the whole of the Salt River Valley, wherein is situated the most productive irrigation project in the United States today. When the whites, living in such communities as Phoenix, Glendale, Tempe, and Mesa, Ariz., heard that all that rich valley land had been included in an Indian reservation, they were furious. They demanded that the Executive order be modified, and some of the whites of the same religious faith as the missionary, although they had great interest and solicitude for the Indians, were of the mind to excommunicate the missionary and to ride him out of the country on a rail. The Executive order was modified, and the transplanted Indians now have a suitable area, very much restricted and suitable for their number, located in good farm land near Scottsdale, Ariz. I cite that case to show how one well-intentioned man who could get the ear of the President of the United States, in the name of a good cause, certainly came near disrupting the orderly development of a large area of our country.

When the Grand Canyon National Park was first marked off on the map, it included a vast area in northern Arizona, and some of that area had no scenic attraction and much of the original proposal had no just right to be included. Both the Grand Canyon National Park and the Grand Canyon National Monument have needed revision downward in area. And, don't you suppose that I am proud of our Grand Canyon? I shall always work for the best interest of both.

About 6 years ago, when it was quite properly suggested that a grove of organpipe cactus in southern Arizona, down on the Mexican border ought to be preserved, because that plant is unique to our State, being found in no other State of our Union, a national monument was created by an Executive order. Now, I heartily approve of such a national monument but, in this case 425 square miles were blocked out and made into a monument and all mining privileges taken away. Now it is a known fact that there is mineral wealth in a part of that area, and the cacti do not occupy the entire area, but this tremendous expanse has been closed to prospector's and miners and unknown mineral wealth locked up unnecessarily. Right at this moment an organization, with the best of intentions, is opposing any change in status in regard to that monument. Now, the people who asked for the monument in the first place did not ask for so great an area to be included, but just the same it was blocked off without regard for need or merit, and without consideration of the wishes of the people, or of the advice of those persons best informed and most interested. It is just exactly that sort of thing that caused our well-informed Senator to propose the Senate amendment in this bill which we have just ruled out on a point of order.

I am certainly much interested in national forests, and, as a student of history and a lover of my own State, I am certainly as much interested in national monuments in it as anybody who breathes the air. It seems ridiculous, however, when an agency of our Government will reach out and "grab the earth and build a fence around it," and even defeat the very thing for which they profess to be working. I could cite instances within the State of Arizona where national forests have been blocked out so extensively that half their area does not contain a tree with a diameter as great as my thumb. Now I understand that this has been the experience of other States.

This could be remedied by proper attitude on the part of Federal agencies and cooperation with the local authorities. For instance, 3 years ago it was proposed that a herd of Big Horn sheep native to a district in Arizona should be protected, and it was also proposed that another area containing native palms should also be protected. The first thing we knew a proposal was put into effect to include 1,500,000 acres in southwestern Arizona. The people of Arizona, officials and others, more vitally interested in Big Horn sheep and Arizona palms than anybody else, indignantly protested including so much area. The result was that several local men came to Washington, sat down at a table with the Government officials here, and came to an understanding about the area which ought to be set aside and something concerning its best management. Both of these districts are included in one area today, and it is now reduced to 660,000 acres to the satisfaction of all concerned and in the best interests of the whole project. I regret to say that the cooperation in the case I have just mentioned has not been usual but quite uncommon.

No equal area on earth can surpass Arizona in natural marvels and scenic grandeur. That State is fast becoming the Nation's playground. We profit greatly by our tourist crop, and we invite the whole world to come to see what Nature has done for Arizona. In keeping with all that, we do want national parks and monuments, but we are not interested in creating "official feudatories" for agents of the Government and we do want some judgment shown in mapping out those parks and monuments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 158, line 8, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which the several motions were agreed to is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point where amendment No. 152 was considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point where amendment No. 152 was rejected and to include in connection therewith two telegrams to myself and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point where amendment No. 152 was considered and action taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear. I asked to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the point following action on amendment No. 105. In addition to that, I ask that in those remarks may be incorporated three tele-

grams I have received from Montana respecting amendment No. 152.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore made I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD upon the farm-labor situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a certain table furnished by the Department of the Interior in connection with my remarks made earlier this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE DAIRY AND THE PRESS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the rural press of this country is in close contact with the producers of the food of this Nation. They realize that butter has averaged only 27.6 cents per pound for the 8 years of the New Deal. They know butter averaged 38.1 cents the 8 years before the New Deal. They know cheese averaged only 13.4 cents per pound the 8 years of the New Deal, and 18.1 cents per pound the 8 years before the New Deal.

They also know that the New Deal pegged the price of butter on April 4 at 31 cents per pound, when it was 33¼ cents per pound the same day, and that the parity price was 37.1 cents per pound the same day. They know that the fall of agricultural prices began when the New Deal got control of the House of Representatives in 1930. In fact, butter has averaged only 26.7 cents per pound, and cheese only 12.9 cents per pound during these 10 years that the New Deal has had control of the House of Representatives.

The following editorial is from the Waupaca County Post of Waupaca, Wis. This is a country newspaper that has always kept in close contact with agricultural problems. The editorial is so right in its approach to this dairy situation that I ask to include it at this point:

THE DAIRY FARMER AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Washington observers on both sides of the convoy controversy agree that the group which has shown least enthusiasm for the administration's war policy is the farmers. With the announced purpose of counteracting apathy in the Farm Belt, Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard has recently been delivering increasingly warlike speeches in the Middle West. From Washington, we have been supplied with a confidential Department of Agriculture memorandum which reveals the Department's extreme concern with the desire of American farmers to remain at peace. To overcome this peace sentiment, it urges key people in agriculture to resort to the crudest type of war propaganda.

A copy of this official attempt to instigate mass hysteria is given here:

"[Confidential: For administrative use only]

"UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
"FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
"*May 7, 1941.*

"To: All information advisers.

"From: John Fischer, Chief, Information Division.

"Subject: Special memorandum on national defense (No. 8).

"The Department has just received information that the British shipping situation is much more serious than most Americans have realized. While the Department has the exact figures, we cannot pass them on to you for military reasons. In general, however, the situation is this:

"(1) British ships are being sunk twice as fast as they can be replaced by the combined effort of British and American shipyards—and at the last report, the rate of loss was still rising.

"(2) Tonnage being landed at British ports is less than half of what it was before the war.

"(3) In the last month Britain has had to cut down on her imports of armaments from the United States in order to increase imports of food.

"(4) The food situation of Britain is so serious that foundation herds of livestock and poultry are being slaughtered.

"Department experts emphasize that these facts do not mean that England has lost the war. There is some doubt, however, whether England can hold out through the winter, if we do not take immediate and positive measures to see that American food and war materials are delivered at British ports.

"What a British defeat would mean to this country should by this time be obvious to all of us. Many of the best informed people in Washington predict an invasion of the Western Hemisphere within 90 to 120 days, if Britain is defeated.

"The Department feels that the American people—particularly the American farmers—do not understand these facts, and that vigorous action of the type needed, cannot be taken until this lack of understanding is remedied. For this reason, every agency in the Department has been asked to do all it can to get these facts before the people.

"We cannot issue formal press releases or radio speeches on the subject for two obvious reasons—it is not the official job of the Department to discuss international affairs; and indiscriminate broadcasting of these facts might play into the hands of the appeasement propaganda groups.

"We are requested, however, to carry these facts by word of mouth to as many as possible of our own officials and other key people in Agriculture, such as F. S. A. committeemen, etc."

We don't know by whom the Department of Agriculture has been "requested" to spread an invasion scare. Most readers will probably agree that "it is not the official job of the Department to discuss international affairs." However, if the extensive apparatus of the Department of Agriculture is going to be devoted to propaganda for war intervention, we'd like to call its attention to the fact that—

(1) Chairman Emory S. Land, of the United States Maritime Commission, with as authentic sources of information as the Agriculture Department, recently asserted that a relatively slight percentage of United States aid to England has been sunk.

(2) Some United States shipping interests agree with the National Maritime Union that before United States vessels enter war zones Britain should transfer its 8,000,000 tons of shipping still engaged in neutral trade.

(3) British livestock is being slaughtered because less shipping space is needed to import meat than fodder; although the food situation of all belligerents is grave, there is no evidence that Britain has been forced to curtail imports of United States armaments.

(4) To our knowledge, no military expert has maintained that the United States will be invaded "within 90 to 120 days." Eight months ago we read a suppressed report of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee denying the possibility of a German invasion. The Department's orders to its "key people" (which, incidentally, have been ignored by lesser Agricultural Department officials actually in touch with farmers) to startle the United States with the possibility of invasion is similar to Roosevelt's warnings last summer about the prospective bombing of Omaha, which were used to push through conscription.

(5) Despite all the governmental urge for farmers to produce more under the slogan "Food for defense," the farmer will not share in this war prosperity.

Read the following statement by State Senator John E. Cashman, one of the

best-informed farmer members of our State legislature:

"Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has urged the farmers to boost their milk output at least 8 percent, but there isn't the slightest assurance that the farmers will be guaranteed even their own cost of increasing production.

"Not only that, but there comes a report that prices of dairy and other farm products will be the first to be pegged, so that the farmers will not receive prices above a level fixed by the Government.

"In the wild riot of spending in progress in Washington it is evident the farmers are being forgotten, while their debts and interest on their debts continue."

Don't stop reading now, but get this definition of "parity" given by Congressman MERLIN HULL, of Black River Falls, Wisconsin's most sincere advocate of a decent, fair break for dairying:

"The President has signed the bill which will permit loans to 85 percent of parity for cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. It is expected that with the limit so raised, those particular farm products may be priced at close to parity.

"At the same time, it is officially stated that the prices of farm products must not go above parity. The five crops on which the favor of higher-loan values is granted comprise less than 40 percent of the total farm production, and less than 10 percent of that total production is within 15 percent of parity.

"There is much confusion in the public mind as to the meaning of 'parity' for farm commodities. Many are misled by the press statements that the farm will have equal purchasing power with industry on the basis of from 1909 to 1914. Really, it is supposed to mean that a unit of farm products shall have the same purchasing power in exchange for things the farmers buy or pay for as the same unit of product had in 1909–14.

"The manner of figuring parity is based on the theories of those who recommended and obtained the passage of the law. Considering the changed conditions from those of 30 years ago, and the even then unsatisfactory conditions in agriculture, 'parity' for the farm is about as much out of date as is a woman's hat of that same earlier time, but it continues to be the measuring stick of the professors and other experts who are in position to define the meaning of farm prosperity.

"In industry, the measure of prices is cost of production plus profit. Sometimes, particularly under monopoly control, the profit is as great as the cost of producing. There is no attempt made to limit the price to the standards of 1909–14. The past 20 years the farmers have had to accept less than parity prices on much of their production most of the time.

"Now, another war is booming many industries, wage rolls are advancing, and rents and profits are being boosted as Government expenditures roll out. The costs for national defense in particular are proving to be many times the estimates of a year ago. With it all comes the warning that prices on farm products must not go above the standards of purchasing power set by parity with those of 1909–14."

The County Post agrees, with all reasonable people, that America should bend every effort for defense. But as spokesmen of Wisconsin dairying we shall expose, fight, resist, and criticize a Government policy which, under the guise of "emergency," makes more millionaires in the cities, more paupers on the farms.

THE PEOPLE WANT PEACE AND RESENT ATTEMPTS TO MISGUIDE THEM

In spite of the professional war agitators, and in spite of the efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture to "sell" the war to the farmers of this country, it is becoming more and more evident every day that the great bulk of people are opposed to war.

The following article shows the result of a recent poll conducted in a fair manner by a fair-minded newspaper, the Antigo Daily Journal, of Antigo, Wis.:

LANGLADE COUNTY RESIDENTS AGAINST HELPING BRITISH, VOTING DISCLOSES

Residents of Langlade County are definitely against United States interference in the European war and favor a strictly "mind our own business" policy. At least such an attitude is revealed in the poll the Antigo Daily Journal conducted last week to secure unofficially this section's stand in the current crisis. Voting in the poll was not large, but even on such a basis it is probably a good indication that Langlade County people want no part in the foreign conflict.

For every 200 votes cast the results ran like this:

Thirty-nine persons voted, "Yes; help the British win." One hundred and sixty voted, "No; let's mind our own business."

Nineteen of the 39 who voted, "Yes; help the British win," favored all-out cooperation with Britain even it means war.

One hundred and fifty-five of the 160 who voted a "mind our own business policy" voted for stopping all aid to England and said they favored strict neutrality.

Eighty-eight of the 159 voting, "No; let's mind our own business," were for limited economic aid to Britain, but not to the extent of convoys, patrols, American ships, men, or military forces.

THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, on his handling of this very complicated bill. It seems that the Interior Department appropriation bill is the one that always arouses the most controversy. I believe this is largely true because many Members do not know the wide scope of this bill, the ramifications of the entire measure.

The gentleman from Oklahoma and his committee have done a splendid piece of work here today, and I wish to compliment him at this time, now that we have accepted the conference report, on getting this measure through. The people of the entire West understand the great task he has undertaken and carried through and we appreciate the meaning of this appropriation.

May I add my voice to the eulogies paid today to that grand old man of the West, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and add a small mite for my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] in regard to this particular measure. He deserves more than this mite. I feel that we have done good work here today in putting this bill through. Even in this time of stress and great national emergency we must not neglect our internal affairs, we must not fail to promote the logical growth of our country. That is what we have been struggling with here today in these various proposals in the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his very generous contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the Tennessee Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HAINES, for the balance of this week, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOUSTON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS), for 1 day, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. HOLBROOK, indefinitely, on account of illness in immediate family.

To Mr. SAUTHOFF (at the request of Mr. GEHRMANN), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Major R. Lee;

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Roche, Connell & Laub Construction Co.;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie;

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y Upham;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds;

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the County of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes;

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Friday, June 20, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

670. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

671. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 1, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Morro Bay, Calif., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 28, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 283); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

672. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 29, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 284); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

673. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mahoning Creek at and in the vicinity of Punxsutawney, Pa., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 2519. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; without amendment (Rept No. 788). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4837. A bill to safeguard the confidential nature of Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia case records in all types of relief cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Patents. H. R. 3206. A bill to afford greater protection to the purchaser of patent rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4865. A bill to increase the amount authorized by the act of July 11, 1940, for the construction of a building for the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5075. A bill to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCHULTE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R 4419. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation; without amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4548. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (title 8, sec. 109, U. S. C. Annotated); without amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 795. Report on the disposition of records by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 796. Report on the disposition of records by the Department of Labor. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 797. Report on the disposition of records by the Navy Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 798. Report on the disposition of records by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 799. Report on the disposition of records by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 800. Report on the disposition of records by the War Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 801. Report on the disposition of records by the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 802. Report on the disposition of records by the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 803. Report on the disposition of records by the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

House Report No. 804. Report on the disposition of records by the Post Office Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4983. A bill to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4937. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations; without amendment (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 215. An act to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to Wirt W. Anderson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5091. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of a naturalized wife residing abroad with her husband, a native-born national of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 5092. A bill to apply the definition of widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, or the Philippine Insurrection, as applied under the general pension law (act of July 14, 1862, as amended) to service-connected death benefits provided for widows of such veterans under part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, promulgated under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 5093. A bill providing for equalization of taxes in counties where there are Government-owned lands; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5094. A bill authorizing the purchase of United States Supreme Court Decisions and Digest; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5095. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5096. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to persons employed at military, air, and naval bases acquired by the United States from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 5097. A bill to provide for the disinfection of mail bags; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5098. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 5099. A bill providing that personal correspondence of members of the armed forces of the United States on active duty be transmitted in the mails free of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 5100. A bill to limit the duties which may be performed by certain officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 5101. A bill to establish a Department of Aviation, to consolidate therein the activities of the Government relating to military aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Act of 1941"; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 240. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their joint resolution relative to the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNES:

H. R. 5102. A bill for the relief of Fred Boehs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5103. A bill for the relief of Evanell Durrance; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5104. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools deposited in a warehouse and shop building maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation at Parker Dam, Ariz., destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5105. A bill providing for the extension of nonquota status of Jozefa Niziolek; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5106. A bill for the relief of Robert Helton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5107. A bill for the relief of Leonard P. Shoun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 5108. A bill for the relief of the Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, Rock Cave, Upshur County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 5109. A bill for the relief of the Zoar Baptist Church, of Kesslers Cross Lanes, Nicholas County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1466. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Otho Potter, secretary, and 339 other members of Townsend Club No. 1, of Fort Pierre, S. Dak., urging consideration and enactment of House bill 1036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1467. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution adopted by the Oswego Chamber of Commerce, Oswego, N. Y., opposing the establishment of price levels on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1468. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12, relative to discrimination in steamship service and freight rates between New York and California ports to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1469. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Birmingham Aero Club, of Birmingham, Ala., calling for the immediate establishment of a separate unified air force in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1470. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1471. Also, petition of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, opposing the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1472. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Rev. A. Dale Fiers, pastor, Central Church of Christ, of Newark, Ohio, and members of the congregation, supporting House bill 2475, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1473. Also, petition of H. H. McEowan, of Columbus, Ohio, and numerous railroad employees of Newark and vicinity, protesting against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1474. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States, now pending before the Congress, in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1475. By Mr. MOTT: Petition of J. V. Hornbuckle and 66 other citizens of Silverton, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 4000, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages in military and naval reservations, and to suppress vice in the vicinities of such reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1476. Also, petition of Hattie Coll and 34 other citizens of Silverton, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852 or Senate bill 983; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1477. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of sundry citizens of White Lake, Plankinton, and Mitchell, in South Dakota, petitioning their Congressman to actively support House bill 1036, known as the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1478. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Wellsboro, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1479. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. A. N. Stevenson, Sr., of Port Washington, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2475 and Senate bill 860, relative to de-

fending the health and morals of the military forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 10, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious Father, Author of Peace and Lover of Concord, who alone canst teach the minds of men and incline their wills to do Thy pleasure: Look, we beseech Thee, with the eyes of Thy mercy upon our Nation, and bless the multitudes who have been called hither out of many lands. Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, greed, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord. Help us to realize that like as we are many members of one body and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, yet are one body and every one members one of another, having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us.

Where we are divided, do Thou unite us, that, in singleness of purpose and unity of heart, we may build a brotherhood in which the ills of the present time shall disappear. Do Thou make America to be cognizant of her unity, that, walking in Thy paths, she may become the earthly counterpart of the Kingdom which Thou hast revealed to us through Thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 19, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 17, 18, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 120, 121, 128, 129, 132, 141, and 145 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 6, 19, 103, 119, 130, 144, and 147 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 152 and 153 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes;

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Roanoke, Va.;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Bone	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bulow	Holman	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McNary	Truman
Chavez	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Tydings
Danaher	Murdock	Vandenberg
Downey	Murray	Van Nuys
Ellender	Norris	Wheeler
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mrs. K. Kurt Baldauf, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against convoying ships to Europe by forces of the United States and against the union of the United States with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Earl McCune, of Stafford, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Montana, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of

military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. HUGHES:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

A petition of sundry citizens of Bushton, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

RESOLUTION OF DIRECTORS OF FOND DU LAC (WIS.) ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE—PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF CHEESE

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of the directors of Association of Commerce, of Fond du Lac, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed by directors of Association of Commerce, Fond du Lac, Wis., Tuesday, June 17, 1941

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has made public pronouncement to the Nation requesting that it reduce the consumption of cheese for the purpose of creating a surplus to be used for export to one of the nations engaged in the European war; and

Whereas the dairy farmers of Fond du Lac County have been contributing to a fund used by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture for the purpose of advertising and increasing the per capita consumption of cheese in the United States; and

Whereas Fond du Lac County ranks eleventh in cheese production among the 71 counties of Wisconsin, and the income from dairy products, especially cheese, vitally affects the economic life of the county of Fond du Lac as expressed by a production during 1940 of 13,123,000 pounds of cheese, using approximately 135,000,000 pounds of milk; and a reduction in consumption would vitally affect the earning capacity of 61,000 milk cows and large investments in modern farm and dairy equipment involving the highest sanitary standards in the Nation, and in addition would affect the income of a large number of people who are active in businesses kindred to the dairy-products industry, especially that of cheese, the revenue from which is accurately estimated to represent more than one-third of the total income from all dairy products of the country; and

Whereas the present level of national consumption of cheese will be necessary to avoid a precarious condition after the present foreign emergency is over: Be it

Resolved, The directors of the Fond du Lac Association of Commerce, representing the industrial, retail, wholesale, and professional men of the city, hereby enter their protest to Secretary Wickard's agricultural program asking for reduction of the consumption of cheese and resolve that the Secretary be respectfully requested to retract his request and as soon as possible consult with the dairy leaders of Wisconsin to the end that our present national per capita consumption may be preserved for the future and that the cheese required to meet the European emergency be obtained by some program of increased production of cheese; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Secretary Claude Wickard, Senators Alexander Wiley and Robert M. La Follette, and Congressman Frank Keefe.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS HOME DEMONSTRATION ADVISORY COUNCIL—MEDIATION OF THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Kansas Home Demonstration Advisory Council, an organization representing 23,000 farm-bureau women in Kansas, have sent me a copy of their resolution expressing their support of proposals to end the European war by mediation. The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, That the Kansas Home Demonstration Advisory Council go on record as giving full support to "the Christian campaign for peace through mediation" now being launched by leading churchmen of America, and that the following peace slogan be adopted:

"We do not want to participate; we cannot arbitrate; but we must make every effort to mediate."

I wish to say that I look with favor on these mediation proposals, and am in accord with the objectives of the council's resolution. I call attention also to the slogan suggested by the council, which reads:

We do not want to participate; we cannot arbitrate; but we must make every effort to mediate.

I think this slogan outlines a wise course. We might do well to give thought to it.

The people of Kansas are overwhelmingly opposed to our active participation in Europe's war. I believe the majority of the people of Kansas are in favor of mediating the European war. Certainly no one wants to see the killing and destruction continued.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. BROWN), from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1619. A bill for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 474).

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4646. A bill to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; without amendment (Rept. No. 475).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 10 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 19, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 913) to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1652. A bill to provide for medical care, subsistence, and treatment in private hospitals and medical attention by civilian physicians and surgeons for certain officers and enlisted men in the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Keffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. BROWN):

S. 1655. A bill for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 1656. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to retain Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, United States Army, on active duty with combat troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1657. A bill to provide for the issuance of insurance policies under section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to prohibit the issuance of insurance policies under the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1658. A bill authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency; to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced a private bill, Senate bill 1628, for the relief of S. R. Brackin, providing for the payment of a claim in the amount of $346.20. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think it more properly belongs to the Committee on Claims. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTBLISHMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the

Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 35, line 2, to strike out the words "24 hours", and insert in lieu thereof the words "30 days."

REPORT ON THE STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WASH. (S. DOC. NO. 70)

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 20, 1941, from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, on reexamination of Stillaguamish River, Wash., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON THE NANTICOKE RIVER, DEL. AND MD. (S. DOC. NO. 69)

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 20, 1941, from the Chief of Engineers of the Army, on reexamination of the Nanticoke River, Del. and Md., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

ARTICLE BY CHRISTINE SADLER ON PUTNAM COUNTY, TENN.

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Christine Sadler, published in the Washington Post of June 18, 1941, relative to Putnam County, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I have on the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on what page is the amendment to come?

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Delaware did not indicate the page.

Mr. HUGHES. It should be inserted at the appropriate place.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Chair state the page on which the amendment is to be inserted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware asked that his amendment be inserted at the proper place.

Mr. McKELLAR. May the amendment be read again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be restated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert:

In the administration of the program provided for by this act each State shall be recognized as an administrative unit.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, my object in offering the amendment is this: We all recognize, I take it—at least I do—that as a result of the reduction in the appropriation there will not be sufficient money to administer the W. P. A. properly. I voted for the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in the belief that the amount should be increased so that the class of our people affected could be properly and adequately taken care of.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me interrupt the Senator to say that so far as I am individually concerned, I have no objection to his amendment. As a matter of fact, it does not change the existing situation, because there is a separate administrative unit in every State; and so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to having the amendment put in the joint resolution.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate that I have had some intimation that in the effort which will be made to administer this law by taking care of as many persons as possible, it may be that the administrative expenses will be reduced, and that one way in which it may be attempted to carry out that policy will be to group some States and do away with the administration of relief in one or two of them. In the case of a State such as my State of Delaware, for instance—which is a small State—there is always a temptation to place the administration of such laws in some one of the large adjoining States, so that we will have no part in the program, causing in the administration of the program our people to go into Pennsylvania or Maryland or some other State, would be very inconvenient. The purpose I have in offering the amendment is that each State's program shall be retained, so that there shall be a relief administration in each one of the States, and that it shall not be taken away from any one of them.

I heartily wish it were not necessary even to consider the matter, and that the program could be continued as it is now, which is highly satisfactory, especially in my State. I think I can very safely say that the administration of W. P. A. has been extremely satisfactory in Delaware, a State in which there has never been the slightest criticism of its administration. I think we have one of the best W. P. A. directors in the whole country, and that he is generally recognized as being so. In fact, while all the daily newspapers in Delaware are of the opposite party, it is a very common thing for them to commend the W. P. A. administrator in Delaware for his fair and honest and capable administration of the law. So the reason why I offer the amendment is that I want to be sure no effort will be made to set up administrative regions nearby and take the administration of the law from Delaware, for instance, and put it under agencies in other States.

That is my object in offering the amendment. The Senator from Colorado says it is already in the law.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not say it is in the law. I say it is in the established practice of the administration, and I have no idea that there will be a change.

Mr. HUGHES. As the amendment was originally drawn, it carried another provision, which is already in the joint resolution. I am satisfied that so far as the W. P. A. Commissioner can do so and is concerned, he would avoid doing such a thing as the amendment seeks to avoid, and that he would attempt to administer the law as it has been administered; but when the money to be administered is so drastically reduced as in this instance, there is a sore temptation to resort to some method of making it go as far as possible; and, in doing so, frequently an injustice is done to some one of the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the funds appropriated by this section may be apportioned for a lesser period than the 12 months of the fiscal year 1942, but not for less than 8 months, as determined by the President, if in his judgment such action is required to meet unemployment conditions during such lesser period, but the funds so appropriated shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such Administration during such period.

And on page 10, line 20, after the date "1942", it is proposed to insert the words "except where a different apportionment is specifically permitted by this joint resolution."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in view of the very extensive argument yesterday on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, it is unnecessary for me at this time to go again into the details with regard to the situation which will develop as a result of the serious reduction in the appropriation for W. P. A. In many sections of the country, in States where national-defense contracts have not been allocated, a serious condition will result from the curtailment which will be made under the joint resolution as it now stands. Therefore I suggest that my amendment should be adopted. It would permit the President to exercise his discretion with regard to the use of these funds in a period of 8 months, if he found it was necessary to do so.

In my State of Montana I find that, as a result of the curtailed appropriations, it will be necessary to suspend entirely the W. P. A. activities in half the counties of the State. It will result in a very serious situation. In those counties unemployment is quite as serious today as it has been at any time during the last several years. If the joint resolution shall be enacted as it now stands, it will mean that those counties will have to go entirely without any W. P. A. activities. I think the same situation will be found in most of the States of the Union where defense

contracts have not been allocated. Therefore, I submit that the amendment should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the following proviso:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this proviso in the bill is certainly extraordinary. It seems to me there is no basis whatever for such a provision in an appropriation measure.

As the joint resolution stands, it provides every necessary safeguard to prevent the employment of persons in W. P. A. who are unworthy of such positions. Therefore, there could be no justification for singling out a particular individual and having the joint resolution provide that no part of the funds appropriated under it may be used for the payment of his salary.

I submit that such a provision would be vicious legislation. It is entirely uncalled for. The basis for it advanced in the House was that this man Lasser was supposed to have been in some manner connected with communistic or subversive organizations. The purpose of the provision was to prevent his employment by the W. P. A. There is absolutely no justification for that charge. I have before me a great number of articles which have appeared in the press of the country, showing that the contrary is the fact. Mr. Lasser at one time was the head of the Workers Alliance, and as the head of that organization it became necessary for him, whenever W. P. A. appropriations were being considered in Congress, to come here for the purpose of advocating increases and other amendments to the bills for the purpose of safeguarding and protecting the rights of those employed on W. P. A.

Necessarily in connection with his work in that regard he appeared before committees, and it seems that offense was taken by some of the members of the committees because of his excessive diligence in representing the rights of the workers. The purpose of the proviso in the joint resolution is to preclude him from employment in the W. P. A. Never since I have been in the Senate have I heard of legislation of this kind, and it seems to me it would be a vicious precedent for the Congress to establish. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be acted upon.

I should like also to call attention to a great number of articles which I have taken from the press showing that Mr. Lasser is not in any manner connected with communistic organizations. He has a record of having been interested only in protecting the rights and representing the interests of the unfortunate people who are compelled to seek employment under the W. P. A.

I shall not read the articles, because it would consume too much of the time of the Senate, but I submit that the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this is not an agreeable situation. I had hoped the amendment would not be offered. Ordinarily it is bad legislation to insert in a bill a provision dealing with the compensation of a particular individual, but there exists a situation which justifies a departure from the ordinary rules.

Mr. Lasser has denounced and condemned the Senate and the House and their committees repeatedly. Mr. Hunter, the head of the W. P. A., was advised that Mr. Lasser was an improper person to have on his roll. He has taken a man who has accused the Senate and the House and the W. P. A. Administration, under which he served, of graft and incompetency, and when the W. P. A. puts him in a place in the organization, which he has denounced, and gives him $4,400 a year, and sends him about the country, Congress has no other alternative but to exercise its own power.

I am compelled to put into the RECORD a word or two from Mr. Lasser's own statement. He appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations, and speaking of the organization under which he operates, he said:

Mr. LASSER. We feel, first, that the set-up of W. P. A. is all wrong. You have a single man, a dictator, at the top. Mr. Hopkins might be as well-meaning and honest as you please, but we don't believe that one man should have the sole dictating power over the relief system of this country. He can be subject to too many pressures and too many failings. I think it is the only case in the country in which one man has the sole power and there is no board to check him.

Secondly, there has grown up because of the dictation which springs from the top and runs down to the bottom, all the graft, all the favoritism, all the politics, that has appeared in the papers. We have known about graft, we have known about favoritism, we have known about politics for a long time, and we feel that under the present system of operation of W. P. A., graft and politics are going to continue. There must be in this W. P. A. set-up some form of representation by the men who are actually employed. If we had a say, and we were free from the fear of discharge when we complained about inefficiency and graft and favoritism, I assure you that the W. P. A. workers would keep W. P. A. clean.

That is the organization under which he operates. He said further:

Now we feel that we have been betrayed; that after accepting this so-called security wage, and after working just a few months, 700,000 of the workers are now being laid off. We feel, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the Democratic Party has sold us out, and has sold us out in order to flirt during this election with big business.

That is the kind of a gentleman he is. Now let me read some of the releases.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. To what organization does this man belong?

Mr. ADAMS. I am not concerned with the kind of organization to which he belongs.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought the Senator was referring to the kind of organization to which he belongs.

Mr. ADAMS. He belongs to the W. P. A. We are complaining that this kind of a man has been given a place in the W. P. A., and the Members of the House have said that they are unwilling to have him continue in that organization. We feel that we should not force upon the W. P. A. a man who has denounced House Members as grafters and as tories.

Mr. HUGHES. When was this statement made?

Mr. ADAMS. The particular statement was made several years ago, but he has been making similar statements year by year and month by month.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not wish the Senator to assume that I am taking up the cudgels for Mr. Lasser.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator is free to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. No. I simply wanted to know when the statements were made and what they were.

Mr. ADAMS. They have been made continuously. I have been serving upon appropriations and other committees for 8 years. Mr. Lasser is the only man I know who has ever appeared before those committees and insulted not only the committees, but the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate a few more utterances of this gentleman. In a statement issued for release by the organization of which he was then the head, he said:

The 1940 relief and work-relief bill is the product of undemocratic, tricky, back-room maneuvers.

He said further:

The same may be said of the other provisions that were rejected and repudiated on the floor of the Senate and then smuggled into the bill behind the closed doors of the conference room.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. May I ask the Senator about whom he is talking?

Mr. ADAMS. About David Lasser.

Mr. GLASS. I understood the Senator to refer to Hunter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Hunter is the man who employed Mr. Lasser, and I might have confused the names.

Mr. GLASS. All this vituperation, which, as I understood, was directed at Mr. Hunter, ought to have been directed at Lasser. I think we ought to cut him off if we can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator whether that last quotation was from Mr. Lasser or from the Republican national platform? [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman further goes on and, speaking of the bill, says:

There were protests against the law foisted on us by the antilabor Garner-Woodrum-Taber clique dominant in Congress.

Mr. President, this gentleman came before the Senate committee, where he denounced Members of the House and

charged them with improper and dishonest conduct to such an extent that we had to delete the remarks he made. Things that Senators were not permitted to say we would not permit this man to come and put on the record. He has lost no occasion when he could denounce Members of the Senate and Members of the House as corrupt, as dishonest, as inefficient. When the Members of the House, whose leadership has repeatedly been denounced by this man, say in the bill that they do not want this man on the rolls, that they have not been able to get Mr. Hunter, the head of the organization, to take him off, I think it is our obligation to stand by the Members of the House and say that we will not employ a man who has insulted the membership of the House and the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the objection the Senator from Colorado has against this man is that he appeared before the committee and freely expressed his views with reference to the W. P. A. and with reference to the matters then under consideration; and, merely because he exercised his right as a free American citizen to come before a committee of the Congress, he is now to be prohibited from having a position in any Government agency. I think that is a violent deprivation of his rights. It seems to me the Senate of the United States should not tolerate that kind of legislation.

As I understand his statement, the only objection the Senator from Colorado points out is that Mr. Lasser came before the committee and made these arguments openly and aboveboard before the committee. The same things have been said by thousands of other people all over the country. If we do what is now proposed to be done we shall establish a new principle in the Congress of the United States, and we will find that this kind of legislation will be proposed every time an appropriation bill comes up for consideration, when the committee is not satisfied with certain employees in various agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, I submit that my amendment should be sustained.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator from Montana makes is quite at variance with the facts. The House objects to Mr. Lasser not only because he comes before committees and makes certain statements but because he is an improper man to serve in a responsible Government place, for the reason that he has no respect for this Government and has no respect for the organization under which he is employed. He had been allowed to come repeatedly before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and say whatever he saw fit to say, until the time came when he denounced Members of the House as corrupt, and then his statements were deleted. We said we would not hear the gentleman the next time he came back, but he came before the committee in company with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and was permitted to be heard because the Senator from Montana sponsored him and said he would be responsible for what he said. The Senator from Montana apologized for what Mr. Lasser had previously said, and assured us there would be no repetition. Only for that reason was the gentleman heard. At that time he was given full opportunity to speak, because of the friendship and support of the Senator from Montana.

It is not sought to take Mr. Lasser off the rolls because of what he has said to our committee, but because of what he has said about the membership of the House, the body to which we owe some loyalty and some allegiance. They ask that we concur with them in taking off the rolls the man who has charged them with being corrupt, with being disloyal. They ask that we take off the rolls the man who has said that the very organization under which he seeks to work is reeking with graft and incompetency.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator has demonstrated that the whole purpose of this provision is to punish a man for something that occurred several years ago. Such action will become the basis for similar legislation in the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) was passed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post of this morning a brief comment concerning the cut in the W. P. A. appropriation, which I should like to have in the RECORD. I read from the article:

W. P. A. SLASH BURDEN PLACED ON CAPITAL—CUT IN ROLLS SCHEDULED FOR JULY 1; CITY FACES PROBLEM, HUNTER SAYS

By July 1 W. P. A. rolls throughout the country will be reduced from 1,413,000 workers to about 1,000,000, but defense projects under W. P. A. will be maintained, Hunter said. A national average of 1,000,000. * * *

This will bring the national W. P. A. roster to its lowest ebb in history, Hunter reported. The last previous low mark was 1,450,000 in September 1937.

Washington faces a 59.4 percent cut in personnel over July 1 of 1940, running fourth to Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maryland. Maryland's slash from last year will be 64.9 percent.

Hunter also revealed that he planned to close down completely all W. P. A. projects in 1,500 counties throughout the country within 30 days.

He expressed an opinion, however, that none of the States or cities scheduled to receive drastic slashes will be able to absorb all their jobless in private employment.

The point I wish to make is that as the complaints begin to come in from the places in the country where W. P. A. is eliminated entirely, or reduced to but a skeleton force, I believe the amendment suggested yesterday by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] will be again presented, and such an amendment will be annexed without difficulty to a deficiency appropriation bill. At least I hope that will occur.

DEPARTURE FROM AND ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4973.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The first amendment reported by the Committee on the Judiciary will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in section 1, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out the word "That."

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the first committee amendment being a purely clerical error, I ask that it be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 3.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "That" and insert "When the United States is at war or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "That any" and insert "Any."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2a, on page 2, line 19, after the words "Sec. 4", to strike out "That the" and insert "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, following the committee amendment previously agreed to, it is proposed to strike out "whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states" and insert in lieu thereof "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I objected to the consideration of the bill because of the fact that apparently the bill would deal with any situation, for all time to come, whenever there exists between two or more nations a state of war to which we are not a party. It seems to me that the bill should be confined to the present emergency.

Before the amendment of the act was proposed, the language applied only when the United States itself was at war. The House has tried to extend the power of the President to apply to any time when war exists anywhere in the world and the President desires to exercise the power.

Such powers are very extreme. They permit the President to prevent any citizen of the United States from traveling outside the United States, and to prescribe rules and regulations under which he may be prohibited from leaving the United States. The proposed powers are practically unlimited over all travel over the borders of the United States; and it seems to me they ought to exist only when there is a real emergency.

My amendment proposes to strike out the words "whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states" and insert in lieu thereof the words "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941." While that emergency continues the provisions of the proposed law would apply.

Even such a provision would give pretty radical power under present conditions. With my amendment, the bill would be satisfactory to me. I very much hope that the Senator in charge of the bill may be willing to accept my amendment. I think it would carry out every purpose sought to be attained by the bill and would apply as long as the present emergency should continue.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, this question was not raised in the Judiciary Committee. All morning I have been endeavoring to get in touch with members of the committee, but only a few of them were present at the time the session opened, so I cannot speak for the committee or for a majority of the committee.

Personally I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio for this reason: As the Senator from Ohio has said, it is proposed to amend the 1918 statute by inserting the words "or whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states." I am revealing no state secret, but I am supported by the Department of State in the assertion that there is more espionage and subversive activity in the United States today than at any previous time in our history. Such activities are not altogether confined to aliens. Such activities are being engaged in, and propaganda is being spread, by native American citizens. It has been the practice, and is the practice today, for aliens and native-born American citizens to travel back and forth between the United States and other countries which are at least jealous of the United States, or not friendly to the United States, peddling information, news, and propaganda.

Every day of the session every Member of Congress is being flooded with correspondence begging Congress to do something to suppress subversive activities. This bill is the first step along that line. It is supported by the Department of State.

The same old stereotyped argument was raised yesterday, that the bill would be another step toward dictatorship. There is only one way to control this matter, and that is through the State Department and the executive department. We have on file in the printed report accompanying the bill the assurance from the State Department that the powers granted in the bill would not be used except for the objective which I have mentioned.

Personally I feel very strongly that the bill should be passed as it is written. Owing to the closing of certain consulates there are in this country today a large number of men who have been accused of—and I think in time will be proved guilty of—the most pernicious activities against the safety and welfare of this country that we have ever experienced in our history.

I see nothing wrong with the bill as it is written. It is imperative that the power be given as soon as possible. The House remained in session all yesterday afternoon waiting for the action of the Senate in order that the bill might become law today. The executive department and the State Department need it immediately. For that reason, and to avoid a conference and further delay, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio may be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the argument of the Senator from Indiana. The amendment I have offered would not in any way prevent this bill from going into effect immediately. The emergency has already been declared, and I propose that during the emergency this power shall be given to the President. The only effect of the amendment is that when this emergency comes to an end the President's power will come to an end, and then Congress will or should deal by statute with the situation which may then exist.

We have on the books all kinds of statutes which were created for emergencies. As a general principle, it seems to me that in the present emergency, when we give any extraordinary powers, when in effect we delegate legislative powers to the President, such powers should be confined to the particular emergency for which we are asked to delegate them; and when the emergency is over they should terminate.

That is all the amendment would do. The amendment simply says that, instead of putting this provision into effect whenever there are wars in other parts of the world, many of which wars may have only a most remote relation to the present emergency, this power shall repeatedly recur. There are always wars going on between two nations somewhere in the world; at least, there have been during the past 10 years. It seems to me it is a very simple thing to change the bill by eliminating that provision, and, instead, stating that the powers granted by the bill shall exist during the present emergency which the President has already declared, so that the bill will go into immediate effect, and the powers will be immediately granted, the moment we pass the bill with my amendment, just as much as if the amendment were not there.

It has been suggested to me that perhaps we might limit the amendment to American citizens. I am quite willing to do that; but it seems to me that to give the President arbitrary power to say that no American citizen shall travel outside this country at any time that any war exists anywhere in the world for all time to come is really asking us to delegate our legislative authority for a period far beyond the time of the actual emergency for which we are asked to delegate that power.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. I desire to have clear in my mind the question whether the bill would apply to the Dominion of Canada and the United States. There has always been freedom of transit across the line between the two countries, and all during the summer thousands of persons come here from Canada, and other thousands go from here to Canada. What would be the effect of the bill upon that condition?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I do not believe the able Senator from Minnesota was here yesterday when we touched upon that point, so I will repeat what was then said.

In the printed report accompanying the bill are stated facts gleaned from the State Department. The State Department makes this observation:

> It is not contemplated, should the proposed legislation be enacted into law, to restrict or to prohibit or in any way to impede the legitimate travel of citizens of the United States or the legitimate and necessary entry into or departure from the United States of aliens. The Department of State in nowise discourages travel of American citizens to countries of the Western Hemisphere or the travel of the inhabitants of such countries to the United States. Such travel is considered advantageous not only to the United States but also to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere in drawing them together more closely in sympathy and understanding, and is encouraged rather than discouraged. It can, therefore, be anticipated that any rules or regulations issued under the proposed legislation would be drawn up in such a manner as to avoid undue inconveniences and difficulties in the matter of the departure from, and entry into the United States of citizens of the United States and aliens, and that particular regard would be given to the matter of affording every convenience to American citizens who desire to

enter Canada or Mexico from the United States and to the citizens of Canada and Mexico who desire to travel in the United States.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The arguments presented by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Indiana, are directed to the bill itself; and under the existing circumstances I doubt that there is a Senator present who is not willing to see this proposed power delegated to the President. But, Mr. President, in granting these extraordinary powers in this emergency, I believe the Congress should be jealous in not extending these emergency powers in an unlimited fashion. The long and arduous efforts made by one of the most distinguished lawyers who ever served in this Chamber, the late Senator from Montana, Hon. Thomas J. Walsh, to secure the repeal of the blanket authority and the emergency powers which were extended during the last war, which repeal in many instances he was unable to secure, I think should give pause to those of us who are now confronted with this constant demand for the extension of Executive authority.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio would not impair the President's power in the slightest degree. It would simply provide that he shall have this power so long as the national emergency, which he himself has declared, and which only he can terminate, endures. That, it seems to me, is only a minor effort upon the part of Congress to restrict these great powers to the emergency itself. Why should we hesitate to do that?

Mr. President, the history of the world shows that parliamentary bodies have their power taken from them bit by bit. All of us recognize that in this situation extraordinary powers must be exercised by the President; but I do not believe the Congress should delegate these powers without limiting them to the emergency itself. Here is no proposal to limit the powers to a specific period of time. No year is proposed in which to terminate them. It is left within the power of the President himself to say when the national emergency is over; but, as various measures come along, unless we provide some such safeguards as this, we shall find that when the present emergency is over we shall have created enormous powers designed to be used for the emergency, but which will extend beyond it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would not the Senator from Wisconsin be agreeable to a provision that as to citizens the powers conferred by the bill shall be good only during the period of the emergency, and leave out the aliens?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I want only to see a general policy established that as we grant these powers which we are willing to give because of the extraordinary situation, Congress shall make certain that they do not extend in futuro beyond the emergency for which the powers were asked, and for which they were granted. This is not my amendment, and I am speaking only upon the general proposition that I hope that in granting these powers Congress will be jealous to make certain that they shall terminate when the emergency is over, and thus not enact a great body of statutes creating in the hands of the Executive extraordinary powers to be retained after the emergency itself shall have passed.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to modify my amendment as indicated on the copy which I gave the Senator from Indiana, which is the only copy I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the proposed modification.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "or", it is proposed to insert "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or, as to aliens."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is so modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when that amendment is adopted the section will read, in part, as follows:

When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more states, and the President shall find—

And so forth. In other words, the amendment, as modified, still gives to the President when a state of war exists between two other nations the power to restrict the travel of aliens out of the United States, but it does not give him power, under those circumstances, to restrict the travel of American citizens out of the United States.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I am of the impression that the amendment, as modified, meets the objection raised by certain Members of the body, and I will be very glad to accept the amendment, as modified, and take it to conference if a conference be necessary. I doubt, however, if one will be necessary, for I think the House will adopt the amendment without a conference. I ask that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn, if that can be done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I object. Let us have a record vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order. The amendment has already been adopted, has it not? Did not the Chair announce, "Without objection, it is agreed to"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification to the amendment has been accepted.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not adopt the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Were not the yeas and nays ordered upon the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation. The Senator from Ohio had the right to modify his own amendment, which he did, and it was accepted by the Senator from Indiana, who has charge of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered. There is only one thing to do, unless the request for the yeas and nays is withdrawn by unanimous consent, and that is to call the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported this bill, I wish to say it was given fair and honest consideration, I think, by the committee, which reported it unanimously. As the chairman of the committee has already said, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio, or the principle involved in it, was not brought up before the committee or considered by the committee. I think I am correct about that. But, Mr. President, as I listened to the reading of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it seems to me it improves the bill. I do not believe any of us would want to pass such a bill as this in time of profound peace, when there was no trouble existing, and I do not believe we would want to confer this power upon anybody if, for instance, there was a war between two countries in Africa or Asia or Europe or Central or South America. Such wars have occurred frequently, but no one has suggested, so far as I know, the advisability or desirability of this kind of a law for the United States.

The Senator from Indiana, in answer to the Senator from Ohio, has made an argument for the bill. It is persuasive; I have no fault whatever to find with it; but, as I understand, it does not apply to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The amendment makes only a slight difference after all; but, when we consider the fundamental question involved, it is an important difference, as I see it.

The President has declared an emergency. During that emergency, so long as it exists, Congress probably will be from time to time imposing upon the President various duties and various obligations and conferring upon him various powers; it will be necessary, it will be advisable to do so; but I do not believe anybody feels that we ought to enact a permanent law which would apply when there was no emergency and no war existing, or a war existing in a remote part of the world in which we would have no interest whatever. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be rejected, the power proposed to be given to the President would continue; it would be perpetual.

I do not know how many Senators remember the fact to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred; but, after the World War, one of the finest Members of this body, one of the ablest lawyers of the country, one of the most studious and patriotic men, a member for

years of the Judiciary Committee, respected by everybody for his ability, devoted a great deal of time, in vain mostly, to bring about the repeal of a good many laws for which we voted during the war, during that emergency, but which he thought—and I now think he was right—ought not to be on the statute books in time of peace.

Really that is all this amendment does, as I see it. It seems to me it is plain that, instead of making a perpetual law that will continue on the statute books and come home to trouble us or those who follow us probably 50 years from now, we should make it terminate with the end of the emergency. Therefore, I cannot see any possible objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. It seems to me, if adopted, it would simplify the situation, and it ought to command the support of everybody.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I doubt whether the Senator from Nebraska heard my observation. I am going to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. NORRIS. As modified?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes; as modified.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the question. The amendment was offered by the Senator from Ohio, and thereafter the yeas and nays were ordered. Then, the Senator from Ohio proposed a modification; there was no objection to the modification, and, therefore, the amendment was ordered submitted, as modified. If there had been objection, it could not have been done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I beg pardon of the Chair. A Senator has the right to modify his amendment at any time before a vote has been taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not after the yeas and nays have been ordered. That, however, is not the question before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio. On that question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I am advised that if he were present, he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am informed that if he were present, he would vote as I have voted, so I will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. HOUSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] are unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent due to the serious illness of his mother.

I am advised that, if present, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—59

Adams	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Reynolds
Ball	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Bulow	Holman	Shipstead
Bunker	Hughes	Smathers
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrnes	La Follette	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Maloney	Truman
Danaher	Mead	Tunnell
Downey	Murdock	Vandenberg
Ellender	Murray	Van Nuys
George	Norris	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Glass	Overton	

NOT VOTING—37

Aiken	Bridges	Davis
Austin	Brooks	Gillette
Bankhead	Brown	Guffey
Barbour	Burton	Harrison
Barkley	Caraway	Hatch
Bilbo	Clark, Idaho	Houston
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Kilgore
Langer	Reed	Wallgren
Lee	Schwartz	Walsh
Lodge	Spencer	White
Lucas	Tobey	Willis
McCarran	Tydings	
Nye	Wagner	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS]; and I again remind him of our colloquy last evening, and his assurances, based upon the report of the State Department, that it is not contemplated that this new authority will be used to require passports for the ordinary Canadian-American traffic across the boundary. I simply want to call his attention to the fact that when we enact this bill we are textually reenacting section 2 of chapter 81 of the United States Statutes at Large, which affirmatively makes it unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States unless he bears a valid passport, except as the President specifically issues an exemption. Therefore, in order to accomplish the purpose which the Senator assures us is intended, affirmative action by the President will be necessary to create this exemption after we shall have passed the bill. I want to make that very plain.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is not an automatic exemption. We are voting to require a passport in connection with Canadian-American traffic unless the President affirmatively acts. Having set up that state of facts, I now assume that the Senator is saying to me, on the basis of what the State Department has written in its report, that we may depend upon that sort of affirmative action by the Executive.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Michigan is entirely correct in his premises and conclusions.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, how will this affirmative action be taken? Will it be taken for each individual who wants to enter Canada to go fishing, or to visit the Canadian parks; or will it be a blanket permission for anyone from the United States?

Mr. VAN NUYS. As debated yesterday, and as again referred to by the Senator from Michigan today, the mechanics of it is a matter of the rules and regulations to be set up by the State Department. Neither I nor anyone else is thoroughly advised at the present time; but I have been assured by the State Department—and it is so recorded in the regular printed report—that the rules and regulations and prohibitions will be so set up as not to affect adversely Canadians coming into this country, or vice versa, or Mexicans coming into this country, or persons going to or from any country of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If a man wants to go to Canada to go fishing, will he have to have a passport?

Mr. VAN NUYS. He does not have to have it today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No; but if this bill becomes a law, will he have to have a passport?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Under the law today he is required to have a passport, but under rules and regulations he does not have to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Indiana think it would be a little better practice to have the State Department give out its rules and regulations simultaneously with the passage of the bill, or just prior thereto?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I will say to the Senator from California that I think it would have been very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As the Senator knows, Mr. Sumner Welles may not be in the State Department a few years hence, or a year or two hence; and Mr. Sumner Welles may change his mind, and we are to be at the mercy of the change of mind of Mr. Sumner Welles.

Mr. Sumner Welles is a most delightful gentleman, but to have our destinies in his hands, and to have him empowered to determine when and where and how we are to have the sort of thing that we now stipulate for is a horrible way to legislate.

This body, of course, had it not fallen into its peculiar situation of today, would resent immediately and continuously this way of legislating. We are told that the greatest travel points out of the United States and into it—Canada and Mexico—will under the bill be subject to regulation by Mr. Sumner Welles, who is a very excellent gentleman, and that when he withdraws his royal prerogative we will be out from under his regulation. That is no way to legislate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may again have the attention of the Senator from Indiana, of course the Senator is correct in saying that the only reason why such passports are not now required in Canadian-American transit is because of the existence of exempting rules and regulations. But the enactment of the bill now before us—and this is the point I am trying to make—certainly would suspend any existing rules and regulations which have been issued under the present status, and the moment the bill is enacted passports will be required unless there is simultaneous action by the State Department and the Executive to renew the exemptions. Am I not correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator is entirely correct; and I have been assured that such exemptions will be provided. I was informed that under the act of 1918, during the last World War, passports were not required between Canada and the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Which was by reason of certain rules and regulations, and those are to be reenacted in the new rules and regulations set up under the bill. I have been assured time and again by the State Department that the situation mentioned by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota will not exist.

Mr. VANDENBERG At the risk of being tedious, I wish to point out again that if it takes a week, or 10 days, or 2 weeks, for the State Department to develop its full rules and regulations for the benefit of the Chief Executive, under the pending legislation, during the 10 days or 2 weeks passports will be required for transit across the international boundary unless there is immediate, simultaneous, independent action to renew the existing exemptions, after the proposed legislation shall have been enacted.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have been assured that such a situation will not occur, and I could pretty nearly underwrite the proposition that as soon as the House accepts the amendments just agreed to, if it does, and the bill becomes law, that situation will be immediately taken care of.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I can hold the Senator from Indiana to that warrant, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, because I prefer his guaranty to some others which might be available.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to impress upon the Senator the fact that there are tens of thousands of persons traveling back and forth in the summer. Many people come from Canada into the United States, where they have summer homes. If they have passports from Canada, they can go back, and they will not have to have other passports, if the regulations now in effect shall continue in effect.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Would they have to have passports or permission to leave the United States if they came into the United States, unless they have special permission as individuals?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Not under the present rules and regulations, nor will they under the future rules and regulations. It will not change that situation or picture at all.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I hope the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I have been so assured by the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4973) was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE MARITIME LABOR BOARD

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4107, to extend for 2 years the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4107) to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Commerce.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "five" and to insert "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 1, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 1004 of such act is amended by striking out the words "the Board to encourage" in the opening lines of said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Sections 1006, 1008, and 1009, and the last sentence of section 1010 of such act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however,* That the Maritime Labor Board may continue to act as mediator in any disputes wherein its mediation services have been requested and the mediation of which the Board has actively undertaken prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should enjoy a statement from the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, or the chairman of the subcommittee regarding the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the bill, as it came over from the House, extended for 2 years the life and activities of the Maritime Labor Board, and the Senate Committee on Commerce reported the bill with two amendments. The first amendment limits the life of the board to 1 additional year, instead of 2, and further limits the activities and functions of the Board to those other than the functions of mediation. All the mediatorial powers of the Board are taken away except insofar as the board may at the present time have taken jurisdiction in specific cases. This would be the effect of the bill as it stands before us at the present time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would I be correct in saying that the Maritime Commission is the principal authority in charge of the subject, and would I be correct in saying that the Maritime Commission considers the Maritime Labor Board to be less than a fifth wheel of a wagon, and that it would be very happy to see it pass out of existence?

Mr. BAILEY. I am not sure about the Maritime Commission, but my recollection is quite distinct as to what happened in the committee. The question was asked of the chairman of the subcommittee, that is, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], whether the Maritime Commission was not opposed to the further activity of this board. My recollection is quite distinct to the effect that the chairman of the subcommittee stated that Admiral Land has indicated in his testimony that he saw really no reason for the further existence or activities of the Board. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Would it also be true to say that the shipowners are unanimously opposed to the continuation of this particular instrumentality, and that more than half of organized labor is opposed to its continuation?

Mr. BAILEY. That was the statement made, and I think it was made by the junior Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the subcommittee. I see he has risen, and I take it he wishes to say something, so I yield to him.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission did not appear and testify before the subcommittee. I am quite definitely under the impression, however, that he does not regard the activities of the Maritime Labor Board as having been helpful.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Maryland describe to the Senate what powers and duties will be left to the Maritime Labor Board if the Senate shall adopt the Commerce Committee's amendments and shear the Board of practically every definitive power it possesses?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The duties of the Board are of a twofold nature. One duty is concerned with mediation, which has been discussed and which it is proposed to eliminate under the pending amendments. The other duties are of various kinds. Under existing law, it is the duty of the Maritime Labor Board to attempt to secure agreements for collective bargaining and other forms of agreements and arrangements which in the opinion of the Maritime Labor Board would be helpful in working out cooperation between employers and labor. Also, there is a provision that agreements shall be filed with the Maritime Labor Board.

One of the chief duties of the Maritime Labor Board has been the study of maritime labor conditions. A report on that subject has been submitted. That report, whatever may be the nature of its conclusions and whether we agree with the Board or not, indicates considerable industry, and certainly shows that much work has been spent upon it. The report attempts to analyze maritime-labor conditions, and to make certain recommendations. As I have said, whether we agree with the recommendations or do not agree with them, certainly very much work and great industry have been devoted to study and research.

Although I understand that the report has been submitted and that it is not contemplated at this particular time that there will be any modification of it, yet to my mind it seems desirable that the Maritime Labor Board should be able to continue those studies. It is not as though they were asked to take up a matter afresh. This is a matter upon which they have been engaged for a long time. In these times, when there are so many new questions arising with regard to maritime-labor conditions and so many other problems affecting maritime activities, it may very well be highly desirable that the Board should continue its research studies during this year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement on the subject. Of course this bill escaped death in the Commerce Committee by only a single vote. The general opinion of the Commerce Committee, as reflected by its attitude and action, is that the Maritime Labor Board is more or less useless in its functionings. The action of the committee in striking down 80 percent of its definitive prerogatives is a clear demonstration of the attitude of the committee toward it.

Even after that had been done, its proponents were able to get the bill out of the committee by a margin of only a single vote. Why? Because the Maritime Commission, to which we look for responsibility in respect to these problems, appears to feel that the Maritime Labor Board is unnecessary. By the way, the Board consists of three gentlemen who draw $10,000 a year for doing what most of us now believe to be nonessential work. Not only does the Maritime Commission appear to have this viewpoint, but the general ship operating industry seems to be a complete unit in its belief that the Maritime Labor Board is inadvisable for further light and action. At least half of organized labor in the maritime industry is opposed to the continuation of the Board. That leaves a very small sector of those elements in the Government and in the community which deal with maritime matters supporting the continuation of the life of this institution.

Mr. President, so far as labor mediation is concerned we have ample machinery and power and authority in other departments, and it is probably of advantage to simplify the contemplation.

The committee itself, under the bill as it now stands, has taken all mediation powers away from the Maritime Labor Board. That was the chief function for which it was created. The committee has reduced the span of extended life from 2 years to 1. I do not know how the committee could have more definitely demonstrated its belief that there is not any necessity or justification for the continuation of this institution unless it had frankly joined the minority in saying this bill should not pass.

The amendments have merely improved the bill, because they have made the Maritime Labor Board more or less innocuous, but I submit that at such a moment as this, at this time when there is a degree of utility in cutting off needless expenditures, if there is any institution under heaven which could be dispensed with this is one that could be sheared away without loss to anyone except the payrollers who are its beneficiaries.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Michigan referred to the fact that the bill in its present form passed the committee by a one-vote margin. I should like to make one point for the RECORD, because an effort may be made a year hence to continue this Board. Was it the Senator's impression, as it was mine, that it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Board should cease to exist at the end of the year?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee, and I doubt if anyone will rise to challenge that statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not rise to challenge any statement, but if the Senator has finished I wish to make a statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have concluded.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to make a statement concerning the report submitted by the Maritime Labor Board to the President and the Congress. Preparation of the report was one of the great objectives of the creation of the Board. I must say that the report is a most excellent one. It is very comprehensive and unusually thoroughgoing. I should like Senators to secure copies of it and I should be willing to stake my judgment that it is one of the best contributions which have been made in the last several years to the study of the labor problem in the country. This study is related to the maritime industry, but there is a great deal of very valuable information in it otherwise. I should like to call attention to chapter 13:

Railway labor legislation in the United States, with especial reference to the development of adjustment machinery.

In this chapter Senators will find an excellent historical review of the railway labor legislation. In one of the appendices is the summary of seamen's laws. I have found it difficult to obtain a good understanding of the seamen's laws of the United States, but this section tends to clarify my mind to a great extent.

There are also summaries of the laws of foreign nations—France, Great Britain, Sweden, and so on. I will not undertake to go into a review of the report generally, but I will say that it is an admirable contribution to the literature on the subject of labor and labor disputes. I am not agreeing with all its recommendations; I have some reservations about them; but I do not think it would be just to let the bill pass without saying that the Board has very greatly served the country and the Congress by submitting an unusually fine report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to what the House committee said in its report with reference to the bill. The committee recommended the bill and said that it had found that the Board had been effective in the settlement of labor disputes, and had done a good job in the work of mediation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has emphasized the value and importance of the studies which have been made. It is, our committee believes, reasonable and desirable at this time that those studies should continue. I do not know, and no one else can know, what may be developed or what the Maritime Labor Board may see fit to do, if anything, with respect to the recommendations which it has already made; but the fact is that the Maritime Labor Board has already demonstrated that it can do research work, and do it effectively. In these times, when so many questions are arising concerned with maritime labor, it seems very wise that this work of research should go on. We are not attempting to create a new board to do the work. We are simply telling a board which has done that kind of work

industriously and successfully that we want it to go on. The general emergency conditions are an argument for the continuation of the Board.

I should like to make one further comment which I think is pertinent. In creating the Maritime Labor Board, Congress saw fit to give it two types of duties which, to my mind, at least, are more or less inconsistent. One was in regard to research and the securing of agreements. The other was the authority to mediate, at times, at least, regarding the agreements which it had helped to secure. Those two duties are not consistent. If any mistake was made, it was the fault of the Congress in creating a board with two such clashing functions. I think the fact that the two functions, more or less antagonistic in nature, have existed side by side has probably been somewhat detrimental to the activities of the Board. Not only has the Board been required to devote certain time to mediation but it has also been put in a more or less awkward situation when it attempted to mediate agreements for collective bargaining, and so forth, which it had helped to secure. It has been unable to specialize and devote itself entirely to a task which would seem to be a very reasonable and natural one, that of doing research work, and also securing certain types of agreements. If mediation is eliminated and the Board is not then hampered by the necessity of attempting to perform various kinds of work which are more or less mutually inconsistent and antagonistic, it is reasonable to believe that it would be a very wise thing to give the Board another year to continue the work of research, which it has done very effectively.

In conclusion I should like to add that most of the objections which were raised to the Maritime Labor Board have not been to its activities in securing agreements or to its research work, but rather to its methods and its success, or lack of success, in mediation. If we can eliminate the element which has been more or less a source of discord, and restrict the Board to the kind of work which, in the opinion of most persons, it has done successfully, it is logical that such action should be taken. I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed, and that thereby the Board will be able to continue on the basis provided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4107) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend certain provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended."

SINKING OF THE AMERICAN SHIP "ROBIN MOOR" (S. DOC. NO. 71)

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the message from the President read?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the message is read and referred, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Bone	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bulow	Holman	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McNary	Truman
Chavez	Malone	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Tydings
Danaher	Murdock	Vandenberg
Downey	Murray	Van Nuys
Ellender	Norris	Wheeler
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am under the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Congress the ruthless sinking by a German submarine on May 21 of an American ship, the *Robin Moor*, in the South Atlantic Ocean, 25°40′ west, 6°10′ north, while the vessel was on the high seas en route to South Africa.

According to the formal depositions of survivors, the vessel was sunk within 30 minutes from the time of the first warning given by the commander of the submarine to an officer of the *Robin Moor*.

The submarine did not display its flag, and the commander did not announce its nationality.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk without provision for the safety of the passengers and crew.

It was sunk despite the fact that its American nationality was admittedly known to the commander of the submarine and that its nationality was likewise clearly indicated by the flag and other markings.

The sinking of this American ship by a German submarine flagrantly violated the right of United States vessels freely to navigate the seas, subject only to a belligerent right accepted under international law. This belligerent right, as is known to the German Government, does not include the right deliberately to sink a merchant vessel, leaving the passengers and crew to the mercies of the elements. On the contrary, the belligerent is required to place the passengers and crew in places of safety.

The passengers and crew of the *Robin Moor* were left afloat in small lifeboats for approximately 2 to 3 weeks, when they were accidentally discovered and rescued by friendly vessels. This chance rescue does not lessen the brutality of casting the boats adrift in midocean.

The total disregard shown for the most elementary principles of international law and of humanity brands the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as the act of an international outlaw.

The Government of the United States holds Germany responsible for the outrageous and indefensible sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Full reparation for the losses and damages suffered by American nationals will be expected from the German Government.

Our Government believes that freedom from cruelty and inhuman treatment is a natural right. It is not a grace to be given or withheld at the will of those temporarily in a position to exert force over defenseless people.

Were this incident capable of being regarded apart from a more general background, its implications might be less serious but it must be interpreted in the light of a declared and actively pursued policy of frightfulness and intimidation which has been used by the German Reich as an instrument of international policy.

The present leaders of the German Reich have not hesitated to engage in acts of cruelty and many other forms of terror against the innocent and the helpless in other countries, apparently in the belief that methods of terrorism will lead to a state of affairs permitting the German Reich to exact acquiescence from the nations victimized.

This Government can only assume that the Government of the German Reich hopes through the commission of such infamous acts of cruelty to helpless and innocent men, women, and children to intimidate the United States and other nations into a course of nonresistance to German plans for universal conquest—a conquest based upon lawlessness and terror on land and piracy on the sea.

Such methods are fully in keeping with the methods of terrorism hitherto employed by the present leaders of the German Reich in the policy which they have pursued toward many other nations subsequently victimized.

The Government of the German Reich may, however, be assured that the United States will neither be intimidated nor will it acquiesce in the plans for world domination which the present leaders of Germany may have.

We are warranted in considering whether the case of the *Robin Moor* is not a step in a campaign against the United States analogous to campaigns against other nations. We cannot place reliance on official declarations to the contrary.

Like statements, declarations, and even solemn pledges have been forthcoming in respect of many nations, commencing with the statement that the Government of the German Reich considered its territorial aspirations satisfied when it seized Austria by force. Evidence that the Government of the German Reich continues to plan further conquest and domination is convincing, and, indeed, scarcely disputed.

Viewed in the light of the circumstances the sinking of the *Robin Moor*

becomes a disclosure of policy as well as an example of method. Heretofore, lawless acts of violence have been preludes to schemes of land conquest. This one appears to be a first step in assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas, the conquest of Great Britain being an indispensable part of that seizure.

Its general purpose would appear to be to drive American commerce from the ocean wherever such commerce was considered a disadvantage to German designs; and its specific purpose would appear to be interruption of our trade with all friendly countries.

We must take it that notice has now been served upon us that no American ship or cargo on any of the seven seas can consider itself immune from acts of piracy. Notice is served on us, in effect, that the German Reich proposes so to intimidate the United States that we would be dissuaded from carrying out our chosen policy of helping Britain to survive.

In brief, we must take the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. It is a warning that the United States may use the high seas of the world only with Nazi consent.

Were we to yield on this we would inevitably submit to world domination at the hands of the present leaders of the German Reich.

We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1941.*

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the report which the Senate has just heard discloses one more cruel, relentless blow of the sword of dictatorship and hardens the conviction which has eaten its way into the consciousness of many of us for so long—that Adolf Hitler must be destroyed, or eventually he will destroy us.

WILLIAM E. THOMAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 768) for the relief of William E. Thomas, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MARGARET M. CUTTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. I submit a conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 28, 44, 45, 80, 90, 91, 122, 125, and 126.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 123, 124, 127, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 148, 149, 150, and 151, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$247,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$265,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$107,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$57,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$484,780"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$949,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 119, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 132, 141, 144, 145, 147, 152, and 153.

CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, as I understand, there are one or two Senate amendments still in disagreement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The situation is that the conference report I have presented embraces the amendments agreed upon by both bodies. The next step will follow when the Chair lays before the Senate the action taken by the House of Representatives on certain Senate amendments which were in disagreement. We have not as yet arrived at that point.

Mr. MCNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move the adoption of the report. Then I will ask that the action of the House on certain of the Senate amendments be laid before the Senate by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Now I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message of the House respecting certain Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 19, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 18, 20, 25, 33, 50, 52, 58, 59, 60, 66, 87, 93, 99, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 113, 120, 121, 128, 129, 132, 141, and 145 to the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ", production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ", production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$325,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$64,505,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, after "bauxite", insert ", aluminum clays"; and

In line 4 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, after "bauxites", insert ", aluminum clays";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$2,400,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$5,531,500";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$8,281,500"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 152 and 153 to said bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 19, 103, 119, 130, 144, and 147.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator whether the motion he has made, if agreed to, will dispose of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, there will have to be one more motion, which is that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 152 and 153.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain what the amendments are?

Mr. HAYDEN. For example, there was an amendment prohibiting the use of the contingent expense fund in the production of alumina from bauxite. That was amended to include certain kinds of clay. The House agreed to the Senate amendment with an amendment. That is the situation in the case of all the Senate amendments as to which the House receded from its disagreement and concurred with a slight further change.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand. Is one of the amendments that which related to historic sites?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, that is not included in the list. I am going to move, as the next motion, that the Senate recede from that amendment, which will dispose of the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to concur in the House amendments to certain Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 152 and 153. That will finally dispose of the bill, and permit it to go to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRNES (for Mr. McCARRAN) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 28, 34, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 41, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,724,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$600,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$15,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$990,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$520,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$3,729,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,968,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,279,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,424,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which at least $100,000 shall be available exclusively to investigate the employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government, and report its findings to Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$4,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5 and 43.

PAT MCCARRAN,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
VINCENT F. HARRINGTON,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRYPT FOR REMAINS OF GUTZON BORGLUM

Mr. BYRNES. On behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], from the Committee on the Library, I report without amendment House bill 3857 and with amendments Senate Joint Resolution 40. They are not controversial and will not call for the expenditure of any money. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 3857 and then shall ask that the Senate consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3857) authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMING OF DR. HENRY MELCHIOR MUHLENBERG

Mr. BYRNES. I now ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the coming of Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg to the American colonies, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with amendments on page 3, after line 12, to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to be expended by the Commission for expenses, including actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, incurred while discharging its functions under this joint resolution. The Commission shall have power to select, hire, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as shall be necessary for the performance of its duties without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to employment or compensation of officers or employees of the United States.

And in line 24, page 3 to change the section number from 6 to 5, so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with Muhlenberg College in a fitting and appropriate observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the arrival in the American Colonies of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Muhlenberg Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States and four persons to be appointed by him, the President of the Senate and four Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four Members of the House to be apointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with representatives of Muhlenberg College to extend appropriate courtesies to the delegates of foreign universities and other foreign learned bodies or individuals attending the celebrations commemorating such anniversary.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number, but the President of the United States shall be designated as the "honorary chairman" of the Commission.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF OLD-AGE-PENSIONS SYSTEM—MINIMUM PENSIONS

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 129, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on June 19, 1941, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the old-age assistance and the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (2) to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means for bringing about the early realization of a minimum pension for all who have reached the age of retirement and are not gainfully employed. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oath, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $2,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 121, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 121) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS May 23, 1941.

The amendment reported by the committee was, on page 1, line 2, after the word "employ", to insert "until June 30, 1942", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs hereby is authorized to employ until June 30, 1942, an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,880 per annum, beginning May 18, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT BILLS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the committees may have permission to file reports upon any bills and also that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I think I favor the request; it is one usually made; but may I ask the able Senator in charge of the work of the Senate if the Senate is to meet on Monday?

Mr. BYRNES. My purpose is that following today's session the Senate shall adjourn until Monday, and on Monday I wish to express the hope that the Senator from Virginia will secure recognition to move the consideration of the so-called revaluation bill. At the conclu-

sion of that and one other bill, I shall then ask that the calendar be called. I believe we can dispose of the business now before the Senate on Monday, and then recess until Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the Senator if on Thursday there will be before the Senate for consideration the large military appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNES. If the Appropriations Committee can complete its work, as it expects to do, upon the appropriation bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon, I assume that we will have that bill ready to take up on Thursday. The only other appropriation bill now in the Senate Appropriations Committee is the District of Columbia appropriations bill, and I had in mind that bill when I asked unanimous consent that the committees have permission to report, so that we can consider the Army bill and the District bill on Thursday, which would still give opportunity for the necessary conferences with the House before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to make a further inquiry. Assuming that the Senate passes those bills next week, during the following week, in which the Fourth of July will come, may it not be understood that there will be no important business transacted?

Mr. BYRNES. Monday will be June 30, the last day of the fiscal year, and, doubtless, there will be business before the Senate until that day. So far as I can now see, there is no reason why, after a session on Monday, we may not adjourn until the following Monday, or, at least, until Thursday, and then until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the request made by the able Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from South Carolina is granted.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 130) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Senate Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises shall report to the Senate by bill or otherwise its recommendations for legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is this a special committee?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in the last session of the Congress a special committee was appointed to investigate the financial problems of the small business enterprises of the country. Under the resolution as presented I judge that the committee does not have the right, as few investigating committees have the right, to report a bill. It is the committee's purpose, as I understand, to ask that the committee be given the right to report a bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is the purpose? It is desired that the report of the committee may be in the form of a bill?

Mr. MURRAY. That it may be made directly to the Senate in the form of a bill.

Mr. BYRNES. I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry with respect to the resolution. It is always the custom, is it not, when bills are introduced in the Senate, to have them go to the regular standing committees of this body?

I understand that the resolution which the Senator from Montana submits is to the effect that a particular bill shall be reported directly by a special committee. That, of course, means that if such a report were made, it would be made without the customary hearings upon the bill itself. That, it seems to me, is a rather wide divergence from the regular procedure. Special committees have been in the habit of filing their reports and their recommendations, which is a perfectly proper method. I can see no objection to the introduction by the committee of a bill; but it seems to me that to have a special committee report a bill merely means that the other Members of the Senate who do not now have any knowledge at all of what the bill may be will be deprived of the opportunity to participate in hearings upon the bill, and the Senate itself will be deprived of the opportunity of having the bill studied in committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I interrupt at this point, if it is agreeable to the Senator? The practice usually followed in a case of this kind, when a special committee reports a bill, is that it is then referred to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter. So in this case, if this resolution should be agreed to, the committee could report a bill, but the bill in turn would be referred to the committee that has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to suggest that if the Senator from Montana would modify his resolution so that it would provide that the committee may introduce a bill, there would be no objection to it, and then the bill would follow the regular course.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am saying that that is the practice and the right and the course which the bill would take, anyway; but if the Senator wants such a modification incorporated in the resolution, very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not my understanding, from what has been said here, that the bill would take that course.

Mr. McNARY. No; I said that if the special committee should report a bill, the bill in turn would be referred to the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the understanding, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. It might be well, if there is to be any misunderstanding about it, to have that modification incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it really ought to be incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no objection to having that done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well, then, Mr. President.

The resolution was modified by Mr. MURRAY by adding thereto the following words:

Provided, That any such bill shall be referred to the appropriate standing committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there came to my desk the statement of I. W. Wilson, vice president in charge of operations, Aluminum Co. of America, which he made before the Senate committee investigating the national-defense program. The statement is a reply to Secretary Ickes' statements. In the interest of fair play, I ask that Mr. Wilson's statement be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF I. W. WILSON, VICE PRESIDENT IN CHARGE OF OPERATIONS, ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

At the hearing Monday, Secretary Ickes made statements challenging the good faith of the Aluminum Co. of America in its efforts to aid in this country's defense program. We welcome the opportunity to refute these accusations, and we believe that when the facts are known no fair-minded person can fail to agree that the Aluminum Co. has done everything within its power, and more, probably, than any other corporation in the United States to uphold the President and the Congress in building up our defenses.

We first want to tell this committee some of the details of what this company has done and is doing to increase its production of aluminum.

In 1938, when our plants produced 286,881,690 pounds of aluminum, and our total shipments were only 175,525,773 pounds, the Aluminum Co. of America finished the year with an inventory of 277,538,066 pounds of aluminum, or more aluminum than normally would be used in a year.

As late as April 3, 1939, Congress had only authorized the Navy to build 3,000 planes, and the Army 6,000. Such a program required no expansion of production facilities, particularly when the Aluminum Co. of America already had more than a year's supply of metal on hand. Yet late in 1938 the company did inaugurate a program which, with the additions since made to it, calls for a capital expenditure of over $200,000,000 of the company's money, and which has resulted in an increase in the number of its employees from 25,000 to about 50,000.

The Aluminum Co. of America is now producing well over double the amount of aluminum produced in 1938, and when its present program is completed the production of 1938 will be almost tripled. The expansion of the production of aluminum is not a simple a matter as is the expansion of many other industries. As this committee is well aware, the production of aluminum requires enormous quantities of electric power. It takes not only large sums of money, but many years to build the extensive hydroelectric developments necessary to get blocks of power in the magnitude required. An aluminum plant without electric power is useless.

In addition to the acquisition of the needed power, this increase in the production of aluminum has already required the doubling of the production of alumina, the tripling of the steamship tonnage used to bring bauxite from South America to this country, and the doubling of the production of bauxite as well. A further expansion of all these facilities is a necessary part of the existing program.

This expansion included large additional facilities for manufacturing fabricated forms. Within a few months the company's capacity to produce strong alloy sheet and extruded shapes will be 6 times that of the beginning of 1938, while our ability to produce aluminum forgings will be 16 times that of the beginning of 1938. All of these products are of vital interest to the aircraft industry.

An inquiry has been made concerning the Aluminum Co.'s attitude with respect to the Fontana power project which will require 3 years to complete. Some months ago a declaration of intention was filed with the Federal Power Commission for this project in the belief that the Commission would not require a Federal license. Such a license permits the Government to take over the project at the end of the license period on terms that might be confiscatory. The Commission, however, made a ruling that would necessitate taking out such a license. The company felt then, and still feels, that in the light of its other huge expenditures for the defense program, it cannot, with proper regard for its financial stability, put up its own money to develop this project in the face of the Government's power to take over the property at the end of the license period. Notwithstanding this feeling, the Aluminum Co. has informed O. P. M., and also T. V. A., that it stands ready to take out a license and develop this project if the Government will assist in financing the development; or, the company will sell the project to T. V. A. so that Authority may develop it; or if neither of these alternatives is acceptable, the company is ready to cooperate in any other way that will make the power from this development available for the production of aluminum. The company now reiterates that position. This matter is, and for some time past has been, under consideration by Government agencies and the Aluminum Co. is ready to proceed in any manner that they may determine.

We have been criticized on the theory that estimates by various governmental agencies were in some way mistakes, attributable to the Aluminum Co. of America. This we emphatically deny.

Many of the things that have been said before this committee concerning aluminum seem to be based on the assumption that it is the function of a private industrial corporation, in this case the Aluminum Co. of America, to estimate not only what it will produce to meet the defense needs of the United States, but also, to set itself up as an authority for what those needs are. Under this assumption we should not only have been able to tell how much aluminum will be required, for instance, to build the number of airplanes needed to defend the democracies, but to forecast how many of these planes will be needed.

We have not presumed to tell Congress, the Army, or the Navy, how many planes are needed for defense. Our function as to forecasts is, and can only be, to tell what we will produce and how far we can expand under the instructions and requests of the Government, and then to produce such aluminum. There has never been a single month when we have not exceeded the amounts of such forecasts.

We understand that the present estimates of O. P. M. call for the production in this country of at least 1,400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. Last October the Defense Commission advised the company that it should increase its production by an additional 100,000,000 pounds per year, or thus to a total of 850,000,000 pounds per year. The company thereupon submitted to the Defense Commission a program of further expansion which would have increased production by more than 100,000,000 pounds per year within a period of from 6 to 8 months. Since then O. P. M. has been advised by the company, again and again, that if O. P. M. would procure the necessary electrical power, the company would increase production by such further amounts as the Government wishes. But it has not yet, to this very hour, been possible to determine at what place, or in what amounts, electrical power will be made available and until this is known the company cannot proceed with the construction of the necessary plants in which to produce the additional aluminum desired by the Government.

Mr. Ickes stated Monday to this committee: "I have a profound conviction that the Aluminum Co. of America would prevent the necessary expansion of our aluminum manufacturing facilities, regardless of the consequences to the country or the world, in order to get them all within its own domination and control." He further stated, referring to the Aluminum Co. of America, "It did its damnedest to prevent us from making this contract for power with the Reynolds Metals Co."

We want to state without reservation that the Aluminum Co. has no desire to prevent the necessary expansion of the aluminum manufacturing facilities in this country or to get them all within its domination and control. We are interested in but one thing, that there be sufficient aluminum produced to meet the defense needs of our country. Furthermore, the Aluminum Co. has never in any way done anything to make it difficult for the Reynolds Metals Co. or anyone else to go into the aluminum business and has never endeavored to prevent the Reynolds Metals Co. from obtaining power.

The company has no desire to use the present emergency for the purpose of increasing its own position in the industry. This is shown by the fact that the company has repeatedly offered to put all of its technical resources at the Government's command, to design and build plants for Government operation if it so desires, and to furnish the technical staff to make this possible, or, if the Government prefers, to operate for the Government under a management arrangement. The company has also offered to use its own resources, as far as they will go, in financing any expansion program adopted by the Government, in addition to the $200,000,000 it has already used for expansion. No company could offer to do more.

Monday, Secretary Ickes referred to a request of February 4 from O. P. M. for an additional 65,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power and explained why he would not allot it to the Aluminum Co. He also said that later he was again asked to allot 65,000 kilowatts of additional power to the Aluminum Co. and gave another explanation as to why he would not do that. Secretary Ickes failed to point out, and perhaps he did not know, that the Aluminum Co. has continuously, over the last 6 months or more, told the governmental agencies that it would make all the aluminum for which power could be obtained.

In the face of that record, in the face of the fact that the Aluminum Co. has already doubled and will shortly triple its 1938 output, and in the face of the further fact that the Aluminum Co. is spending over $200,000,000 of its own money to advance defense, it is hard to understand how Secretary Ickes could state to this committee Monday that "When the story of this war comes to be written, it may have to be written that it was lost because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America."

Secretary Ickes may know how wars are lost, but you gentlemen know that wars are won by using, as quickly as possible, every available resource for the production of war materials.

Allegations have been made that the Aluminum Co. of America is a monopoly and is a party to agreements with various foreign companies, or foreign agencies, under which it is claimed production of aluminum has been restricted in this country. These and other similar questions are now pending in the courts against the company and its officers. In view of the fact that these suits are still unadjudicated, we feel constrained to remain silent in the face of these charges, believing it to be improper to discuss, or make any representations, publicly regarding matters which are still pending before the courts for decision. Suffice it to say that all of the principal officers of the company have vigorously denied that any such agreements exist, and they likewise have denied such charges are justified. I can assure you that it is no easy matter to be compelled to keep quiet in the face of charges that we regard as unfounded, but the proprieties of the situation have unfortunately made this necessary.

The Aluminum Co. of America was the first company in the world ever to produce aluminum at a price which brought it into commercial use. It pioneered the industry. It is still the foremost company in the aluminum industry, in spite of the fact that it has had the most severe competition from foreign companies, at least one of which is government-owned.

The Aluminum Co. of America has given the United States leadership in this industry, both from the standpoint of knowledge and technique as well as quality of product. Until Germany came into the fruition of its enormous armament program in 1939 the productive capacity in the United States was the greatest of any country in the world. In pioneering this industry, the principal job of the Aluminum Co. of America has been to find new uses for the metal. The problem of the company, therefore, has heretofore been not the production of aluminum but the finding of people who would buy the metal and use it.

Let me assure you gentlemen that the sole desire of the Aluminum Co. of America is to be allowed to use its every resource in the production of aluminum for the defense of the country. We urge that we be allowed to do so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a number of years we have had what has been called the regime of the great planners. Now, when every plan seems to have gone awry, more confusion is added to the national picture, in that the leaders in government, because they themselves have "missed the boat" take it upon themselves to criticize and damn someone else.

America is interested in defense. We have just received a message from the President in which he called our attention to a significant episode, and then we were told that Mr. Hitler must be destroyed. This is a time for reason and common sense to come into play. As someone in my section of the country once said, "if you are going to take a tiger by the tail you had better have something to knock his head off with."

We are interested in defense. The people want America strong. The people want to maintain their freedom. They do not want to have the leaders of the Nation going around lambasting people who disagree with them, nor do they

want to have the leaders in the Nation "pass the buck" when they themselves are to blame. What America needs now is to remember that much water has gone over the dam which will never be brought back. It is up to us now to knuckle down to the challenges of the present and become prepared.

The paint-brush and stinkpot methods were never the ways of Lincoln. If we tell the people the truth, that is all that is needed.

I do not know who is right in the controversy that Secretary Ickes has precipitated. I do know that all the planning of the great planners has gone steadily awry. All the great promises of the great promiser have never been fulfilled. So to divert, I suppose, the people's attention from those facts, the thought is to smear someone else, time and time again.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate for more than a few moments.

We are about to consider a tax bill in the very near future. I am just back from my own State. The people say they are ready to pay the taxes if—

First. We cut out a lot of unnecessary Government overhead.

Second. If we will reduce, where they can be reduced, nondefense items.

Third. If we will get value received for the taxpayer's dollar.

Fourth. If, in the program under the Lend Lease Act the President will be practical and get collateral where it can be gotten. Many months ago I called attention to the fact that Britain had $4,000,000,000 in South American securities. I said that if Hitler got possession of that collateral he would win this war in South America without firing a shot in this hemisphere; or, if the war were a stalemate, and he got possession of those $4,000,000,000 in stocks and bonds, he would own South America.

Fifth. The farmers are ready to do their share in relation to the tax bill, also, but they expect that the Government will use its head. For over 8 years now about 80 percent of the farmers, because they have not gotten the cost of production out of their milk, have been losing ground. The Government has been taking over farms. Insurance companies have acquired multitudes of them. Now, when there are $500,000,000 available in the Lease Lend Act for farm products to give to Britain, the farmers expect that this Government will see to it that they get at least the cost of production for the products that the Government gives away, for the products that the Treasury of the United States buys with the people's money to give away.

Wisconsin's cheese is selling in London for a dollar a pound. If it costs the Wisconsin farmer a dollar and eighty-five cents a hundred pounds to produce his milk in this period, when wages and everything else are going up, he does not want the Government he is now asked to support to chisel in and take from him the opportunity to get the cost of production out of his product; and 100 pounds of milk will make over 20 pounds of cheese.

All America is defense conscious, but the folks who are paying the bill expect, and have a right to demand, that the managers of government get rid of the planners who missed the boat for so many years, and become realistic in their approach to our problems. Frequently realism is merely a synonym for common sense or horse sense.

We have heard the saying so often that a day of reckoning is coming. If so, and I think it is coming, it is about time that we realistically considered what the phrase "day of reckoning" means.

In the last 8 years, under the present managers of government, we have run behind three and one-half billion dollars a year, on the average. It is estimated that this year we will spend in the neighborhood of $25,000,000,000. How long we will continue to spend money on that vast scale no one can tell. But the necessities of the situation demand that we pay as much as we can out of earnings.

The second requirement is that we proceed reasonably and sensibly to stop the spiral of inflation. In this connection, the American people can buy defense bonds instead of spending all their earnings. Savings should again be a virtue.

If, as has been said, there are 15,000,000 wage earners in this country who will have their wages increased between $300 and $500 a year, when their earnings are shot into the economic bloodstream of the country there will be precipitated a fine spree, which will bring about inflation. During the last war we had a dollar worth 50 cents. If conditions continue as at present, as seems likely, unless we become realistic, we will have a dollar which will be worth 10 cents.

Third. Instead of attempting to carry out projects throughout the Nation which are not defense projects, we should in every community, city, county, and State accumulate these projects, and if possible accumulate in the treasuries of the various political units some money with which to pay for the projects when the present emergency shall have come to an end. The purpose of accumulating such projects is that when our boys come back from the Army and the Navy and the defense industries there will be something for them to do. We can by that method absorb a part of the shock which will come.

Mr. President, all over our country people are wondering which way we are going. We find extremists on both sides befuddling and confusing the intellects of our people. What we need now is simply to proceed cautiously, carefully, as we would proceed if we recognized that we were trustees of property of great value. We must not go down the way to war if it is possible to avoid it. Ninety-nine percent of the people of the country do not want to go to war unless war becomes necessary as a matter of self-defense.

DISCHARGE OR RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN AND PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 239) to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Philippine Scouts in certain cases, which were, on page 2, line 9, after the word "the", to insert "average", and in line 10, to strike out the word "immediately" and insert "for six months."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations of officers in the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

POSTMASTER AT DES MOINES, IOWA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there was favorably reported today by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the nomination of Edith M. Johnson to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa. At the request of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], I ask that the nomination be now confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Malcolm Elliott, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received June 20 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Maj. James W. Flett to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Lofton R. Henderson
Francis M. McAlister

Capt. Jack P. Juhan to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May 1941.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1941:

Paul E. Becker, Jr.
Cyril E. Emrich
James J. Owens
John W. Howe
Clarke J. Bennett

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of May 1941:

Staff Sergeant Wallace G. Fleissner
Corp. Robert H. Gray
Corp. Schuyler D. Ferris
Sgt. Eugene V. Boro
Corp. Frank T. Whiffen
Corp. Louie N. Casey

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 10), 1941:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Malcolm Elliott to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE CAPTAINS

John S. Baylis
Charles G. Roemer

TO BE CAPTAINS (ENGINEERING)

Benjamin C. Thorn
Milton R. Daniels

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

William L. Sutter
Gilbert R. Evans
Wallace L. Hancock, Jr.
Adrian F. Werner
Woodrow W. Vennel
John Montrello

TO BE A CHIEF MACHINIST

Michael J. Hoosick

TO BE A CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Hamlett I. Allen

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

Edwin G. Williams
Gerald M. Kunkel

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Edgar B. Johnwick	Harald M. Graning
Lawrence W. Brown	Karl Habel
Francis J. Weber	Francis T. Zinn
Thomas R. Dawber	Ralph E. Wenzel
Thomas H. Diseker	Robert T. Hewitt
Theodore F. Hilbish	Robert R. Smith
Michael L. Furcolow	Murray A. Diamond
George E. Tooley	Max R. Kiesselbach
Robert L. Zobel	Frank L. Price
Thomas F. Crahan	Weldon A. Williamson
Raymond F. Kaiser	Robert D. Wright
Glenn S. Usher	Aaron W. Christensen
Charles C. Smith	Nobel W. Guthrie
Wendell A. Preston	Albert G. Love, Jr.
Murdo E. Street, Jr.	John P. Turner
James V. Lowry	

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

Fritz R. Jackson
John A. Hammer

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Edward J. Driscoll
William C. Neaf

POSTMASTER

Edith M. Johnson, Des Moines, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, our heavenly Father, we offer our tribute of praise. Without Thee nothing is good, nothing is pure, and nothing can abide. Do Thou smite the false idols of this world which are blinding it to the wondrous simplicity which is in Christ our Lord, that it may be delivered and its soul may find the way that leads to enchanting and enriching freedom; then shall Thy teaching take a deep foothold in the conscience of man. Grant that our democracy may more and more be the torch bearer in the long line of all backward races, marching upward victoriously to the lands of promise.

Do Thou be with any of our number who may be ill; remain with them very graciously as an angel of light in their presence. Give them strength, O Lord, according to their need. We ask for them, that love which works for the regeneration of the soul, for purity, and sweetness which flower in beauty and in fragrance of character. Behold us with those eyes whose power is in their love and enable our innermost selves to triumph over all the evils of discouragement. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. WHEELER be excused from service as a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k)," and that Mr. BULOW be named to the vacancy created thereon.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. JOHN H. FOLGER, Member-elect from the State of North Carolina, is present, and I ask unanimous consent that the oath of office may be administered to him, notwithstanding the fact that his certificate of election has not yet arrived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER appeared in the Well of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

ASSISTANT READING CLERK

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts of the House I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 241) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise authorized by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the sum of $3,600 per annum, payable monthly, as compensation to an assistant reading clerk to be appointed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That the authorization and appropriation herein contained shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs in a position of reading clerk.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, HARE, THOMAS of Texas, HARRINGTON, ENGEL, and KEEFE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from Mr. Bruce H. Mills, representing the Ventura County Lemon Growers, relating to the interference with their production and harvesting operations. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of his report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, under special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] has unanimous consent to address the House today. I request that the order be vacated and in lieu thereof that the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] be allowed to address the House on Tuesday, July 1, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and all legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a very informative letter regarding the threatened shortage of oil and gasoline in Massachusetts from the Department of Labor and Industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article in the American Mercury for July, entitled "Ordeal of American Air Power," by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 25, after the legislative program of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas is full of well-equipped, well-manned machine shops capable of turning out great volumes of vital defense machines. Hundreds of these shops and factories have waited patiently to help with the Government defense program. Most of us have thought that the Office of Production Management was going out into the highways and byways of this country to seek aid in this economic struggle. It seems we are wrong. Perhaps the explanation of no business for the machine shops of Texas comes from the following statement made by Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Director of Purchases for the O. P. M.:

> Defense business is not going to seek any man out. In the very nature of things that is impossible. No manufacturer is likely to get many defense contracts unless he is willing to display the same ingenuity, persistence, and energy in going after them that he would display in seeking any normal kind of commercial business.

This is an inexcusable attitude. These services should be sought and no man should have to "sell" vital employment of men and machines to the Government at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by Dr. Montgomery in my district on Monday last, and also an address made by myself at the same time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Report From Putnam County," by Christine Sadler, in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSUMPTION OF CHEESE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to insert in the RECORD a resolution passed by the directors of the Chamber of Commerce, Fond du Lac, Wis., June 17, 1941; also a news item appearing in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks, and the matter referred to, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks relative to highways in general and particularly to Highway 60, through Oklahoma, and also to insert necessary quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech I delivered to the farmers of eastern North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENNETT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 242, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on the Public Lands is authorized as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue until January 3, 1943, the investigation begun under House Resolution 284 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by House Resolution 284 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.
>
> Any unexpended balance authorized for use of the said committee under House Resolution 285 of the Seventy-sixth Congress is hereby continued for such purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extracts from the Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLUETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article written by me on the St. Lawrence River project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. BENDER were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I desire to insert in the RECORD the statement made by Amos Pinchot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31, 35, 36, 46, 48, 49, 54, 57, 64, 72, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 43, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 71, 77, 83, 89, 91, 95, and 96, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and also including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, twenty thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which fifteen thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand for the use of the Senate, $20,000, and including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, thirty-five thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which twenty-six thousand two hundred shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and eight thousand eight hundred for the use of the Senate, $30,000," ; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$48,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$304,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,241,455"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$11,050,411, of which $14,411 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$99,558, of which $1,558 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$782,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$249,337, of which $2,337 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,051,261"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$870,651"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$7,790 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics', and not to exceed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$1,797,348, of which $9,348 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$18,589,609"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$9,990,165, of which $34,665 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$314,469"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$877,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$182,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$690,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,329,978"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,284,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$685,668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$483,332"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$749,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,133,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$533,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$6,421,308"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,633,362"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$23,516,775, of which $58,425 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$25,602,109"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$499,388,671, of which $467,451 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$100,150,000, of which $116,850 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation. 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$47,962,910, of which $33,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$5,559,827, of which $59,827 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$2,488,912, of which $38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$747,453, of which $8,764 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$2,752,412, of which $574,173 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,988,777"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$64,000,000, of which $115,171 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$120,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$3,887,900, of which $77,900 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, 80, 93, 94, 97, 98, and 100.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
R. A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Correction of totals, etc.

The following amendments relate to the correction of totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.: Amendments Nos. 3, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 32, 39, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 62, 73, 74, 76, 88, and 95.

Press clippings

Amendments Nos. 2, 91, and 96: Strike out the House provisions authorizing the purchase of press clippings. As to these amendments the House has receded.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1, salaries: Appropriates $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the services of an assistant to whom the Secretary of Agriculture, under the provisions of the Schwellenbach Act, may delegate certain regulatory functions which the Secretary is required by law to perform.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 4: Retains the Senate language authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to transfer to the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor from the funds available for the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farm Credit Administration such sums as may be necessary for the legal services of these agencies; and providing that no salary for legal services for the Department shall be paid in excess of that authorized by law for the Solicitor of the Department.

Office of information

Amendment No. 5, horse and cattle books: Provides $20,000 for printing and binding "Diseases of the Horse" and $30,000 for printing and binding "Diseases of Cattle", as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 for each, as proposed by the House, and divides them, 15,000 of the horse books for the House and 5,000 for the Senate, and 26,200 of the cattle books for the House and 8,800 for the Senate, as proposed by the Senate, instead of dividing them equally among the entire membership of both Houses, as proposed by the House.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendment No. 6, Hawaii: Appropriates $67,500 as proposed by the House, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special research fund

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $1,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 12, Puerto Rico: Appropriates $100,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $128,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, administration and coordination of extension work: Appropriates $550,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriates $857,105, together with $1,762,895 transferred from certain other appropriations, as provided in those several appropriations, making in all $2,620,000 as proposed by the House, instead of a direct appropriation of $3,120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 22, inspection and quarantine: Retains the Senate increase of $8,000 for intensification of work along the Mexican border.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 25, cereal crops and diseases: Retains the Senate increase of $9,000 for increased seed flax investigations.

Amendment No. 26, drug and related plants: Provides an increase of $5,000, instead of $6,500 as proposed by the Senate, for herb and spice plant investigations.

Amendment No. 27, dry-land agriculture: Retains the Senate increase of $2,400 for increased work at the Sherman County Branch Experiment Station, Moro, Oreg.

Amendment No. 28, forage crops and diseases: Provides an increase of $4,000, instead of an increase of $6,500 as proposed by the Senate, for additional turf grass investigations.

Amendment No. 29, forest pathology: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000 for cactus

disease investigations of the sagauro and organ-pipe cacti of the Southwest.

Amendment No. 30, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000 for azalea disease investigations.

Amendment No. 31, tobacco investigations: Eliminates the Senate increase of $5,000 for tobacco investigations in Pennsylvania.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 33, national forest protection and management: Appropriates $11,050,411, instead of $11,004,500 as proposed by the House and $11,086,000 as proposed by the Senate. Retains $50,000 of the Senate increase of $75,000 for cooperation with the Work Projects Administration in mining and forestry areas. Eliminates the Senate increase of $25,000 for intensifying the management of national forest ranges.

Amendment No. 34, private forestry cooperation: Appropriates $99,558, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $98,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $1,558 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $2,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, forest management: Eliminates the Senate increase of $50,000 for investigations of cutting and management of Douglas-fir forests.

Amendment No. 36, range investigations: Eliminates the Senate increase of $10,000 for range investigations in the national forests of Oregon and Washington.

Amendment No. 37, forest products: Provides an increase of $150,000, instead of $367,500 as proposed by the Senate, for the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

Amendment No. 38, forest survey: Appropriates $249,337, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $247,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $2,337 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $3,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42, forest fire cooperation: Appropriates $2,425,000, instead of $2,350,000 as proposed by the House and $2,490,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers not to exceed $7,790 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $10,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43, acquisition of lands for national forests: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the language inserted by the House, "under sound commercial title satisfactory to the Attorney General as provided in said Act". This elimination is in conformity with the act of October 9, 1940 (Public, 825, 76th Cong.), which more effectively meets the situation which the language stricken from the bill was designed to do.

Amendment No. 44, acquisition of lands for national forests: Appropriates $1,797,348, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,988,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $9,348 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed $12,000 as proposed by the House.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $9,990,165, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,955,500 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $34,665 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed $44,500 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering

Amendment No. 50, agricultural engineering investigations: Retains the Senate increase of $10,000 for additional investigations on the development of more efficient methods and machinery for the pulling and processing of fiber flax; provides $10,000, instead of $14,981 as proposed by the Senate, to expedite the development of machinery for the production and harvesting of sweet potatoes; and eliminates the Senate increase of $14,500 for investigations on machinery for the collection of agricultural residues.

Amendment No. 51, naval-stores investigations: Retains the Senate increase of $23,000 for investigations to improve the methods of production and to increase the consumption of turpentine, rosin, etc.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 54, Mexican fruitfly control: Appropriates $167,960 as proposed by the House, instead of $175,460 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, citrus canker eradication: Appropriates $13,485 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, Dutch elm disease eradication: Appropriates $300,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57, European corn borer control: Appropriates $10,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $27,939 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58, barberry eradication: Appropriates $182,500, instead of $162,500 as proposed by the House and $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59, bee culture: Appropriates $83,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60, insecticide and fungicide investigations: Appropriates $130,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61, foreign plant quarantines: Appropriates $690,000, instead of $680,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

White pine blister rust control

Amendments Nos. 63, 64, 65, and 66: Appropriates $1,284,000, instead of $1,159,000 as proposed by the House and $1,409,000 as proposed by the Senate; allocates to the Department of the Interior, $115,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $215,000 as proposed by the Senate, to the Forest Service, $635,668, instead of $644,000 as proposed by the House and $694,000 as proposed by the Senate, and to the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, $483,332, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 67, crop and livestock estimates: Retains $10,000 of the Senate increase of $20,000 for preharvest wheat surveys.

Amendment No. 68, market news service: Retains the Senate increases of $7,500 for market news service on livestock in the Detroit market area and of $1,000 for extension of the period of market reports on apples at Martinsburg, W. Va.; and eliminates the Senate increases of $12,500 for market news service on hogs at Columbus, Ohio, of $7,500 for market news service on livestock at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and of $6,500 for additional market news service in Oregon.

Amendment No. 69, Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts: Appropriates $533,000, instead of $439,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate, the increase granted to be prorated to markets for the several types of tobacco in proportion to the total number of existing markets for each type in the several areas.

Amendment No. 70, Federal Seed Act: Appropriates $80,000, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $85,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71, Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates $381,879 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $356,879 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72, enforcement of the Insecticide Act: Appropriates $168,180 as proposed by the House, instead of $193,180 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 75, soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates $23,516,775, instead of $23,533,350 as proposed by the House and $23,458,350 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $58,425 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," instead of not to exceed $75,000 as proposed by the House.

Soil conservation payments

Amendment No. 77, automobile for the Administrator: Allows $1,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $750 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates $499,388,671, instead of $499,521,220 as proposed by the House and $498,921,220 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $467,451 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79, regional laboratories: Allows $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Disposal of Surplus Commodities

Amendment No. 81, disposal of surplus commodities: Appropriates $100,150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $135,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $116,850 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $150,000 as proposed by the House.

Sugar Act of 1937

Amendment No. 82: Appropriates $47,962,910, instead of $47,973,960 as proposed by the House and $47,923,960 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $38,950 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 83: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the language of the House, as follows:

"*Provided*, That conditional payments in connection with the 1941 sugar program shall not be made if, by proclamation under section 509 of said Act, title II or title III shall have been suspended and shall remain suspended until July 4, 1941."

Federal Crop Insurance Act

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates $5,559,827, instead of $5,576,800 as proposed by the House and $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $59,827 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $76,800 as proposed by the House.

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 85, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,488,912, instead of $2,499,962 as proposed by the House and $2,449,962 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $38,950 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 86, liquidation and management of resettlement projects: Appropriates $747,453, instead of $749,939 as proposed by the House and $738,689 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $8,764 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $11,250 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87, land utilization and retirement of submarginal land: Appropriates $2,752,412, instead of $2,836,675 as proposed by the House and $2,278,239 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $574,173 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $737,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 89: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the House language "and to other needy persons", so as to limit the appropriation to needy farmers.

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates $64,000,000, instead of $58,846,130 as proposed by the House and $66,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $115,171 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $147,845 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 92, rural rehabilitation loans: Authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance $120,000,000, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farm Credit Administration

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates $3,887,900, instead of $3,910,000 as proposed by the House and $3,810,000 as proposed by the Senate, and transfers $77,900 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", instead of not to exceed $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments in disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 13, 17, 21, 93, and 98 relate to totals and an allocation which are dependent upon action taken upon the remaining amendments in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7, payments to States, agricultural experiment stations, under Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates $2,463,708, instead of $2,400,000 as proposed by the House, and provides that $63,708 of the total amount shall be allotted to the several States and Territories in such manner that no State or Territory shall receive a smaller amount in 1942 than was allotted to it under the like appropriation for 1941.

Amendment No. 11, extension work Act of April 24, 1939: Appropriates $555,000 instead of $203,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 80, parity payments: The House made a direct appropriation of $49,991,160 and authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make additional commitments or incur additional obligations of not to exceed $162,000,000, with respect to parity payments in connection with the 1942 crop. The Senate struck out the entire House provision and made a direct appropriation of $300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and a supplemental appropriation of $150,000,000 for the 1941 crop. The House provision that, if the acreage allotment for any farm under the agricultural conservation program has been exceeded by less than 10 per centum, parity payments with respect to such farm shall be reduced by not more than 10 per centum for each 1 per centum, or fraction thereof, of such excess, is incorporated in the Senate language with respect to both the appropriation of $300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and that of $150,000,000 for the 1941 crop. The Senate language also makes the provision applicable to the appropriation of $212,000,000 made a year ago for the 1941 crop. The House language contains a provision, not included by the Senate, which transfers not to exceed $125,000 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Amendment No. 94, cooperative farm forestry: Appropriates $700,000 instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration: Appropriates $3,946,000, instead of $3,923,425 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House provision which transfers not to exceed $50,000 to the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

Amendment No. 100: Section 3 of the bill, inserted by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any appropriation made in the bill, to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, together with certain penalties if such person or persons who accepts employment under any of the appropriations made in the bill.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House present a conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, providing for a total appropriation of $1,060,500,063, the largest amount ever carried in an agricultural appropriation bill in the history of the Congress. The bill as agreed to in conference appropriates an amount in excess of that carried in the bill last year by $23,541,141, and exceeds the Budget recommendations by $2,748,092.

The bill as it originally passed the House was approximately $5,000,000 under the Budget estimates but was increased by the Senate to a total of something like $285,000,000 above the Budget recommendations. As submitted today it is $7,676,026 above the House bill and $280,122,681 below the Senate bill.

This bill implements the parity program and supplements the loan bill recently enacted and signed by the President just a week or two ago.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has contributed so ably to the success of the parity program.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman just made the statement that this bill implemented the parity program and supplements the mandatory parity-loan law, the 85-percent provision. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that that act was passed since the Budget Director gave his estimates upon one item in this bill, the Federal grading of tobacco, and that it is necessary to have a Federal grade placed upon tobacco before the Commodity Credit Corporation can make a loan upon that commodity. Otherwise, they would not discriminate between $4 tobacco and $40 tobacco. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the item brought back in the conference report of $533,000 is sufficient to bring to the markets Federal grading of tobacco?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret to say that under the changed conditions brought about since the Budget estimate was received on this bill the amount we provide in this bill is not adequate to take care of the burley tobacco crop. It does supply sufficient funds to provide the necessary inspection of all other classes of tobacco. The bill before us would provide a total of $145,000 for burley tobacco. Of that amount $113,000 was included in the original Budget and the remaining $32,000 is the proportion allocated to the burley markets from the increase above the Budget which is included in the bill. A recent investigation which I have made discloses the need for $131,000 additional for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman, in his survey, has also come to the conclusion, I believe, that that is absolutely necessary for the burley markets, in order that the burley farmers may participate in the loan program which the Congress has directed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Under the regulations prescribed by the Department and under the law a loan cannot be made until the tobacco has been inspected and graded. Unless this tobacco is inspected it will not be eligible to receive loans through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order to provide that grading, which I thoroughly agree with the gentleman should be provided, it will be necessary to appropriate an additional $131,000.

Mr. GORE. And we cannot have a separate vote on this item in the conference report, under the parliamentary situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately that is true, and any further money for the purpose will have to be supplied through a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. GORE. And the gentleman feels we can get a sympathetic hearing before that committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, I can only speak as one member of the committee. As far as I am personally concerned, I am very sympathetic with the gentleman's position. In justice to the producers of one of the principal agricultural crops of the Nation, some provision must be made for this indispensable service.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. When the bill to which this report pertains left this Chamber it contained an item of $10,000 for research in the field of onion disease. That comes under the heading of "Bureau of Plant Industry." May I have the gentleman's assurance that the item of $10,000 for onion-disease research originally agreed to in the House is now in the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say we were able to make ample provision for that item and that we appropriated the full amount advocated by the gentleman for that purpose. It is one of the most justifiable items in the bill.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. Did I understand the gentleman to say there was no way, under the present parliamentary situation, to remedy Senate amendment No. 69 on tobacco grading, here in the House now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We would, of course, vote down the conference report and then take up the amendments singly, but that is not practical, and I am certain the gentleman would prefer to make application to the deficiency committee which is in position to remedy the matter.

Mr. CREAL. That is the point. I am for all the report, understand, including that item, and, of course, would not even offer a motion to vote down a whole conference report because it had one speck on it.

I would also say, if the gentleman will permit a further interruption, that what he has just said is what I said when the item came up on the floor of the House and we attempted to raise those figures. The gentleman at that time—which he now admits—was very much in error. It was defeated by 17 votes here on the floor. Everything he says now I said then, but it fell on deaf ears.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately, the entire situation has changed since that time. The gentleman was in error at the time the bill was originally considered in the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Amendment 81 on page 81 under the subhead "Disposal of surplus commodities," is one on which the Senate receded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Senate receded.

Mr. COCHRAN. And it is included in this conference report as in agreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conferees agreed on that item.

Mr. COCHRAN. The amendment not being in disagreement, naturally we cannot have a separate vote unless the conference report is voted down. I am not going to advocate the voting down of the conference report because I feel confident that the amendment eliminated by the Senate's receding will be inserted either in the relief bill or in the deficiency bill on the other side of the Capitol. I do believe, however, that the conferees made a mistake in not agreeing to the Senate amendment to give this organization the same amount of money it had during the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take an additional 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri, my distinguished colleague from St. Louis, is in the same situation in which the gentleman from Kentucky who just discussed the tobacco-inspection amendment finds himself. The situation has changed, unforeseen conditions have arisen, but we have provided in this bill precisely the same amount for food stamps, $125,000,000, which was provided for that purpose in the last bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. But, my colleagues, do not be misled. The gentleman's statement is correct but be it remembered the relief bill as it passed the House did not contain the additional money for food stamps that it did last year, so up to now they are short.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But that bill was not the Agricultural bill, and the item was not a farm item. It was a relief item, and I am advised that the Senate in acting on the relief bill has inserted $50,000,000 for the purpose desired by the gentleman. That is where it belongs. That gives the gentleman a clear profit of $15,000,000 on the transaction. The Senate amendment to this carried only $35,000,000. The Senate amendment to the relief bill is for $50,000,000. So then you have gained $15,000,000 through the action of the conferees in rejecting the Senate amendment to this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. The solution, then, is that instead of being carried in this bill it will be carried in another bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly. Agricultural items should be carried in the Agricultural bill, and relief items in the relief bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I had my way, if I had the opportunity and the parliamentary situation permitted, I would make a preferential motion to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has always been a friend of the farmer and I want to express grateful appreciation for the support he has always consistently accorded farm legislation. Like most metropolitans, he may not have a great deal of technical information on the needs of the farmer and conditions which affect him—he may not know which end of the mule contains the dynamite—but I am certain his heart is in the right place, and that when he understands the merits of the matter he will want to put things where they belong. And appropriations for the relief of the city consumer do not belong in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I suppose surplus commodities are grown on the sidewalks and in the streets of the large cities. The farmer gets no benefit at all, I am to believe.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Surplus commodities, when they are taken from the farmer at less than cost of production and distributed to the gentleman's constituents free and without price, are for the benefit of the city and not for the benefit of the farmer, and that is what his amendment would do.

Mr. COCHRAN. When surplus commodities are purchased, they are purchased from the farmer who raises them; and when you lower the supply, you naturally increase the price, and there is benefit to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I call the attention of all who support the Senate amendment to the fact, that every dollar of the vast sums which have been spent on food stamps up to date have been spent to take food away from the farmer who produced it at less than parity prices; and whenever you take food away from the farmer at less than parity price you are subsidizing the man who eats it, subsidizing the constituents of my beloved colleague from Missouri; and not the farmer and his wife who worked 14 hours a day to produce it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman in his extension of remarks tell us, if he can, how much above parity the ultimate consumer pays when he places the commodities on his table?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Plenty. I sell eggs from my farm at home at 18 cents a dozen and pay 40 cents a dozen in Washington. I get 10 cents for my hogs and pay Washington merchants 35 cents for bacon. I get $1 for wheat and pay at the rate of $16 for breakfast food.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the trouble.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the middleman as well as the beneficiary of the stamp plan is from the gentleman's district. This bill is for agriculture, not for the middleman or the relief client, and appropriations for their benefit properly belong in the relief bill, where the Senate has placed them.

Mr. COCHRAN. The consumer is paying a price for what the farmer raises far above parity and if you farm boys will find a way to get some of that money that the consumer pays for the farm products back into the hands of the farmer, the farmer will not be asking for any assistance from the Federal Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take 5 additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the bill carry in the way of appropriations for agriculture outside of administrative expenses, we might say? In other words, what is the net amount outside of administrative expenses?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The figures have not been segregated on that basis, and it would be very difficult to make such a computation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give us a rough idea?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. About the only accurate criterion that could be cited would be the fact that this bill is in excess of the bill which last year carried practically the same items by $23,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I take time to make one observation? I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement with reference to the operation of the stamp plan. It seems to me that an enormous quantity of the surplus commodities purchased by the Surplus Commodities Corporation from the farmer is purchased at a time when the price reaches just about the bottom, and, as the stamp plan operates, it operates to monetize the price of those farm products at the price sold at the retail grocery. The real benefit does not go to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Supplementing what the gentleman has very well said, the farmer not only loses the amount between the parity price and the price actually paid, but that low price fixes the price of all the rest of his crop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am interested to find out if the committee is going to advocate an increase in parity payments, and I want to see the parity prices increased for two reasons. I have just been home and I have noticed some recent changes in the farm situation. While the parity price for farm products is fixed by a broad average, weighing it against the labor price, a broad average of labor prices, the things the farmer buys, like transportation and other items that I might mention, are the things that have been subjected to great increases recently. Whereas average labor prices have raised a little, labor costs and prices on tractors and other things farmers buy have raised a great deal.

I went over with a farmer, who keeps a good cost-accounting system, his situation, and we went over the wages, and so forth. He found his laboring men, on account of the things they have to buy, are going to have to have their wages raised. This is partly because of the defense wages, which are drawing labor off the farm, and partly because of an increase in their cost of living and the things they buy. On the farm next to ours they are raising wages $1 a day for farm labor. Other farmers will find it necessary to do the same. I do not think the farmer can operate under these conditions, so changed since this parity matter was voted by the House. I wonder if the committee took into consideration those circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the gentlewoman's inquiry, it should be noted that the farmer is very modest in his requests. All he asks is bare parity, while industry takes all the market will bear, and labor asks all the situation will permit. The farmer alone has been moderate and reasonable in his legislative program. As a matter of merit he is, of course, entitled to as fair a price for his products as industry and as honest a wage for his labor toil as labor, and as decent a standard of living as any other for his family as anyone else.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the parity price is a variable figure. If the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is functioning properly, the parity price will raise, and if the items the distinguished gentlewoman has mentioned, or if the reports for the next few months should show a raise, there will be a raise on all parity prices in the basic commodities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Georgia is correct. That is what parity involves.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom we are indebted for the parity-loan bill.

Mr. FULMER. Replying to the gentleman from Illinois, may I say that the 85-percent parity bill passed some time ago and does not have anything to do with actually fixing parity at this time. I believe parity now on cotton is 16 cents. Because of what the gentlewoman said awhile ago about these increases, it may be that the parity price on cotton should be 17 cents or 18 cents a pound and, if so, under the 85-percent parity bill it would mean 85 percent or 17 or 18 cents, or whatever it may be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take 1 additional minute, in order to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I notice that the Senate struck out the entire House provision and made a direct appropriation of $300,000,000 for the 1942 crop and a supplemental appropriation of $150,000,000 for the 1941 crop.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do I understand that is $450,000,000 for the 2 years?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the Senate amendment, providing $450,000,000 for parity payments in lieu of the House appropriation of $212,000,000 for that purpose, would have supplied sufficient funds to have made up the entire deficit between market prices and parity prices. The enactment of the 85-percent-of-parity bill made such an appropriation unnecessary, as the $212,000,000 carried by the House, in connection with the funds provided for soil-conservation payments, was sufficient to insure full parity prices without the additional funds contemplated in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 more minute to reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], who, in my opinion, has contributed as much to beneficial farm legislation as any Member of either the House or the Senate.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I would like to have my distinguished friend from Missouri tell me, approximately, how much is in this bill which is charged up against agriculture which is really something else, like forests, highways, and some other things of that nature.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that there are vast sums appropriated in this bill which are not primarily farm items. While the full amount of the appropriation is supposed to be for the exclusive benefit of agriculture, there are numerous appropriations in the measure for many activities which benefit the Nation as a whole.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Most of the criticism of the bill relates to the enormous sums appropriated, but, as I understand it, these sums really go to other matters.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. There are, for example, millions in the bill for highways alone which do not benefit the farmer any more than any other citizen or industry, if as much, and various other similar items too numerous to mention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take one more minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am interested in inquiring about some amendments in disagreement. I am particularly interested in two of them regarding extension work and research work in the land-grant college. I understand that the conference report will have to be voted up or down. What will then happen to the amendments in disagreement?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that the amendments to which he refers, amendments 7 and 11, have not been included in the conference report. Those amendments have been brought back separately and after we agree to the conference report we will then take them up, and the House conferees will offer motions for their disposition. I may say it is the intention of the conferees to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take a minute to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Notwithstanding all of the provisions that the Congress has made with respect to attempting to give the farmer parity prices for his products, yet in view of the prices of all the things that the farmer has to buy, including his labor prices and his taxes, he still does not get parity for his products.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He does not get parity in the market, but under the provisions of the bill reported by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], for which he is entitled to the thanks both of the Nation and the industry, in connection with the conservation and parity payments authorized by this bill the farmer at the end of the year will have received full parity.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But he does not get it under this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. After he has received the 85 percent authorized by the Fulmer bill, he then receives the remaining 15 percent under this bill. Of course, he should receive full parity in the open market, without having to depend on appropriations from the Treasury.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. May I state to the gentleman that it is not the fault of the legislation we passed but the fault is in fixing parity by the Department of Agriculture. If the farmers should today receive $1.50 for wheat and 18 cents for cotton, which would be fair, then it would be up to the Department to formulate that parity price and the Congress to work it out.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I compliment the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for what he has done and what his

committee has done, and I also compliment the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress for what they are doing for the farmer, but in the face of all that the farmer does not receive full parity for his products, though this Congress has done more and gone farther for the farmer than any other Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take sufficient time to make an additional statement.

The reaction of the metropolitan press to the legislation reported out by Chairman FULMER, of the Committee on Agriculture, providing 85 percent parity prices for farmers has been nothing short of reprehensible. Editorials couched in the most unbridled language have referred to "predatory farmers," "greedy, grabbing, grasping, farmers," and their "gimme policies," although this legislation gives the farmer only 85 percent of parity, whereas industrial prices are in many instances 200 percent of parity and recent union wage scales are 300 percent of parity. And the prices charged by these same newspapers for advertising are approximately 200 percent of parity.

One of the statements on which all these abusive diatribes agree is that giving the farmer even this inadequate percentage of parity will start a price spiral which will bring on inflation. A survey of the retail prices of foods in the open markets will show how erroneous these statements are. While there have been, naturally, slight advances in some food costs along with all other costs in the last few months, food is today selling, on an average, lower than it was in 1937. The daily market reports in the New York Times show that in the late spring of this year beef, for example, was selling for less than it sold for in the same period in 3 out of the 7 preceding years.

These figures are corroborated by the latest reports just received from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, as follows:

Chuck roast: Retail price per pound at New York, 1933–41

[The 3 years in which the price was higher than the 1941 price are italicized]

Year	March	April	May
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
1933	18.9	18.2	18.1
1934	17.3	18.2	18.9
1935	24.8	26.4	*26.8*
1936	22.7	23.3	21.9
1937	25.0	25.6	*26.4*
1938	21.4	22.6	23.5
1939	25.0	25.2	*25.4*
1940	22.4	22.8	22.9
1941	26.1	25.6	25.2

Round steak: Retail price per pound at New York, 1933–41

Year	March	April	May
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
1933	29.3	28.5	28.9
1934	27.8	29.3	32.9
1935	39.1	39.2	*41.6*
1936	35.6	36.3	36.5
1937	39.1	40.0	*40.2*
1938	35.1	36.4	37.1
1939	39.1	39.9	*39.2*
1940	36.1	35.9	37.1
1941	39.9	39.4	39.0

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from records of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The New York Times for May 17, 1941, carries a table showing the following comparative showing retail prices of meats as follows:

	1940 prices	1941 prices
	Cents	*Cents*
Rib roast, pound	30	31
Porterhouse steak, pound	43	44
Sirloin steak, pound	37	37
Round steak, pound	38	36
Leg of lamb, pound	29	29
Loin chops, pound	45	45
Shoulder chops, pound	32	31
Breast, pound	15	13
Fores, pound	20	19

And yet labor and industry complain that the cost of food is so greatly increased as to justify increases in prices already 200 percent of parity, and the editor, receiving the largest salary ever paid for his position or his services, is apprehensive lest meat prices will start a price spiral.

On June 14, the Labor Department reported that wages were rising faster than the cost of living. According to the statement, "Industrial wages are more than keeping pace with rising living costs."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported living costs in mid-May were 2.4 percent higher than in June of 1940. At the same time, Secretary of Labor Perkins said weekly earnings in manufacturing industries in April averaged $29.10, or an increase of 15.8 percent since April 1940.

Wage increases were given more than 800,000 workers in the March–April period, Madam Perkins said, and average hourly earnings went up to 70.8 cents, a gain of 7.0 percent over April 1940.

Agriculture heartily approves these gains in wages of labor and profits of industry but wonders at the savage abuse hurled at the farmer when he is given even 85 percent of the lowest price every economist, and Congress itself, has said he should have.

Mr. Speaker, how much time does the gentleman from Kansas desire?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] desires 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take 5 minutes. I rise to say in connection with such work as I, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, have been able to do on this committee of conference, that I approached the matter feeling very strongly that the Subcommittee on Appropriations had gone as far as it ought to go in respect to spending the people's money. I realize that the only way to get the matter out of hand and along the way was to compromise. I do not approve of, and I voted for some of these matters with mental reservations.

I recognize the fact that agriculture is not a nondefense element in this emergency. On the contrary, it is basically and fundamentally our first internal line of defense. Of course, appropriations should be made for agricultural support to the extent that they are incident to and do promote our defense, and I am, generally speaking, for all appropriations of that nature.

However, there are items included in this bill of which I do not approve, and for the reason that at this time we must cut somewhere if we would not have our own throats cut by the knife of indeterminate and extortionate and extravagant spending. We should save the taxpayers every possible dollar, for God knows they will need every one in order to contribute to the revenue, called taxes, which comes from their pockets.

We cannot go along as we have been going, and there is no sense in assuming that we can. Some projects will have to be curtailed. Some projects which were and are still very worth while and which should be fathered and fostered in nonemergent days, should now be permitted to continue only at low tide and at the lowest possible cost, without expansion or extension, and that at the lowest possible expense consistent with the preservation of the project at status quo or less, and for such further development in the future as may be justified by the financial condition in which we may find ourselves at the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for anybody, at the taxpayers' expense or at the peril of the loss of our liberty, to demonstrate the practicability or impracticability of his theories.

Does it contribute to our defense and will it continue so to do? These are the practical questions we must ask every time we are solicited to spend a dollar, and if the answer is, "No," there should be no appropriation further than that necessary to keep alive the project, if and when by reason of failure to keep it alive our loss would be greater than to let it die.

Just one more word, Mr. Speaker, suggested by a recent speech on the floor. Over and over again I have asked what is parity, and it has occurred to me more than once that the real farmers are being skinned alive by the parity payments that were provided. I have also observed that they have seemed to like it, and a good many of them could not see it as I did.

What is parity? Will we ever get parity if wages continue to rise? The answer is, "No"; but you cannot make a lot of people believe it.

There are a lot of other things I might talk about, and I have only spoken about parity because one of the last speakers talked a lot about it and said nothing. Everybody who has ever tried to explain to me what parity means has eventually left me in the same state of mind and with the same opinion I had when they commenced to talk, possibly because I am dumb. I do not admit it.

However, dumb or not, I finally signed my name to the conference report as such and shall support it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are a dozen or more amendments in disagreement. There are three or four groups which should be considered together. I ask unanimous consent that those groups which cover the same subject be considered simultaneously, and I send the request to that effect to the desk, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asks unanimous consent that amendments numbered 7, 8, and 9, relating to the appropriation for experiment stations and the correction of totals relating thereto be considered together;

That amendments numbered 11, 13, 17, and 21, relating to the appropriation for extension service and the correction of totals relating thereto be considered together;

That amendments numbered 93 and 94 relating to the shelterbelt appropriation under cooperative farm forestry and the correction of an allocation relating thereto be considered together; and

That amendments numbered 97 and 98 relating to the appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration and the correction of the total for that agency be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first group of amendments, 7, 8, and 9, in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 7: Page 12, line 24, strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,463,708: *Provided*, That of this amount $63,708 shall be allotted to States and Territories for which allotments under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, for the fiscal year 1942, are less than the allotment of the respective State or Territory in the fiscal year 1941, each such State or Territory to receive a total allotment under the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, in 1942 at least equal to the allotment for the respective State or Territory in 1941."

Senate amendment numbered 8: Line 9, page 13, strike out "$6,862,500" and insert "$6,933,708."

Senate amendment numbered 9: Page 14, line 24, strike out "$7,107,235" and insert "$7,178,443."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, and 9, and agree to the same with an amendment to amendment No. 9, as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by amendment numbered 9, insert "$7,170,943."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 11: Page 16, line 19, strike out "$203,000" and insert "as amended, $555,000."

Senate amendment numbered 13: Page 17, line 20, strike out "$13,806,918" and insert "$14,186,918."

Senate amendment numbered 17: Strike out "$14,596,918" and insert "$15,046,918."

Senate amendment numbered 21: Strike out "$26,890,268" and insert "$29,882,371."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments 11, 13, 17, and 21, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On amendment numbered 13, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "$14,158,918."

On amendment numbered 17, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "$14,948,918."

On amendment numbered 21, in lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert "$27,313,976."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 93: Page 90, line 19, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$600,000."

Senate amendment numbered 94: Page 91, line 8, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$700,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Washington to offer a motion on those amendments.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments 93 and 94, and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next group of amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 97: Strike out "$3,923,425, of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics", and insert "$3,946,000."

Senate amendment numbered 98: Page 93, beginning in line 14, strike out "$3,923,425" and insert "$3,946,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 97 and 98 and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by amendment numbered 97, insert "$3,962,375, of which $38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.'"

And in lieu of the sum inserted by amendment numbered 98, insert "$3,962,375."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 80: On page 76, beginning in line 12, under the caption "Parity payments", strike out the entire paragraph down through line 9 on page 77 and insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, $49,991,160, of which not to exceed $125,000 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics,' to remain available until June 30, 1944, and the said Secretary is authorized to make additional commitments or incur additional obligations, not to exceed $162,000,000, with respect to parity payments in connection with the 1942 crops of the commodities herein named: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded by less than 10 percent, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, $212,000,000, of which $97,375 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics," to remain available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment. The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar deductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

"If the sum of the prevailing basic-loan rate for the crop year 1942 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so

adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

"The proviso contained in the paragraph headed 'Parity payments' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment': *Provided*, That the item entitled 'Parity payments' contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended by inserting, immediately following the figures '$212,000,000' and before the colon, a comma and the following: 'together with the unobligated balances of the appropriation made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1940, approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 939)'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I would like to have the chairman, than whom there is no better farm friend in America, explain this long and intricate amendment that he is proposing about parity payments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides in brief that the farmer shall have parity price for his products. It provides that price from three sources. First, his price in the market. Second, the checks which he receives from the Federal Treasury for compliance with the Soil Conservation Act. Third, his Government checks from the amount appropriated by this bill for parity payments sufficient to bring the price of his products up to parity.

The verbiage of the amendment provides that the farmer shall not receive above parity out of the Federal Treasury. It is the consensus of opinion of this Congress and of the American people that the farmer ought to receive his price in the open market, as every other industry does; that he should not have to resort to the Federal Treasury in order to get a fair price for his products and a fair wage for his labor. But lack of legislation for agriculture similar to legislation already provided for industry, transportation, and labor makes it necessary in order to secure a parity price to subsidize the remainder of the price from the Federal Treasury. It is our hope and expectation that we will have that legislation this Congress, and tne Committee on Agriculture assures us they will shortly bring in legislation to that effect, permitting the farmer to collect his price in the open market and not out of the Federal Treasury. But in the meantime, while we are entitled to parity, we do not want to take more than the parity price out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GILCHRIST Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It is the understanding of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee that parity will be reached chiefly by virtue of commodity loans on these principal commodities; that the commodity-loan provisions will bring up the price of those commodities toward parity, together with the benefit payments, as we may call them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The commodity loans will supplement the first source mentioned—that is, the price in the open market. Commodity loans will insure his getting in the open market 85 percent of parity. Then we will add to 85 percent of parity, secured by the bill just passed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the checks which the farmer receives for soil-conservation payments. After you have added to 85 percent of parity his soil-conservation payments, he is still short of parity, and in order to bring it up to parity we provide for additional checks in the form of parity payments out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The amendment that is here offered is of such length that no one can follow it or digest it from the mere reading of it here this afternoon by the Clerk. But I am willing to take the word of the friend of agriculture from Missouri, who is in charge of the bill. I am willing to accept his statement that he believes this, as now formulated in this amendment, will bring parity to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will give us parity beyond peradventure of a doubt.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I gladly yield to the chairman of the committee which reported and passed the parity-loan bill.

Mr. FULMER. I wanted to call to the attention of the House the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, and a friend of the farmers of this country, that parity will be reached through parity payments, the soil-conservation checks, and the loans under the 85-percent parity loan provision. As far as I am concerned, it is very unfair to the farmer to include in parity the soil-conservation checks and the loans under the 85-percent parity loan provision. As far as I am concerned it is very unfair to the farmer to include in parity the soil-conservation checks because the farmers in earning the soil-conservation checks have to do all types of work and buy all kinds of materials. I have contended all along and I contend now that soil conservation should not be included in what is paid as parity; and I hope when we bring in a major bill we may give to the farmer his soil-conservation check for the actual work and material he buys out of that program, which is what was really intended.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from South Carolina, and that was the unanimous attitude of the conferees on the part of the House, but to give more than parity price including that item would necessarily be an additional amount above parity out of the Treasury.

All the farmer asks is that we take from the Treasury merely enough to give him bare parity. Notwithstanding the charges that have been made in the newspapers in the last 2 weeks since the passage of the bill reported by the gentleman from South Carolina, that the farmer is profiteering, the truth is he has been exceedingly moderate, he has been very conservative. He asks only bare parity, and we include in this bill language which will preclude his receiving out of the Federal Treasury money that will carry the price of his products above parity. We hope the economic law of supply and demand which still operates to some extent will work in his favor in addition to the minimum that comes out of the Federal Treasury, and I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina that the Committee on Agriculture is preparing major legislation which will give the farmer full parity prices excluding soil conservation payments.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. The bill we passed a little while ago providing for 85-percent parity loans is good for only 1 year, if I remember.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PIERCE. Does this amendment carry authorization for an appropriation from the Treasury next spring on basic commodities? The money is paid to the growers of wheat, for instance, in the spring. Does this bill carry a sufficient amount of money to give them that parity payment a year from now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill carries money to provide for each commodity the parity payment as it becomes due.

Mr. PIERCE. We want to be sure the wheat growers, for instance, will get their 85-percent parity loans next spring.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman may be assured of that.

Mr. PIERCE. Is this amendment supposed to be sufficient in the absence of the certificate bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This provides for 1 year. Beyond that we must have permanent legislation. We feel confident we can accept the assurance of the Committee on Agriculture that they will bring out permanent legislation to deal with the problem.

Mr. PIERCE. But it does carry parity payments for 1942.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has often expressed the thought that in the present emergency labor and industry are running ahead of the farmers in the matter of profits.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Far ahead.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does this legislation at least for 1 year provide that there shall be some evening up, some equalizing in regard to these three?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For 1 year it provides bare parity. In the meantime industrial wages and prices have reached the highest levels ever known in the economic history of the Nation, and are still advancing.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the chairman and the committee on the excellent way in which they have handled the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We appreciate the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has made a very clear statement pointing out the three sources through which parity is to be achieved: Market price supplemented by 85-percent loans, conservation payments, and finally these parity payments. Was it the opinion of the conferees that this $212,000,000 would more than meet the amount required to supplement those other sources? Or how was the $212,000,000 arrived at?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. According to the estimates submitted to us by the Department of Agriculture, $212,000,000, with 85 percent of parity provided by the bill submitted by the Committee on Agriculture and with the conservation payments would provide just a little in excess of parity. Of course, under the law, none of this money can be expended on a commodity selling at parity, and any excess remaining after the five basic commodities have reached parity will revert to the Treasury.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think, if we had time, I could show the House that within the next 6 months parity will simply not be enough for the farmer, he will not be put on an equality with industry from which he has to buy; so I should like to know from the chairman of the committee if there is any possibility of getting a deficiency appropriation for additional parity payments within the next 6 months?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every day that goes by decreases the need for parity payments.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Within the last 2 weeks butter and eggs have reached parity. Cattle is now above parity; hogs have gone up to $10. So with every increase in the price of agricultural products the need for an additional amount for parity payment decreases. Beyond a peradventure of doubt the $212,000,000 provided in the House bill and approved by the conference committee will more than provide sufficient funds for the purpose.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But it is the cost of production that is rising. Farmers' wages, in comparison with the wages and the price of farm implements, are rising. Within the next 6 months we will have to have higher payments to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman from South Carolina explained, as the cost of the product rises the parity price rises, but there is a corresponding rise in the 85-percent loans available under the loan bill.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I want to join with my chairman. It is most unfortunate that the committee felt it necessary to include soil-conservation payments in calculating parity prices for the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and every member of the conference committee agrees with him. We are waiting for the Committee on Agriculture to bring in legislation which will obviate that requirement.

Mr. PACE. The amendment the gentleman sent to the desk retains the last four lines of the original Senate amendment, which extends the power of the Department of Agriculture in making parity payments. It goes beyond the range of the basic commodities that have received parity, and authorizes the Department not only to compel compliance with the parity crops but also to compel compliance with any crop under which any limitation is put into effect under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I would like to know why the chairman feels it is timely to place this additional authority in the Secretary of Agriculture whereby in order to earn a parity payment a producer must not only comply with his cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco but he must comply in acreage allotments under this language with every single crop that comes under the terms of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act on which no parity payments are made? It is quite a departure from the practice of the past, it is quite new legislation, new farm legislation, and I am quite sure the farmers of the Nation would want to have an explanation of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I fully share the regret of the gentleman that it is necessary to include this provision; but as long as you are taking money from the Federal Treasury you must necessarily circumscribe that process by reasonable precautions. The gentleman has the remedy in his own hands. He is one of the most influential, one of the best qualified members of the great Committee on Agriculture. That committee promises to solve the problem and we are waiting for it to bring in the solution, and when it does we will back it to the last vote in the House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Entirely aside from the merits or demerits of parity for the farmers on these basic commodities, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this bill as it has come back to us from conference represents the high-water mark in Government benefits to the farmer? And has the gentleman taken into account the effect of such a great outlay of the public's money, not only in the farm-parity payments but soil conservation, or call it what you will, on the taxpayers who are being called on now to make the highest contribution to the country that they have ever been called upon to make and at a time when the interests of the Government are increasing in every direction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is in error in his assumption. While this bill as a whole carries a larger amount than has been carried by any former bill, the amount for parity payments in this bill is only $212,000,000, whereas we previously carried $225,000,000. The soil-conservation payments at this time are $500,000,000, and that is identical with the amount carried for the last several years. Soil conservation has been $500,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to be clear on this. It may have been covered by some of the statements the gentleman has made. Do I understand that provision has been made in what is called the loan bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and provision made in this bill to provide parity payments for the commodities covered in the two bills for the years 1941 and 1942?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We take care of the 1941 and 1942 crops.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to compliment the gentleman as one of the best friends the farmer has in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. He and his committee have done splendid work for the farmers in this bill, and I may say that goes for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and every member of his committee. We are all doing our utmost to place the farmer in the same position as other groups. The farmer has nothing whatever to do with fixing the price of his products. That is done by others who have little sympathy for his condition. When he goes to buy anything he pays the other fellow's price for that article, whatever it is. Consequently his only forum is the Congress to which he can present his complaints and troubles. This Congress has responded honestly and sincerely to help him solve his problems. These are the first real attempts that the Congress ever made to help the farmer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to consume 5 minutes, but I do desire to address a question to the gentleman from Missouri with respect to the colloquy between him and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], concerning the impression under which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr PACE] was laboring to the effect that parity payments could not be made on any commodity if the acreage allotment to any other crop on any particular farm on which the commodity is planted would be exceeded.

I conceive that the gentleman from Georgia is laboring under a mistaken impression. I think the language of the gentleman's amendment which is now pending before the House makes it clear that it is only required that the acreage allotment for the particular commodity

on which the parity payment is to be made shall not be exceeded. I know that it was the purpose of our subcommittee to bring about that result. While certain discretionary power is in a later portion of the amendment vested in the Secretary, it is not expected that this will be used to nullify the provision for full payment when the acreage allotment for the particular crop has not been exceeded.

The contrary result, which has been in effect through the regulations issued by the Department is, in my judgment, not justified by existing law. The two provisions are to some extent in conflict. It was my impression that the language which is proposed here by the committee will make very clear the fact that the only thing that is required in the way of compliance in order to authorize payment to a producer of his parity payment is that he shall not exceed the quota for the particular crop on which the parity payment is being paid. I read:

Provided, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm-acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program—

And so forth. I do not see how that language could be susceptible of any other construction except that which I have given it. While subsequent language vests some discretionary power in the Secretary, it is a power which ought not to be exercised except in extreme cases, and I do not see how any departmental regulation could be made and enforced which requires absolute compliance with all regulations of the A. A. A. as to other crops, and if so construed the second provision would be in conflict with the first providing for full payment to the producer of the crop of the particular commodity upon which the parity payment is being made, if he shall have complied with the requirements of the program as to the planting of that particular commodity. Perhaps the two provisions construed together are not clear. I think the RECORD ought to disclose that it is the purpose and intent of the subcommittee proposing this amendment that the exercise of the discretionary power later vested in the Secretary shall not nullify the mandatory proviso quoted.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I should like the gentleman to get a statement from the chairman that that is his interpretation.

Mr. TARVER. That is what I am trying to do. For example, Mr. Speaker, where a producer of cotton has complied with the requirements of the program and has not exceeded his allotted acreage of cotton, he is, as I construe this language, entitled to his parity payment, although he may have planted some other commodity on which he is not receiving a parity payment in excess of the acreage allotment to his farm for that commodity. He, of course, would not receive a parity payment on the other commodity. The matter was discussed in conference as well as in our subcommittee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

The thing to which our friend, the gentleman from Georgia refers is the provision on page 79, as I understand, which reads as follows:

The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar reductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

I do not believe we had in mind just what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] inquired about, but in my response to the gentleman from Georgia I answered him on this proposition.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia misunderstood the inquiry, and I have already answered that inquiry. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. TARVER. I simply wanted to make it clear that it was the purpose of the committee, no matter how some provision of the amendment may be construed, that the only thing that should be required of the producer of any commodity is compliance with the acreage allotment with reference to that particular commodity. That is right, is it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In that case you are getting the whole contract all mixed up. The contract I signed this spring provides several things, that I have to keep my soil-depleting acreage under a certain point, I have to keep my acreage of corn under a certain point, and I have to keep my acreage of wheat under a certain point.

Mr. TARVER. I am talking about the contracts to be made under this bill, which has not yet been enacted into law, not contracts made this year, which I think have been made under a mistaken construction of existing law by the Department. I hope that these contracts will not be repeated by the Department, and I do not feel that they should be, under the language of this amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. As I understand, my colleague states that it is his understanding and it is the assurance of the chairman of the committee that it is the understanding of the committee that, in order for the producer to qualify for the parity payments so far as his planting is concerned, he is required only to stay within the acreage allotment for that particular commodity, and his production or planting of other commodities will have no relation thereto?

Mr. TARVER. That is certainly my understanding. I am sure it was the understanding of the subcommittee.

That is the language of the first proviso quoted—that "payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount" if the acreage planted to that commodity is not in excess of the allotment. The addition of language vesting certain discretionary powers in the Secretary may, as I have said, conflict with this mandate. If so, the mandate should control. Certainly if it is intended to mandatorily require compliance with regulations of the A. A. A. regarding all other crops, the proper place for such a requirement would be in the proviso first quoted. The second provision vesting certain discretionary powers not very clearly defined should not be construed to destroy the quoted proviso.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee that I think he is to be complimented on the work he has done and the effort he has put forth in trying to clarify his position, which, I think, should be the position of all of us in regard to the food that is distributed through the stamp plan. This plan belongs in the relief bill and should be in the relief bill. The appropriations for the stamp plan should not be included in the agricultural bill for two reasons: One, the farmer up to this time received a small amount of the money; two, the public criticizes the agricultural appropriation amounts, and this stamp plan increases the total.

Furthermore, in connection with these parity and soil-conservation payments, I think the following is a clarifying statement about that. I would like to have him correct me if this is not right: On the basis of all the farms in the United States we have around $80 per farm soil checks or $500,000,000 for a little over 6,000,000 farms. We have about $35 for parity checks, which makes $110 per farm on the average for the United States. The soil checks are not distributed in that way and neither are the parity checks, but so far as the consumer is concerned, the effort at the present time by the chairman of the committee is to take the prices of agricultural products and add on, we will say, on the average, $110 per farm, if necessary, to give the farmer parity for these products.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only 2 minutes, because I do not wish to go into the details of this report. Lately I have had opportunity to read the RECORD rather carefully, and I have been greatly interested in the progress of this particular item.

I have always been interested in the magic word "parity." It is not so wonderful to other classes of people who are taxed to pay it out of the Treasury of the United States. I am very willing that the needy farmer gets considerable aid, but I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], who made an appeal the other day, that we omit the farmer who has great acreage and

those who do not and should not receive such outright gifts. I am willing for the farmer who works at farming as a vocation to get the money, but why give it to so many of the wealthy people of the Nation who simply operate farms as an avocation? But you will rise and tell us that they will not conform to the soil program unless you pay them to do it. I object to such payments, however.

I was amazed at the excuse that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] received from the House when I read the RECORD. Of course, it is indefensible. The minority party has ever been very good to the majority in its program to aid the farmer. But we are receiving great criticism for our lack of protest. The minority voted for economy day in and day out last year until this parity question came along, and then we capitulated ingloriously. No wonder the newspapers of the United States condemn us as a minority party for our lack of courageous action in this matter. Therefore, as one member of the minority party, I repeat that I desire that the needy farmer, who farms as his vocation, get this money, but I cannot understand why we cannot find a way to stop handing over this money to these luxury-loving people who are farming just for the pleasure of it. They contribute to overproduction and lower prices, yet we hand them millions in largess. It would be interesting to know what proportion of these funds go to this class of farm acreage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no reasonable man or woman in this House who wants the farmer to come to the Treasury of the United States to be recompensed for more than the difference between parity and the price he receives under parity for the food he produces for the rest of the Nation. I know I for one would be ashamed to get up here and ask at any time that my own personal profession receive more from this Congress than what I call a square deal, but I cannot agree with the sentiments expressed by the last speaker, neither can I agree with the sentiments as expressed in the eastern newspapers in the peculiarly inspired and perfectly timed editorials terming the farmers as grabbers and what not, just because we have demanded and have received, I am glad to say, from this Congress, the 85-percent loans. These loans, coupled with the parity and soil conservation payments, will give us—for the first time in 10 years—parity, not on all basic crops, but simply upon five or six of the major crops. Surely that is not asking too much for the people of our Nation whose hours are from sunrise to sunset, and not 40 hours per week.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois. If all of the Members of this House were as interested in the welfare of agriculture as she has proven herself to be, there would be no question as to the farmer receiving his fair share of the national income. The lady very ably represents her great agricultural district.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The Government is asking and getting tractor factories to build tanks and they are doing this for cost-plus. The Government is paying cost-plus for all their articles of defense, but they are asking the farmers to produce cheese and to raise wheat and paying them less than the cost of production in order to help England.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentlewoman is absolutely right, and I do not see the opponents of parity or these eastern newspapers getting up here and making speeches or writing editorials protesting against the 10 percent cost-plus to all of the industrialists who have the large national-defense contracts. Billions of the taxpayers' money are involved in such contracts, but there is no great outcry concerning the hundreds of millions of profits guaranteed by the Government to big business.

I do not see any of these same people asking for excess-profits taxes, to refund some of these excessive profits to the Treasury. Yet the press of the East bewail giving the farmer an even break.

I do not see or hear these same people or these newspapers protesting against giving $7,000,000,000 to the people of another nation.

If they want to be consistent, why do they not protest against the Government squandering tens of millions of dollars in Army camp construction under the diabolic cost-plus system? All that we are asking for is not a profit above cost of production, but simply a square deal, and that is a parity with other lines of industry. Agriculture is the basic industry of all, and I am glad to see that it is beginning to be recognized by this Congress as such.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no man in the House for whom I have a higher regard than the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. He is one of the best friends of agriculture in the House, and I regret the time is not available to yield to him. There is one question I want to ask of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I also thank him for the hard work he has done for years for the 30,000,000 farm people of America. He states in his amendment that this particular $212,000,000 will be available providing parity does not require otherwise, and in that case it will be shaved down in the payments to the farmers. Is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the price of a commodity nears parity, the amount will be decreased.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Have we any assurance from the Department of Agriculture that it will bring in a new basis for parity regularly and at stated intervals? Parity on the farm that I operate is a little different today from what it was 2 months back. Prices for everything the farmer must buy, labor, and other commodities, have risen sharply. That is the question I want the chairman of the subcommittee to answer before they begin to take away from the farmers the little payments that they receive for parity. Let us make sure they know exactly what parity is as of that date before any deductions are made from the none too large payments to cooperating farmers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The computations as to parity are made at stated periods by the Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I well know that; but the assurance of regular computations as to what parity is constitutes my main concern in this regard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to express my appreciation for the fine work this subcommittee has done. I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], upon the diplomatic way in which he has ironed out the controversies involved in this conference report before bringing it to the floor. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee has made certain concessions with respect to the shelterbelt project, for which I am very grateful. His sound reasoning and fairness is exemplified in this conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota said a moment ago, all of which I heartily endorse, about farmers and parity payments, I want to add a final thought. When this Congress or this country gets ready to repeal all of these artificial laws that grant benefits to a thousand different industries and groups of people, when the men from Massachusetts or New Mexico, or wherever they may come from, are ready to repeal the laws that increase the prices which the farmer must pay for the things which he buys, when they get ready to repeal the tariffs and all the other factitious things and laws that bolster up industry and trade and manufactures and transportation and wage labor, then the farmers will not ask for or expect any sort of benefit payments. The farmer will take care of himself. Do not worry about that; he will feed himself and clothe himself and house himself. He will then be on a parity with the fellows who are constantly bawling about farm legislation. I am not in favor of repealing these tariffs and these other things that I refer to. I am in favor of them; they make a better America for all of us; but I do say to the advocates of these one-sided arguments that when you get ready to repeal these other things, then we will meet you and repeal the farm benefits. Let everybody be on a parity basis. Special privilege for none and parity for all.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. To keep the RECORD straight and to make it perfectly

fair to all of the farmers concerned, there is one group of farmers that are getting parity now; measured by their standards, above parity, as the result of the action of Congress.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not know to whom you refer.

Mr. REED of New York. I do. They are the farmers of South America.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I might admit what the gentleman said be true. I thought he was going to say something about farmers in America.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And I would like to say to some of these eastern farmers that the same steak that costs $1.65 in the meat market here brings only about 30 cents on the farm. It is not the farmers who are getting that difference.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And I do not know whether you gentlemen know what a clevis is, but it used to cost me 15 cents, but now you pay $1.35 for a little hairpin of iron that the farmer used to buy for 15 cents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 100: Page 102, line 7, insert:

"SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 100 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the first proviso in said amendment, after the colon, insert: "*Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SINKING OF THE AMERICAN SHIP "ROBIN MOOR"—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 285)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am under the necessity of bringing to the attention of the Congress the ruthless sinking by a German submarine on May 21 of an American ship, the *Robin Moor*, in the South Atlantic Ocean (25°40′ W., 6°10′ N.) while the vessel was on the high seas en route to South Africa.

According to the formal depositions of survivors the vessel was sunk within 30 minutes from the time of the first warning given by the commander of the submarine to an officer of the *Robin Moor*.

The submarine did not display its flag and the commander did not announce its nationality.

The *Robin Moor* was sunk without provision for the safety of the passengers and crew.

It was sunk despite the fact that its American nationality was admittedly known to the commander of the submarine and that its nationality was likewise clearly indicated by the flag and other markings.

The sinking of this American ship by a German submarine flagrantly violated the right of United States vessels freely to navigate the seas, subject only to a belligerent right accepted under international law. This belligerent right, as is known to the German Government, does not include the right deliberately to sink a merchant vessel, leaving the passengers and crew to the mercies of the elements. On the contrary, the belligerent is required to place the passengers and crew in places of safety.

The passengers and crew of the *Robin Moor* were left afloat in small lifeboats from approximately 2 to 3 weeks when they were accidently discovered and rescued by friendly vessels. This chance rescue does not lessen the brutality of casting the boats adrift in midocean.

The total disregard shown for the most elementary principles of international law and of humanity brands the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as the act of an international outlaw.

The Government of the United States holds Germany responsible for the outrageous and indefensible sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Full reparation for the losses and damages suffered by American nationals will be expected from the German Government.

Our Government believes that freedom from cruelty and inhuman treatment is a natural right. It is not a grace to be given or withheld at the will of those temporarily in a position to exert force over defenseless people.

Were this incident capable of being regarded apart from a more general background, its implications might be less serious—but it must be interpreted in the light of a declared and actively pursued policy of frightfulness and intimidation which has been used by the German Reich as an instrument of international policy.

The present leaders of the German Reich have not hesitated to engage in acts of cruelty and many other forms of terror against the innocent and the helpless in other countries, apparently in the belief that methods of terrorism will lead to a state of affairs permitting the German Reich to exact acquiescence from the nations victimized.

This Government can only assume that the Government of the German Reich hopes through the commission of such infamous acts of cruelty to helpless and innocent men, women, and children to intimidate the United States and other nations into a course of nonresistance to German plans for universal conquest—a conquest based upon lawlessness and terror on land and piracy on the sea.

Such methods are fully in keeping with the methods of terrorism hitherto employed by the present leaders of the German Reich in the policy which they have pursued toward many other nations subsequently victimized.

The Government of the German Reich may, however, be assured that the United States will neither be intimidated nor will it acquiesce in the plans for world domination which the present leaders of Germany may have.

We are warranted in considering whether the case of the *Robin Moor* is not a step in a campaign against the United States analogous to campaigns against other nations. We cannot place reliance on official declarations to the contrary.

Like statements, declarations, and even solemn pledges have been forthcoming in respect of many nations, commencing with the statement that the Government of the German Reich considered its territorial aspirations satisfied when it seized Austria by force. Evidence that the Government of the German Reich continues to plan further conquest and domination is convincing, and, indeed, scarcely disputed.

Viewed in the light of the circumstances the sinking of the *Robin Moor* becomes a disclosure of policy as well as an example of method. Heretofore, lawless acts of violence have been preludes to schemes of land conquest. This one appears to be a first step in assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas, the conquest of Great Britain being an indispensable part of that seizure.

Its general purpose would appear to be to drive American commerce from the ocean wherever such commerce was considered a disadvantage to German designs; and its specific purpose would appear to be interruption of our trade with all friendly countries.

We must take it that notice has now been served upon us that no American ship or cargo on any of the seven seas can consider itself immune from acts of piracy. Notice is served on us, in effect, that the German Reich proposes so to intimidate the United States that we would be dissuaded from carrying out our chosen policy of helping Britain to survive.

In brief, we must take the sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a warning to the United States not to resist the Nazi movement of world conquest. It is a warning that the United States may use the high seas of the world only with Nazi consent.

Were we to yield on this we would inevitably submit to world domination at the hands of the present leaders of the German Reich.

We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1941.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by me over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DISNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT BASES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 203, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3537, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "exceed", strike out the words "one hour" and insert the words "two hours."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution will make in order consideration of the bill commonly referred to as the blimp-base bill, which comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There is always some controversy when considering legislation dealing with lighter-than-air craft. This bill comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs, I understand, with a unanimous report. Of course, it deals with a subject that is essential to national defense. I understand it is the purpose of the legislative committee to offer an amendment which will authorize the Navy Department to conduct some experiments of a pretty general nature in regard to lighter-than-air craft generally, including gliders. I shall not undertake to discuss the merits of the bill. It comes from a legislatitve committee that has an enviable record in the House for presenting its legislation in splendid fashion. There are members of that committee who are far more able than I to inform the House as to the purpose and effect of this legislation. Certainly it is a subject that the Congress ought to consider, because of its national-defense nature. I can think of few subjects more pertinent than that of investigating the possibilities of lighter-than-air craft in regard to military operations.

What I am interested in is the adoption of this rule. I think there will be no particular controversy, as far as I know, about the fact that the rule ought to be adopted and that this important subject should be considered for at least 2 hours by the House, in order that it may pass judgment upon the question of whether these bases should be established or not.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], this rule was reported unanimously. The Naval Affairs Committee will explain the details of the bill. However, I am sure that the Naval Affairs Committee will give the Naval Affairs Committee view entirely. I have no requests for time on this side and shall therefore offer a few general observations.

As I understand the situation it is about like this: Some legislation passed in the last session in one of the naval bills, which authorizes 48 of these lighter-than-air ships. That is, ships similar to these blimps which we see hovering over Washington. Possibly some of them are a little larger and perhaps some of them a little smaller. Under the authorization, contracts have been entered into for the construction of a number of these lighter-than-air craft. The chairman of the committee advises me that there are 6 such contracts in existence. This bill as reported by the committee and as presented to the Rules Committee would authorize the construction, erection, and establishment of bases for these blimps. In other words, if there are 48 blimps authorized, this bill now before the House, without amendment, would authorize the construction and location of 48 bases for these lighter-than-air craft.

I am one of those who has doubted the wisdom of lighter-than-air craft as a necessary or advantageous adjunct to our military forces at this time. I cannot help but remember that Germany was the pioneer in lighter-than-air craft and that Germany some time ago abandoned entirely, as a military weapon, lighter-than-air craft. If I am not correct, the gentleman from Georgia will inform me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think the reason that Germany abandoned them is the fact that she did not have any helium?

Mr. MICHENER. Well, I was coming to that. I am not a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. I gleaned the information I have from the members of the Naval Affairs Committee when they appeared before the Rules Committee. Germany has abandoned lighter-than-air craft as a military weapon. This is the fact. As to their reasons, there may be several, one of which undoubtedly is that Germany does not have helium available. They use hydrogen. Hydrogen is explosive and this characteristic reduces the value of lighter-than-air craft immensely.

From what I can learn from the members of the Naval Affairs Committee who appeared before the Rules Committee, if we had these lighter-than-air craft and got into the kind of conflict we must today indulge in if we engage in warfare, we would have to hide the blimp; we would have to hide these lighter-than-air balloons because they would have no chance against the swiftly maneuverable airplane.

The purpose, we are told, is to use these particular craft in a particular region. In a homely way let me describe the region. For instance, today the American first line of defense—our frontier—is out where the Western Hemisphere begins. This is rather indefinite, but as near as I can figure out, our first line is out in the ocean where the Western Hemisphere begins. Out there at this good hour, plying to and fro, our Navy is patrolling the ocean. We do not know what naval craft are out there but we do know some are there, and I for one do not believe there is any doubt but what as a part of that patrol are airplane carriers with airplanes. Between that line out yonder at sea and the American shore line lies a vast expanse of ocean. It is intended to use these lighter-than-air blimps to hover over this expanse of ocean to keep a watchful eye on the ripples of the sea to determine if possible whether any of these German or Axis submarines have penetrated the first line

of defense and are lurking in that body of water between that line and shore. If this purpose can be served, it would be a laudable one, but I for one am not convinced we should expend hundreds of millions of dollars at this particular time when labor is needed, when material is needed, when men are needed, when facilities are needed, and when such money as we have is needed in other lines. I am not convinced we should expend all these millions in constructing this type of military defense implement. I do not speak as an authority, I speak as just a common, ordinary, everyday, garden-variety American citizen who wants proper defense, wants it now, and who wants a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who comes from Akron where they construct these lighter-than-air craft. He should know something about it and if all of the 48 blimps are not built it will not be his fault.

Mr. HARTER. Is it not a fact that with the blimps the Navy will be able to patrol thousands of square miles of ocean at far less cost than by the use of surface vessels which cost many times the price of hundreds of these blimps?

Mr. MICHENER. I still cling to the old philosophy the Naval Affairs Committee advocated a number of years ago—before we had all these airplanes we have now—that lighter-than-air craft were valuable for certain limited purposes.

In my estimation this is a blitz war, a mechanized war, where strokes are made with terrifying speed and ferocity. I cannot conceive that 48 balloons hovering over this ocean territory could be of much service against airplanes engaged in combat overhead.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman considered the relative cost of patrol as between blimps and surface vessels?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I know nothing about costs and am not qualified even to guess about them; but I have given some consideration to the potentialities of the two types of aircraft. We are not thinking much about costs now; all we are thinking about is national defense that will defend. I cannot conceive of building 48 bases suitable for these blimps at this time. The hangars would have to be built underground, they would have to be built where no one could find them, and in the event of real trouble we would have to hide these lighter-than-air balloons if we did not deflate them and lose the helium they contained.

Mr. KERR. Assuming that the relative cost is a point to be considered, would not the gentleman choose that efficient system which cost less? Does not the gentleman believe that one question involved in this matter of patrolling the seas is the matter of cost?

Mr. MICHENER. I undoubtedly used unfortunate language because the gentleman certainly has not understood my view when he suggests that it is generally admitted that blimps and airplanes are equally valuable as defense weapons and that now we should consider the cost. If the matter of cost were the sole question involved, as the gentleman's premise would indicate, I would, of course, agree with him; but I do not believe his premise is right. I do not believe the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will say that the gentleman's premise is right. I believe these blimps are an experimental thing. I believe some of us have been trying—and I was one who in the beginning tried—to keep this great airdrome, if that is what they call it, at Akron, Ohio, functioning.

I thought there was a real reason for it, I thought there was logic for it, but the whole thing has changed since Hitler moved suddenly and quickly with his mechanized armies. It is panzer divisions now, not balloons. All things have changed. We do not want a slow-moving air balloon to hover over dangerous territory. We want airplanes that go quickly, that go fast, that carry death and destruction with them, that are able to go thousands of miles and return quickly. We do not want an air balloon that we must get out of the road as soon as the fighting begins or the enemy appears.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As the gentleman knows, I, too, have some doubt in my mind about the military value of these vessels, but the gentleman also recognizes the fact, does he not, that there are already some six of them being constructed and that it is necessary to have some place to house these blimps.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. That is what this bill does. I entertain the same doubts the gentleman does about the value of them, but I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me it is necessary, since we are already constructing them, to have some place to house them?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I am just coming to that. The gentleman from Mississippi is also a member of the Rules Committee, and he knows at least as much about this thing, and he has as much information as I have. I think we agree as to the military value of these blimps.

If I may use another homely illustration, we have bought the horses, we have contracted for six balloons, we have six balloons in the process of manufacture. We do not know what we are going to do with them. We have not the stables to put them in. We have not the places to tie them. We have not the locations to place them. We do not know what we are going to do with them. Therefore, an amendment will be offered to the bill providing for, first, the location, then the construction for the six stables to put these beautiful horses in when they are completed, and for which the taxpayers' money is now being expended.

Mr. HARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman does not think for a minute that these lighter-than-air craft are going to be sent into combat with heavier-than-air planes, does he? I take it from his statement he did have that idea. These blimps are to be used not for combat purposes but for patrol purposes, for the detection of submarines in parts of the ocean and in areas where enemy heavier-than-air craft will not operate because they cannot conveniently operate at such great distances from their bases. The gentleman must realize our national-defense problems, with the two great oceans forming our frontiers, are quite different than Germany's and all other closely connected European nations.

Mr. MICHENER. We did not have any such information as that from the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I do not believe he will give the House any such information. The information was that these blimps were to hover in territory which I have described and in the manner in which I have described. If I am not correct, I hope he will correct me now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman from Michigan has stated exactly the military mission of them. The military mission as contemplated by the Navy Department is to work between the front line and the shore line in the area that the gentleman has referred to. For instance, if the fleet is five or six hundred miles out on patrol duty in the Atlantic, then the military operation of these blimps will be to patrol the waters from there back to the shore to keep submarines from coming in or detecting submarines and locating mines.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman. He is always fair.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say that it was contemplated by the Naval Affairs Committee to reduce the number of bases to six?

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the matter, contracts have been let or negotiated for six of these craft. If I am not correct, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will correct me.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. Appropriations have been made for the construction of 6. To state it accurately, in the bill passed last June we authorized 48 blimps. The Appropriations Committee made the money available for the construction of 6, and 6 are in contemplation or being constructed now by the Goodyear-Zeppelin Co. This bill merely seeks to give bases for the entire program which dealt with 48. Of course, if you have only 6, and that is the end of your program, why, it would not probably cost as much, but the next program is to bring in an appropriation for 21; then the question of military value can be raised if anyone desires to do so.

Mr. LEWIS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say, however, that there were six bases contemplated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I understood the gentleman to so state. I have been under the impression, as the gentleman from Colorado evidently has been, that all known objections to the bill were probably satisfied with the agreement made on the part of the Naval Affairs Committee that it would move to amend the bill to reduce the number of fields from six to three.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS. I wanted to clear up that there were only three bases contemplated.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I had reached the part in my talk where I intended to say that we already have the horses, and I favor building the stables for the three we have on order; but I am not in favor of appropriating millions of dollars or possibly hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out the rest of the authorized program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am satisfied that the House beyond a shadow of doubt on a roll-call vote will approve the program as mapped out by the Navy Department with reference to the construction of 21 blimps. When that issue rises I will be more than glad to submit it to the House. But that is not the question before us right now, which the gentleman clearly recognizes. The only question now is whether we will provide facilities or bases to take care of what we are doing right today.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course; and my only purpose in talking today is to meet the very thing that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has suggested—to wit, that when the Committee on Naval Affairs brings in any bill in the name of national defense which has the approval of the Navy Department this House will overwhelmingly pass it on a roll call; and I will possibly be one of those voting for it. Why? Because we are placed in the anomalous position of being compelled to forget our own views and go along with the admirals at this particular time in the name of national defense.

But I do want to call the attention of the country, I do want to call the attention of the Navy Department, and I do want to call the attention of the President of the Nation at this particular time to the apparent futility, as I see it, of spending this vast amount of money for carrying out this blimp future program. When the day does come and the hour does arrive that the gentleman from Georgia rises in behalf of his committee and asks that we construct the remainder of these 48 lighter-than-air blimps, I hope the House will be so advised, and that we will be able to act intelligently, not because of any national-defense war hysteria or any pressure brought by any group or any manufacturers or anyone else who wants to sell something to the Government.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has put the wrong interpretation on it that this matter is here because it is being advocated by some manufacturer. It is here based exclusively upon the recommendation of the general board of the Navy and every Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics on its merits, on its military function. I am perfectly willing to let it stand exactly on its military needs, and if it cannot be justified from a military standpoint it should be defeated and not even a place to put these six aircraft should be provided for.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course; and I agree with the gentleman; but I remember also—and he was here and I was here—when there was a man down in the War Department by the name of "Billy" Mitchell. I wonder if the spirit of "Billy" Mitchell does not hover over the country today. Had the admirals in the Navy and his generals in the Army adhered to the advice and the counsel of "Billy" Mitchell our national defense would not be in the deplorable condition it is in today. The only lesson to be learned is that we must give some consideration to these things other than to follow blindly the theories of these men, even though they are our military experts. They are not infallible. I have great respect for them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman inform the House and the country wherein the generals or the admirals have failed to follow any suggestion made by "Billy" Mitchell except for a united air force?

Mr. MICHENER. I would not attempt to cross swords with the gentleman who is now addressing me on anything in connection with naval or military affairs, but I do recall that Billy Mitchell was forced out of the Army; he was obliged to leave his own Army, because the progressive notions he had about heavier-than-air craft did not coincide with and conform to the ideas of the generals and the admirals who are today dictating the policy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman believe the policy the admirals and the generals have followed is a wise policy, because today the Navy has the greatest aeronautical branch in the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Far be it from me, a humble Member, to make a recommendation. I am making suggestions only—I am calling attention to some things that are facts.

The gentleman says we have the finest Army and Navy. Of course; but the Germans, as much as we dislike them, followed Billy Mitchell's philosophy, and look where they are today so far as military equipment is concerned.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But Germany does not have a large navy as does the United States Government.

Mr. FADDIS rose.

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot discuss military or naval tactics with the distinguished military authority, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Colonel FADDIS] who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and always believes in, stands up for, and insists upon the rightness on every occasion of anything the generals of the Army contend for. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FADDIS. I thank the gentleman for his compliment, but I must assure the gentleman that I do not always stand up for what the General Staff wants.

In connection with the gentleman's statement about the late General Mitchell, I make this statement to inform the gentleman that some time before his death General Mitchell made this statement before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and it is a matter of record. He said, "All we need in the matter of national defense is 2,000 airplanes and 50 zeppelins."

Mr. MICHENER. That is all we did need at that time, and had we had that number at that time we would have had a lot more than all the rest of the world had put together. We are living in a different day. Mitchell's philosophy was correct, and had we accepted it the principle would have been adopted.

Mr. FADDIS. I merely make that statement at this time to call the attention of the gentleman and of Members of the House to the fact that after all he was not the greatest prophet this country ever produced. He was in error sometimes as to the needs of the national defense.

Mr. MICHENER. Billy Mitchell was human, as was natural. He had courage. He got kicked out of the Army and was disgraced because he had that courage. If it has not already been done, the time will come in this House when we will pass legislation and the two gentlemen who have just queried me will join in some kind of honor to Billy Mitchell and the things he stood for.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time than I intended. I have digressed from what is just before the House. I do hope that we shall all think of this matter before it comes before the Congress in another form at another date. I hope this rule will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who undoubtedly does not agree with me. He is in the shadow of Akron. He knows more about lighter-than-air craft and where they are manufactured than I do.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope my dear friend from Michigan does not mean to insinuate by the fact that I am from Ohio that I am under the shadow of Akron in the sense of being dominated by the Goodyear Co. Akron has a very able Congressman here to speak for it. I wish to stress two thoughts on this subject that have nothing to do with Akron. First, we should never forget that popular prevailing theories about flying are subject to repeal without notice by the irrepressible daring and ingenuity of man. When I first started to fly 25 years ago, we studied a textbook which proved that you could not loop the loop, but a man named Pegoud spoiled the entire text by looping the loop in France while we were studying the book in America. Our country developed the attack airplane and then abandoned it, and then the Germans showed how valuable it is in modern warfare, and we had to start over again. Our country developed the glider but failed to see the possibilities of it. Now, just because lighter-than-air craft are passing through a period of unpopularity is

certainly no reason why our country should not continue to pioneer in that great field. Just because the Germans have been smart on certain aviation developments, and are apparently not stressing lighter-than-air, is no reason why we should do the same. I do not think we have to ape the Germans in everything they do in the air. It may be that we can be smarter than they are and can develop uses for lighter-than-air craft that even those astute students of the air have not been able to develop.

Second, the military situation affecting the use of blimps in this hemisphere is entirely different from Europe.

In naval scouting over the vast expanses of the sea in the Western Hemisphere we have an entirely different problem from scouting the close and narrow waters around Europe. We have got to cover an awful lot of territory and see what is going on, and blimps afford a cheap and efficient method for scouting such vast areas. Speed is not nearly as important as ability to go slowly when you are looking for something. Whether it is a hairpin or a submarine you are looking for, you can hunt a whole lot more effectively if you can go slowly. You cannot go slowly in an airplane. You can in a blimp.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think this bill is a wise step, not because it looks so attractive right at this moment from a popular standpoint, but because it has great possibilities in the peculiar problems of defense in the Western Hemisphere, and I hope we will not do anything at this time that would prevent the carrying out of the modest experimental program that is here laid out for us to consider.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 22, 1918 (40 STAT. 559)

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4973) to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559), with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "That."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "That" and insert "When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or as to aliens."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the words 'That any" and insert "Any."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the words "That the" and insert the word "The."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that one of the amendments is longer than what the gentleman read to me.

Mr. BLOOM. I may explain to the gentleman that the Senate, when they took up the bill H. R. 4973 this morning, inserted the words "during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, or as to aliens." In other words, they have limited the time of this resolution to the national emergency, and then after that it only applies to aliens and not to citizens.

Mr. MICHENER. And it is satisfactory to the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was that done by unanimous vote of the Senate?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, there has been something added to the bill since yesterday when the gentleman showed it to me?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but I have taken it up with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and other members of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I notice the bill puts this national emergency in the same category as a state of war. Is that a new idea or was that in the original bill that was passed here?

Mr. BLOOM. This simply limits this resolution to the emergency that exists at the present time. After the emergency is over then it only applies to aliens and not to citizens of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I wish the gentleman would read that language where you have a national emergency coupled with a declaration of war.

Mr. BLOOM. The language is—

When the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941——

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I am raising the point about. There you put the national emergency on the same level as a state of war. Was that the original language?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I wanted to bring to the attention of the House. I did not remember just what had been done. I am not as well versed in these matters, of course, as is the gentleman, but it seems to me you are putting the present emergency on the same basis as a state of war. Is that a new idea or was that in the other measure?

Mr. BLOOM. No; it is not a new idea at all.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not this the situation: The present national emergency is not the same as a state of war, but is stated as the opposite situation, another entirely different situation. There is a possible war situation and there is this national emergency, and then there is a third situation when two countries are at war and the President finds certain things.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. So there are three circumstances under which this law would go into effect. One is during a war, when it goes into effect automatically. The second is during the present national emergency, and it goes into effect automatically. The third is when two countries are at war and the President finds our interests are involved. Then he has discretion to put it into effect.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And does it not simmer down to this—we are at war, are we at war, when we will be at war, and where are we if we are not at war?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Rev. F. S. Brown, of Knoxville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR SHIPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 3537, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3537, with Mr. Cox in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. If the membership of the committee will bear with me and give me their attention for a few moments, I think I can separate some of the chaff from the wheat, so that Members can clearly understand what the bill does. First, I think it important to call attention to the fact that I am

thoroughly in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan when it comes to the military needs and necessities of blimps, and I think that possibly with one exception every member of the Naval Committee is also.

Mr. Chairman, the President and the Congress have often repeated their determination to provide our country with a total defense. This clearly involves a Naval Establishment complete not only in numbers and tonnage, but also in all types of weapons, offensive and defensive, that can be useful for our protection. Today I bring up such an item required to round out the effectiveness of our Naval Establishment. It is a subject which, unfortunately, has not yet had the priority and attention to which we of the Naval Affairs Committee believe it entitled.

In expanding our naval aeronautical arm the Congress provided for not only thousands upon thousands of airplanes, together with their many necessary shore facilities, but also in the act approved June 15, 1940, and upon the recommendation of the Navy Department itself, committed us to a program calling for 48 nonrigid lighter-than-air ships. These craft, in common with all the seagoing units of the Navy, must be supported by adequate, strategically located shore facilities to permit their efficient operation. With only 1 lighter-than-air station now in existence, it is obvious that additional facilities are required. It is the purpose of this bill, H. R. 3537, as amended, to carry out our obligation and authorize the shore facilities required for the already authorized 48 nonrigid airships. It is needless for me to say that this program of facilities has been carefully worked out and recommended by the Navy Department.

For the benefit of those who have not had the opportunity to investigate the subject of lighter-than-air craft, let me add a few remarks as to their value in our national defense. Now mark well the distinction between the rigid type of dirigible such as was represented by the *Akron* and the *Macon* with which we admittedly had some pioneering hard luck, and the widely different, smaller cousin, nonrigid or blimp type. The 48 authorized airships are of this blimp type and the facilities to be authorized by H. R. 3537 are for blimps. The record of blimps during and since the World War of 1914–18 has been an imposing and successful one. Blimps can do an effective job in our defense under today's conditions also.

By this time it should be apparent to anyone who wishes to see that once we become engaged in actual hostilities we shall most probably be seriously confronted, from the very opening moment, with actual danger from enemy submarines and mines, both highly developed and modernized, and both in vastly greater numbers than some 25 years ago. I trust that the public as well as we in the Congress have not forgotten the enemy submarine attacks against us in the summer of 1918. Then in even only a half-hearted diversion rather than in a determined campaign, a half dozen German submarines roamed our coastal shipping lanes in the Atlantic from the Carolinas to Canada, and frequently within the very sight of our shores, stealthily laid mines, torpedoed and otherwise sank a hundred ships of 200,000 tons, and took 435 lives. On the forenoon of July 21, 1918, in broad daylight, thousands of American citizens summering on Cape Cod, were amazed witnesses to an attack by the German submarine *U–156* on an American tug with a string of barges in tow. So close was this action to the shore, that residents ducked into cellars and shelter for fear of stray shells. The United States armored cruiser *San Diego* was sunk by a German mine off Fire Island, and our battleship *Minnesota* was damaged by striking another German mine off the coast of Virginia.

No one can deny that today also a determined enemy could attack our shipping in our own coastal sea lanes, and also strew deadly mines therein, by means of greater numbers of highly improved modern submarines. We know also, only too well, the terrible plight of British shipping wherein terrific losses, largely due to modern enemy mines and submarines, threaten Britain's very life line of supply.

Nor can anyone dispute our unmistakable duty of preparing every possible precaution against every possible enemy act and agency, particularly for those which we can foresee.

In shaping such a total defense we must realize that geographical and other factors may make one weapon quite suitable for our own defense whereas it might be of little use in combat zones around the British Isles. There is no such thing as a universally useful weapon or type. We must realize that each weapon in our Army and our Navy is a specialist which because of its own emphasized characteristics, under certain conditions which we expect to arise in naval warfare can do certain jobs better than can any other type. Even though today they are of no use to us, we do not, for example, decry the use of camel corps by the British who find a usefulness for them in their desert theaters of war. Similarly, we cannot rule out lighter-than-air ships from our own defense simply because lack of helium and overwhelming enemy airplane superiority may today deprive the British of use of airships. Mere mimicry in our national defense might conceivably lead to disaster.

We shall use our 48 nonrigid airships as members of the inshore patrol to guard our densely packed coastal shipping lines and the approaches to our numerous important harbors from attack by lurking enemy submarines and planted enemy mines. This inshore patrol team will be composed of several types of surface vessels and aircraft, it is true, but each is needed for some particular phase of the job. Unlike any other practicable aircraft today, the blimp can hover motionless in the air or proceed at slow speeds and thus afford its crew an unequaled opportunity to sight on or beneath the surface such objects as submarines and mines and to make a thorough investigation of the meager, suspicious clues that may lead to detection of these lurking enemy denizens of the deep. At a speed of 75 or more miles per hour, the blimp can also proceed to attack submarines by means of depth bombs while summoning mosquito boats and seaplanes, if necessary, to finish off the enemy. If we do not have sufficient numbers of highly efficient aerial observation posts in our coastal lanes, we would need enormous numbers of surface vessels, such as destroyers, which cannot possibly do as effective a job of observation, and, besides, are far more expensive than blimps and badly needed elsewhere in concentration with our three great fleets, where their highly effective combat abilities must ever be in readiness. As an antimine agency, it is recorded that 1 airship located and marked 368 mines in a single day. With the aid of modern science, it is not unreasonable to expect new additional uses for modern blimps.

It is significant that every Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics has officially expressed his belief in the usefulness of blimps. The General Board, that group of elder statesmen of the Navy, says:

> In discussing the use of airships for naval purposes, it is appropriate to point out that small airships (blimps) are relatively cheap to build and to operate. Within the limits of their cruising range they can perform effective service off harbors and along coastal sea lanes in observation and patrol duties in areas where enemy aircraft attack is not anticipated, cooperating with small surface craft to make an effective patrol. The blimp, therefore, in war, would be an important factor for antisubmarine work and for locating enemy mines off our own coasts. By flying at slow speeds, they can operate for long periods with little expenditure of fuel, keeping careful watch over an area much more economically than airplanes. For these reasons and for this purpose, the further development by the Navy of nonrigid airships or blimps, in the opinion of the Board, is fully justified.

Now, I am well aware of a common opinion that lighter-than-air craft are vulnerable craft. Of course, they are, but not nearly so much as some believe, nor sufficiently so to preclude their use in the field where they belong and can do important work. Every vessel or airplane one can mention is vulnerable to something; none is immune. In war, we expect and accept losses of useful weapons. We think little of exposing almost totally unarmored destroyers, for example, to violent enemy attack, and we expect high losses. Both belligerents are losing airplanes by the hundreds; the accepted antidote there is mainly increased output of replacements. Blimps are vulnerable only to enemy guns or enemy airplanes. We certainly are not going to send our blimps out against enemy shore batteries. We are going to use our blimps in our coastal waters; if enemy men-of-war and enemy airplanes ever get into our coastal sea lanes where they can attack our blimps, then something strange would have happened to our deep-sea Navy that I cannot visualize. But we cannot close our eyes to the high probability that enemy submarines can penetrate into our coastal sea lanes.

This bill contemplates the establishment of airship shore facilities in such strategic continental locations as these:

Boston area; New York area, already in existence at Lakehurst, N. J.; Norfolk-Hatteras area; Florida area; Puget Sound area; San Francisco area; southern California area. The Navy Department has divided this program of facilities (and airships) into two increments, the first one involving Boston, Hatteras, and San Francisco areas, and will initially ask for funds for this portion only. The President has advised the Secretary of the Navy of his hearty approval of this first increment of the program. H. R. 3537 proposes to authorize facilities for the second increment also. I, for one, am confident that this also meets with the approval of the President who realizes the value of this type of craft to our defense. I need not dwell upon the obvious advantages to the Navy Department of having such authorization also for this part of its duty in preparing our naval defense; a far more efficient and economical job of planning can be done on this broader basis rather than piecemeal. Training of personnel alone is one of the involved phases that particularly requires careful, advance planning.

As to the proposed location of airship facilities outside the continental limits, this provision has been included at the express wish of Admiral Stark, our far-seeing Chief of Naval Operations, who of course has an unparalleled preview, if anyone has, of what our naval needs may require.

On several occasions the Naval Affairs Committee has reviewed the lighter-than-air situation; but it has been a long time since the country has taken any really worth-while action toward furthering developments of this little-understood type of aircraft. This is no time to temporize over any weapon that has potential usefulness in our defense. Our God-given advantage of abundant noninflammable helium gas makes the dirigible an exclusively American type. We want no chinks in our armor; no Achilles' heel in our defense. The committee unhesitatingly recommends and urges the enactment at this time of this bill as amended, in the necessary interest of rounding out our naval defense.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Would the gentleman care to express his opinion as to the possible use of the autogiro, based largely on the same merits as those advanced with reference to blimps? In other words, I take it the report of the general board on the blimp indicated that its low cost of operation, its ability to fly at low altitudes, and its work in connection with the sea lanes immediately adjacent to the land, provides a justification for its use. I wonder whether or not the gentleman feels, if we are going into lighter-than-air work, that some thought should not also be given to the use of the autogiro.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] for bringing up that question. Some weeks ago, after consultation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and other Members of the House, I appointed a subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] and other members of the Naval Committee to go into that subject, and after a week's hearings, calling in all of the experts of the country, it was concluded that we will propose an amendment to authorize the expenditure of $100,000 for experimental work along the line suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true, however, that in the present situation the blimp operates much more economically than the autogiro?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I do not know about that, but we should go forward and try to develop all these things. Therefore, we are asking this committee to incorporate an amendment based upon suggestions made by other members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and we are asking $100,000 for this purpose. So we will propose an amendment along this line:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to conduct aeronautical experiments in the field of other than standard heavier-than-air craft, such as but not limited to rotor-wing-type aircraft, gliders, metal hulls, and other than conventionally propelled lighter-than-air craft, the cost not to exceed $100,000.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the so-called blimp would be helpless in an attack by an airplane?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under certain conditions the blimp would not. Under certain conditions it would. It all depends upon conditions.

Mr. WHITE. Can you conceive of any condition where a blimp could take the offensive against an airplane or protect itself?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call attention to this: You see a little blimp flying through the air. You say, "It can be shot down immediately." Do you know that a blimp is so constructed that a great many holes could be shot into it and it would not come to the ground, because it contains helium? You would have to almost rip it to pieces before it would come down. But what is its military mission? Its military mission is to patrol, not at the scene of battle. Any admiral would be foolish to put an airplane carrier in the line of battle, because it is vulnerable and can be destroyed, but it has a certain mission of getting the airplane within a radius of two or three hundred miles of the battle. During the World War one blimp alone located some two or three hundred mines. The military purpose of a blimp would be to fly from the coast out to where the ships are patrolling, in that large area, where they would see the submarines lurking, and to see if they could locate mines. Going as slowly as they would go, around 60 or 70 miles an hour, they can see many fathoms into the water. No other ship can do so. Therefore if they locate a mine or locate a submarine, instead of engaging in battle they would communicate to the destroyer, the submarine, or the airplane that is to do the fighting that here in a certain longtiude or latitude is a mine or a submarine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his information. That was the purpose of my question.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman knows my interest with regard to lighter-than-air craft, with particular emphasis on all-metal ships. What has happened to the authorization with regard to the construction of all-metal lighter-than-air craft?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Some years ago the Naval Affairs Committee brought in a bill to authorize an experimental expenditure of $300,000 for a metal-clad ship. I think it was about 18 or 20 years ago. That ship is still flying. This amendment permits further experimentations to be carried on with that and with others.

Mr. DINGELL. But will the Navy do it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope so.

Mr. DINGELL. So do I; but I forced them to do it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have no force over anybody, not even myself.

Mr. DINGELL. Well, the committee and the Congress certainly has.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All we can do is request these technical people to make investigations, but forcing people to do things is a different story.

Mr. DINGELL. Their recommendation was favorable to the development of the all-metal ship, but the reactionary brass hats in the Navy are standing pat and will never build it until the Congress asserts itself.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I hope the Congress will assert itself and pass this bill with this amendment, and we will get somewhere.

Now, this bill takes care of 6 ships or more. In June last year I brought in a bill, by direction of the Naval Affairs Committee, authorizing some 10,000 airplanes and 48 blimps. The Appropriations Committee made available money to build 6 blimps. They have a program to build 21 more. That program has not been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. This bill provides housing facilities.

In this program we sought to include the whole program, but when we came to the Rules Committee, in view of the fact that it had not been authorized by the Budget, we agreed to take out the second-year program. So all this bill does is to provide for three stations, one in the Boston area, one in the Norfolk area, and to transfer back from the Army to the Navy the Sunnyvale station that was built years ago. That is all this bill does, and that is all it provides for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, let me call attention to this: These blimps cost $325,000. Their cruising radius is from 1,800 to 2,000 miles.

They only have a crew of some eight men. To do the same military work that this ship would do, which only costs $325,000, would require a destroyer or a submarine.

A destroyer costs around $5,000,000. A submarine may cost a little more or a little less than $5,000,000. There would be a personnel of at least 150 to 250 men on such water craft, yet neither ship could cover as much territory as one of these blimps. The cruising radius of a destroyer is much more limited, nothing compared to that of the blimp; and the speed of a submarine or a destroyer is not more than 20 or 25 knots an hour, whereas a blimp 3,000 or 4,000 feet in the air has a speed of 60 knots an hour.

This bill has been well thought out, recommended by the Budget, and approved by the Navy experts.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I feel that the committee is to be commended for requiring the Department to send figures bearing on the cost of the several stations. I do think it is significant that in many instances the figures are exactly the same, irrespective of the fact that local conditions may be entirely different. For instance, we note that the railroad connections to each of these proposed stations are exactly the same, $150,000, even though the station in one instance might be entirely different, more removed, or more difficult to get to than in the other. Would it not therefore be well for the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee also to try to exact from the Department something more in the way of specific information, actual figures rather than these figures which in most instances appear to be shots in the dark?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. Here is the situation: Whenever the Navy Department comes before the committee asking for any money we make them break the item down to show how every dollar is to be spent—that is the authorization committee. We do not appropriate, we are the authorizing committee; but we do this as a guide to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, so he will be in a position to make them justify, just as he pointed out, why it should cost this amount at this place and the same amount at another place.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require within the hour. I have no formal statement to make but shall be glad to answer questions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I shall be pleased to yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We were talking about this bill in the cloak room, and it was suggested that these blimps could fly both low and slowly.

Mr. MAAS. The gentlewoman remembers the old slogan, "Fly low and slow, mother dear."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes. It was suggested their speed could be controlled while they were doing police work. We were wondering if this did not offer the possibility of their use as highway patrols thus releasing State police for duty with the Army and Navy.

Mr. MAAS. They could be used for that purpose, but their great value is on in-shore and off-shore patrol. Their tremendous value lies in locating submarines that are submerged, and particularly in locating mine fields which are very difficult to see in any other way. During the last war we could spot submarines from planes, but our plane flew only 80 miles an hour, whereas today planes fly from 300 to 400 miles an hour and at that speed the observer could not recognize a submarine submerged.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. These will cruise at about 55 miles an hour, will they not?

Mr. MAAS. That would be about their cruising speed, but they could slow down to nothing, they could hover, they could stand still, they could come down and rest on the water, they could take on additional salt water ballast if necessary; they could come down close over a surface ship, cut off their engine, and with a megaphone talk to the captain and crew of the ship. They have tremendous value.

They are not intended to come in contact with hostile aircraft. They would of course be vulnerable to hostile aircraft, although less vulnerable than one might think. These ships filled with helium would be very difficult to shoot down. The ordinary machine gun could riddle it and not seriously affect it. Incendiary bullets would have no effect, because of the absence of hydrogen. Most of us keep thinking about the old hydrogen-filled balloon.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman is willing to answer questions for I wish to ask some and mine are asked merely to obtain some information.

Mr. MAAS. Since the last quiz program we were on together I think the gentleman needs it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am sure the gentleman was in the same class with me on the quiz program.

Mr. MAAS. I admit it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Do these blimps have any striking power?

Mr. MAAS. No. They can carry depth charges against submarines and would carry machine guns. They might carry light defensive armament. Their purpose is not combat, but they could carry depth charges that could be used effectively against submarines.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Where will they cruise, along the trade lanes?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; offshore, perhaps out as far as 500 miles, but principally in patrolling the approaches to our major harbors, and the trade lanes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is, they would be part of a patrol system to discover mines; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. That is correct. That would be one of their missions, to discover mines and submarines.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. This is purely a lay question. How could a blimp flying at 3,000 feet discover a submerged submarine except under the most ideal conditions?

Mr. MAAS. Well, it could not. If the water was rough, or if the sea was very deep, or it had the wrong kind of a surface, it probably could not; but the point is it opens up a new avenue for the discovery of submarines that you have no other way of doing, and whatever you get out of it is velvet.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Its principal purpose is to discover enemy ships and mines; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. Enemy surface ships, submarines, or mine fields.

Mr. SUTPHIN. They are being used extensively in conjunction with the submarine program at New London, Conn.?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. SUTPHIN. In tracing torpedoes which have been fired which cost more than $20,000 each. They discover dozens and dozens of them which would normally have been lost.

Mr. MAAS. I think they more than pay their cost, and, as a matter of fact, they have been a very valuable and potent part of our neutrality patrol from the time it was organized and are still functioning as part of it.

Mr. CURTIS. I notice on page 2, lines 11 to 14, provides for the establishment of these bases outside the continental limits of the United States. Where might they be located?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is what is known as the second-year program, and we are striking that out.

Mr. CURTIS. That is going out?

Mr. MAAS. It is going out of this bill, but when the time comes it may be used in connection with some of our British island bases.

Mr. CURTIS. One more question. How long will it take to construct the bases and the lighter-than-air craft that is provided for by this bill?

Mr. MAAS. There is no lighter-than-air craft provided in the bill. It is just the bases for the lighter-than-air craft. The lighter-than-air craft itself has been authorized, and some of it already under construction or under contract now. It is necessary that we pass this bill in order to start the construction of some of these bases so that we will have the bases when the ships themselves are delivered to the Navy.

Mr. O'HARA. How many of these so-called blimps have we ordered; how many are in use and how many are on order?

Mr. MAAS. We have authorized 48. At the present time I believe we have 6. There are 6 under contract. The authorized total program is 48.

Mr. O'HARA. We have four stations to be created; is that right?

Mr. MAAS. Three.

Mr. O'HARA. Boston, Florida——

Mr. MAAS. That is out of this year's program. Florida is cut out of this year's program.

Mr. O'HARA. What has the Navy done in the development and the use of these blimps since the last World War, or during the last 10 years?

Mr. MAAS. The Navy has been using the blimp as distinguished from the dirigible, which we are not discussing at all.

Mr. O'HARA. We have had some tragedy with the dirigibles.

Mr. MAAS. We had a lot of tragedy with automobiles, but we have not discontinued them.

Mr. O'HARA. The Navy quit using the dirigibles.

Mr. MAAS. They have quit building them because we would not give them the money to build any more. But in connection with the blimp as distinguished from the dirigible, they have been carrying on a constant program since the World War. We use them for training. We have six in operation now. We have had approximately that number or around that number all the time. They are used in training lighter-than-air pilot personnel, ground crews, and in patrol work. As I say they have been used as a part of the neutrality patrol from the day it was organized, and it is a very valuable part.

Mr. O'HARA. The only other part I was trying to find out from the distinguished member of the committee is why the committee waited so long to start this program? I am curious to know why the Navy Department has waited until now to develop this program.

Mr. MAAS. The Navy has not waited until now. The Navy has been developing them constantly, in line with the general expansion of the whole of the Navy. This program for expanded development comes before us just now as the two-ocean Navy proposition came before us last year. It is nothing new. It is carrying on a continuous program of the Navy Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish the gentleman would give us the essential difference between the dirigible and the blimp.

Mr. MAAS. The dirigible is a large, rigid airship. The blimp is nonrigid; it is much smaller; and, of course, they have entirely different missions because they have a different range. A dirigible, which may be anywhere from 3,000,000 to 10,000,000 cubic feet, can circumnavigate the globe; it can carry airplanes; while the blimp is a small proposition, generally referred to as being useful for offshore patrol.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the difference in cost?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The technical difference would be that a dirigible has ribs in it made of steel, like hoops, with a covering put over it. A blimp is one solid fabricated thing without any sections in it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the difference in the character of gas that keeps them in the air?

Mr. MAAS. They use the same—helium. The difference in cost would be comparable to the difference in cost of a Ford and a Lincoln Zephyr, or perhaps more so.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the usual cost of a dirigible and what is the cost of a blimp? The blimp is about $325,000.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Three million seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MAAS. Three and one-half million dollars for a dirigible.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I may say also that the blimps are also being used in the marine parachute school.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. They have found them to be very useful for the training of parachutists.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would it not be fair to say that you could keep a man who is scouting—that is, just generally looking for things—in the air more cheaply with a blimp than you can with any heavier-than-air craft?

Mr. MAAS. Generally speaking, that is true. There is no conflict between the blimp and the autogiro, for instance. They serve two different purposes. They have different missions. They are not in competition with each other. They should both be developed. They both have invaluable purposes.

Let me illustrate. We might find it necessary to drop parachutists in some tropical island with a heavy undergrowth. In order to get those men out again we could not reach them with planes, but they themselves with their machetes could hack out a clearing large enough—a clearing the size of this room would be sufficient—for an autogiro to come down and get them, pick them up, and take them out again; whereas they could not possibly undertake the clearing of a landing field sufficient for ordinary planes. That is just one possibility of the use of an autogiro against a blimp or any other type. They all have their separate missions, and we should not overlook the possibility of any kind of a weapon or defense device.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Pitcairn's autogiro. I believe that is what it is called.

Mr. MAAS. The self-catapulting autogiro.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes. It does not move 1 foot forward or backward; but like an elastic that gets wound up, it jumps into the air. It occurred to me that that type of plane could be put upon a merchant ship. The autogiro could carry depth bombs, for one thing, in a special apparatus on the deck. It could just jump off the deck or land upon it. I wonder what the Navy is doing with respect to the development of that type of ship?

Mr. MAAS. The subcommittee of which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] is chairman, and of which I have the honor of being a member, has just concluded extensive hearings on that subject. We are convinced, as is the gentleman, that it has such possibilities. We are recommending to the Navy Department a further study and a report back to the Congress on that very project.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. There is no conflict between the autogiro and the blimp?

Mr. MAAS. Not at all. They are in two separate fields.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. What is the cruising speed of the blimp?

Mr. MAAS. The top speed is 72, and the cruising speed would be about 55.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I voted against this bill in committee, and, I think, for a very good reason. My distinguished chairman has discussed this bill on the floor for 20 minutes and it is significant that he never mentioned what effect these balloons have had in the present war.

If you want to tickle Hitler, let the word go across the water that our Army is getting ready to fight with horses and our Navy is getting ready to fight with balloons. Of course, that will be good news for him.

For several years the Navy has been slow about developing these balloons. Since the President has been in office he has been slow to approve their use, but they have gotten after the President and burned him up about this program, and they are pushing this thing through. They are getting ready now to set up along the Atlantic coast and along the Pacific coast a number of balloon bases that will have to have large hangars, and they will have to buy considerable land at high prices, so they will be starting on a program of expenses that will carry this country far afield with its present Budget.

We all know that when this war started England had a lot of balloons, but what happened to them? They were shot down immediately, and what are left are in shelters and in cellars. Who needs to look for mines any worse than England does? Who needs to look for submarines any worse than England? Why does not she do it with balloons? Because they are a complete failure.

The gentleman from Michigan stated a few minutes ago that we had these balloons and we had to build barns and stables for them just as if they were horses. England is begging us to send her every effective weapon she can get her hands on to repel invasion, yet to this good hour she has never asked us to send her any balloons. It is simply foolish to expend millions for a useless weapon that cannot be used in battle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the feasibility and usefulness of blimps for naval-patrol duty it appears to me that the conclusions of one of our outstanding experts on this subject would be timely. For the information of the Congress and the country I include herewith an article by Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, of the Navy Department, who is a recognized authority on lighter-than-air-craft development:

THE CASE FOR THE AIRSHIP TODAY

(Presented at the National Aviation Forum at Washington, D. C., Wednesday, May 29, 1940, by Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, U. S. N.)

(NOTE.—The opinions or assertions made herein are the private ones of the writer and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or of the Naval Service at large.)

In any appraisal of American air power, modern airships demand serious consideration. Up to date the current war has developed nothing to minimize continued contentions that for the United States, lighter-than-air craft can perform very valuable

naval tasks. Indeed, our older main ideas of airship functions have been reinforced and new ones seem indicated.

When one reflects on the enormous strides made by the United States in other aeronautical fields, he cannot but be perplexed over the chaotic status of the American lighter-than-air-craft project. This is all the more amazing upon realization that through Nature's bestowal of an unlimited supply of helium solely on the United States, the modern airship has become a unique and exclusively American type of aircraft. Yet, it remains a deplorable fact that even after years of half-hearted dabbling in dirigible effort there is no such thing as a recognized airship program, or even an American airship policy. Believe it or not, nowhere in the governmental framework for aeronautical development has the airship yet been granted recognized standing.

Under current world conditions it would seem merely common sense that we vigorously pursue the development of every type of military and naval instrumentality that even appears potentially useful in our national defense. Day by day this grows increasingly so in the case of aircraft.

Who would have dreamed until recently, for example, that a handful of silk, originally developed into the parachute as a peaceful, life-saving device, would appear on the battlefield as an instrument of war?

Employment of air power in the present war has so suddenly and dramatically shattered some of yesterday's conceptions that today it is vitally important to re-evaluate the whole terrifying air situation and every known air instrumentality. Who can say that some of our previously conceived airplanes may not now have been rendered obsolete? Who can say that modern lighter-than-air craft may not have become increasingly important to the United States?

That we should wittingly or otherwise pass up a type of aircraft which has already demonstrated a substantial degree of utility seems unthinkable. Nothing less than a state of mental atrophy would be suggested were we to confine our arming efforts merely to mass production of only those types which have in the past proven themselves popular, if in so doing we curtail accelerated research and experimentation with less popularly understood types. While I do not even suggest the existence of mental lethargy or blind prejudice in airship matters, it is nevertheless difficult to understand why a country which has produced such aeronautical triumphs in the heavier-than-air field should manifest such indifference to the distinctly American modern helium-filled lighter-than-air vessel in either our sea-going air commerce or our national defense.

In neither the Army or the Navy is there any weapon or type whose usefulness is universal. Neither on the surface nor in the air is there any commercial or military vehicle that is fully effective or useful under all conditions. Widespread as their uses have become, airplanes are distinctly specialists, and no airplane yet conceived embodies all the virtues we should like an aircraft to possess.

And so I fail to see how, in these days of recognized and stimulated specialization, our country has not yet grasped and admitted the essential fact that the airship is another specialist possessing virtues that adapt it better than any other type to the accomplishment of certain special tasks.

Most significantly, an American war correspondent in Europe recently stated that it seems apparent that one side went to war on a 1918 basis, while the other military machine is geared to 1940.

Just as the airplanes of the first World War, so it is granted that the crude 1918 airships, utterly dependent as they were on the use of fiercely and readily inflammable hydrogen, today are truly obsolete. But the modern American airship, inflated with fireproof American helium, endowed with modern equipment and the American development of carrying its own airplanes, is not a zeppelin but a vastly superior craft of the 1940 period.

Before the first World War the Germans are reported to have had little faith in submarines, never trusting them out of contact with surface vessels. Very quickly, however, submarine exploits brought about a complete change of opinion and the submarine achieved enormous importance. But by the latter part of the war the 1918 German submarine had been toppled from its throne and its usefulness almost completely nullified. Its defeat certainly was at least as bad as that of those hydrogen-filled Zeppelins that had been used for bombing raids, a job for which they were not well suited.

Yet, unabated, the important powers pursued their feverish development of the submarine, and now look at the importance of today's subsurface vessels in the navies of 1940. Comparably, the advent of helium alone did more to modernize the airship than any basic submarine improvement in sight at the end of the war held out hope for the submarine. Today's airships, just as today's submarines, belong in today's American naval strength.

It is important to realize that the modernized airship has not yet had a work-out in naval warfare. To reject it solely on theory or conjecture would be a reflection on our whole armament-expansion brain work. I challenge any statement or contention that our meager peacetime exercises have proven airships unworthy of further development or lacking in either naval or commercial utility to the United States. In my opinion, any further neglect of airships could be based only on superficial judgment and decision or on disregard of the facts.

Compared with the lavish funds and efforts already expended on the development of airplanes and their extensive and expensive necessities of life, the outlay on airship development is almost infinitesimally small; yet actually the returns from even this lean investment have been large. Pioneering mistakes and casualties have occurred, it is true, but many practical lessons have thus been learned through the inevitable school of hard knocks, similar to the history of submarines and airplanes, and we are now ready and able to go ahead on a firmer basis.

Judging by the appended list of important groups who have endorsed American airship development, it is hard to see how anything but the country's indifference, bred of misunderstanding, procrastination, indecision, and dodging of the issue, are responsible for finding the American airship cause floundering about without either rudder or compass and without even any idea of where it is headed. The equivalent cost of a single cruiser could by this time have determined the extent of usefulness of large airships to our Navy. The cost of a single modern merchantman would have gone far toward a decision concerning the commercial airship under the American flag.

You and I both sometimes hear the statement, "No other nation has airships, so why should we?" Is such an idea meant to imply that we should be slaves to fashion even in the matter of national defense? If so, we might conceivably ape the wrong fellow sometimes.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the mentally lazy assertion that just because no other nation possesses them, the United States, too, should deprive itself of modern airships. The simple fact is that today airships belong in the commerce and armament of but few nations. At least one country was frustrated by following the mirage of a short-cut "royal road" to airship success and airships to them became "sour grapes." The one nation that paid the price of continuity and effort achieved outstanding airship results. But now, unless the elusive but long-sought fireproofing of hydrogen has been attained, their lack of adequate helium stymies every other country on earth today, and the only country that can provide itself with modern airships is the United States.

Obviously, the national defense of each country must be fashioned to fit its own particular situation, needs, and strategy. In its relatively smaller areas warfare at sea in Europe today is not an adequate gage of what would be expected of our naval arms in warfare in the enormous ocean expanses surrounding us. A watchdog may not be of use to me in an apartment house, but on your country estate you may value such a warning safeguard. Airships simply do not fit into the restricted combat pattern of the current European war, but they are decidedly valuable to our own defense or offense at sea in our vast oceanic sphere where long range is an enormously vital factor in which field the big modern airship continues to excel.

But, at the same time, possibly not all the surprises of this war have yet been revealed. We should not overlook the possibility that large airships may yet at any time turn up in the European picture in at least an auxiliary capacity for rapid, long-range, large-load aerial transportation in the safer regions behind the combat zones.

From my experience I definitely consider that two general types and sizes of airships are important in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

The smaller or nonrigid airship, commonly called a blimp, has maximum and cruising speeds of about 75 and 60 land-miles per hour, respectively, together with a cruising range of some 800 to 3,000 miles, dependent on size. Able to land on water, ride to a sea anchor, moor out at a mooring mast in very high winds, today's helium blimp is a vastly improved descendant of the 1918 model.

Ability to make observations of the water or the ground from an airship exceeds that afforded by any heavier-than-air craft. Sustained aloft by its buoyant helium, an outstanding virtue is the airship's ability to remain in flight at any speed from zero up to its maximum. Hovering or cruising along leisurely—and as low as desired—the blimp is an unequaled aerial observation post quite in contrast to today's fast airplanes, which move at such speeds that in turning his head for only a moment the observer may totally miss objects on or beneath the surface. You can read the signboards and take in the scenery along the road better at moderate than at breakneck speeds.

From protected comfortable stations the blimp look-outs scan the surface of the sea and the depths below for enemy mines in shipping lanes and harbor approaches; they watch also for readily detected air bubbles, oil slicks, the tell-tale periscope "feather," the wakes of enemy submarines that may be lurking on or beneath the surface to torpedo hapless surface vessels. Approaching a sighted submarine, the blimp delivers a greeting in the form of machine-gun fire, bombs, or depth charges; it then throttles down, flies low and slow, keeping the sub continuously under observation while the destroyers it has summoned by radio are on their way for more violent attack on the sub and the hunt to the finish.

Not only can the blimp sight and mark mines, as well as submarines, but has demonstrated in wartime that it can sink them. Generally, mine fields are marked by flagged buoys dropped from the blimp so that antimine vessels can readily find and destroy them. On one occasion, in the first World War, a lone airship in 1 flight sighted and marked 368 mines.

During the 1914–18 war allied blimps operating over the English Channel spotted 49 submarines and dropped bombs on 27. There is abundant proof that submarine captains on both sides had wholesome fear of

airships. After the Allies began escorting their merchant convoys by airship, no successful submarine attack was ever made against such a convoy. Translating the scene from yesterday to our own American locale today, I feel certain that blimps can serve more effectively than any airplane in harbor, coastal, and inner patrol work, convoy escort, antisubmarine and antimine tasks. Besides, the blimp can perform a variety of general utility tasks at a real advantage over other aircraft.

Fortunately, it appears that the blimp is about to achieve recognition although to be effective the project has to gather vastly more support and momentum. The blimp situation seems well summed up in the words of the late Secretary of the Navy Swanson in his 1937 annual report:

"There has been a revived interest in nonrigid airships, or blimps, and a growing appreciation of the value of this type in certain activities."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities, with which shall be included the authority to acquire land, and to construct or acquire buildings and accessories, with approximate costs as indicated, at or in the vicinity of the following areas:

Norfolk, Va.-Cape Hatteras, N. C., naval air station, $5,205,000.

Boston, Mass., naval air station, $5,205,000.

San Francisco, Calif., naval air station, $5,905,000.

Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air servicing sites, $750,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, at the end of line 4, after "facilities", insert "designed primarily for lighter-than-air purposes."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this committee amendment. It will take me about 1 minute to explain why. I have been through the hearings on this bill. As I understand, this language was not in the original draft of the bill. The committee inserted it to be sure that the Navy Department would use these bases for lighter-than-air purposes.

I do not see what harm it would do to leave this language out. Personally, I share with the gentleman from Kentucky, who just spoke to you considerable doubt about the effectiveness of lighter-than-air craft. I am no expert on the subject, of course, but I am just doubtful on the basis of the record of performance.

Now, if this amendment were not put in the bill, the result would be to leave the Navy Department somewhat more free to develop these bases, if they saw fit to do so, for other than lighter-than-air purposes, or if they thought that was the desirable thing to do. In other words, by not putting this amendment into the bill, you simply would not tie the hands of the Navy Department; and if they found, on the basis of further consideration, it was not wise to do all this for lighter-than-air craft, then they could use it for heavier-than-air craft.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then the objection of the gentleman from California is to the language "designed primarily for lighter-than-air-craft purposes."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, that is all the bill deals with. The bill does not deal with heavier-than-air craft, because heavier than air means airplanes, and it has no desire to deal with heavier than air in this kind of language.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is it not true, I will ask the gentleman, that that language was not in the original bill, and that there was discussion in the committee as to whether or not the Navy Department might not decide to have some development for heavier-than-air purposes, and you included this language so that it would not do that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We want to concentrate on this one thing. Of course, if that language were left out, with the language in the bill as it is now, the Department would concentrate on it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree that it probably would.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But we want to be specific and positive that the whole expenditure here is for dealing with lighter than air, and for that reason we did not want these bases built with a dual capacity in mind. We wanted them built exclusively for lighter than air and not for heavier than air.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But the difference between——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a big difference between the two.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For instance, in connection with the lighter than air you do not have to have a runway, whereas with a heavier than air you have got to have a runway at least 1 mile long and about 300 feet wide. So the committee knew exactly what it was doing, and we did not want to mislead the Congress and say that this is a lighter-than-air bill when the Navy Department later on could say they wanted it for heavier than air.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that very well and I appreciate the committee's purpose. It just happens that my own feeling about the matter is that I would rather leave more discretion in the Navy Department about this because, as I said before, I frankly question the effectiveness of this type of ship.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Naval Affairs Committee feels that the Congress should know positively and as much as possible everything the Navy does. It is our responsibility. We fix the policy. Why should we delegate the authority to someone down here after we have proceeded on one line and then the Navy may go and do something absolutely to the contrary?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My only reason for opposing this committee amendment is because of my basic concern about the effectiveness of lighter-than-air craft. I felt that by not putting this language in the bill we would leave the Navy Department with more freedom in the matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to enter into any discussion of the merits or demerits of aircraft, lighter or heavier than air, but there are Members here today who remember my discourse in regard to the metal-clad *ZMC-2*. It is today the oldest flying thing in all the world; in spite of its 13 years of service it is still above maximum requirement at the time it was launched. I think it has been flying consistently and in the hands of students, receiving the hardest kind of wear and tear, and according to such men as Commander Rosendahl, who is foremost in this field and who ought long ago to have been recognized and been made an admiral, and such men as former Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison, former Army Chief of Staff, Douglas McArthur, and other experts who have passed on the question, it is acknowledged that it has definite and special offshore patrol value. To a certain extent, they are almost indestructible rather than to say they are really vulnerable, especially when they are inflated with helium gas.

We have men in the House here today who would have you believe that we ought not to have blimps of any kind, either all-metal or fabric-covered. That is the sheerest kind of bunk and nonsense. The fact of the matter is, it is a dangerous philosophy when this Government of ours spends billions for tanks and for airplanes and billions for surface craft of all kinds without spending even nominal or small or trivial amounts for the training of personnel to handle blimps. Ships of the blimp type and trained crews may be desperately needed some day and then we may not have either ships or trained hands. There are times when an airplane can neither take off nor land—when a ship of this type can take off and land at will and can inflict effective damage to an oncoming enemy, and can be used for observation and for general reconnaissance, for locating mines and lurking submarines which a plane at high speed could not begin to detect effectively.

It seems to me the amount of money asked by the committee is very reasonable and very small. It is only an experimental amount that is requested and the House cannot afford to turn it down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out "$5,205,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$5,205,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike cut "San Francisco, Calif., Naval Air Station, $5,905,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air servicing sites, $750,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, insert "Florida area, Naval Air Station, $6,500,000."

Line 8, insert "Southern California area, Naval Air Station, $6,500,000.

"Puget Sound area, Naval Air Station, $6,500,000.

"In such vicinities outside the continental limits of the United States as the Secretary of the Navy may in his discretion deem desirable, not to exceed five Naval Air Stations, $15,000,000.

"Various locations, auxiliary lighter-than-air facilities, $3,000,000."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out on page 2, line 7, the words "Florida area, Naval Air Station, $6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 7, strike out "Florida area, Naval Air Station, $6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the committee amendment. I do so for several reasons. One of them is to ask something of the distinguished chairman of the committee if I may have his attention. The question is whether or not the Budget has approved the Florida item.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Naval Affairs Committee included in this the items of what is known as the first and second year program. That is due to the fact that in the hearings the Department asked the Naval Affairs Committee to map out a whole program, a first- and second-year program. The Boston, Mass., area, the San Francisco area were included in the first-year program and they were approved by the Budget. To try to do the thing in good shape we thought we might put the whole program in. The second-year part of the program has not been approved by the Budget. The Department has requested that the second-year program be stricken out entirely, because it may be changed. Therefore, we are asking that all of the second-year program referred to in this bill be stricken out and I hope the committee will strike it out.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. And may I ask the chairman what other projects in the main program are affected as a result of this striking out?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We will strike out the Florida area, the southern California area, the Puget Sound area, and to take the place of the California area in line 3 we are asking to transfer back to the Navy what is known as the Sunnyvale base. That leaves only three, and I trust the Committee of the Whole will sustain the Naval Committee on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Southern California area, naval air station, $6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 8, strike out "Southern California area, naval air station, $6,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 10, I move to strike out "Puget Sound area, naval air station, $6,500,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 10, strike out "Puget Sound area, naval air station, $6,500,000."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The way this bill is being formulated now, it means that the entire Northwest area, which is closer to Japan and closer to the Orient, is going to be out of the picture. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the first year's program it is.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, that is for quite some time, is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. We hope some time later on, just as soon as the Budget makes a recommendation and the administration approves it, to include the Puget Sound area.

Mr. JACKSON. When does the chairman contemplate that actual construction will be started?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On all these projects?

Mr. JACKSON. No; the projects that are being stricken, particularly the Puget Sound area.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say that the Navy Department has definitely determined at what place in the Florida area, the California area, and the Puget Sound area bases shall be located. Just as soon as the Budget and the administration approve it, they will come before the committee and the committee will hold hearings on it and bring it before the House.

Mr. JACKSON. I have been advised that the Navy has not decided upon the area in the Puget Sound section.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then I am misinformed. I thought they had.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the chairman have any idea when the work will actually be started?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On Puget Sound?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I could not answer that. I do not have any positive information as to when it is going to start, but I know they cannot start until the Budget has approved it, because they cannot send it in here.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me that here you have the entire northwest area, which is in a very vulnerable spot, and nothing is being done, while in other areas they are establishing bases.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, you cannot do it all in one day or all at one time. We are doing it as fast as possible and if we can make some headway today, we can start part of it today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am only taking this time for the purpose of asking the chairman a question or two by way of explanation. As I understood from the gentleman's statement a moment ago, he stated that the naval officials had appeared before his committee with a map on which it was definitely indicated that the changes that are now indicated in this bill are necessary. Is that right?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said that the Navy Department laid out a 2-year program. We incorporated it all, but as the Budget has only recommended for the 1-year program, we have decided to abandon that part of the bill which the Budget has not recommended. Those items in italics are the ones put in which have not been recommended by the Budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that, and I thank the gentleman. May I ask this question: Where did the proposed sites finally wind up after the committee made its changes and recommendations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not have the slightest idea where they will put it in the Puget Sound area, but from Captain Rosendahl my information is that all the places have been located. What we are doing in California is this—bear in mind that the bill as sent up by the committee provided for the San Francisco area $5,000,000. What we did there was this: The Army had a lighter-than-air base known as Sunnyvale, and that

was transferred by Executive order. Instead of building a new one out there we have a provision in the second paragraph that transfers that back to the Navy, and then we will reimburse the Army so it can build a place to suit its needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was only 2 years ago that Sunnyvale was the property of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. Now we are putting it back, because it was built exclusively for lighter-than-air craft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the gentleman's comments in response to my inquiry, I am assuming that those particular sites have no definite location that the chairman knows of at this time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether they have been marked by metes and bounds. For instance, in the Boston area I do not know what particular place has been selected, or in the Norfolk area. That is a matter that the committee does not try to deal with, and we do not have that information. We leave that to the military men to determine, because they are better qualified. I can say one thing, there is going to be no logrolling in connection with it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I was not intimating that there was logrolling. I was just curious, because we people out on the coast figure we are entitled to this information because of our exposed condition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question arises on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 2, line 11, strike out all of lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTPHIN: Page 1, line 7, after the word "acquire", insert "under contracts entered into as a result of competitive bidding."

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions representatives of departments have urged Congress to grant them authority to enter into negotiated contracts stating that time was of the essence. Time certainly is not of the essence in the construction of these facilities, as the ships themselves will not be available for 2, 3, or possibly 4 years. If this amendment is adopted and this construction work is built on a competitive-bid basis, we shall have then an opportunity of determining which method is the cheaper and the better.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is wise wherever possible to have competitive bids. We have been forced in certain types of construction to have negotiated contracts, but where no delay is caused we shall adhere to the competitive bid. So it is with pleasure I accept the amendment and hope it will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The custody and control of the former naval air station at Sunnyvale, Calif., now known as Moffett Field, are hereby transferred from the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Navy, who is authorized to reestablish the same as a naval air station, and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish at such location as he may, with the approval of the President, deem best suited to the purpose, basic heavier-than-air training facilities in lieu of those at Moffett Field at a cost not to exceed $6,500,000. Physical possession of Moffett Field shall be transferred when, in the opinion of the President, the facilities herein authorized for the War Department are sufficiently complete to permit of their use for the purposes specified, but not later than 8 months after the approval of this act."

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER: Page 3, line 5, after the word "after", strike out "the approval of this act" and insert "money is made available to the War Department to provide such facilities."

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to give the Army time within which to provide itself with facilities for heavier-than-air training in lieu of Moffett Field which under the provisions of the committee amendment is to be turned over to the Navy. The Army is now using Moffett Field for the training of heavier-than-air pilots. Under the provisions of the amendment as proposed by the committee the Army is directed to turn Moffett Field over not later than 8 months after the approval of this act. Under my amendment it would be 8 months after the money is made available to the War Department to provide such facilities. In other words, this is an authorization. Under the committee amendment the time would start to run from the approval of the act, but under my amendment it would not start to run until the money is made available.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The amendment is perfectly agreeable because, of course, the Army should not be ejected from the field until they have had time to make other arrangements.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 3, line 6, change "section 3" to "section 4" and insert new "section 3" to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to conduct aeronautical experiments in the field of other than standard heavier-than-air craft, such as, but not limited to, rotary-wing type aircraft, gliders, metal-hulled and other than conventionally propelled lighter-than-air craft and the like at a cost not to exceed $100,000."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee explain the reason for offering this amendment inasmuch as it was never considered in the committee, and some of us did not know it was to be offered?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, grows out of the fact that last week a subcommittee was appointed to inquire into the types of lighter-than-air craft referred to here. On this committee were the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and others. The subcommittee had a hearing and heard experts with reference to gliders and the types of craft specified in the amendment. I felt it was justified to have experimental work going on so that the country would know that the Congress was trying to keep abreast of the times by at least making money available for experimental work of this character.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee is going into that matter at quite some length. I further understand that they have not as yet made a report. It seems to me before we accept an amendment of this kind to this bill that we ought to have the benefit of the opinion of that subcommittee from the Naval Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The gentleman is mistaken, because the report has been written and filed by that committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know when that was.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The gentleman is not a member of the subcommittee. It has been sitting for 2 weeks. We have been going on just the same.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If the report has been filed and it is favorable to this amendment, I have no objection to it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether the report endorses this amendment or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wanted to inquire whether or not the subcommittee has endorsed this amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The inference left by the gentleman from New Jersey was that the subcommittee had endorsed it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not offering the amendment as a committee amendment. I am offering it on my own responsibility as a Member of the House. I think this is a very important amendment because it enables the Navy to go forward and make these investigations if the facts, in the opinion of the Navy Department, justify it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In view of the fact a subcommittee has been ap-

pointed for the purpose of exploring into the advisability of such action, it seems to me that the Naval Affairs Committee might well withhold an amendment of this kind. I would like to know whether or not the subcommittee has reported it and, if so, whether they are favorable to the amendment.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I am favorable to the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "2", and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3537, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 203, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the program for next week.

Monday will be District day. There will be two or three small bills called up, but the important one will be the so-called small loan bill.

The Whittington bill will be called up in a few minutes. That is the so-called flood-control bill, and if that does not pass this afternoon, it will be taken up after District business is considered on Monday.

If that bill is disposed of, then the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be the next one in order, and that bill will probably take the remainder of Monday, if the District of Columbia Committee does not consume the entire day, and Tuesday.

A deficiency bill will be called up on Wednesday, and the consideration of that bill will probably take Wednesday and Thursday.

Following that there will be the May bill reported out of the Military Affairs Committee, which will be next in order.

There is the Casey resolution, which we are hopeful will be considered some time the latter part of next week. That has to do with an investigation of price ranges and so forth.

All of this is subject to such conference reports as may be called up during the week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include an article on lighter-than-air craft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be permitted to extend his remarks relative to the birthday of West Virginia and to include therein a short poem by Harry E. Leeper, of Fairmont, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

DEFERMENT OF MEN BY AGE GROUP OR GROUPS UNDER SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 243, Rept. No. 811), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 1524) to authorize the deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RESERVOIRS, LEVEES, AND FLOOD WALLS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 234.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side. I believe it is understood and agreed that the rule should be adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4911, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on June 22, 1936, for the first time Congress adopted a national flood-control policy and authorized $300,000,000 for flood-control improvements. An emergency act followed that bill in 1937 applicable to the lower Ohio Valley. In 1938 the second major

flood-control bill was passed, and Congress authorized for flood-control works in the principal river basins in the United States $396,000,000. An emergency bill was passed in 1939. It was the policy of the committee to report a bill in 1940. Extensive hearings were conducted. All who desired to be heard from New England to Los Angeles and from Florida to Seattle were heard. The bill H. R. 9640 was reported on May 7, 1940, and the hearings were published.

About the time the bill was reported France fell, and our thoughts turned to national defense. The committee decided to withhold a request for the consideration of the bill during the last session. During the present session there have been conducted hearings on all projects that have been favorably reported to the Congress since the bill to which I have just referred was reported in 1940. Hearings have been published and are available on that bill. In a word, the bill under consideration embraces all of the projects, with the exception of two items that have been enacted into law as emergency projects, that were contained in the bill H. R. 9640, reported a year ago, and in addition thereto it embraces the projects on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports and the committee has made investigations since May 7, 1940.

The bill under consideration provides for authorizations aggregating $260,000,000. At present there are authorizations of approximately $310,000,000 for flood control, but about $180,000,000 of that amount is definitely required to complete projects that are under construction, so in all parts of the country there are available authorization for new projects in the amount of about $130,000,000.

It is the program, as was stated by the President in his Budget message, that following the existing emergency there shall be carefully studied and carefully planned projects on the shelf, so that in addition to providing for projects that are now under construction that should be constructed and that should be completed, after the emergency is passed there will be worthy, constructive public works that will enable the country to meet the problem of unemployment that must inevitably follow the emergency.

This is a rather long bill, but it has just eight sections. It is a simple bill. I shall give you an analysis of the bill in a few words, and I believe you can follow me. After all, if you take the bill and the report of the committee, you get a definite statement covering each project authorized in the bill. The reports are available. The bill is definite.

I repeat, to emphasize, that no project was included in this bill until that project had been studied on the ground by the district engineer, in the field by the division engineer, and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and approved by the Chief of Engineers and investigated and studied by our committee.

If members of the committee will turn to the bill, in just a few words I shall undertake to explain it.

Section 1 of the bill is substantially existing law. It provides for the continuation of the policy adopted in 1936.

Section 2 is an administrative provision in the bill, and it is most important. It is necessary to adopt this section. The law was supposed to be amended by section 2 in the bill we reported a year ago.

The yardstick for local contributions is the same in all parts of the country. Local interests are required to provide under the general law rights-of-way and lands for levees and flood walls. The Federal Government since 1938 has paid for the cost of reservoirs.

In 1938, when we provided for the first time that the Federal Government should pay for the cost of reservoirs, an innocent amendment was added to the bill. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who was on the committee at that time, and is now sitting before me, will recall that that amendment was inserted on the floor of the Senate, and before the conferees agreed to it we undertook to get all the information we could that that was really an innocent amendment and would not cost very much. It provided that the Government should pay the cost of channelization. It has developed that that amendment has cost the Government millions of dollars.

Section 2, the administrative provision of this bill, undertakes to amend the act of 1938 to restore the general law or the act of 1936. There is a novel provision that occurs for the first time in a flood-control bill, in section 2. It provides that if a project is authorized and the local community does not make its contribution after 5 years, that project is definitely eliminated and will not stand in the way of other worthy projects that have been approved.

There is another worthy provision in section 2 that will enable the Chief of Engineers upon the acquiring of a site to proceed with the construction in line with river-and-harbor work.

Section 3 deals with projects that are approved, and that section covers some 23 pages in the bill. Every project that is authorized is described in section 3, and reference is made to the reports of the Chief of Engineers recommending these projects or any other reports referred to in the bill, so that Members of Congress can take the bill and the report of the committee and find out and be fully advised with respect to any project.

I want to say this, in passing, with respect to one project in New England along the Connecticut River: We authorized in 1936 something like $10,000,000 for reservoirs. Among those reservoirs was a reservoir in New Hampshire, the Bethlehem Junction. The same document was approved in the act of 1938, but a subsequent discovery by the Chief of Engineers developed that a better reservoir site might be adopted for some of those reservoirs, and among others Sugar Hill. The committee heard the testimony with respect to this project, and we approved the document; but I call your attention to that fact, and I have the document in my hand, and that document, House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, suggested the substitution of Sugar Hill for Bethlehem Junction. This was an interim report.

There was objection by the people in New Hampshire to the construction of Sugar Hill, and as a member of that committee I shared the objection. It would have utilized one of the most beautiful valleys in the White Mountains, one of the most magnificent areas I ever saw. So the Committee on Flood Control adopted a resolution calling upon the Chief of Engineers to provide for a restudy of the Sugar Hill Reservoir with a view to substituting another reservoir in place of the Sugar Hill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

So I can state that under the terms of this bill Sugar Hill is not authorized to be constructed.

We have provided for projects in section 3 in the Connecticut River Basin, the Thames River Basin, and the Pawtuxet River Basin, Lake Champlain Basin, the Oswego River Basin in central and upper New York, and the yardstick for local contributions there where the Chief of Engineers states in his report that the works are largely local is the same yardstick that obtains for local contributions in other parts of the country, and I know of no area in the United States that has been more generously dealt with than central New York or west central New York and northern Pennsylvania, because in the Flood Control Act of 1936 we authorized projects in that general area following the disastrous flood of 1935, that provided that the Federal Government should spend $27,000,000 and the local interests contribute about $1,000,000.

There are some eight projects in the Finger Lakes area and then there are projects in the Susquehanna River Basin, the Delaware River Basin, the Mobile River Basin, the Allatoona Reservoir, and there are the Tombigbee River, the Colorado River Basin, the Brady Creek, and the Brazos River projects.

Now, just a word in passing with respect to the lower Mississippi. Until 1936 Congress provided for flood control only in the lower Mississippi River and the Sacramento River, the lower Mississippi being the father of rivers and the father of floods in our country.

Under the act of 1928, supplemented by the act of 1936, the Mississippi River was divided into three sections, from Cairo to the mouth of the Arkansas, from the mouth of the Arkansas to the mouth of the Red, from the mouth of the Red to the Gulf of Mexico, and was provided with a project that would protect it against the maximum flood. The upper section has been practically completed. The lower section has no difficulties. In the middle section of the river there were authorized, through the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, floodways first through the Boeuf Basin and then through the Eudora Basin for the diversion of floodwaters, and I call your attention to the fact that as a result of a provision that Congress made in the Flood Control Act of 1928, for studies and investigations, the establishment of the

greatest flood-control laboratories on earth, the Mississippi River, the longest navigable river in our country, between the Arkansas and the Red, as you will recall from your geography, has been shortened by cut-offs a distance in 370 miles of 137 miles and navigation has been afforded at the same time, because today in the lower Mississippi there is more navigation than there was in the halcyon days of the steamboat, long before the railroads came to supplant the steamboats. The navigation is largely by barges. As a result of these cut-offs, the Chief of Engineers and the president of the Mississippi River Commission in charge of that part of the lower Mississippi Valley, recommended that there could be adopted any one of three projects and thus elimination of these large areas of land for diversions would occur, because they said that the flood heights had been reduced from 5 to 10 feet as a result of these cut-offs.

So, without increasing the authorization for the main Mississippi River, this bill provides for the adoption of the report of the engineers for increasing the height of levees in the lower Mississippi Valley and the elimination of the diversions. Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi, the States primarily interested, have agreed to the provision. In the Red Ouachita Basin there is a reservoir project. Flood projects are authorized along the White River Basin, the Arkansas River Basin, the Ohio River Basin, and one project along the Tennessee River Basin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall save time if I yield myself 5 minutes more. One of the most dangerous flood-control programs in the United States today is Chattanooga, Tenn., and that, notwithstanding the T. V. A. for both the Chief of Engineers and the T. V. A. report to our committee and testified that levees 20 feet high are essential to protect the city of Chattanooga. I shall extend my remarks in that regard because we are dealing primarily with flood control, and any reservoirs that are authorized in this bill are primarily for flood control. But wherever power can be developed, penstocks are to be installed, and provisions are to be made for the development of power, because water is one of the greatest natural resources of our country, and they are resources that belong to the people and they should be utilized for the benefit of the whole people whenever there is an opportunity. [Applause.]

Provision is made for increasing the authorizations along the Ohio River, the Missouri River, the White River, and in Los Angeles. I now yield to my friend from Los Angeles the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It was not about that that I wanted to ask the gentleman to yield. It is about another matter.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then, just one moment. Important work has been done in and about Los Angeles, and provisions are made also for work along the Sacramento River and along the Willamette and one or two prospects along the Columbia.

I now come to section 4. Probably more Members are interested in this section than in any other section of the bill. There is a flood problem in practically every district in the United States. Members of Congress desire their rivers surveyed and studied, and section 4 includes every bill introduced by Members of Congress which has been submitted to the Chief of Engineers, when he recommends that a study and examination be made of the flood problem. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND] on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. BOLAND. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the Lackawanna River. It flows through my district. It is a tributary of the Susquehanna. A survey was made. I asked for a survey and they have embodied it in the Susquehanna report. What is the status of that survey?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has been most diligent. As I recall, in the act of 1936, three times you will find provisions for surveys of the Susquehanna River and tributaries. The gentleman introduced a special bill for the Lackawanna River, which is a tributary of the Susquehanna. One of the criticisms of the Corps of Engineers by some sources is that instead of studying the problem in the entire watershed they pick out a unit here and there, so that when the Chief of Engineers came to report on the Lackawanna River he found he was directed to report on the Susquehanna. So, unfortunately, without any fault on the part of the gentleman, the report on the Lackawanna River has been delayed because the report on the Susquehanna of which it is a part has not been completed. I know that the gentleman has a worthy project, and that is the only reason the committee was unable to consider it, and personally I think the report should be facilitated and submitted to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BOLAND. Might I ask the gentleman, then, for a serious consideration of the matter when it does come before the committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, I do not give any other kind of consideration than serious and careful consideration.

Mr. BOLAND. I was about to ask the gentleman for favorable consideration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall do the best I can. I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Before I ask my question, as a member of this committee, permit me to say that I appreciate more than I can say the splendid leadership that our chairman has given us. I do not believe there is another committee in the House that is as efficiently and effectively carried on as this committee. I just wanted to ask a question about section 2, because in his remarks on section 2 I believe the gentleman stated that the provisions of our section 2 in this bill would restore the law to what it was in 1936.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Only in one regard.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Only with regard to channel rectification?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But not with regard to reservoirs?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, not at all; simply channelization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very interesting and illuminating statement. He has done fine work. There is nothing for the Merrimac River in this bill, but the engineers tell me they have all the authorization they require for that river.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true. But reservoirs are authorized in the acts of 1936 and 1938 at a total cost of $11,000,000. I do not know of any river that has more flood-control help than the Merrimac River. It is one of the finest rivers in the United States and is in the gentlewoman's district. None has been more diligent or successful for flood control than she.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am apprehensive about the limitation in section 2 which says that "the authorization for any flood-control project heretofore or herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date of approval of this act unless local interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished." I am wondering whether or not that should not be 5 years after the appropriation has been made, because of the uncertainty of the period of time between authorization and appropriation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Flood-control projects have been authorized generally since 1936. That is the limitation with respect to rivers and harbors, and it has worked out very satisfactorily. Those interested in this legislation think it will facilitate matters. Some objection is made to new authorizations, because we have projects that have been authorized and never yet constructed. The local interests can prevent it if they say they are willing to make the contribution. In fact the President, among others, suggested the limitation.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. And they do not have to make it; simply say they are willing?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; just so they are willing, and ready to comply, and furnish assurances.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very fine statement about flood conditions in Ohio. Anybody who knows anything about it knows that the Ohio River is the greatest transportation carrying river in the world. What is the latest development, may I ask the gentleman, with reference to the Blue Stone Dam?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Blue Stone Dam was authorized in 1936, and because of litigation was authorized again in 1938. We did not have any investigation

about that, because there was no occasion for us to go into it. But it is my understanding that the Blue Stone Dam is under way, at least, it is authorized.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And as far as the gentleman knows, there is no impediment to the Blue Stone Dam except this litigation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; and certainly not in view of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dennison Dam case.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Board of Engineers and the division engineer have made a study and investigation of all these projects. The Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers recommended every one of these projects?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; all were recommended or agreed to by the Chief of Engineers. They would not be in the bill if the Chief of Engineers had not agreed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. On April 14 I introduced a bill, H. R. 4348, which authorized additional funds for the Department of Agriculture. Would the gentleman explain where in this bill matters affecting the Department of Agriculture are contained?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has anticipated me. I will come to it. Five million dollars is authorized for the purpose you have in mind, it is in the last section of the bill. If you can get that, go to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I am trying to facilitate the passage of this bill. Some of you know of the difficulties under which I am working at the present time, and of my feelings for a friend desperately ill at this moment.

Section 5 contains a new authorization for the first time. If there is a flood on any river in the United States where there are flood-control improvements, without coming to Congress the Corps of Engineers can go out and help repair and maintain. That is section 5.

Section 6 makes applicable to flood-control work the acts mentioned that are now applicable on river and harbor improvements, in the acquiring of lands, taking possession of them, and so forth.

Section 7 is a clarifying amendment, so as to enable the Department of Agriculture to use funds heretofore as well as herein authorized for the purpose, under the act of 1936, as amended.

The last section of the bill, section 8, authorizes $260,000,000 for flood-control works, $10,000,000 to be equally divided between the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture for preliminary examinations and surveys; $5,000,000 for works for the Department of Agriculture.

I beg your pardon for having detained you, but it occurred to me that under the circumstances I could save time by explaining the sections of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman's committee for the courteous manner in which they have taken care of the Santa Ana River Basin. Our last flood cost 36 lives and $627,000,000. For those things which you have put into this bill we are extremely grateful, and we thank you.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the Members for their consideration, and unless there be some further question by some member of the committee, I will yield the floor, but before yielding I trust that the bill may be passed by the unanimous vote of the committee and of the House, as it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Flood Control. [Applause.]

Under leave to extend, at the risk of repetition, I should like to emphasize the need of additional authorizations, the necessity of Public Works following the existing emergency, the need for amending provisions of existing flood-control acts, and I would like to analyze the bill a little more in detail.

On June 22, 1936, as I have said Congress passed the first national flood-control bill and authorized $300,000,000 for the construction of improvements in the principal regions of the country.

A sound policy was announced. Investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water retardation and soil erosion prevention on watersheds were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. The investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways were placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The Departments of War and Agriculture have cooperated, their works are coordinated, there is no duplication. Progress in flood-control prevention and protection has been made.

In 1938 Congress passed the second national flood-control bill following an emergency act that was passed in 1937.

Rivers are being investigated and streams are being studied. There is need for orderly development of the national policy. Annual authorization bills might properly be introduced, however, in 1939 no general authorization bill was introduced but a bill was passed to amend existing laws and to provide for examinations and surveys.

Under the adopted policy, after extensive hearings, a flood-control bill, H. R. 9640, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, was reported on May 7, 1940. On account of the national emergency and the second World War the bill was not pressed. The bill under consideration embraces all of the provisions of the said bill reported in May 1940 except an emergency project and except a statutory provision that were passed as matters of urgency and defense.

In addition to the projects reported in the bill of 1940 the pending bill contains projects on all reports favorably submitted by the Chief of Engineers since hearings were conducted on the said bill reported in 1940. The bill in 1940 authorized appropriations amounting to $196,000,000. The bill under consideration authorizes appropriations for flood-control improvements aggregating $260,000,000, and $10,000,000 for examinations and surveys and $5,000,000 for soil-erosion works by the Department of Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS

The act of 1936 and subsequent acts authorizes $693,926,000 for flood control throughout the United States, exclusive of the Lower Mississippi River. Including appropriations for the fiscal year 1942, some $383,000,000 have been appropriated for general flood control. There is thus left about $310,000,000 as a backlog. The Chief of Engineers estimates that it will cost about $180,000,000 to complete projects under construction or scheduled for construction in the fiscal year 1942. There is thus left a backlog of only $130,000,000 of authority available for new flood-control projects.

Many important projects cannot be constructed without additional authorizations. Generally, flood-control projects must be constructed consecutively. Reservoirs require long periods to be completed. Benefits do not accrue until reservoirs are completed. It took 6 years to complete the Fort Peck Reservoir.

Devastating floods may jeopardize the national defense by halting industrial production, by shutting down power plants, by crippling railroads, by destroying highways, and by interrupting communications. Additional authorizations both for national defense and the general welfare should be made at this time.

As stated, the bill reported last year was not pressed on account of national defense. The hearings conducted on the 1940 bill are available in connection with the pending bill. The Committee on Flood Control did not report, but hearings were conducted on all reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings were conducted on the bill reported in 1940 and the Flood Control Act of 1938. Hearings are, therefore, available covering all projects embraced in the pending bill.

FAVORABLE REPORTS

No projects have been included in the pending bill except modifications of existing or new projects, on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

Under the terms of the bill, when there are additional authorizations for drainage basins in which projects have already been authorized and appropriations have been insufficient for their construction, the selection is left to the Chief of Engineers. The provisions of the act of June 28, 1938, obtain, except as amended. It is contemplated that priority projects will have first consideration. Authorizations in one drainage basin cannot be transferred to another.

MULTIPLE-USE PROJECTS

The reservoirs provided for in the pending bill are primarily for flood con-

trol. It will be kept in mind that water is the most valuable of natural resources; it should not be wasted, and it should not be polluted; it should be made to serve and not destroy.

Reservoirs may be built for flood control, for navigation, for the generation of power, and for the conservation of water for reclamation or other uses; they may be operated primarily for one purpose or for several purposes. It is often practical and economical to build reservoirs with sufficient capacity to detain floodwaters and store water for other purposes. If operated for several purposes they are called multiple-use reservoirs.

Wherever power can be provided in dams that are for flood control, provision is made for such power. Studies are conducted by the Federal Power Commission. Penstocks are installed wherever the Federal Power Commission and the Chief of Engineers believe that a multiple-use reservoir is practicable.

The Federal Power Commission does not construct reservoirs. It can make a great contribution in solving the use and marketing problem of electric power. It is not necessary for the Commission to engage in construction. It has authority to license and it might well be vested with the authority to dispose of the power. The final solution may require time but it is not necessary to permit the assets of falling waters to go to waste. The public is entitled to the benefits of economical power that can be developed from their natural resources. Water power is not only valuable in itself, but it contributes to needed public improvements that might otherwise not be built for flood control, navigation, and irrigation.

The power possibilities along the White River in Missouri and Arkansas are remarkable, and demands for power not only exist but will increase as the power is developed. It will take many years to construct the reservoirs. By the time the projects have been completed all of the power that can be developed will be needed. It is wise to authorize multiple-use projects now so that they can be constructed in an orderly manner to meet the emergency needs for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power.

PUBLIC WORKS

The President of the United States, in his Budget message in January 1941, recommended reductions in appropriations for flood control, river and harbor, and reclamation work. He put national defense first. He did recommend that the projects under construction go forward to completion. The President also emphasized the need for surveys, investigation, and planning of new projects, so that following the national emergency construction could be resumed without delay. I quote from his message:

> This will produce a long list of public-works projects apart from defense construction, arranged according to priorities. Such a list could be submitted to a future Congress for appropriation of funds to put it into operation.

The President, therefore, made it clear that planning in connection with domestic public-works projects would continue. He wanted plans and engineering works complete and on the shelf so that they could be used when the national-defense emergency is over. When the defense employment ends it will be possible to take these projects off of the shelf and put people back to work on useful public works.

The bill under consideration, therefore, not only provides for the orderly development of flood-control improvements but it makes authorizations for useful works so that they will be ready for execution when the appropriations are made.

THE BILL

The urgent need for additional authorizations for prosecution of approved plans is recognized and the bill makes provision for additional authorizations which the Chief of Engineers considers essential for orderly prosecution of work in a number of the most important river basins. In addition, individual projects which have been found to be economical and desirable are authorized.

As stated, the last general Flood Control Act was passed in 1938. A large number of reports on surveys authorized by Congress have been completed and reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and reports with favorable recommendations have been transmitted to Congress. These projects are included in the pending bill. All have been carefully examined with the view to producing the greatest good to the greatest number of people. The plans are practical and comprehensive. A number of the plans include multiple-purpose reservoirs which will permit the development of economical hydroelectric power in addition to providing storage for flood-control, municipal and irrigation water supply, pollution control, and other purposes. New projects are authorized in the principal drainage basins in the country.

The bill continues the procedure of authorizing additional surveys and examinations for flood control and, as I have stated, authorizes the sum of $260,000,000 to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of the act.

ANALYSIS

Section 1. Policy

Section 1 is identical with existing law. It contains the declaration of policy respecting flood control and provides for the investigation, planning, and prosecution by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army of flood control and other allied works.

Section 2. Administrative changes

Section 2 provides that section 3 of the act of June 22, 1936, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1938, shall apply to all works authorized by the pending bill and that the provisions of (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of the act of June 22, 1936, shall apply to channel improvement or channel rectification projects except as otherwise provided by law. This provision merely reenacts the original intent of Congress with respect to local contribution requirements for the various types of flood-control works.

This section also repeals the provisions of the flood-control acts of 1937 and 1939 which give the President authority to waive certain requirements with respect to local cooperation for certain flood-control projects in the Ohio River Basin. The repeal of this emergency provision will place the Ohio River projects on the same basis as similar projects in other parts of the country. The same yardstick applies to all flood-control projects under all flood-control bills.

There is a unique provision embraced for the first time in section 2. All authorizations requiring local contribution expire 5 years from the date of approval unless the local interests within that time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required local contribution will be furnished.

There is also a provision in section 2 that will permit the initiation and partial accomplishment of projects which might otherwise be delayed for long periods of time due to lack of sufficient advance appropriations for the completion of large projects.

It is economical and advisable for the Government to secure the land rights for flood-control and power reservoirs as early as practicable and well in advance of prospective construction. Moreover, there are reservoir sites where it may be practicable and advantageous to construct dams smaller than those planned for full utilization of all the possibilities.

The railroads were first built as single tracks and then double tracks were constructed. The famous Aswan Dam across the Nile in Egypt has been raised three times during its life.

Section 2 gives the Chief of Engineers the authority to begin and prosecute projects in whichever way he may determine to be advantageous under the conditions and circumstances that obtain from time to time.

Section 3. Authorizations

Section 3 adopts and authorizes the improvements set forth in the bill and continues the provisions for pen stocks in the reservoirs authorized.

In the Connecticut River Basin, $6,000,000 is authorized for local protective works and $10,000,000 for reservoirs for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved by the act of 1938 for the Connecticut River Basin and the comprehensive plan is modified to include the works recommended in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. The said House Document No. 724 includes reservoirs at Sugar Hill and Honey Hill, N. H. It also includes reservoirs at Williamstown, Vt., and Barre Falls, Mass.

While Sugar Hill Reservoir is embraced in House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, the Committee on Flood Control, at the request of the local interests, passed a resolution calling upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and previous reports on the Connecticut River with the view of finding a substitute reservoir which can be built in place of the Sugar Hill project.

The Chief of Engineers stated in said Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and I quote:

> This second interim report considers changes in certain figures of the approved general reservoir plan for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin and additional local protective works now found desirable. A final report to be submitted under this and other authorities will cover the Connecticut River as a whole.

In view of the fact that the report embracing Sugar Hill is an interim report and in view of the further fact that the Committee on Flood Control has requested a review as stated in the report on the pending bill by the Committee on Flood Control none of the funds authorized are to be used for the construction of the Sugar Hill Dam.

It may be well to say in this connection that the Bethlehem Junction Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. This authorization has not been repealed. The committee understood that both Bethlehem Junction and the Sugar Hill would not be constructed. Several substitute for Sugar Hill have been suggested. The committee, therefore, declined to authorize funds for the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir. No part of the $10,000,000 authorized and no part of funds previously authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936 or under any other act is available for the construction of the Sugar Hill Reservoir.

The $10,000,000 will cover two reservoirs. The probability is one of these reservoirs will be at Williamstown, Vt., and the other may be at Honey Hill, N. H., or it may be that the Chief of Engineers will decide to construct the Bethlehem Junction Reservoir unless he is able to find a better and more satisfactory substitute, but definitely the Sugar Hill Reservoir is not authorized and will not be constructed without further authority from Congress.

Oswego River Watershed, New York

Among the projects authorized is the Oswego River watershed, New York. The projects authorized are covered by House Document No. 846, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session. Congress has been most liberal in past authorizations in west and central New York. The act of 1936 authorized flood control works at Binghampton, Cornell, and other areas in southern New York and Pennsylvania at an estimated Federal cost of $27,000,000, with only $1,000,000 local contribution. The Oswego River project is embraced in the bill just as recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The principal project is the Syracuse project. It will be kept in mind that this project is constructed under the provisions of the act of 1936, as amended, with respect to channelization in the pending bill. Lands for reservoir sites are paid for by the Federal Government. The yardstick that is applicable therefore to the Syracuse project is the general yardstick that is applicable to all flood-control projects in the United States. The local interests are required to furnish the lands for channelization, for bridge alterations, and highway relocations where there is channelization. For 2 years, from 1938 to 1940, as a result of a provision in the act of 1938, a great deal of channelization was done at Federal expense. Such was not the intent of Congress and the present bill amends, as I have already stated, the act of 1938 to eliminate channelization at Federal cost and restore the provisions of the act of 1936 applicable to channelization.

The projects in the Oswego River watershed are local in their nature. As stated by the Chief of Engineers there is no general flood problem in the Oswego River Basin requiring comprehensive measures for flood control. There are a number of independent problems where measures providing for protection have been considered. There are eight localities. As stated by the Chief of Engineers the benefits from the projects are largely local in character and would accrue within a limited area. The committee, therefore, followed the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the provisions for local contribution in the Oswego project are on all fours with similar projects in other regions of the United States. I may add that as stated by the Chief of Engineers and as stated by the President of the United States before he transmitted the report to Congress, properties in Syracuse will be greatly enhanced in value as a result of the construction. The local contribution is about 20 percent, or one-fifth of the Federal cost. I repeat that it is on all fours with channelization and reservoir projects elsewhere. The same yardstick applies.

Lower Mississippi River

The act of May 15, 1928, authorized the plan of the Army engineers for flood control in the lower Mississippi River. The project was divided into three sections—the northern, from Cape Girardeau to the Arkansas River; the middle, from the Arkansas River to the Red River; and the southern, from the Red River to the Head of the Passes. The project has been practically completed in the northern section and there are no difficulties in the southern section.

In the middle section the adopted project provided for a diversion, without compensation to the landowners, through the Boeuf Basin. The act of June 15, 1936, substituted the Eudora diversion and extension for the Boeuf diversion, and this act was amended by the act of June 28, 1938, to provide for compensation for flowage rights in the Eudora diversion.

As a result of cut-offs in the middle section of the river, which is 370 miles, the river has been shortened between the Arkansas and the Red Rivers 137 miles. It is now well established that the work which has been done on the main river between the Arkansas and the Red has greatly increased its flood-carrying capacity and as a consequence has reduced the height of flood lines of all floods confined between the main levees.

The States of Louisiana and Arkansas, in which the Boeuf and Eudora diversions are located, always protested against the construction of these diversions, and as a result of their opposition the diversions have not been constructed. It is maintained that such diversions are no longer necessary in view of the reduced heights resulting from the cut-offs. The State of Mississippi, on the other hand, maintained that while cut-offs are beneficial, they have not been tested by a major flood between the Arkansas and the Red, and they advocated diversions to supplement levees. Pending a major flood, Mississippi further advocated protection against the maximum flood while cut-offs were being tested by major floods.

The lower Mississippi River project is under the direct supervision of the Mississippi River Commission, subject to the general supervison of the Chief of Engineers.

The Chief of Engineers was requested by the Flood Control Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate to review the adopted project in the Flood Control Act of 1928, as amended, in the lower Mississippi River, and on March 7, 1941, a review report was submitted by the Mississippi River Commission to the Chief of Engineers and it is contained in the hearings. This report was in response to resolutions adopted according to law.

In submitting the report it was emphasized that no modification of the existing project, which does not safeguard the interests of navigation, was considered. It was pointed out that a larger tonnage was carried on the Mississippi River than at any time since the halcyon days before the advent of the railroads.

It was further stated in the review report that if cut-offs had existed in 1928, serious consideration would probably have been given to confining floods between main line levees.

The report submitted three alternatives for protection against the project flood. A fourth, or interim plan, was suggested which provided for higher levees on the east bank to give to the east bank the protection that would have been accorded to it in the event the diversions on the west bank had been constructed. The differential on the east bank would have protected a densely populated area, including the city of Greenville. The very heart of the Mississippi Delta lies opposite the mouth of the Arkansas and White Rivers. Because of its location, populations, improvements, and topography a higher levee on the east bank is justified.

The committee, therefore, followed the review report and adopted alternative plan 4 which provides for levees only except that provision is made for a 3-foot freeboard on the east bank of the Mississippi River from the Coahoma-Bolivar County line to Vicksburg, thus preserving to the east bank whatever superiority in topography and in grade it is entitled to and at the same time the project protects both banks against the project or largest predicted flood.

The bill contains no authorization for any appropriation for the main Mississippi River. Backwater area projects are authorized for the Yazoo and for the Red Rivers. A similar project was authorized for the backwater area of the White River in 1936.

Provision is made for the Federal Government paying the costs of setback levees and the recommendation of the

report respecting maintenance was followed by the committee and hereafter, as provided by the bill, maintenance shall not be considered as reducing present remaining balances of authorizations.

The projects authorized in the bill aggregate $254,890,100 but inasmuch as the costs in a number of cases are estimated the committee included an authorization for $260,000,000.

Projects are authorized in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, in the southeastern section of the United States; along the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, along the Arkansas, the White, the Ouachita, the Little Missouri, the Tennessee, the Mobile, along rivers in Texas that flow into the Gulf, along rivers in the Rocky Mountain regions, including the Denver, Colo., area, in the Los Angeles area, along the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, along the Willamette River, and in the Pacific Northwest. Projects are authorized, therefore, in the principal drainage basins of the United States.

I should like to point out that the projects authorized and the reports included in the pending bill are described in the comprehensive report of the committee on flood control and I suggest that all interested read the report in connection with the bill.

Section 4. Preliminary examinations and surveys

Section 4 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to cause preliminary examinations and surveys at the localities designated in the section. Probably more Members of Congress are interested in this section than in any other section of the bill. Members introduce bills to provide for preliminary examinations and surveys. Reports are requested as to whether such surveys are advisable. All streams on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted favorable reports for preliminary examinations and surveys are included in this section.

Members ask about projects in which they are particularly interested. I recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WALTER, has been interested in a project to project the city of Bethlehem. No report has been submitted to the committee covering this project.

I recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative PAT BOLAND, has been in frequent contact with the committee respecting a project for the protection of the city of Scranton, Pa. In the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and again by special bill on June 25, 1936, the Lackawanna River was to be investigated and surveyed, but in the act of 1936 the Susquehanna River in New York and Pennsylvania, and the Susquehanna River by three descriptions in that act alone was ordered to be studied and reported on.

The Lackawanna River is a tributary of the Susquehanna. The President of the United States has insisted that a river system shall be studied as a whole, and that reports shall cover the entire river system. The National Resources Board is on record as favoring comprehensive reports covering entire river basins. No report has been submitted on the Lackawanna because it is a part of the Susquehana River system, and in accordance with the policy announced by the President, individual tributary rivers will not be considered where reports have been requested on comprehensive river systems. The committee, therefore, was unable to report a project in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BOLAND, was interested because no report had been submitted on it.

Section 5. Emergency fund

This is a new section. It has not occurred in any previous flood bill. It provides for emergency repair and maintenance work in flood. This is an important provision.

Section 6. Extension of certain river and harbor laws to flood-control work

Section 6 provides for the application to flood-control work of certain existing laws for river and harbor work pertaining to the inclusion of lands, right of entry to land, and manner of determining just compensation for lands required for authorized flood-control projects, and for the disposal of lands no longer needed for such work.

Section 7. Extension of law affecting the Department of Agriculture

This is a clarifying provision. It extends the authority of section 5 of the act of June 28, 1938, to all funds heretofore appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement.

Section 8. Total authorization in bill and maintenance

Section 8 authorizes $260,000,000 for appropriations. It authorizes $10,000,000 for examinations and surveys. It authorizes $5,000,000 to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture in carrying on works of improvement. It also authorizes appropriations necessary for the operation and maintenance of flood-control works to be operated and maintained by the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this flood-control bill was reported unanimously to the House by the Committee on Flood Control after very exhaustive hearings. We heard witnesses from practically every section of the United States—local people, engineers representing flood-control boards and levee districts, and citizens of all types who were interested in the measure. Every section of the country was given consideration. I do not believe that for many years there has been a bill for public improvements prepared with the care that has been given to the present measure. This bill is a flood-control bill in the full sense of the word, but some projects carry possible future hydroelectric developments. The bill has a distinct national-defense character in the protection of industrial areas from floods.

I want to compliment the chairman of the committee for the care with which he studies these projects. He is a student of the flood problems in every section of the country. He is extremely conscientious. He consults with the Corps of Engineers daily during the hearings, and he is unbiased in his opinions. In my judgment, this bill should pass by a unanimous vote of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I add my word of appreciation to those that have already been said in behalf of the chairman of this committee. I have appeared before a great many committees in the course of my congressional experience, but I can truthfully and honestly say that I never was more courteously treated, nor could the witnesses I brought forward have been more courteously treated than they were by the present chairman of the Flood Control Committee. This is entirely irrespective of the fact that the projects in which I am interested have been favorably considered by the committee. It is purely academic in complimenting the chairman of the committee for the efficient manner in which he serves the House, and as well for the courteous fashion in which he treats the witnesses who appear before the committee.

The problems that are of interest to me are two, that of the Connecticut River which appears on page 4 of the bill, and the Hudson River Basin which includes the Hoosic River, and appears on page 5. I think the best authority for the inclusion of these projects in the present bill is given by the House report where it refers to both projects as being deserving of the consideration of the Congress and also as contributing to national defense.

Proof of the need of the Connecticut River project is the experience over the period of the past few years along this river and its tributaries. The city of Holyoke is one of the largest industrial cities in the country so far as concentration of manufacturing is concerned. I do not mean it is the largest in size, but I mean it has great concentration of industrial production. The mayor of the city of Holyoke appeared before the committee and I think the picture he presented at the last hearing is still in the hearing room of the committee. This river is practically one continuous paper mill throughout the entire length of the section where the retaining wall is needed to protect these industries. One of the large businessmen of the city who appeared as a witness, testified that one mill had bought $1,000,000 worth of cotton to be used in the production of national-defense contracts, but that they were obliged to hire space in the upper part of the city to store this cotton, so afraid were they of a repetition of the floods that have come down through the Connecticut Valley over a period of years. There was a tremendous flood there in 1936, and the legislation of that year covered the conditions that resulted from the high water of that time, the highest water they had up to that time ever known. Two years later, in 1938, an even greater flood descended on them, a flood that destroyed millions of dollars' worth of property. There is testimony to the effect that the floods of 1927 and 1936 caused direct damage of $60,000,000

in that particular area. So it is not a matter of conjecture as to the danger existing in the minds of the business people of that area.

Further than that, in Holyoke one part of this project has been finished, but it so happens that from an engineering standpoint the completion of that project makes the possible damage to the city greater than if nothing had ever been done. I believe the chairman of the committee will confirm this statement. This places an additional obligation on the Federal Government to carry out its original project. I therefore urge very strongly the inclusion of this item in the bill. Witnesses have appeared before the congressional committee on two different occasions. Engineers have all reported favorably as to the need of it, and I call it to the attention of the House at this time for inclusion in this bill.

Now, a word in relation to the Hoosic River. The bill follows the recommendations of the Army engineers in House Document 182 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and authorizes an appropriation of $2,178,000.

Flood damages in the past have occurred along the Hoosic River on an average of once in every 3 to 5 years. Until the 1927 flood, however, such damages had not been of sufficient magnitude to arouse the communities to concerted action in the matter of flood protection. With a disastrous flood in 1936 and another of even greater violence in 1938, the entire Hoosic River Valley became intensively interested in such protection.

The tributary area of the Hoosic River is mountainous in character, with steep slopes from the mountain ridges to the relatively narrow valleys below. In the section in which I am especially interested the valley is not over 2 miles wide and the mountain grades are steep, so that when the floods come the force of water is terrific and the resulting damage to property beyond description.

In my district the Hoosic River runs through the industrial communities of Adams and North Adams. The industries and a large portion of the employees are housed in the narrow confines of the valley, so that both groups suffer the full force of the floodwaters. The mills and factories in these communities are working night and day on defense contracts. The communities themselves, with such aid as the State has been able to give, have done what they could, but the problem is of such magnitude that only the Federal Government can provide the necessary protection.

Therefore I join with the members of the Flood Control Committee, especially as regards my particular interest in this bill, in hoping that a unanimous agreement of the House will be reached and a unanimous vote will be cast this afternoon for this very meritorious measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to speak at any length in regard to this bill, perhaps not the full 5 minutes which have been allotted me.

I, like others who have served on more than one committee of the House, find myself in an awkward position in comparing the work of the chairman of the Flood Control Committee with the work of chairmen of other committees. I do not believe it is an overstatement of the fact to say that in the gentleman from Mississippi, Judge WHITTINGTON, the Flood Control Committee has one of the finest men in charge of a committee it is possible for Congress to produce. I have served on this committee now for 5 years. I have never seen anything which looked like partisanship come into any discussions before the committee. As a presiding officer he is without equal.

So far as the flood-control program is concerned, it has developed to a point where we are discussing not only flood control, as we did 5 years ago, but the multiple use of water in our various streams. We find that we are not only obtaining benefits for our citizens by spending money on flood-control measures, saving them from losses which they have been incurring from great floods over many years, but we are also securing actual dividends from the use of water for purposes for which it is needed. This includes navigation, to which the chairman referred. Today our rivers are coming back to a point where they carry more traffic than they did in the days of the steamboat and before the railroads supplanted the steamboats. Likewise we find that by joining our flood-control dams with hydroelectric power we are able to produce power for the citizens of these different valleys at a cheaper rate than it is possible for the utilities to provide similar electricity from steam-generated plants. That is true in the Connecticut Valley today.

In the valley of the Connecticut during two floods alone, in 1927 and in 1936, the direct losses were $60,000,000 and the direct plus the indirect losses $120,000,000, which is in excess of the total amount of money to be expended for flood control in that valley. Since 1936 we have had an equally great flood, and the worst of all time. That was in 1938.

The result will be that when the entire system is completed seven cities and towns will be absolutely protected from any possible flood that has been envisaged by the Army engineers and the reservoirs to be constructed will take about 8½ feet off the crest of any flood which they have planned for. This being so, we find that with the ability to control all this high water, the smaller towns where the farming is done and where it is not possible to protect them with local works, will probably suffer no losses in the future from springtime freshets and will be safe from all floods other than extraordinary ones.

I am sure that the people of the Connecticut Valley feel that the Congress in this flood-control bill and in other bills which have gone before it is doing a wonderful piece of work for the whole of the United States. In addition to the Connecticut River we find for the first time in this bill the Thames River. When this project is carried out four reservoirs will be built in Massachusetts and three in Connecticut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as he may desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill has been very carefully worked out, and I join with the chairman in urging the House to adopt it by a unanimous vote. I would be violating my own conscience if I did not take a moment to pay tribute to the fine work of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the chairman of our committee. The manner in which he conducts the work of his committee, his fairness, his knowledge of the problems involved, his patience, and the thoroughness he displays in undertaking a problem is most gratifying to all of us.

I would also like to compliment the Corps of Army Engineers for their work in flood control. They are both dependable and successful. Their cooperation with the committee has been most helpful.

For the purpose of the RECORD I wish to speak on the part of this flood-control bill, H. R. 4911, that deals with the territory which I represent. This bill carries an authorization for an appropriation of $7,000,000 for initial work on the Republican River, this being a part of the Missouri River Basin. The particular language which I refer to is as follows:

> Including the project for the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River, Nebr., recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and such other supplemental flood works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

It is not my purpose to reiterate all of the flood damages that have been suffered in the Republican Valley in recent years. Very frequently flash floods occur in that watershed, and do a great deal of damage. The greatest flood from the standpoint of the loss of human life, occurred in 1935. During that flood, 112 Nebraskans lost their lives. Great damages were sustained by farm land, buildings, roads, bridges, railroads, livestock, farm machinery and everything that came within the path of that great flood. Since that time, there have been several devastating floods in the Republican watershed of Nebraska and Kansas. Only a few weeks ago, following heavy rains over a wide territory, the river again went out of its banks. In those tributaries of the Republican which experienced these recent heavy rains, damages to farm lands surpassed those of 1935 for specific localities. Likewise, numerous tributaries during 1940 witnessed more extensive damages than in 1935. So the 1935 flood can be used as a barometer only insofar as the loss of lives far surpassed other periods of high water.

These floods have been one of the major factors in the loss of the top soil in this area. The problem has been neglected for so long, that the soil situation is serious and an investment in flood control for this basin would pay dividends in many ways. It not only protects life and property from the ravages of high water, but it conserves the soil, and impounds the water to be used on the parched land in the dry periods which always follow.

The testimony from the Office of the Chief of Engineers described the flood problem in the Republican Basin as twofold. It involves impounding the water and protecting the lower valley from great floods, particularly the area around Kansas City. The second portion of the problem is local protection for the upper Republican River and its tributaries. The language quoted above from the bill was intended to meet that two-fold problem. It calls for: First, the construction of an on-river dam at Republican City, Nebr., sometimes known as the Harlan County Reservoir, and second "such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable."

The 1938 flood-control bill authorized an on-river dam near Milford, Kans., for the protection of the Kansas City area. House Document 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, recommends the Harlan County Reservoir instead of the Milford, Kans., dam. H. R. 4911 authorizes this change. This will bring the benefits of flood control to four Nebraska counties, considerable territory in Kansas, and at the same time result in practically the same amount of protection to the Kansas City area as would the Milford, Kans., dam. The site for the reservoir in Harlan County is claimed superior by the Engineer Corps, and the storage costs would be less.

In the report filed by the committee, and accompanying this bill, we find the following statement concerning the necessity for the early construction of the Harlan County Dam:

> Destructive flooding is a constant threat to farm lands and urban property in the Republican, Kansas, and Missouri River Valleys. The flood danger to 154,000 acres in the Republican River Valley would be completely removed by the construction of the Harlan County Reservoir on that river, 236 miles above its mouth. In addition, this reservoir, together with two other reservoirs in the Kansas River Basin—the Kanopolis Reservoir, now under construction, and the proposed Tuttle Creek Reservoir—would provide partial protection for agricultural lands in the Kansas and Missouri River Basins, and would enhance flood protection at such important municipalities as Topeka and the Kansas Cities, where the design of local protection works now under construction is predicated on the eventual construction of upstream reservoirs. Many industries and facilities vital to the national defense lie within the area to be protected. Improvements for flood control would be beneficial to—Substantial portions of the military reservation and all of the Air Corps flying field at Fort Riley, Kans.; to two airports at the Kansas Cities; to defense training schools; to a large assembly plant for military aircraft, now under construction near Kansas City; to the stockyards and packing plants and the major portion of the grain-storage and flour-milling facilities at the Kansas Cities; and to the important transportation network at the Kansas Cities and in the Kansas and Missouri River Valleys.

The Harlan County Dam should be built as soon as possible.

It has been the opinion of the Army engineers that complete flood protection to the lower portion of the basin could not be obtained without an on-river reservoir on the Republican River. If a reservoir were built at Milford, Kans., it would give protection to industrial Kansas City, but not to anyone upstream. The engineers believe that the Harlan County Dam is the point farthest west that they could go for an on-river reservoir which would at the same time give full protection to the lower basin as would the Milford Reservoir. The very favorable ratio of benefits to costs for a large on-river dam exists because of the protection it gives to the more expensive industrial properties of Kansas City.

The engineering details for flood protection for the upper Republican River and its tributaries have yet to be worked out by the Army engineers. This upper territory has suffered each year from floods. In the 1935 flood, previously mentioned, most of the lives were lost in this upper portion of the basin. The loss of land, crops, soil erosion, and other problems in the upper basin likewise has been very heavy throughout the years.

While it is true that other agencies may bring some flood protection to the upper basin, the work of the Army engineers will not be completed until they extend flood protection to the entire valley. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture will, before long, contribute to the solution of the flood problems in the upper portion, but the task of the Army engineers is not completed until flood protection is given to the entire Republican watershed. The language of this bill establishes such a policy and conforms to the twofold idea of the problem as expressed by the Office of the Chief of Army Engineers. That is why the language has been used—

> In addition to the Harlan County Reservoir such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

I am told that the district engineer at Kansas City has advised Nebraska State officials, as well as residents of the upper watershed above Republican City, that the Engineer Corps can find feasible the construction of an on-river dam as well as a number of tributary dams, with the benefits from such construction equaling estimated costs. The corps is now at work studying flood-protection needs of the entire watershed. The Army has been directed to harmonize its studies and conclusions with those of the Bureau of Reclamation so that ultimate construction would provide joint flood control and irrigation. Only through such a program can the agricultural economy of this entire valley be restored and stabilized.

Residents of the upper valley are cognizant of the necessity for flood control at Kansas City because of national-defense industries located there, and so are perfectly agreeable to the construction of an on-river dam at Republican City for that purpose. However, they will continue to demand that all feasible flood control be provided to meet their most pressing needs upstream. For this reason, it seems essential that the Engineer Corps bring forth as quickly as possible a program of flood control for the entire watershed, to make habitable once again those equally rich upstream farm areas.

Mr. Chairman, the earth's surface is limited. At the present time, and throughout the ages, nations have fought expensive wars to gain rich, fertile land. We are not true to our highest responsibilities until we have done everything that we can to conserve the water and soil of America. It is an established policy of our Republic. I think it is rightly so. On July 1, 1854, Abraham Lincoln said:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacity. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House is, in my opinion, the best flood-control bill that has been presented to Congress since I have been a Member of this body. The committee has worked long and diligently. In fact, this bill is the result of the hearings for 2 years. Last year we held hearings for about 3 weeks and, as you know, we did not report out a bill. This year we held additional hearings for 3 or 4 weeks and I can therefore assure the Members of the House that every item in this bill has been most carefully considered. I hope that the bill will receive the united support of the membership.

When I came to Congress, I inherited a tremendous flood-control problem for Louisiana. Some years ago Congress provided for overland floodways to accommodate the excessive waters on the Mississippi River. This Congress has heard before of the Eudora floodway. When I came here, I came determined to do my best to free Louisiana from the blight of this floodway. To me, it seemed a terrible thing to destroy nearly a million acres of the finest land in the Mississippi River Valley by converting it into a sort of river. It was unfortunate that the interests of the great States of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana did not harmonize on this question. The overland floodway through a portion of Arkansas and Louisiana gave protection to our sister State of Mississippi but it created a very bad situation for Louisiana. We have sought repeatedly to solve that problem. We wanted to do justice by each State. This bill does not give us exactly what we had asked, but it is the nearest possible approach to it. This bill, insofar as this particular flood-control problem is concerned, is somewhat of a compromise, but I want to say that this bill puts Louisiana in the very best position it has ever been in in its entire history. The bill eliminates entirely the Eudora floodway. The people in the Delta section of Louisiana can therefore have more peace than ever before. They get protection from floods and that is what they want. Mr. Chairman, this is therefore a happy moment for me when I can stand in this House and see the culmination of my efforts to get rid of the Eudora floodway. Chairman WHITTINGTON, Senator OVERTON, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], have cooperated with me in these

matters, and I am happy that our efforts have borne fruit.

Not only does this bill eliminate the Eudora floodway, but it gives the great Red River backwater area protection equal to the Yazoo River backwater area on the Mississippi side. This means that the Red River backwater area will have far greater protection than ever before. There are other projects in Grant and Rapides Parishes on Red River included in this bill which will be of great benefit to the people. There are still other projects, particularly on Red River, which we have not been able to include in the bill in the House because the reports of the Board of Engineers have not been officially submitted to Congress, but I hope that these reports will be received in time to include them when the bill reaches the Senate.

While I have spoken of the great problem which we have had in the lower Mississippi River region, I wish it understood that I am also interested in the flood-control problems of the entire Nation. I have been happy to cooperate with my colleagues from other sections. Flood control long ago became a national problem, and this committee so views it. At our recent hearings we considered the problem at length from a national-defense standpoint. We held exhaustive hearings on dams and reservoirs for power for the future development of strategic minerals. You will find in the hearings some very worth-while information on this phase.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to express by appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is the very capable chairman of this committee, and to all the other members of the committee for their cooperation and help, and I sincerely hope that every Member of this House will vote for this very fine flood-control bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate what I said awhile ago when I interrupted the chairman about my sincere appreciation for the splendid manner in which he conducts his committee. It is a pleasure to serve on it for that reason.

I also wish to say that the passage of this bill means a very great deal to the section of the country from which I come, a section where we have 3,000,000 people in an area approximately 40 miles by 50 miles in area. Practically all of those people are subject to danger from floods that come to us without more than sometimes a couple of hours' notice. In this bill there is included the approval by the Congress of what is known as House Document No. 838, which is a new and revised plan of the Corps of Engineers for flood control in the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River Basins. That plan will, we believe, when consummated give us a real program of flood control in our area.

I should also like to say that our county, the county of Los Angeles, has already expended of its own funds in excess of $100,000,000 for flood-control purposes, and it certainly intends to continue to carry its end of the load and also to cooperate fully with the Federal program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that the gentleman had the honor of introducing the bill which became the act of June 22, 1936, and that, as a distinguished member of the Committee on Flood Control, who is always looking out for the interest of our joint section of the country, he is familiar with the bill H. R. 4348, which I introduced, the purpose of which was to effectuate the act of June 22, 1936.

I understand that section 7 of the bill carries certain funds for the purposes of the act of June 22, 1936. Would the gentleman kindly state what the total authorization will be for the purposes of the Department of Agriculture when this bill is passed?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for what he said in his question. I may say that the act of June 22, 1936, was the regular flood-control bill of that year. It is true there was another short bill introduced to set up upstream flood-control work by the Department of Agriculture, and that was included in the general act. Naturally, the gentleman and myself are both deeply interested in that upstream flood-control work because in our section water conservation is quite as important as flood control. We want to conserve as much water as we can and throw it underground.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe it was hoped by the Department that H. R. 4348 would be included as a section in this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I may say to the gentleman that in this bill we have appropriated an additional $5,000,000 for the upstream work of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman will correct me if I am in error in saying that that means a total appropriation available to the Department of approximately $19,000,000 up to date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct, and it is fair to say also that this is primarily a flood-control bill and that the Congress of the United States appropriated approximately $20,000,000 in the agricultural appropriation bill for soil conservation. I may also say that I feel sure the Department of Agriculture feels that we have done as well as we could for them in this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman be interested in the language contained in H. R. 4348 for future purposes?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am always interested in any language in any bill about flood control or soil conservation, but this language here is pretty carefully studied out. I am always glad to look further into the matter of which the gentleman speaks, but I may say that we heard the Department of Agriculture and consulted with them with respect to this authorization.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that those are the only things I feel compelled to say right now about this bill. I should like to add my word to those of the others who have spoken to the effect that I hope very earnestly that it will pass the House without dissent. I am certain that as we look forward to the future, to the time when, as we all hope and pray, the present international crisis will be over, it is most important that there be prior to that time studied out by us all, in the most careful way possible, various means of seeing to it that unemployment and things of that kind do not result. I believe this bill is a contribution to that end.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill to be the most equitable flood-control legislation that has been presented to the House since the great flood of 1927. The bill is not perfect; it is not all that some of us had worked for; but it is much better than previous flood-control bills. We believe it should be unanimously passed by the House.

On April 21, 1927, a portion of the district of which I have the honor to represent, suffered the most tremendous and devastating flood recorded in history. The flood of that year in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River took a toll of something like 200 lives, rendered approximately 700,000 people homeless for approximately 1 month, and inflicted property damage estimated to be upward of $200,000,000. Since 1927, we have been wanting flood control within the levee walls of the Mississippi River, but nothing has been done by Congress during all of these years to accomplish this desire on the part of our splendid citizens. It is commonly known that flood control in this section of the Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. General Tyler, before our Flood Control Committee hearings this year, testified, in part, as follows:

> It is well known that flood control in the alluvial valley of the Lower Mississippi River is the greatest problem of its kind in all the world. For over 50 years, or perhaps 100 years, progress on that plan has been continuous until the protection now afforded is good, better than anybody 25 years ago thought it would be.

After the devastating flood of 1927 the only request our citizens made of the United States was that our National Government give us a fair assurance that the calamity of 1927 would not again occur.

On May 15, 1928, the Congress of the United States recognized and accepted national responsibility for flood control on the main stem or channel of the Mississippi River throughout its alluvial valley, and adopted the Jadwin plan, as set forth in House Document No. 90, Seventieth Congress. The Jadwin plan, among other things, provided for a diversion from the main channel of destructive floodwaters in excess of the carrying capacity of the then existing levees, the most important of which diversion was the Boeuf floodway in the critical

middle section of the river lying immediately south of the mouth of the Arkansas River and flowing through southeastern Arkansas into Louisiana designated to carry approximately 100,000,000 cubic second-feet of water, six times the volume of water flowing normally over the Niagara Falls.

The property owners of that area upon the passage of the act, assumed that it was necessary for the floodway to be constructed in order to give the maximum levee benefits possible to the greatest area affected by the floods, and while they did not desire to sell their property and very greatly hoped for adequate flood control, they felt that under the guaranty contained in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States that "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation," they were entitled to equal levee protection for just compensation for their property. They were willing for the authorities to determine which should be done: First, levee protection; second, compensation for property, caused by the floodway. I think it can be said that the property owners accepted the decision at that time of Congress, that the sacrifice of their property in the Boeuf floodway was necessary in order to protect the remainder of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, and, of course, assumed that they would receive fair and reasonable compensation for their property.

To this end a test suit to collect reasonable compensation for their property was prosecuted through the Supreme Court of the United States under the style of Mrs. Julia Caroline Sponenbarger against United States, and the Court's decision was to the effect that they were not entitled to compensation. Hence, if they are not entitled to compensation, they now take the position that they are entitled to equal levee protection with their neighbors to the north, south, and east of the Mississippi River, such levee protection now being possible according to the testimony and reports of our Army engineers.

In the report of the Army engineers, contained in Document No. 90, several suggestions for the control of the floodwaters of the Mississippi River were made. They have been very efficient in their work and have secured the maximum benefits from several of the methods suggested in House Document No. 90 to reduce the flood hazards of the Mississippi River. Some of the methods are as follows:

First. Dredging the river annually.
Second. Side channels.
Third. Set-back levees.
Fourth. Straightening river channel.
Fifth. Clearing between levees.
Sixth. Forestry work.
Seventh. A multiplicity of other minor suggestions.

On page 18 of the Commission's report, further to illustrate how successful the efforts of our Army engineers have been in the operation of several methods of flood control, as above mentioned, we find that the Mississippi River has been shortened between the mouth of the White River and the lower end of the Glasscock cut-off approximately 137 miles. This was done by straightening the river channel. It is well established that the Army engineers have very greatly increased the flood-carrying capacity of the Mississippi River through the other methods mentioned above, and as a consequence have very greatly reduced the height of crest-flow lines of all floods confined between front-line levees.

General Tyler further testified before our Flood Control Committee as follows:

In 1928, when the existing project was laid down to include a west-side overland floodway in the middle section, the capacity of the main river leveed channel was estimated at about 1,950,000 cubic feet per second, and the capacity of the floodway at about 1,250,000 cubic feet per second. The capacity of the main river leveed channel at Arkansas City is now about 2,600,000 cubic feet per second. Had these conditions existed in 1928 serious consideration quite probably would have been given to confining the project flood between the main levees, for to do so would not have involved such substantial increases in levee heights as were then estimated.

The report of the Mississippi River Commission contained, among other things, the following statement:

Had the flow conditions of today existed in 1928, consideration also would quite probably have been given then to a west-side floodway of less capacity than the one recommended and adopted.

These accomplishments were recognized in 1936 when Document No. 1, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, was filed with the Congress covering the flood control of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. This report was dated February 12, 1935, and the abandonment of the Boeuf floodway was recommended by the Chief of Engineers and a modified floodway provided, referred to then as the Eudora floodway. The Eudora floodway was a miniature floodway of the original Boeuf floodway. At that time, owing to the improvements which had been made by the Army engineers regarding the control of flood waters of the lower Mississippi River, it was considered advisable to have a small modified floodway, and that the modified floodway, in view of these improvements, would be ample in every respect to control any flood which could even be visioned in the future by the Army engineers.

Our engineers have continued their very fine work on flood control in this and other sections of the Mississippi River, and now on page 30 of the Report of the Mississippi River Commission, now before our committee, we find the following language:

Under existing conditions of the main river channel there are three physically feasible alternatives to the adopted plan which will afford protection equal to that contemplated by the existing project when it was adopted, and a fourth which will give protection equal to that afforded by levee and flood-wall projects on other rivers.

According to this, there are now five feasible plans presented to the Congress, and which the Flood Control Committee considered. The Engineers outlined those plans and said that either at this time would give adequate flood control, but that the plan to be selected is one of policy for the Congress of the United States, and not one involving a question of engineering. The Report of the Mississippi River Commission sets out in full the five plans presented to the Flood Control Committee.

Prior to the presentation of the report of the Mississippi River Commission, as a member of the Flood Control Committee, I introduced H. R. 3064 in the House of Representatives, and Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, introduced S. 705 in the Senate. My bill was, and is, as follows:

A bill to amend the project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the acts of June 15, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby amended so as to provide that the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River existing at the present time in accordance with the provisions of said act is hereby modified, and as thus modified is hereby adopted, as follows:

Pending the completion of the ultimate plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is authorized to make revisions in the grades and sections of the main line Mississippi levees on both the east and west banks and to adjust and equalize the unequal freeboards which now exist, or may hereafter develop. Between the latitude of the Arkansas River and a point at, or south of, Deer Park, La., revision, adjustment, and equalization shall be made so as to obtain net grades of existing front-line levees generally of such height above the computed crest-flow line of the project flood as the Chief of Engineers may deem advisable as affording reasonably safe protection against such project flood.

The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the back-protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project, adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned.

The levee on the south side of the Arkansas River shall be enlarged in grade and section so as to afford, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, reasonably safe protection against the project flood of the Mississippi River.

From time to time additional protection against floods shall be given simultaneously to, and equitably distributed between, the Yazoo River backwater area and the Red River backwater area under such plans as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers.

The total authorizations heretofore for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, but any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law.

The bill carries out plan No. 4 of the Mississippi River Commission.

Before the Flood Control Committee this year I exerted every possible effort to secure the approval of the Overton-Norrell bills. Each of these bills, as above stated, provides for the abolition of the floodways, construction of the levees on the Arkansas side to the 1940 grade and section, equal in height and strength to the levees on the opposite side of the river, giving fair and equal protection to both sides of the river.

The Mississippi River Commission reported that this could be done. General Tyler and his corps of assistants testified before the Flood Control Committee that such plan could be done. Engineers and a number of lay witnesses gave the same testimony. Testimony also before the Flood Control Committee was that under the law Mississippi levees now are from 3 to 6 feet higher than the levees on the Arkansas side in various places and that under the law they have the flood protection of the floodways and fuse-plug area on the Arkansas side, and that the citizens of Mississippi very vigorously oppose the abolition of these existing differences between the east and west sides of the river.

After much testimony and extensive arguments the Flood Control Committee finally recommended the adoption of plan No. 4, which was the provision of the Overton-Norrell bills, with one modification, to wit: That the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River, south of Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan, shall have a 2-foot freeboard over the west side of the river in this area.

The Flood Control Committee rewrote this provision of my bill, and I quote in part from the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4911, which is the omnibus bill of 1941, from line 6 of page 10 to line 6 on page 11, having to do with this section of the Mississippi River, as follows:

The project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended by the act of August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby modified and, as modified, is hereby authorized and adopted, and the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The existing engineering plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is hereby modified so as to provide for the construction of plan 4 as set forth in the report of the Mississippi River Commission, dated March 7, 1941, to the Chief of Engineers, except that the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of the Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan shall have a three-foot freeboard over the project flood, and all levees shall be constructed with adequate section and foundation to conform to increase levee heights. The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway as well as the northward extension and the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extensions are hereby repealed.

The actions of the Flood Control Committee in reporting this change in the law with reference to the Mississippi River is adequately supported by our Army engineers. I quote their testimony in part as follows:

Whatever may be the ultimate plan for the middle section, it is apparent that advantage should be taken of the opportunity to attain increased protection at small cost by bringing up to some common and higher grade the lesser levee freeboards that now intervene between reaches of maximum stage lowering. Not to do so is to fail to obtain the maximum possible return on a portion of the present investment, for the maximum possible return on a portion of the present investement for the maximum freeboard is the controlling freeboard, and makes the contiguous higher freeboard of little avail.

Complete confinement of the project flood to the leveed channel of the main river throughout the middle section appears now to be physically practicable.

The Eudora and Boeuf floodways, insofar as they represent definite projects and locations, could be abandoned.

General Tyler has testified that No. 4 would give greater flood protection benefit to a wider territory than any of the other suggested plans. General Tyler and the other engineers, however, take the position that since they have advised Congress with reference to the engineering and financial feasibility of these several plans, and that either is now physically possible from an engineering standpoint, the plan actually to be inaugurated is a question for Congress to determine, as it is purely a matter of policy, and not an engineering question.

For approximately 14 years the citizens of the Boeuf and Eudora floodways have been subjected to the constant and continuous menace of the floodways, fuseplug area, and differentials in existing levees from 3 to 6 feet in the floodway area. They have lived for approximately 14 years under the shadow of the fuseplug levee that might at any unexpected time be used by the Government in diverting the destructive waters of the Mississippi River and consequently again, and in a most terrifying form, flood their lands as was done in 1927, when approximately 200 people lost their lives, 700,000 others were made homeless for approximately a month, and something like $200,000,000 worth of property was destroyed. If the floodway is not necessary, they do not wish to live under the shadow of the act of Congress providing for the floodway. Their property has been constantly damaged by virtue of the provision of our statutes, insurance rates have been increased, loans cannot be secured, and normal development cannot be expected by that section of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi until the floodway is abolished, and they are given equal levee protection.

The adoption of the Overton-Norrell bill, even as amended herein by the committee, and placing in operation plan No. 4, as modified, will have the effect of restoring an empire on the west side of the river in Arkansas and Louisiana to its rightful position. It will remove the constant fear that has been upon them for 14 years, and the hazards and uncertainty under which they have lived, give the west side security, increase values, and permit a healthy, normal development.

They are desirous that these mandatory provisions be enacted by the Congress to divert the presently existing fuseplug levee in southeast Arkansas into a standard levee of 1940 grade and section, giving to all the property owners in the presently existing Boeuf and/or Eudora floodways adequate protection.

I have also been intensely interested in adequate levees on the south bank of the Arkansas River from Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark., for the protection of one of our best agricultural areas and for the protection of other important enterprises.

Fortunately, we have succeeded in obtaining a favorable report and recommendations from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, after the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had completed a thorough study of the matter over a period of several years. I and others who have been earnestly interested in flood control in this area were pleased to have this highly important recommendation.

Need for these levees is emphasized by the lengthy history of disastrous floods in the locality from Little Rock to Pine Bluff. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors found that "during the 66½-year period of record, flood stage has been equaled or exceeded 46 times in Little Rock." These floods occurred in an area where the property value has been set by Army engineers at $2,375,310 and the annual farm income is estimated to be $1,180,079 annually when not interfered with or damaged by floods. The vast extent of damages is not known. Estimates, however, that have been made reveal the desperate need for action by this Congress. Other than the destruction of crops, there has been with each flood tremendous damages to fences, farm houses, barns, and other outbuildings, farm implements and tools, drainage ditches, loss of livestock, damage to existing levees. These represent direct losses. Indirect losses include interruption of business and gainful occupation during and after a flood, interruption of traffic, evacuation and reoccupation of the flooded areas, the pollution of wells used for drinking water, the increased number of breeding places for mosquitoes, and the creator of other conditions adverse to human health and happiness. All of these conditions reveal the need for corrective legislation.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has made this recommendation:

Raising, strengthening, and extending of these levees to give complete protection against floods—at a cost fully warranted by the amount of direct damages prevented, the indirect damage that will be eliminated, the appreciation in the value of lands that can profitably be put to productive use, and the general, though intangible, benefits to a large number of people through the threat of frequent disruption of normal activity. The Board recommends that the levees along the south bank of Arkansas River, between Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., be raised, strengthened, and extended generally in accordance with the plan contained in the report of the district engineer, at an estimated first cost of $641,000.

The Flood Control Committee has presented the recommendations of the Army engineers in the pending bill to the House for consideration, and I sincerely hope that this feature of the bill is retained.

I appreciate the actions of our distinguished chairman in agreeing to plan No. 4, submitted by our Army engineers and modified by the committee as above stated. I appreciate the actions of the committee in voting the additional flood-

control protection for Arkansas. I very greatly appreciate the fine cooperation I have had from General Tyler, Major Reber, and other engineers from the War Department. They have all been very helpful. Of course, I deeply appreciate the efforts of citizens of Arkansas and Louisiana in coming to Washington and testifying with reference to the matter before our Flood Control Committee, and on behalf of them, I wish to express my appreciation to the membership of the House for the passage of the bill today, and I sincerely hope that it is passed in the Senate and approved by the President.

If it is finally enacted into law, I am advised by our Army engineers that it will constitute a very enormous saving to the Government and at the same time there will be expended in the building of the levees on the Arkansas and Louisiana side the sum of $31,453,000—the sums of $17,128,000 for work in Arkansas and $14,325,000 in Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, last but not least, I desire to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS, who so ably represents Chicot County, for his very fine cooperation and outstanding service with reference to perfecting this plan before our Flood Control Committee. He has rendered every possible service. Also, I shall always be grateful for the outstanding service rendered by Senator OVERTON and Congressmen MILLS and ALLEN, of Louisiana, who never ceased to exert every possible effort for enactment of the proposals included in this measure.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, when the committee was holding hearings I appeared in opposition to any projects on the White River in Missouri and Arkansas which would provide for generation of power. My outstanding objection is that I am informed there is an abundance of surplus power now being generated on the Grand River project in Oklahoma that is available for the area that would be served by the White River projects.

It is true this bill only provides for one project—that at Norfork—Table Rock and Bull Shoals being eliminated. The Norfork project gets $24,000,000, but let it be remembered if in the end the flood-control project is abandoned and it becomes a joint flood-control and power project the ultimate cost will be $79,000,000 with $25,000 annually for maintenance.

Until it is shown beyond question that a power project is actually needed in this section of the country I maintain it should not be authorized. The Grand River Dam is owned by the State of Oklahoma, and that State is willing and ready to furnish power at an extremely low rate.

One of the first votes I ever cast in this House was for the Sears amendment, which provided for reservoirs in connection with flood-control projects. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated, although some years after the view of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Sears, was accepted and reservoirs were authorized as a result of which floods have been eliminated in many parts of the country.

The Norfork Reservoir is under way as the report shows, but provisions are made in this bill in the proviso at the bottom of page 3 for pen stocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power. They can be installed for future use in the development of hydroelectric power. This, however, must be approved by the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission. It is my purpose to appeal to the Secretary of War, as well as the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission, to make a complete survey to determine whether or not there is sufficient power in this area being generated at the present time to satisfy the needs of this part of Arkansas and Missouri.

As the report clearly indicates, this is an undeveloped section of the country. True, it is supposed to be rich in minerals as well as raw materials. The report further shows that it is a nonindustrial region. We should be extremely careful in providing for the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of money on a hydroelectric project if there will be no demand for the power generated.

Some would lead you to believe that the people of this section of the country are unanimous in favoring this project, but my mail clearly indicates that this is not the case. The conservationists are especially very active in their opposition.

I realize the futility of endeavoring to defeat this provision in the bill, but, nevertheless, no matter if I am alone in my opposition, I am opposed to it until, as I said before, it is clearly demonstrated it is the only way that power can be secured for this area.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me time to call to the attention of the House again the condition that exists in the Mahoning Valley, Ohio. I hope this bill will correct the situation that now exists there.

For the past 15 or 20 years we have been visited by floods in that valley and work has had to stop in the steel plants. We not only suffer in the wintertime but I would also like to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that out in that valley there are 75,000 men working on national defense. Three weeks ago we had a statement in the press and also by the United States Engineers that there was just enough water to run the steel plants 60 days. Can you imagine 75,000 people working on national defense, producing one-tenth of the steel manufactured in the United States, in that valley with only enough water to run 60 days?

In addition to this, in the summertime the flow of that stream falls from 50,000,000 gallons to 30,000,000 gallons and the steel plants alone use 800,000,000 gallons. Under normal conditions there are 40,000,000 gallons of that 50,000,000-gallon stream of untreated sewage and the people of Warren, Ohio, drink that water. That is one reason the people of this Nation are known as wonder people—they can drink that sewage and still live.

I am now asking that this bill be passed because, as I repeat, just this week and every week we are losing 25,000 tons of steel in that valley, and yet the O. P. M. is asking that we build steel plants or expand them to the extent of one-half billion dollars.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What does this bill do to correct this terrible situation?

Mr. KIRWAN. It authorizes the construction of a dam at a cost of $7,000,000.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is a very fine thing to do.

Mr. KIRWAN. I may say that I am thankful for this opportunity to tell about the conditions in that valley with respect to the school children and all of the people out there who have to drink this water.

I do not know that I ought to state this on the floor, but it was only 2 weeks ago that the Republic Steel Corporation cut into a sewer known as the Red Creek sewer, and that is all that kept the Republic plant going. If that is the kind of national defense we have got to depend on, God help this country.

For these reasons I am thankful for anything that can be done to pass this measure.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the benefit of some of the younger Members of the Congress who have been praising the chairman of the committee so highly, as well as the work of the committee, when the chairman and I came to this Congress—and we came the same year—I do not know whether the Flood Control Committee had then been established or not, but, anyway, at that time it was a very small committee and was fighting for its life. The dignity to which this committee has risen since then is due largely to the work of the chairman.

As I look back over the years since he and I have been here, the gentleman from Mississippi representing flood control for his side of the aisle and I, in my humble way, trying to represent our side, much progress has come to the cause of flood control. The gentleman represented the great Mississippi Valley and I represented the Ohio Valley. I am willing to accord to him the most of the credit, yet together we, with the assistance of many other stalwart friends of this great plan to save the lives and property of those who lived in the great river valleys of the country, are glad to feel our work was not in vain.

In the short time I have remaining I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can tell me how the $45,000,000 that goes to the Ohio Valley is going to be spent. I find nothing in the report to give me this definite information.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As the gentleman is aware, most of the money that has been appropriated for the Ohio Valley for reservoirs has been spent above Pittsburgh. There are many reservoirs that are available, and they are selected in the order of their priority by the Chief of Engineers, but, to answer the gentleman's question specifically, it is my thought that for the further protection of the populous area of Pittsburgh, the Connamango Reservoir, the Berlin Reservoir, in the gentleman's State, and then a reservoir along the Miami River. This gives the information so far as the reservoirs are concerned.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Then the priorities that had previously been established have been followed. I am glad of that.

The Flood Control Committee owed its origin to the fact that there were some flood and water conditions that the Rivers and Harbors Committee could not handle in the most advantageous way. For a long time after the establishment of a Flood Control Committee there was constant confusion between that committee and the Rivers and Harbors Committee over matters of jurisdiction. Gradually these differences were ironed out and the Flood Control Committee came into its own. The great flood in the Mississippi Valley, I think in the year 1927, increased the stature of the Flood Control Committee mightily. That was the time when the President assigned to Mr. Hoover the task to bring relief to the devastated areas of the Mississippi Valley, especially in the Southern States.

Then the great flood of 1936 in Pittsburgh and the great flood of 1937 in the lower Ohio Valley came, and from this terrible calamity and devastation the Flood Control Committee received additional recognition and assumed an additional responsibility. I well remember the time when the chairman and I arranged a meeting with the President of the United States whereby and from which we worked out the plan for passing proper legislation to set up what is known as the Disaster Loan Corporation. This Corporation began to function immediately and did much good in the Ohio Valley section.

About that time also we contacted the President of the United States, and from this contact we were able to work out a proposition whereby legislation was passed providing for the construction of flood walls and flood protection for the various cities and communities along the Ohio River. This law was well drawn and provided for local contribution. I am proud to say that my home city of Ironton, Ohio, was the first community in the United States to qualify for flood-control assistance under that program. I am also proud to say that my home city of Ironton was the first in which any flood-control work under the new program was done. And likewise it was the first city for which a flood-control project has been completed. The community in which I live today is living safely behind flood walls constructed by the Army engineers according to the most modern methods. The people of my city are proud of this fact, and they are glad to feel relief against the terrible danger and inconvenience and expense of floods such as formerly visited our community.

The fact that my home city was the first to qualify under this law and the first in which the full flood defense has been completed is due largely to the wisdom and efficiency of the city manager and city council and the city officials generally and due to the patriotism of the people in my city who were willing to come forward with a sufficient bond issue to guarantee the city's part of the program.

I am proud to have been one of the pioneers in flood-control legislation in Congress, and I rejoice today with all of you that we are having up for consideration before us a bill which from all indications will pass the House by unanimous vote. There is no appropriation in this bill for any community in my district. All the communities of my district that can qualify have done so. Nevertheless, I have not lost one bit of my zeal for adequate flood protection because those of us who live in the Ohio Valley know better probably than any other people in the Nation what big devastating floods mean to a community. I want every community that can qualify to have the benefits of flood protection [Applause.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, having served on the Flood Control Committee for 4 years, I could not let this opportunity go by without expressing my appreciation for the excellent work the committee has done. This is another illustration of the fine work that can be done and has been done under the direction of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. They always bring in a good bill, they always bring in a good report, and the measure has been presented in an excellent way here today.

I sincerely trust the Committee will pass this bill without opposition from anyone. The Army engineers have recommended these projects, they have been thoroughly studied, the committee has made an excellent report, and we have sections in the United States suffering from the effects of floods. Let us get these authorizations through, and let us try to take care of these various sections at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of this Flood Control Committee I pay tribute to the chairman. It was a revelation to me to learn of the knowledge that our chairman has of the different streams and rivers throughout the country. The work of the committee is very interesting, and as I am representing a district that has suffered for a great many years from floods, no doubt my interest was somewhat enhanced. I represent a district where 200,000 people have suffered from floods for many years, and I know that they will be very happy when they know that this bill has been reported favorably and passed, to realize that we can look forward to a time when the lives lost and the suffering endured because of floods in our district will be eliminated. I especially pay my respects to the chairman of the committee and thank him for the manner in which the representatives from my district that appeared before the committee were received by him and by the committee.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the able and distinguished chairman of the committee with regard to the dam at Sugar Hill, N. H., it is not necessary for me to take much of the time of the House. It may seem curious to be objecting to a project for a dam in my own region, but I would like to point out that as far as concerns flood control in the upper Connecticut Valley it is not primarily for the benefit of the State of New Hampshire. The benefit is to the lower part of the valley, as described by the gentlemen from Massachusetts, for the protection of cities in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The State of New Hampshire is very glad to cooperate in such a matter, but it does want to have something to say about the location of dams when there is interference by them with local conditions.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment specifically omitting a reservoir at Sugar Hill, N. H., from the list of approved projects.

In the report of the committee, however, on page 8, I find the following language:

> With the understanding that none of the funds authorized in this bill shall be used for the construction of the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir on the Ammonoosuc River in New Hampshire, the Flood Control Committee recommends the modification of the approved flood-control plan for the Connecticut River in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. The committee by recent resolution has called upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and previous reports on the Connecticut River with the view of finding a substitute reservoir which can be built in the place of the Sugar Hill project.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The Bethlehem Junction Reservoir was authorized in the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. The authorization has not been repealed. The committee understands, however, that both Bethlehem Junction and Sugar Hill would not be constructed. Several substitutes for Sugar Hill have been suggested. As stated, the committee has provided for a review of previous reports and from information furnished to the committee it is believed that a suitable substitute or substitutes can be found for the Sugar Hill project. The committee, therefore, has declined to authorize funds for the Sugar Hill Dam and Reservoir. No part of the $10,000,000 herein authorized and no part of funds previously authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1936 or any other act is available for the construction of the Sugar Hill Reservoir.

It is my understanding that the intention of the Congress as thus stated by the committee will govern the Board of Engineers and will operate to prevent the use of the Sugar Hill site just as positively as would an amendment to the bill.

If I may, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if he will confirm this statement of the case.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think I have answered the gentleman's inquiry, but I read again from the report, House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session:

This second interim report considers changes in certain figures of the approved general reservoir plan for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin and additional local protective works now found desirable. A final report to be submitted under this and other authorities will cover the Connecticut River as a whole.

If you were to strike out that whole Document No. 724, you strike out the provisions for local protection, and I would say that in view of this being an interim report, in view of our report that there is no authorization for it, Sugar Hill is definitely out of this bill, as the authorization does not provide for Sugar Hill.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I might say that that was the unanimous opinion of the committee—that it is definitely out of the bill.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I am entirely satisfied, and I believe that my constituents will be. I would like to express my appreciation to the able and distinguished chairman of the committee and the members of the committee, and I thank them for the courteous and effective consideration that they have given to the views and wishes of the people of the Ammonoosuc Valley.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Committee having resolved itself into one of mutual admiration, I wish to join in the participation of that, although I do not share in any of the benefits of this remarkable bill. I rise, however, to discuss another phase of floods, that might properly be considered by some other committee. It is not strictly under the jurisdiction of this particular committee. We are speaking, however, of national defense, and that the membership of the House might be interested and know and understand a notice recently published and widely circulated in a typical American village in the State of New York, not in my district, circulated without protest. I shall read it to you and then for what it is worth refer it to some committee that might be interested in this particular form of flood that is sweeping over the country:

COMMUNIST RALLY TONIGHT, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1941

Special showing of the great Russian Communist moving picture, Mannerheim Line. See the crushing defeat of the Finnish Army by the mighty Communist war machine—just as the greedy bankers and the ignorant American reactionaries will soon be crushed by the Communists of America.

Show your loyalty to our great leader, Joseph Stalin, and the local branch of the Communist Internationale by your presence at the Van Etten Hall tonight.

Come prepared to defend our cause in case of interference by narrow-minded police officials.

I see the majority leader present. I was interested some years ago when he carried on an investigation of these subversive activities. I also remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] was active along the same line. I say to you the time has come when we cannot temporize with this sort of thing, especially when it appears to be a published bill poster such as this, distributed without protest by the community.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have seen what the gentleman has presented to the House. I think that is the most outstanding piece of anti-Americanism I have ever seen. Somebody ought to be called to task, whoever is responsible for that sort of an article.

Mr. REED of New York. It is in the RECORD for those who are in authority to act upon those particular matters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Flood Control Committee, I wish to say I have enjoyed the interesting work which has characterized the Flood Control Committee this session of Congress.

The chairman of the Flood Control Committee and the members of the committee with whom I have had the pleasure to serve have worked diligently and patiently to give people throughout our Nation who have flood-control problems the opportunity to present any facts pertinent to the various sectors of our Nation. I wish to say right here in my opinion no chairman of any committee in Congress is more energetic, fair, understanding, and efficient than our own able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON. The Nation and the Congress are fortunate indeed to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] occupying the post at which he so signally and successfully serves.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, first I desire to congratulate the Flood Control Committee of the House and its chairman, the Honorable WILL WHITTINGTON, for their very splendid work in the handling of this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], as all of us know, has during his many years in Congress taken a particular interest in flood-control matters, and is the Nation's foremost authority on flood-control problems.

The committee has given very close and thorough consideration to all the projects that have been submitted. It has analyzed the reports of the Corps of Engineers, and I am sure that every project included in the authorization bill is meritorious and should receive the support of Congress.

I realize that during these days of great national stress we are primarily concerned with the manufacture of munitions of war and with doing those things necessary for the protection of this country and for the defeat of that ruthless totalitarian force that seeks to destroy the fundamentals of our civilized society. We should not, however, overlook the great importance of preventing death and destruction to our property caused by the ravages of floods. Furthermore, almost every flood project contained in this authorization bill has a direct bearing to national defense. This is especially true of the Chattanooga-Rossville, Ga., project, which I shall later discuss in more detail.

The mere fact that floods have not occurred in some communities during the past few years is no reason why protective works for those sections should not be authorized and undertaken at this time. The history of flood protection is replete with instances where either through ignorance or deliberate negligence communities have postponed action until overtaken by disaster. Protective works have too often been built after a great flood rather than before it. The result of delay has been a gross cost of double or treble the actual cost of protection, combined with loss of life and property that can never be replaced.

The Flood Control Committee of the House has wisely included in this authorization bill an authorization for the construction of flood-protective works for Chattanooga and Rossville, Ga. The building of these works has been very vigorously recommended by the Corps of Engineers in House Document No. 479, Seventy-sixth Congress, and by the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which report is contained in House Document No. 91, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Chattanooga is the largest city in the Tennessee River Basin. The city proper, which extends on both sides of the river, has a corporate area of 27.42 square miles, and a population of approximately 150,000. Rossville, Ga., which joins Chattanooga on the south, is located on the headwaters of Chattanooga Creek and has a population of about 5,000. The Tennessee River Basin above Chattanooga has a drainage area of 21,400 square miles, which is an area 10 times the size of the State of Delaware. All of the water from this area flows through the city of Chattanooga. The city is the bottleneck for this drainage district. The flood stage at Chattanooga is 30 feet. During the 64-year period from 1875 to 1938, this stage has been reached or exceeded 71 times. A 57.9-foot flood was suffered by the city in 1867. Since that time there have been frequent floods, the last one being in 1932. If a flood such as the one in 1867 should occur, approximately 8,000 acres of the city would be under water. It is estimated that 50,000 people would be homeless and that property damage would be $90,000,000. The Corps of Engineers estimates the cost of the project to be $1 to $2.27 in proportion to the benefits; that is, for every $1 invested a return of $2.27 in protection would be secured. This is a very high proportion, and is much higher than most of the projects included in this bill.

That Chattanooga is awake to its vital need for protection and has sought assistance from the Federal Government in the manner prescribed by Congress was evidenced by the response to a public

hearing held at the call of the War Department and the Department of Agriculture on August 16, 1938. Petitions and briefs were presented by many organizations. Among the signers were the commissioners of the Chattanooga flood-protection district; Mayor Bass, of the city of Chattanooga; Judge Cummings, county judge of Hamilton County; and Mayor Bennett, of the city of Rossville.

Along with the rest of the country, this region has received assistance from the Federal Government in financing the construction of public buildings, sorely needed housing facilities, and other developments. Much private building has been possible because of mortgage loans through the F. H. A. and H. O. L. C. As a result of this, there is a large Federal investment in the community which is secured by public bond issues or by private mortgages; also, the T. V. A. has much property in Chattanooga. Much of this is invested in properties subject to direct damage or total loss due to floods.

It seems unnecessary to set forth at length the value of the Tennessee Valley as a great national asset for war as well as for peace. Due to its natural advantages of topography and location and to the development of its resources, it is bound to play an important part in any comprehensive development of the country for purposes of national defense. This fact is generally recognized. Chattanooga is the principal city of the valley. It is termed properly a crossroads city. Interstate highways and railroads from north and south, east and west intersect there. It is located on air and water routes. Its strategic location and many natural advantages are attested by the fact that it has become a prosperous city in spite of the hazard of flood damage. Its continued development hinges on security against floods.

Attention is called to the fact that on March 15 last this project was endorsed by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress as one of only 18 projects in the entire country found to be "sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status" so that it "should be promptly constructed in the public interest."

Since the beginning of the national-defense effort many of the large manufacturing plants in Chattanooga have taken orders and are manufacturing vital defense materials. A recent survey showed that Chattanooga manufacturers, which are in the flood zone, are manufacturing $90,000,000 of defense materials. Some of the plants are being enlarged so as to increase their capacity. Floods are no respectors of wars. Our national-defense effort would be impaired if floods should cause damage or destruction at Chattanooga during this period. Calamities are bad enough under normal conditions, but floods would have especially grave results under conditions of extraordinary and intensified activity in our industrial and military areas.

I hope that the Members of the House will look with favor upon this greatly worthwhile project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries authorization of $11,000,000 for power-generating equipment and full flood-control and power authorizations for the $45,000,000 Bull Shoals and the $34,000,000 dams, all on the White River.

This is one of the most important bills, so far as Arkansas and southern Missouri are concerned, that has ever come before this House.

These three dams will—

First. Eliminate all of the most disastrous floods of the lower White and contribute to the control of the lower Mississippi.

Second. Produce 450,000 kilowatts of cheap power. In spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says, there is a drastic shortage of power in the area.

Third. Contribute to navigation of the lower White.

Fourth. Return the Ozarks to their former and proper status as the playground of the Mississippi Valley; and in spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says, it will increase, and not decrease, the fishing.

Should the war continue long, the Norfork power will be a vital aid to the national defense.

What a blessing it would have been to the defense of this Nation if we could have had one or more of these great projects in production at this critical hour. Who knows but that the hours ahead may add to our needs in this crisis.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation to the committee for including in the bill a project for flood control on the upper Missouri from Kansas City to Sioux City, brought about, as it is contended by development of the stream for navigation, the building of revetments, dikes, changing of the course, and causing one and a half million acres to be flooded.

My primary object in asking this time is to object to a provision in the bill on page 21, line 23:

> The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide protection to the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified to include cut-offs in the vicinity of Liberty Bend substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 722, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Liberty Bend is about 30 miles east of Kansas City and is a rather sharp bend in the shape of a horseshoe. The town of Liberty in my district is a town of about 4,000 people. It gets its water supply from the banks of the Missouri River. That is, it has some wells in the alluvial soil adjacent to the river. If this bend is cut off it will leave those wells about 3 miles from the channel of the Missouri River. It is the contention of the officials of the town of Liberty that this will lower the water level so that they will have to put in additional pumping equipment.

They also dump their sewage into the river in this bend. It will be necessary for them to extend their sewage system a very considerable distance.

There is also objection to it from numerous farmers in the community who say if this cut-off is made that the streams now running into the river will be clogged by brush and other things; weeds will grow up in the river bed and cause those streams to overflow, thus causing damage and floods that do not now exist.

Senator TRUMAN, on April 29, obtained approval in the Senate of a resolution to further study this project, that is, the flood-control projects in the Kansas Citys and area. Liberty Bend is in that area. The Army engineers say that they have no satisfactory data at this time to determine what the effect of this cut-off will be on the water supply and sewage system of Liberty. However, they take the position that there probably will be none, but they definitely refuse to state that there will not be some.

I want to read from a letter from General Schley, dated May 29:

> On the basis of the information now available, it appears that the proposed Liberty Bend cut-off will not cause material damage to the water supply or sewage-disposal facilities of the city of Liberty. Further investigation of this subject will, however, be included in a comprehensive study for flood control in the vicinity of the Kansas Citys which the Department is now making pursuant to several directives from Congress, including the authorization contained in a resolution adopted on April 29, 1941, by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate. That resolution requests the Department to review its report on the Missouri River, which is contained in House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, with a view to determine whether any modifications should be made therein at this time with respect to protection of the Kansas Citys and adjacent areas from floods on the Missouri and Kansas Rivers and on the tributaries entering that river between approximate river-mile 386 and 356. The Liberty Bend is within this portion of the Missouri River. If the investigation made in connection with these authorized surveys show a justification for remedial measures in the vicinity of the water wells and sewer outlets of the city of Liberty, you may be assured that appropriate recommendations will be submitted to Congress in the report of the Department.

I want to ask, when the time comes, to strike this provision out of the bill until the War Department has completed its further studies pursuant to the resolution approved on April 29 in the Senate.

There are a number of other projects in this vicinity that will be affected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in reference to the matter brought up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN]. We all remember in Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., the flood of 1903 that paralyzed the whole commercial life of the two cities. Every packing house, all in Kansas City, Kans., were in water from 4 to 35 feet; every railroad at a standstill. It paralyzed the transportation system that centers there, because Kansas City is within 200 miles of the territorial center of the United States.

It is of vast importance that this Liberty Bend project remain in the bill, because it is one of the necessary links that makes Kansas City secure from floods, and it is so determined by the United States Army engineers, by the engineers of the Highway Commissions of Missouri and Kansas; and all of the interests of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., are behind it. This is the first time in many years that these two cities have got together, and we do not want to disrupt the harmony in this one common interest.

It is a matter of vast importance to national defense to prevent a return of floods, such as of 1903 and of 1927. And I want to pay my tribute to our chairman, and add my word of commendation to what has already been said. It is a tribute well deserved. I was a member of this committee early in 1927, after the 1927 flood. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has been the most diligent student of this question I have ever known on the committee, and this is what has made him such a splendid chairman. It is another vindication of the seniority system of the House which provides the opportunity for Members to prepare for useful chairmanships.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is there not some objection to this project as evidenced by Senator TRUMAN's resolution? Senator TRUMAN is a resident of Independence, Kans., which is a part of Kansas City. He introduced a resolution asking for a resurvey.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. There may be some little disadvantage to Liberty about it; but as Napoleon once said, you cannot have an omelet without breaking some eggs.

Mr. DUNCAN. But why should we suffer any damage?

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. This is a vastly important thing to Kansas City. We cannot afford another disruption of communications from coast to coast as happened in 1903 when people could not get out of Kansas City or could not get in on account of the floods of the Missouri-Kaw Rivers, one of the most acute flood situations in the United States. Had the flood of 1927 occurred 10 years before it would have stopped the whole process of national preparation for the war in 1917, because transportation east and west was paralyzed from Cairo to the Gulf.

I am sure if there is any injustice or disadvantage to the little city of Liberty—a fine little town by the way—the Government will take care of it as it is its duty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I should be unappreciative if I failed to join in the statements by other Members of the House commending the manner in which the hearings on this bill were conducted by this great committee and by its great chairman. Furthermore, I should be unappreciative indeed if I failed to acknowledge my personal gratitude and the gratitude of the people of Denver, whom I have the honor to represent, for the careful study by the Army engineers and by the Flood Control Committee of our problem and for the inclusion in this bill of the item providing for flood control of Cherry Creek and its tributaries for the protection of Denver, Colo., and adjacent territory.

This stream is of the same character as that one which the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has just described as menacing Los Angeles, and Cherry Creek also is a flash stream—a mere trickle at noon, a cloudburst upstream in midafternoon, and an enormous flood at night. When constructed, this project will protect Denver from what is now an ever-imminent danger of a ghastly major tragedy.

The item in this bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the Cherry Creek project is as follows:

The comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized $2,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The statement in the unanimous report by the Committee on Flood Control (Rept. No. 759, 77th Cong., 1st sess, filed June 9, 1941) is as follows:

CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO

(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

The possibility of a major flood on Cherry Creek threatens the city of Denver, Colo., with a major catastrophe. Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., flows northerly to join the South Platte River in Denver. The topography of Cherry Creek Basin is such as to cause large floods of great intensity which may descend on Denver with little warning. For the lower 5½ miles of its course Cherry Creek flows through industrial and residential sections of the city. The great flows which would result from major floods on Cherry Creek would submerge a large part of the central portion of Denver, including important business districts, railroad yards, industrial establishments, and extensive residential areas. Denver is the most important industrial center between the Missouri River and the Pacific coast, and any disruption of the normal activities of that city would be detrimental to the whole country. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937 and a report has been submitted to Congress.

The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for the construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek at the Cherry Creek No. 1 site and at the Castlewood site, both above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of $10,500,000.

Construction of the recommended project would protect Denver against any flood reasonably to be expected and would eliminate practically all further damages from Cherry Creek floods in the agricultural valley above that city. In addition, water for irrigation is to be stored in the Castlewood Reservoir. Unquestionably the benefits of the improvement would greatly exceed its cost. The Flood Control Committee reaffirms its previous recommendation that the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers should be approved by Congress, and because of the need for the contemplated flood protection at Denver $3,000,000 should be authorized at this time to provide for the construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and the completion of the detailed plans and other necessary preliminary work for the Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1.

On May 14, 1941, I made the following statement before the Flood Control Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

FLOOD CONTROL OF CHERRY CREEK FOR THE PROTECTION OF DENVER, COLO., AND ADJACENT TERRITORY TO THE SOUTH

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish again to call your attention to the project for flood control of Cherry Creek and tributaries for the protection of Denver, Colo., and adjacent territory to the south. This "flash stream" flows into the South Platte River, which is a tributary of the Missouri River, in the heart of the business district of the city of Denver, which I have the honor to represent. In the last Congress I introduced a bill to authorize this project, which bill was favorably considered by this committee. In this Congress I have introduced a similar bill, H. R. 3641, which has been referred to your committee, and for which I earnestly entreat your favorable consideration.

The Corps of Engineers' report on this project was transmitted to the House of Representatives with letter dated July 14, 1939, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Honorable Harry H. Woodring, Secretary of War.

This report and accompanying papers were, on July 17, 1939, referred to the Committee on Flood Control and are printed as House Document No. 426 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

Denver, the city that is menaced by floods in Cherry Creek, as stated by the Corps of Engineers in their report (p. 9, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st. sess.)

"Denver is the most important industrial and commercial center between the Missouri River and the Pacific coast. It is the center of a large trade area, being about 600 miles distant from other cities of comparable size. Its scenic beauty attracts thousands of tourists each year, and its altitude, low humidity, and large percentage of cloudless days have made it a health resort of national repute. Educational facilities include the University of Denver, the University of Colorado Medical School, and four other institutions of higher learning.

"Denver's manufacturing industry covers a wide diversification of products, including meat and other food products, clothing, wood, metal, stone, concrete, clay, printing, and many others. Stockyards and railroad shops are important factors of industry."

Including the adjacent suburbs (which, nevertheless, are outside the corporate limits of the municipality known as the city and county of Denver), the population, according to the final figures on the 1940 census, is 384,372. Of these, 322,412 are within the corporate limits.

Denver's "sleeping tiger"

Cherry Creek is a typical western "flash stream." Under ordinary circumstances there is on the surface of the channel only a trickle of water. It looks as if perhaps three or four fire hydrants had been turned into it. But, at any time between the last of April and the first of October, after heavy rains or cloudbursts up the valley to the south, this thread of water may suddenly and without warning change into a raging torrent for a few hours and then return soon to its normal state of quiescence. These floods have caused millions of dollars of property damage in Denver and, although the records are not entirely complete, the loss of nearly 100 lives.

Like all western "flash streams," Cherry Creek is treacherous. Its floods come suddenly and without warning. I have often referred to it as Denver's "sleeping tiger."

Floods in "flash streams," coming without warning, afford no opportunity to make emergency preparations for protection

When floods are threatened on the Ohio, the Mississippi, or the Missouri Rivers, the towns and cities menaced have several days, and on the lower Mississippi, at Memphis or Vicksburg or New Orleans, they have many days—sometimes 2 weeks or even longer—to prepare against the coming flood. Furthermore, these cities on the lower part of the big rivers have fairly reliable advance estimates of approximately how great a flood to expect. But, of floods in Cherry Creek, Denver has no warning—unless someone up the valley telephones that a cloudburst is occurring and that high water is coming. There is no time to make any emergency preparations against a flood, and, even if there were time, no possibility of estimating how great the flood will be. Our only safeguard lies in having constructed in advance permanent works which the best engineering investigations determine will be sufficiently large to protect our city against any flood resulting from any storm which meteorological investigations determine is likely to occur.

No city on Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans is as large and as vulnerable to flood damage as is Denver from Cherry Creek

A glance at the map shows that on the main stem of the Ohio River from Louisville, Ky., down to Cairo, Ill., and on the main stem of the Mississippi from St. Louis to New Orleans, there is no city as great in population or in wealth as Denver—and no city which is as vulnerable to floods from those great rivers as Denver is vulnerable to attack by floods from the comparatively insignificant and harmless appearing Cherry Creek.

The "syllabus" of the Army's report on this project is as follows (p. 5, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

"Survey of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado.

"Cherry Creek is a small tributary of the South Platte River which joins the South Platte within the city of Denver. Floods have occurred frequently in the past and have caused a considerable amount of damage in the upper valley and a great deal of damage within the city of Denver; the most recent flood, that of 1933, having caused a damage of over $956,000 to this community. The watershed is within the eastern Colorado cloudburst zone and is immediately adjacent to other similar watersheds which have suffered flood-producing storms of magnitude many times greater than any which have occurred on Cherry Creek. The occurrence of such a storm on Cherry Creek would cause a flood several times larger than that necessary to overtop the existing flood-control dam above the city, and would cause a loss, at the present stage of economic development, estimated at $40,000,000. Additional flood-control storage in this watershed is absolutely necessary. A feasible irrigation development within this basin has been reported on by the Bureau of Reclamation and should be incorporated in any proposed plan of development. The irrigation development can repay a total cost of not to exceed $429,500. The most feasible plan for all purposes would involve construction of Castlewood and Cherry Creek No. 1 Reservoirs, which would cost $1,782,250 and $6,409,938, respectively. The proposed improvement is recommended for immediate construction as a Federal flood-control project."

The results of the exhaustive hearings, examinations, and surveys conducted by the Army engineers, beginning in November 1937 and carried on continuously until the report (H. Doc. No. 426) was sent to the Congress on July 14, 1939, are so fully and carefully set forth in the report that it would be superfluous to attempt to review them further in this statement. However, I believe it is pertinent by way of emphasis to quote the paragraphs indicating the extent of the catastrophe to Denver which every year impends, and will continue to impend, until this project is authorized and actually completed.

At set forth at pages 21 and 22 of House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the damages which would be wrought by the flood which may occur any year, and which this project will avert, are summarized by the Army engineers as follows:

"Damages from reservoir-design flood

"The hypothetical flood which may occur on Cherry Creek would have a discharge of 230,000 cubic feet per second at Denver, as determined in paragraph 37. This would be approximately 14 times greater than any previous flood of record at this station, and would produce a height approximately 16 feet higher than that of the maximum flood of record. The flood would arrive with little warning and velocities would be sufficient to prevent rescue work. The effect upon Denver would be that of a first-class catastrophe. A summary of the principal damages which would result from this flood is given in the following paragraphs:

"Denver: The flood would submerge a larger part of the central portions of the city. Important business districts, municipal buildings and parks, railroad yards and station, streetcar barn, bridges, and some of the finest residential and recreational areas would be covered. The property, valued at $23,000,000 affected by the 1933 flood, would all be covered some 16 feet deeper with silt-laden waters carried at high velocities. An incomplete flood damage field survey showed that damages within the area covered would total $19,913,200.

"When a flood occurs on Cherry Creek large numbers of people gather to watch it from the bridges and the sidewalks adjacent to the stream, which are higher than large areas lying farther away. Numbers of people would probably also be trapped in the area between Cherry Creek and the South Platte, as there would be a heavy flow over the divide between the two streams. It is quite possible that a loss of several hundred lives might occur.

"It was estimated that damages in areas not covered by the field survey would total about $6,100,000. Other tangible damages not covered include damages to railroads (except Union Terminal), to the Public Service Co., and to municipal facilities, such as bridges, roads, parks, and sewers.

"Intangible damages include a major interruption to business, probably for a period of years; enormous costs of clean-up; relief and emergency assistance to the homeless; loss of business and municipal records; interruption to rail and tramway service; panic depreciation of property values; flooding of Denver General Hospital and Steele Memorial Hospital; and interruption of city sewer system. Denver is a center of commercial and governmental activity over a wide area, and normal activities of all kinds would be dealt a terrific blow. Furthermore, the city has a record of continuous growth, and damages of such an occurrence will be greater in the future.

"Considering all factors, it is believed that the total of tangible and intangible damage which would be caused by an occurrence of such a flood would probably equal $40,000,000 at the present time, or an average of $50,000,000 over the economic life of the structures being considered.

"Damages above Kenwood Dam: A large portion of the community of Parker, with a population of 200, including the business district, would be affected by the reservoir-design flood, and there would undoubtedly be some loss of life. It is estimated that the direct damage from this flood would amount to $75,000. The only other town in the basin is Franktown, which is situated so that there would be no damage from the hypothetical flood.

"Damage to rural districts: The area above Kenwood Dam is largely an agricultural district, with the exception of the towns of Parker and Franktown. It is estimated that in this area the damage to farm lands would be $318,600, in the present stage of development.

"The main highway is susceptible to damage along the valley, as are the numerous local unsurfaced roads which cross the stream by means of small wooden or steel bridges. The hypothetical flood would cause some damage to the roads and would probably destroy all the bridges.

"It is estimated that the damage to highways, bridges, and local roads from a hypothetical flood would amount to $100,000.

"The occurrence of the hypothetical flood would undoubtedly cause some indirect loss to business by interruption of transportation, communication, and trade, and would also cause some lasting depreciation in real-estate value within the affected zone. The community of Parker would be most severely affected. The indirect losses of this character would probably amount to about 20 percent of the other flood losses, or $98,720.

"The future damages that would result from the occurrence of the reservoir-design flood, between Kenwood Dam and Castlewood Dam site, are summarized as follows:

Parker	$75,000
Rural districts	318,600
Highways	100,000
Intangible damages	98,720
Total	592,320"

The district engineer, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., Lt. Col. W. M. Hoge, concludes his report as follows (p. 32, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"It is recommended that the proposed improvement be constructed as a Federal flood-control project."

The division engineer, Col. C. L. Sturdevant, says, in his report to the Chief of Engineers (p. 32, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"The flood-damage potentialities in the Cherry Creek Valley, especially in the metropolitan Denver area, and the recent experiences with severe floods in that locality, indicate the desirability of early adoption for this project. It is therefore further recommended that this project be considered of early priority in the selection of flood-control projects for construction."

The report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, by Brig. Gen. M. C. Tyler, senior member of the Board (p. 4, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), concludes, as follows:

"The Board considers that these improvements are well warranted by benefits that would accrue to the project and recommends construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1, on Cherry Creek, Colo., at an estimated first cost of $10,500,000, with $3,000 annually for maintenance."

Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, after reviewing previous reports, says, in his letter of transmittal to the Secretary of War (pp. 3 and 4, H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views of the Board. Cherry Creek Basin lies in an area where storms of cloudburst intensity occur. Studies indicate that floods many times greater than any that have occurred in the past are a definite possibility. Should such a flood occur under existing conditions, the destruction and dam-

age that would occur in Denver and the valley above would be enormous. There is also the possibility of serious loss of life. The two reservoirs proposed by the district engineer, with the existing Kenwood Reservoir, would provide full protection against any flood reasonably to be anticipated, and, in my opinion, their construction is essential if the security of the city of Denver is to be provided. * * * I recommend construction of the Castlewood Reservoir and Cherry Creek Reservoir No. 1 on Cherry Creek, Colo., at an estimated first cost of $10,500,000, with $3,000 annually for maintenance."

It is difficult adequately to express the vital importance of this project, not only to the city of Denver, which comprises my congressional district but also to that part of the Cherry Creek Valley south of the city limits of Denver in the Second Congressional District of Colorado. Until this project is authorized and completely constructed, Denver, every year, between April and October, will be in ever imminent danger of a ghastly major tragedy.

In the last Congress this committee embodied the Cherry Creek project in the omnibus flood-control bill, H. R. 9640. In favorably reporting that bill (Rept. No. 2103, 76th Cong., 3d sess., filed May 7, 1940), this committee made the following statement (at pp. 23–24) concerning this Cherry Creek project:

"CHERRY CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO

"(H. Doc. No. 426, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

"Cherry Creek rises in El Paso County, Colo., and flows north to join the South Platte River in the city of Denver. The valley of Cherry Creek for over 20 miles above Denver is a rich farming area and for its lower 5.5 miles Cherry Creek flows through the residential and industrial sections of the city. The need for flood control on Cherry Creek has been investigated by the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1937, and his report has been transmitted to Congress. This report indicates that the Cherry Creek Valley lies in a cloudburst zone and has suffered damaging floods since its earliest settlement. Major floods of Cherry Creek have caused extensive damages at Denver and the flood of 1933 destroyed the old Castlewood irrigation dam above the city. It has been estimated that the maximum probable flood on Cherry Creek would cause damages in Denver of from forty to fifty million dollars, and might cause large loss of life.

"The plan of protection recommended by the Chief of Engineers provides for construction of two reservoirs on Cherry Creek, at the Cherry Creek No. 1 and Castlewood sites above Denver, at an estimated cost to the United States of $10,500,000.

"The recommended reservoirs would protect the city of Denver against any flood reasonably to be anticipated and would largely eliminate flood damage in the valley above the city. In addition, it is proposed to reserve water for irrigation in the proposed Castlewood reservoir. The benefits of the improvement would be greatly in excess of its cost. The Flood Control Committee therefore believes that the project merits approval by Congress and that it is of such an urgent nature that $3,000,000 should be authorized at this time so that the necessary lands can be secured and detailed plans can be initiated as soon as funds are appropriated by Congress."

March 18, 1940, at the hearings during the Seventy-sixth Congress on H. R. 9640, page 11, Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, made the following statement concerning floods in so-called flash streams in the West and the necessity for flood control of Cherry Creek for the protection of Denver:

General SCHLEY. Those are in the semiarid sections, where the river channels have very small capacities and where the rains come like cloudbursts. As the cities grow larger and become more important, the destruction by these cloudbursts is very much greater.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON of Mississippi). You have also submitted a report and recommendation for the protection of the city of Denver, Colo., have you not?

General SCHLEY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a rather populous area?

General SCHLEY. The possibilities of danger there are very great. It has been simply a matter of great luck that Denver has not had a great catastrophe since it h.. been a large city. The floods, according to the historic record, have not been anything like as great as they might be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to what has been said my appreciation of the fine bill the chairman and members of the Committee on Flood Control have brought before this House. On the east boundary of my district, the lower part of the Mississippi, extends the Wichita and Red Rivers. I know the people of my district will be very happy to receive the benefit afforded by this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I desire to speak just a few words in behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] who so ably represents my old district where I was born and reared. The citizens of the various districts throughout the United States who have untiring Representatives on their toes like the gentleman from Arkansas, CLYDE ELLIS, of the Seventh Congressional District of Arkansas are indeed very fortunate.

Around Norfork and in Baxter County, Ark., where I used to reside, I lost one of my beloved school teachers, one of my classmates, and one of my relatives by reason of floods. Through the efforts of the gentleman from Arkansas, CLYDE ELLIS, his constituents and members of the Committee on Flood Control, the swift waters of the White River, the North Fork, and other deep, cool, clear mountain streams have been harnessed to an advantage.

The rivers and channels of the rivers in Arkansas are deep, while the rivers in my district are usually a mile wide and a foot deep until the floods come and then havoc is wrought for miles. My district, the Seventh Oklahoma District, needs flood control badly, but, unfortunately, Mr. Massingale passed away January 17, 1941, before his plans materialized and before the Army had completed its surveys and reports with respect to our program. I did not take the oath of office until April 14; consequently, during the intervening 3 months our district was without representation. I feel sure, however, that by the next session I will have prevailed upon the Army engineers to the extent that my district will be included in future bills and will ultimately benefit thereby.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot say all that I would like to say. I cannot be thankful, like my colleagues here, for any projects in my district, my city, or in my State. There is nothing in the bill that will benefit my section. However, Chicagoans are always pleased to aid other sections of the country, especially if it is for the best interests of the country.

It is gratifying to me to see so many of my friends on the Republican side as well as my friends on the Democratic side—I am an independent you know—approve this activity and the action of the committee. It merely proves what I have said, that the Democratic Party has acted wisely in legislating in the interest of our country. This legislation I know will be of great benefit.

We have no floods but we need water. We have been trying to get a little water to make the Illinois River navigable. I hope when the time comes we will get a little more water for the channel that cost the city of Chicago $180,000,000 and to which the Government did not donate a single cent. Whenever we ask for a little relief, however, it is not forthcoming. Notwithstanding that fact, I am here endorsing this bill and hope it will aid all the sections that are included in it.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I shall not unduly take up the time of the House except to direct attention to the cooperative spirit and liberality displayed by the Members representing the great Middle West in support of this measure and other legislation that has proven beneficial to other sections of our country. Within recent years the Middle West compared with other sections of the country has shared very little in the large appropriations that have been made. I recall the time when the bills covering appropriations for the construction of the Panama Canal were under consideration that many Midwestern Members realized the very material benefits which would inure to the East with the enactment of the legislation, and they also honestly appreciated that it would prove of benefit to the whole country and I am pleased to state that a large majority of them voted for the appropriation bills. There was serious opposition to the expenditure which was then considered a tremendous sum, but time has proven that the judgment of the midwestern Members was correct and today we have the operation of the Panama Canal which has been of such great benefit to the water transportation of the United States and all the world.

Mr. Chairman, we will shortly have before us a bill that will not only aid Chicago but the country as well—namely, the St. Lawrence waterways bill—and I hope you gentlemen whose districts have benefited by reason of the enactment of some of the large appropriation bills will express some reciprocity in support of legislation to make that great project possible. I feel the St. Lawrence project in years to come will also prove its value

and those farsighted men who have advocated it for many years, who have been subject to frequent criticism will, as time goes on, be generally acclaimed upon their courage and judgment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, except as otherwise provided by act of Congress.

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act, except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the third proviso of section 1 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937 (Public, No. 406, 75th Cong.), and all of section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939 (Public, No. 396, 76th Cong.), are hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That the authorization for any flood-control project heretofore or herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date of approval of this act unless local interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished: *And provided further*, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations. The Chief of Engineers is also authorized in his discretion to modify the plan for any dam or other work heretofore or hereafter authorized so that such dam or work will be smaller than originally planned with a view to completing a useful improvement within an authorization: *Provided*, That the smaller structure shall be located on the chosen site so that it will be feasible at some future time to enlarge the work in order to permit the full utilization of the site for all purposes of conservation such as flood control, navigation, reclamation, the development of hydroelectric power, and the abatement of pollution.

SEC. 3. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of national security and the stabilization of employment, and shall be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission:

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 for local protection works and $10,000,000 for reservoirs for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Connecticut River Basin, and such comprehensive plan is hereby modified to include the works recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and House Document No. 724, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, with such further modifications as may be found justifiable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The Secretary of War is authorized to reimburse the city of Hartford, Conn., the sum of $252,000 heretofore contributed to the United States by said city for the realinement of the South Meadows section of the flood-protection works in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 653, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from the aforementioned sum any reimbursement which may be made to said city pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1938, approved July 19, 1937.

THAMES RIVER BASIN

The plan for a system of reservoirs and channel improvements in the Thames River Basin, Conn., R. I., and Mass., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 885, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved, and there is hereby authorized $6,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

PAWTUXET RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the North Branch of Pawtuxet River at Clyde, R. I., and for the Pontiac diversion is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 747, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $1,320,000.

HUDSON RIVER BASIN

The projects adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works in the Hoosic River Basin at North Adams in Massachusetts; at Hoosick Falls, N. Y., and at Bennington, Vt., are hereby modified and extended to include the town of Adams, Mass., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 182, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and are authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of $2,170,000.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Winooski River at Waterbury, Vt., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 656, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $880,000.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works on Otter Creek at Rutland, Vt., is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 171, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and is authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of $308,000.

OSWEGO RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood control and other purposes at Canandaigua, Keuka, and Owasco Lakes, and at Hammondsport, Watkins Glen, Montour Falls, Ithaca, and Syracuse, N. Y., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 846, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $3,220,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide for local flood-protection works on the Susquehanna River at Sunbury, Pa., is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 366, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and is authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with said recommendation at an estimated cost of $1,900,000.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on Rancocas Creek in the vicinity of Mount Holly, N. J., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 128, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $300,000.

MOBILE RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection at Prattville, Ala., on Autauga Creek, a tributary of the Alabama-Coosa River, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 657, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $530,000.

The plan for the Allatoona Reservoir on the Etowah River in the Coosa River Basin, Georgia, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 674, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $3,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The project for flood control on the Tombigbee River authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, is hereby modified to provide for additional channel improvements and related works for flood control for the Tombigbee River and tributaries above the mouth of and including the Noxubee River in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $150,000.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN (TEXAS)

The plan for improvement of the Lower Colorado River, Texas, for flood control in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 312, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $6,500,000 for the construction of the project.

The plan for San Angelo Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on the North Concho River, Tex., and for local flood-protection works at San Angelo, Tex., in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 315, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $2,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The plan for Hords Creek Reservoir and for enlargement of the existing Lake Brownwood Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on Pecan Bayou and its tributaries in Texas, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 370, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $1,400,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project, including $460,000 for the Hords Creek Reservoir.

The project for local flood protection on Brady Creek at Brady, Tex., is hereby author-

ized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 441, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $825,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The plan for Whitney Reservoir on the Brazos River in Texas, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 390, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $5,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended by the acts of August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, is hereby modified and, as modified, is hereby authorized and adopted, and the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The existing engineering plan for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is hereby modified so as to provide for the construction of plan 4 as set forth in the report of the Mississippi River Commission, dated March 7, 1941, to the Chief of Engineers, except that the levees in the Yazoo Basin on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of the Coahoma-Bolivar County line in said plan shall have a 3-foot freeboard over the project flood, and all levees shall be constructed with adequate section and foundation to conform to increased levee heights. The Boeuf floodway in the project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and the Eudora floodway, as well as the northward extension and the back protection levee extending from the head of the said Eudora floodway north to the Arkansas River in the project adopted by the act of June 15, 1936, as amended, are hereby abandoned, and the provisions of said acts relating to the prosecution of work on said floodways and extension are hereby repealed.

(b) The project for flood control of the Yazoo River shall be as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 15, 1936, as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938, except that the Chief of Engineers may, in his discretion, from time to time, substitute therefor combinations of reservoirs, levees, and channel improvements; and except that the improvements contemplated in plan C of the report of March 7, 1941, of the Mississippi River Commission are authorized, including the extension of the levee on the east bank of the Mississippi River generally along the west bank of the Yazoo River to a connection in the vicinity of Yazoo City with the Yazoo River levee, authorized by the existing project for protection against headwater floods of the Yazoo River system, and the adjustment in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers of the grades of the existing levees in the backwater areas on the east bank of Yazoo River below Yazoo City, all at an estimated additional cost of $11,982,000: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall fix the grade of the extension levees along the Yazoo River, with higher levees in his discretion, so that their construction will give the maximum practical protection without jeopardizing the safety and integrity of the main Mississippi River levees: *And provided further*, That prior to the beginning of construction local authorities shall furnish satisfactory assurances that they will (1) maintain the levees in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, and will (2) not raise the levees in the backwater above the limiting elevations established therefor by the Chief of Engineers.

(c) The construction of a levee and improvements contemplated in the report of March 7, 1941, of the Mississippi River Commission from the main-line levee on the west bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Shaw, La., westward and northward to the vicinity of Newlight, La., for the protection of that part of the Red River backwater known as the Tensas-Cocodrie area at an estimated cost of $6,976,000 is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers shall fix the grade of said levee, with a higher levee in the discretion, so that its construction will give the maximum practical protection without jeopardizing the safety and integrity of the main Mississippi River levees: *And provided further*, That prior to the beginning of construction local authorities shall furnish satisfactory assurances that they will (1) maintain the levee in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, and will (2) not raise the said levee about the limiting elevations established therefor by the Chief of Engineers.

(d) The Chief of Engineers, with approval of the Secretary of War, shall reimburse local authorities for actual expenditures found by the Chief of Engineers to be reasonable, for providing at the request of the United States, in accordance with local legal procdure or custom, rights-of-way and flowage easements required for future set-backs of main-line Mississippi River levees.

(e) The existing engineering plan for flood control of the St. Francis River is hereby modified so as to permit the substitution for the suspended portions of the original project below Oak Donnick, Ark., of the construction of a ditch in Cross County, Ark., beginning in the vicinity of the outlet end of the existing Oak Donnick to St. Francas Bay floodway and terminating in St. Francis Bay about 2 miles north of Riverfront, including the construction of a highway bridge at State Highway No. 42 made necessary by the ditch construction: *Provided*, That local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (1) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction; (2) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (3) maintain the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(f) The total authorizations heretofore made for the flood-control project of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River shall not be increased by reason of any provision in this act, except for the additional amounts necessary for the Yazoo and Red River backwater improvements, and any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made or authorized for said project as herein or heretofore modified may be expended upon any feature of the said project, notwithstanding any restrictions, limitations, or requirements of existing law: *Provided*, That funds hereafter expended for maintenance shall not be considered as reducing present remaining balances of authorizations.

The project for flood control on the Homochitto River in Mississippi, authorized by the act of June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), and modified by the act of June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), is hereby further modified to provide for additional channel improvements and related works for flood control on the Homochitto River and tributaries in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers, and for the execution of these plans there is hereby authorized $50,000.

RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Ouachita River near Calion, Ark., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 427, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $50,000.

The project for local protection on the Red River in Grant Parish below Colfax, La., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to add and authorize the following: Levee enlargement, new levee extension, and the construction of appurtenant drainage structures on the left bank of the Red River opposite Alexandria for the protection of Pineville, La., and vicinity, at an estimated cost to the United States of $159,100, subject to the provisions of section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936.

The project for local flood protection on the Red River in Grant Parish below Colfax, La., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby further amended to include and to authorize the following: Levees and appurtenant drainage works on the left bank of the Red River and along Bayous Darrow and Rigolette, the improvement of the channel of Bayou Rigolette, and the separation of the channels of Bayous Darrow and Rigolette in the Aloha-Rigolette area, Grant and Rapides Parish, La., all at an estimated cost to the United States of $914,500, subject to the provisions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936.

The plan for the Narrows Reservoir for flood control and other purposes on the Little Missouri River, Ark., and for local flood protection on the main river below Murfreesboro and on the Terre Noire and Ozan Creeks, substantially in accordance with recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 837, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $3,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $24,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the White River Basin in Missouri and Arkansas, including the projects for flood control and other purposes recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 917, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and the modifications in the Norfork Reservoir project recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The projects for local flood protection on the White River, on the east side between Augusta and Clarendon, Ark., and at the town of De Valls Bluff, Ark., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 98, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $2,847,500.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, for the Arkansas River Basin is hereby modified to include the reservoirs in the Grand (Neosho) River Basin in Oklahoma and Missouri and in the Verdigris River Basin in Kansas, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Nos. 107 and 440 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $29,000,000 for the prosecution of said comprehensive plan.

The project for local flood protection on the Salt Fork of the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Cherokee, Okla., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 480, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $800,000.

The project for local flood protection along the south bank of the Arkansas River between Little Rock and Pine Bluff, Ark., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 718, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $641,000, with such modifications as may be advisable in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The project for local flood protection along the north bank of the Arkansas River in the Crawford County Levee District, Arkansas, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 720, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $284,000.

The project for local flood protection on both sides of the Arkansas River in the immediate vicinity of Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $513,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $45,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Ohio River Basin, modified to include the Allegheny Reservoir project in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 300, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

TENNESSEE RIVER BASIN

The projects for local flood protection on the Tennesee River at Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga., are hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 479 Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $13,500,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, for the Dry Run Reservoir near Decorah, Iowa, is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to modify the project so as to provide protection by diversion of floodwaters in accordance with revised plans now on file in his office, at an estimated Federal cost of $460,000.

SEBEWAING RIVER

The project for local flood protection on the Sebewaing River in the vicinity of Sebewaing, Mich., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 286, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $250,000.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $7,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Missouri River Basin, including the project for the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River, Nebr., recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 842, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and such other supplemental flood-control works on the Republican River as the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may find advisable.

The comprehensive plan for the improvement of Cherry Creek and tributaries, Colorado, for flood control and other purposes in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 426, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $3,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The project for local flood protection on the Platte River in the vicinity of Schuyler, Nebr., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 250, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $63,000.

The project for local flood protection on the Missouri River and Indian Creek at Council Bluffs, Iowa, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 577, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $18,000.

The project for the improvement of Fall River and tributaries, South Dakota, for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 655, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $1,050,000.

The project for flood protection in the vicinity of Sioux City, Iowa, and along both banks of the Missouri River between Sioux City and Kansas City for flood control in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 821, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved and there is hereby authorized $1,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment thereof.

The project adopted by the act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection of the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., is hereby modified to include cut-offs in the vicinity of Liberty Bend substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 722, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500,000 for the prosecution of the projects approved in the acts of June 22, 1936, and June 28, 1938, for flood control in the Santa Ana River Basin and for the protection of Orange County in California.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN AND BALLONA CREEK

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the basins of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek as set forth in House Document No. 838, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, is approved, and in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized $25,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of that plan.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

The projects for the control of floods and other purposes in the Sacramento River, Calif. adopted by the acts approved March 1, 1917, May 15, 1928, and August 26, 1937, are hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 205, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $10,500,000, and also modified to provide for channel clearing, rectification, snagging, and bank protection on the Sacramento River and tributaries in Tehama County, and from Red Bluff southerly, at an additional estimated cost of $150,000.

The project for the Fresno County stream group for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 845, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $510,000.

UMPQUA RIVER BASIN

The project for improvement of the Umpqua River in Oregon for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 684, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $176,000.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $11,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the act of June 28, 1938, for the Willamette River Basin in Oregon.

The project for improvement of the Pudding River in Oregon for flood control is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 185, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $62,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection on the Touchet River at Dayton, Wash., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 662, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $146,000.

The project for levees, channel enlargement, and channel rectification on Walla Walla River in the vicinity of Milton and Freewater, Oreg., is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 719, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and the project for the protection of the city of Walla Walla, Wash., authorized by the act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 719, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $754,000.

The project for levees on the Cowlitz River, Washington, for local flood protection at Castle Rock, Washington, is hereby authorized to be constructed substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 721, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, at an estimated cost of $31,000.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, including floods aggravated by or due to tidal effect at the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of such localities; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as hereby authorized on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law or by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Commerce of the Senate: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Byram River and tributaries, Connecticut.

Blind Brook and tributaries, New York.

Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers and their tributaries, New York.

Bronx River and tributaries, New York.

Hutchinson River and tributaries, New York.

Saw Mill River and tributaries, New York.

Garden Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Indian River, Upper St. Johns River and Marsh, and North Fork, St. Lucie River, and their tributaries, Florida.

Rio Grande and tributaries, New Mexico.

Mimbres River and tributaries, New Mexico.

Pearl River, Miss.

Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, from the Orleans-Jefferson Parish line westward and northward to the vicinity of Frenier.

Black River, Catahoula and Concordia Parishes, La.

Dogy and Clear Creeks, tributaries of the Arkansas River, Oklahoma.

Salt Creek of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Osage County, Oklahoma.

Red River of the North Drainage Basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Inlets and outlets to Lake Hendricks, South Dakota and Minnesota.

North Fork and South Fork of the Shoshone River and their tributaries, Wyoming.

Emery River and tributaries, Tennessee.

Redstone Creek and tributaries, Pennsylvania.

West Fork River and tributaries, West Virginia, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a system of multiple-use reservoirs.

Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin.

Little Black River and tributaries, Michigan.

Sturgeon and Otter Rivers, and their tributaries, Michigan.

Cuyahoga River and tributaries, Ohio.

Pig Sur River and Carmel River, and their tributaries, Monterey County, Calif.

Laguna Canyon, Calif.

All streams in San Diego County, California, flowing into the Pacific Ocean.

Coyote River and tributaries, California.

San Francisquito Creek, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, California.

Alhambra Creek and tributaries, California.

Matadero Creek, Santa Clara County, California.

Petaluma Creek and tributaries, Sonoma County, California.

Guadalupe River and tributaries, California.

Silvies River and tributaries, Oregon.

Columbia River and tributaries, Washington, from the downstream point of Vancouver Lake to upstream point of Bachelor Island.

Salmon Creek, in the vicinity of Juneau, Alaska.

Yaguez, Estero, Portuguez, Bucana, Lapa, Guamani, Chico, Maunabo, Quebrada Arena, and Susua Rivers, and tributaries, Puerto Rico.

Creque Gut and Fair Plain Gut and their tributaries, Island of Saint Croix, and of Turpentine Run, and Crown Mountain water courses and their tributaries, Island of Saint Thomas, V. I.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $1,000,000 for any one fiscal year to be expended in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood.

SEC. 6. That the provisions of the following acts of Congress relating to river and harbor improvements are hereby made applicable to works of flood control heretofore or hereafter authorized: August 8, 1917, section 9 (40 Stat. 267); July 18, 1918, sections 5 and 6 (40 Stat. 911); and August 30, 1935, section 7 (49 Stat. 1048).

SEC. 7. Section 5 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), is amended by striking out the words "in carrying out the purposes of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in carrying out the purposes of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), as amended and supplemented"; and by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "The provisions of this section shall be applicable to any funds heretofore appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement for measures of run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention upon watersheds."

SEC. 8. That the sum of $260,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the improvements herein, the sum of $10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of War and Agriculture for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act and any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by said Departments, and the additional sum of $5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture in carrying on works of improvement of the character specified in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. All appropriations necessary for operation and maintenance of flood-control works authorized by law to be operated and maintained by the United States are hereby authorized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that amendments to any section of the bill may be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 27, in line 12, strike out the word "creek" and insert the words "and Dunlap Creeks."

On page 27, between lines 16 and 17, insert "Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana."

On page 27, after line 25, insert a new line as follows: "All streams in San Diego and Imperial Counties, Calif., flowing into the Salton Sea."

On page 28, between lines 5 and 6, insert "Novato Creek and its tributaries, Marin County, Calif."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this contains three preliminary surveys according to a bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], which the Chief of Engineers approves. This includes all of the surveys which have been requested of the committee and this is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 21, strike out all of lines 23 and 24 and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 22.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, all of you were here when I discussed this amendment a moment ago. Since that time the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] has discussed the flood situation there. It so happens that my district joins Kansas City on the north. It is true that there was a flood there 37 or 38 years ago, but since that time there have been worse floods on the upper Missouri than there have been at Kansas City.

The area to which I refer in this amendment lies more than 20 miles east of Kansas City. I understand the only reason for including it in the project with respect to the Kansas Citys is that it will cheapen the work. If this project is carried out, it will be necessary to remove a bridge across the Missouri River. There will have to be another built.

The channel will be moved approximately 3 miles, and the Missouri River bridge now across that river is in the middle of the top of this bend. It will have to be taken out and removed to the new channel. It is estimated by the engineer of the town of Liberty that it will cost them $100,000 to change their water system and their sewage system if this project is carried out. I have no objection in the world to it if they will compensate the people of that community for the damage they do to them.

It has been my experience when the War Department starts carrying out these projects, they do not pay any attention to the people along the banks. They do not compensate the people for the actual damage. They carry out the project in accordance with the act of Congress. So, if they move the river, there will be a dispute as to whether or not the town is damaged.

A study is being made by the War Department, and I did not assume, in view of the correspondence between myself and General Schley, dated May 29, which I read to you a moment ago, that this project would be included. It is under study again, in accordance with Senator Truman's resolution adopted on April 29. As I said, in view of that fact, I did not assume it would be included in the bill. I am asking that it be taken out until that study has been completed. They may come back here with some other type of recommendation which will relieve that community of this burden.

There is another situation a little farther to the west that is causing considerable dispute in respect to this particular project. I believe it is known as the Blue Valley project.

The Blue River runs into the Missouri River there and the flood problems are of considerable importance. They are asking for an investigation of that. It all enters into this one project, and I doubt very much that this Congress is going to appropriate any great sums of money at this session of Congress, in view of the enormous demands for money from other sources.

When you see the tax bill that comes in to you next week you will be a little more careful about your votes on appropriations than you have been in the past, and I doubt that you will vote on any projects that are absolutely not essential when you see the provisions of that tax bill and how it hits the people of this country.

I am simply asking in fairness to the people of this community, 20 miles away from Kansas City, that it be left out until the War Department has completed its further study to see what can be done for the protection of people who are away from Kansas City. We sympathize with them. As I say, I represent the district adjoining Kansas City, and part of my district suffers some of this flood. But I do not believe the people down there ought to pay the difference, and I understand it is a considerable amount, in the cost of taking care of the flood-control situation in Kansas City without this project being included. It can be done.

It is simply a little bit easier and maybe a little cheaper if this cut-off is made. It is fair by the people who know the Missouri River, and we who live on it do know it. It is one of the worst rivers in the country. It cuts and slices and takes away farms overnight. The streams that are running into it and come into this bank will be filled up as the old channel from which the river is taken fills up. It will grow up with willows, and every time the river comes up there will be a foot or two of silt put in there. Then these streams that are running into it will begin to spread out over the land through which they are now running. Certainly the War Department is not going to take care of those farmers who suffer flood damage after the channel has been put in. There is no way of getting them to do it. So I am just asking for plain, ordinary justice for these people in this small community.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Flood Control would not want to do any area any injustice. This item was included in the bill, first, because it was favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers. It was included in the bill, secondly, because it was advocated by the municipal officials of the city of Kansas City, Mo., and other citizens representing the public, and thirdly, because there was no real opposition before the committee.

In an effort to be as fair as it could be, the committee after this item had been included understood that some thought that there might be some danger to Blue Valley, to Liberty Bend, to the sanitary sewage, and to wells. The Chief of Engineers and his staff were recalled before the committee and his representative stated that this project would really be of benefit to the Blue Valley, substantially that, and that it would not injure the sanitary system in the vicinity of Liberty in any way.

I can appreciate how the gentleman feels. This is an amendment, not a new law. It is an amendment of existing law. One of the first projects authorized by Congress was at Kansas City, Mo. That project was authorized on June 22, 1936. The Chief of Engineers, because of the difficulty in obtaining rights-of-way, found that they could go down below the city of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., and construct this cut-off down there and save the Government, on this one project alone, $100,000, and the Government would pay for the construction of the bridge.

I would say in deference to the gentleman from Missouri that no material opposition was uttered before our committee with respect to this project. I would also say, in view of his statement, which I understand to be absolutely correct, that a Member of the Senate has asked the Committee on Commerce to pass a resolution, and the resolution has been passed, and that in all fairness, although this project is recommended by the Chief of Engineers, it is an amendment of existing law.

I believe the gentleman can rest well assured that the project will not be constructed until the Chief of Engineers has complied with the resolution of the Committee on Commerce, which has been authorized and passed. If that committee is convinced that there is any injustice to the local water supply or the sanitary system or the land in that bend down there, the project will not be constructed, and there will be an opportunity to amend it later on.

I would say that in view of the fact that the local people out there, not at Liberty Bend but in Kansas City, came here before the committee and said it was necessary to protect airfields and national-defense projects, and since this statement was supplemented by the statement of the Chief of Engineers that this project is worthy and will save the Government at least $100,000, as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, the gentleman's amendment should be voted down. If it should appear when this bill goes to the Senate that this provision should be eliminated on further study, that body will have the privilege of so doing.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DUNCAN. Was the information from the War Department before them, this letter of May 29?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not know anything about a letter of May 29 before today. The Chief of Engineers advised us that he was making a study, just as he stated in the letter of said date he wrote the gentleman, of the Missouri Basin, including the Blue Valley and including this area around Liberty, and that report would be submitted to the Congress just as soon as it could be completed. In view of that statement and that this is an authorization, and, as the gentleman stated, because we are engaged in a national-defense program, we are not making an immediate appropriation and there will be ample time before the Congress is called upon to make the appropriation for Congress to consider a modification of this project if it develops that it will do any injustice.

Mr. DUNCAN. It is already in the bill now. It is an authorization. If the appropriation is made, it will still be in it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Certainly. I repeat, this is an authorization bill. The appropriation has to be made. But I maintain that inasmuch as there was no real opposition before the Committee on Flood Control the provision should not be changed now.

Mr. DUNCAN. May I, in fairness, ask the gentleman this question: In view of the letter from General Schley on May 29 stating that the matter was under study and that further investigation was being made, did not the people interested have the right to assume that it would not be included until the War Department had completed that study?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall answer the gentleman by saying that the hearings before the Committee on Flood Control had been completed and the committee had agreed to report the bill. The hearings were being printed. That letter is nothing more nor less than the information we had.

I trust the gentleman's amendment will not be agreed to. If it is desired to eliminate that provision, it can be eliminated in another body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4911) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 234, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 244), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4972, a bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil

Service, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, in connection with an extension of my remarks made in the discussion of the flood-control bill, short excerpts from the bill and the committee report, and also to include a statement which I made before the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the flood-control bill and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the flood-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARITIME LABOR BOARD

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4107, to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) Line 5, strike out "five" and insert "four."

(2) After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 1004 of such act is amended by striking out the words "the Board to encourage' in the opening lines of said section."

(3) After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 3. Sections 1006, 1008, and 1009, and the last sentence of section 1010 of such act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however,* That the Maritime Labor Board may continue to act as mediator in any disputes wherein its mediation services have been requested and the mediation of which the Board has actively undertaken prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. No one can have any idea what those amendments mean—to strike and insert certain things that are not before the House. It will take time for anyone to get the law and superimpose the amendments upon the law. I have repeatedly called attention to this reckless, nonsensical, asinine method of procedure, and unless the gentleman can explain the matter very fully in a very few words, I shall object.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the amendment substantially does this. It continues the life of the Maritime Labor Board for 1 year instead of 2. The life of that Board terminates on Monday next. The language that is stricken out "the Board to encourage" in section 1004, leaves it so as to read that it shall be the duty of the maritime employers, their officers, agents, and their employees, and the duly appointed representatives of their employees to exert their reasonable effort, and so forth, and continues the same duties that were existent in the original law, except that it strikes out the words that it is the duty of the Board to encourage. The other amendment in striking out the section tacitly terminates the work of the Board except in collecting its data, and in submitting that to Congress, and in terminating such mediations as the Board has already undertaken.

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the judge or the Administrator who is supposed to pass on or interpret the law to which the gentleman refers will not have the advantage of having the distinguished and able gentleman from Virginia at his arm, to tell him what the law means. And may I hope that the next time the gentleman brings a bill before the House, he will bring in a bill that one of ordinary intelligence can tell what it means by reading it. With that I withdraw the reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Newport News Daily Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLMENT OF A BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill H. R. 4973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] had 35 minutes to address the House today. He does not desire to use that time, but asks unanimous consent that the time be transferred until Monday under like conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBMARINE "O-9"

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to report another very sad accident that occurred in the Navy today. The submarine *O–9*, a wartime boat, built 23 years ago, after being reconditioned at the Portsmouth (N. H.) Navy Yard, went on a trial test today and at 9:36 a. m., submerged offshore in 375 feet of water and has not, up to this time, returned to the surface.

The *O–9* carries a crew of 34 officers and men. Plans are already under way by the Navy Department to carry on the rescue work. Practically all the equipment used in the rescue of the men on the *Squalus* and in the salvaging of that submarine is now on the scene, most of it having been kept in Portsmouth and Boston since that sad accident occurred about 2 years ago. The naval divers at the time of the *Squalus* incident carried on the greatest rescue act in maritime history, in 240 feet of water. Naval divers left Washington at noon today by plane and are now at Portsmouth.

The location of the submarine *O–9* at this moment is not yet determined. The naval authorities assume that 375 feet of water covers the boat. Everything is being done to bring about proper equipment and the carrying on of the rescue work which will be so necessary if the submarine is located.

I wanted to say that at the time the *Squalus* went down in 240 feet of water, 59 men were on board, of which 33 were alive, the other 26 having died in the flooded compartments. All of the men who were alive were rescued through the diving bell. I want the Members to feel sure the Navy Department is going to exercise every bit of human ingenuity to bring about the rescue of the men on the *O–9* as they did during the sinking of the *Squalus*. We have the greatest confidence in the organization—officers and men who make up the personnel—and you may all feel sure that the Navy Department will leave nothing undone to save the lives of the men who are on that submarine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Major R. Lee;

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Roche, Connell & Laub Construction Co.;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie;

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y. Upham;

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds;

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

674. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Stillaguamish River, Wash., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted June 6, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted May 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 286), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committes were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 241. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a temporary assistant reading clerk of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5052. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4693. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 243. Resolution providing consideration of S. 1524, a bill authorizing deferment of men by age group or groups under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 244. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4972, a bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 5110. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5111. A bill authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5112. A bill to authorize the commissioning in the Regular Army of Reserve officers who are married; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5113. A bill to appropriate funds for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building and the installation of an adequate lighting system therein on San Jacinto Battlefield near Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5114. A bill to prohibit subversive individuals from representing employees for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5115. A bill to provide for the inspection and certification of plants and plant products offered for export to meet sanitary requirements of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 5116. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5117. A bill to promote safety in the development of air commerce by regulating the lighting of airports and other landing areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. TENEROWICZ:

H. R. 5118. A bill making eligible for citizenship any alien heretofore admitted to the United States for permanent residence under special act of Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 5119. A bill to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PADDOCK:

H. R. 5120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of the remaining portion of the Grosse Point Lighthouse Reservation by deed to the city of Evanston, Ill.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 5121. A bill to extend the franking privilege of the United States mails to individuals serving in the land and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 5122. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, between the Boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 5126. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oklahoma of certain lands in full satisfaction of the claim against the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution commending the work of the San Jacinto Museum of History Association and authorizing an appropriation for the completion of San Jacinto Monument Building on San Jacinto Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution creating a Committee to Investigate the Feasibility of Transferring Certain Bureaus and Agencies of the Government from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 245. Resolution suggesting the need for developing a plan for furnishing food and supplies to the stricken and hungry peoples of Belgium and other countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution relative to raising of additional revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5123. A bill granting a pension to John William Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 5124. A bill for the relief of John R. Agurkis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pansy Thomas; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1480. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of sundry residents of Galt, Sacramento County; Acampo, San Joaquin County; St. Helena, Napa County; and Sanitarium, Napa County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, bills to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1481. By Mr. HART: Memorial of 21 residents of the State of New Jersey, protesting against enactment of House bill 3852, known as the District of Columbia Barbers' Opening and Closing Hours Act of 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1482. Also, petition of the Department of New Jersey, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, endorsing the proclamation by the President, that an unlimited national emergency confronts this country, and making suggestions for the national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1483. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Limer Post, No. 25, of the North Carolina Department of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled at Warrenton, N. C., on June 5, 1941, relative to strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of John Nix & Co., New York City, favoring passage of House bill 4760; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1485. Also, petition of the United Marine Division, Local 333, International Longshoremen's Association, New York City, urging passage of the longevity bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1486. Also, petition of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, New York City, favoring a resolution to supply food for small democracies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1487. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Federation of Belgian Societies of North America, adopted at the convention at Rock Island, Ill., with reference to foreign policy and national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1488. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the proposals of the Treasury Department now pending before Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1489. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Motor Car Dealers Association of San Francisco, Inc., recommending that the excise tax on new automobiles be increased up to, but not to exceed, 7 percent of the manufacturer's wholesale price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1490. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1491. Also, petition of residents of Boston, protesting against the enactment of House bill 3852; to the Committee on Labor.

1492. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the Hairpin and Cosmetic Workers' Union, No. 22180, Shelbyville, Ill., expressing their approval of the Illinois State Planning Commission project No. 33, to construct a dam for the purpose of flood control in the Kaskaskia River Basin; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1493. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exceptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1494. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, Alabama, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1495. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 9, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3849, relative to the regulation of private forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1496. Also, petition of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the fullest possible moral and health protection for our soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1497. Also, petition of the National Association for the Calling of a United States Constitutional Convention, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to delays and stoppages of work in industries; to the Committee on Labor.

1498. Also, petition of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to safety from criminals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Loving Father, tender Shepherd of the souls of men, who slumberest not nor sleepest, who art often nearest when we feel Thou has forsaken us: At this solemn moment, as we lift up our hearts, so heavy with the burdens of today, yet knowing not what the morrow may bring forth, we beseech Thee to remove the clouds that veil our sight, that we may discern some gleams of purpose working behind this tangled human world, to the quieting of the strange and throbbing yearnings of our souls.

Again the silent messenger has come and has taken from us one we felt could not be spared at this fateful hour of our country's destiny; and yet Thou knowest best. We thank Thee for his great and noble soul, the fineness of his character, the loyalty and devotion to his every duty, the tenderness of his affection, and the transfiguring quality of chivalry which graced his high and holy sense of manhood.

Do Thou comfort now and through the days that lie ahead the beloved companion of his life, the children who rise up to call him blessed, and all others who are near and dear.

And as we stand here in this National Shrine, where he hath wrought so nobly, may some portion of his spirit fall upon us, for we know that his life has not set in a night of pain and gloom, but amid the splendors of Thine everlasting day. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Him who hath brought life and immortality to light, Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. HARE, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KEEFE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3537. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4911. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FOR REFERENCE OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn until Thursday next; that during the period of the adjournment bills coming over from the House of Representatives may be referred to the appropriate committees; that the committees

have permission to file reports; and that the Vice President be authorized to sign any enrolled bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF SENATOR PAT HARRISON

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it becomes my very sad and painful duty to announce to the Senate the death of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi, Hon. PAT HARRISON. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 131) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator, and that the Vice President be, and he is hereby, designated as a member of the committee.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently, under the second resolving clause, appointed the following Senators to constitute, together with the Vice President, the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator and President pro tempore of the Senate:

Mr. BILBO, Mr. BONE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUNKER, Mr. BYRNES, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HERRING, Mr. HILL, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. WILEY.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our deceased colleague, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, speak to us in the silence of these moments; open Thy heart in loving response to those who seek Thee. Time and space are nothing; Thou alone art life; so we believe, we aspire, and we pray. We need Thee for our weakness and weariness, for our pains and perils, for our tempests and our tears. Grant that we may ever strive earnestly to do Thy will as revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord.

For the strong, noble men and women of vision who have observed the laws which Thou hast ordained, we give Thee thanks. Thou hast proved them and found them worthy of the calling wherewith they are called. Blessed Lord, a statesman of soldierly courage, our friend and brother, has left us. His pathway was ever weaponed by a sense of right and sweetened by the spirit of genuineness, surpassing the fictions of life, he labored on until the eveningtime. Companioned by the Lord of Heaven, having laid the earth away, he walks forever tearless and deathless with those who rest on the enchanting shores of eternity. The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God; they are in peace.

Oh, be Thou where the willows wave, hiding the gloom through the glorious eclipse whose shadow tells of the light. With that love which encircles all, give comfort and rest to the sorrowing ones. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 20, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the coming of Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg to the American Colonies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases; and

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 768) entitled "An act for the relief of William E. Thomas," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4270) entitled "An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4590) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes";

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 6, 19, 103, 119, 130, 144, and 147 to said bill; and

That the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 152 and 153 to said bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on June 20, 1941, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on June 20 he, on that date, signed the foregoing bill.

EMERGENCY RELIEF, 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 193, to provide for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, with amendments of the Senate, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

REGINA ELIZABETH THOMPSON

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 246):

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Regina Elizabeth Thompson, widow of Philip Gannett Thompson, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Philip Gannett Thompson.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Territories may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LANHAM presented a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, for printing, under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GREEN, for a few days, on account of the illness of his mother.

To Mr. BLOOM, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4107. An act to extend certain provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did, on the following dates, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On June 20, 1941:

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

On June 23, 1941:

H. R. 4107. An act to extend for 2 years the provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 131):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi and President pro tempore of the Senate.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator, and that the Vice President be, and he is hereby, designated as a member of the committee.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

THE LATE SENATOR BYRON PATTON HARRISON

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of one of America's most valiant public servants and one of Mississippi's most illustrious sons, Senator BYRON PATTON HARRISON, chairman of the Finance Committee and President pro tempore of the United States Senate, who passed away on yesterday.

Senator HARRISON was born in Crystal Springs, Miss., on August 29, 1881. He was educated in the public schools at Crystal Springs and in the Louisiana State University. In 1905 he was married to Miss Edwina McInnis, of Leakesville, Miss., and three children were born to them, a son and two daughters.

He served as district attorney of his district for 6 years, resigning in 1910 to become a Member of the Sixty-second Congress. He served in this body with distinction for four terms. In 1918 he was elected to the United States Senate, to which position he was reelected in 1924, in 1930, and in 1936.

A prince once said of a king struck down
"Taller he seems in death,"
And the word holds good, for now, as then,
It is after death that we measure men.

PAT HARRISON will grow in stature as the years pass by and the American people come to realize the great value of his services to his country.

His death is an irreparable loss to the Nation, especially at this time, and one of the greatest blows the people of Mississippi have ever sustained. Able, affable, and efficient, he was imbued with a supreme consciousness of duty to his country, and always placed that duty first in considering public affairs.

He was one of the most popular men who ever served in either House of Congress and one of the most pleasant Members of the United States Senate with whom any State delegation in this House ever had to deal.

To me his death is a keen personal loss, one that words are simply inadequate to express. All I can say is—

Farewell, dear friend, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the death of PAT HARRISON the Nation has lost one of her outstanding political leaders and statesmen; Mississippi has lost her most gifted public servant, and I have lost a very dear personal friend.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the Senate, SENATOR HARRISON played a valiant part in the first World War. He was chairman of the Committee on Finance in the Senate and he was the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in that body. He has taken a conspicuous part in the passage of all legislation in the present emergency and the second World War.

PAT HARRISON was an unusual boy who became an unusual man. As a lad selling daily newspapers on the streets of the town in which he lived, he attracted the favorable attention of the leading citizens of the community. He possessed a marvelous personality. Friendly and affable as a boy he grew up to be magnetic as a man. He sprang from humble but honorable parentage; he made his own way as a youth and he made his own way as a public servant. He worked his way through the public school and through the university; he early learned that the best way to have friends was to be a friend. From a humble home he became one of the conspicuous public figures in the era in which he lived.

PAT HARRISON loved the common people; he was loyal to every friend and faithful to every trust; he loved people; he delighted to mix and mingle with his fellow man. He was the best liked and most popular statesman in the State which he delighted to honor and serve.

He possessed a generous nature; he always sympathized with the downtrodden and with the oppressed. He believed in justice to all men whether of high or of low degree. He counted his friends in all walks of life; their name was legion.

PAT HARRISON loved his home; he was devoted to his family. He was never so happy as when around his own fireside. His noble son, who bears his name, and his gifted daughters were his pride and his joy. He had great confidence in the judgment of his beloved wife.

He was a leader. He possessed unusual qualities that fitted him for leadership. He knew human nature; he knew how to give and take; he was able in debate and wise in counsel.

PAT HARRISON was a patriot; he loved his country; he believed in party government. He was a great Democrat but when the good name of the United States abroad was at stake, when the institutions of the Republic were involved, when the foreign relations of the United States were at stake, he put his country above his party. He stood for America first.

He literally grew up in the public service. Shortly after his admission to the bar he was elected district attorney of the judicial district in which he resided. His reputation as a prosecuting attorney attracted the attention of the State. He was elected to the House of Representatives before he turned the age of 30. Although serving but three terms, he became a member of the powerful Rules Committee during the first World War. He went to the Senate from the House. He grew in political wisdom and in political stature. For 30 years he left his impress upon the legislation of the United States. He became one of the elder statesmen of the Republic. No man was more influential in the Senate of the United States than he. He was unanimously elected President pro tempore of that body. Presidents, Cabinet members, and Senators sought his advice. He possessed an unerring political judgment. He was trained in the arts and science of government; he was one of the most efficient legislators of his day.

Senator HARRISON lived the good life of his time. He enjoyed the friendship of men in all walks of life. He numbered among his personal friends men in every State of the Union. No man of his day had a wider acquaintance in political circles. He never lost a friend; he was always dependable; his political word was his political bond.

Senator HARRISON was not only well trained for a political career, but he possessed an attribute essential to the success of all statesmen. Gentle and affable, on occasion he could be firm. He

possessed political courage to an unusual degree.

He was not perfect; he was human, but he lived the full life of his time. He was stricken at the very zenith of his career and at the full maturity of his powers. At a time of national and international crises in the greatest emergency in the history of the Republic, Senator PAT HARRISON has been gathered unto his fathers. The country can ill afford to lose men of his ability and influence.

A mighty man in the land has fallen.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Mississippi's distinguished Senator—PAT HARRISON—the entire Nation has suffered an irreparable loss, and our hearts are sad and heavily laden with grief.

Senator HARRISON, although a native Mississippian, belongs in part to each of the 48 States of these great United States.

He was a stalwart national figure. His life's work and outstanding statesmanship in behalf of this Nation as a whole truly earned for him a place in the hearts and history of our people as an outstanding American statesman.

Men like Senator HARRISON have made this country great, and his efforts will help preserve the cause of democracy.

PAT HARRISON possessed all the qualities that make a great and noble character.

He came up the hard way and pressed on to scale the heights. He knew and loved his fellow man and appreciated always the other fellow's position, whether he was high or low, rich or poor, friend or foe.

Senator HARRISON could give and take, forgive and forget, and be as magnanimous as it was humanly possible to be. He was kind, gentle, affable, frank, keen, brilliant, and courageous.

When engaged in debate or in a campaign he asked no quarter nor did he give any. When the smoke of battle cleared away, he emerged big in heart, noble in purpose, steadfast in principle, honored and respected by all.

He was happiest when he was helping others. In fact, his unselfish and untiring service for others no doubt shortened his life.

On the pages of time and the history of the country and State he loved and served so well he has left an imperishable monument of constructive service in all branches of our Government.

Senator HARRISON is more than worthy of all the many honors that have been bestowed upon him, and at some more appropriate time I shall have more to say concerning the life and character of this devoted husband and father, this true friend, this distinguished Mississippian, this great American—PATTON BYRON HARRISON.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in the life of individuals when words alone cannot express one's intense loss. I feel that occasion today.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great Mississippian and an outstanding American. The tall, stately pine from Mississippi has fallen. The man who was victorious in so many legislative and political engagements has bowed to the inevitable victor—death. The genial, capable, and illustrious PAT HARRISON is dead, but his memory, his achievements, and the impression that he made upon the country will be remembered throughout the years to come. I mourn with you, his colleagues, his family, his fellow Mississippians, and the country, who can ill afford to lose a man of his character at this time.

PAT HARRISON came to Congress from the district which I have the honor to represent when he was scarcely more than a boy, and for 30 eventful years he has been a power in the political and legislative arena of the land. Who can estimate with any degree of accuracy the influence which he wielded and the manner in which he has colored the stream of American civilization? Few men in a country filled with opportunities have accomplished more in the brief but crowded span of 59 years. From a newspaper boy on the streets of a little Mississippi town he rose to the pinnacle of legislative and political achievement. No Mississippian ever received more popular acclaim at the hands of his fellow citizens than did this splendid son. Surely the recorders of the deeds of men will place him among the country's truly great. Mississippians will ever hereafter accord him a place in its hall of fame and rank him along with her Jefferson Davis, her L. Q. C. Lamar, and her other immortal and illustrious sons.

PAT HARRISON, the idol of Mississippians, was beloved and appreciated throughout the country. Never refused political preference at the hands of his fellow Mississippians, who can gainsay that had he lived in another section of the country he would have become the President of the United States.

Nature is a great equalizer of persons. She does not bestow upon any one man all of her virtues. But that she was generous in her attitude toward this great Mississippian is recognized by all. PAT HARRISON was a good man. There was nothing small in his make-up. He was generous to a fault. He was devoted to his friends and considerate of his few political enemies. Unselfishness was one of his outstanding attributes. If each recipient of a good deed at the hands of this good man were but to write a word in his book of memory, it would require volumes to record them.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been intimately associated with this humble but great man for the past quarter of a century, I join with you, his colleagues in the Congress, and the country, in mourning his passing. A giant of the forest of humanity has fallen. May the great God of us all be merciful and generous of any shortcomings of which he might have been guilty, even as he in his own big, broad-minded way was prone to forgiveness of uncharitable acts at the hands of his fellow man.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with a sad and heavy heart because of the loss of one of the best friends I ever had anywhere. When I came to Congress a few years ago I looked up Senator HARRISON for advice and guidance. I mourn and share the sorrow that his family and friends everywhere feel today. Mississippi and the entire Nation has lost an outstanding statesman and one that will be hard to replace.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE].

Mr. MCGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here at this hour paying tribute to one of Mississippi's grandest and noblest sons, whom the Omnipotent One has seen fit to take from this world of life's activities, which was one of duty, pleasure, sorrow, and care, before what apparently should have been his allotted span of years.

To those of us who were privileged moments and hours of association, companionship, and service with him, because of his untimely death are beginning the more to realize that we know not when our life's pathway shall end.

Senator HARRISON died in the front line of battle; a position in the conflict of life that he has occupied since early manhood, beginning at, you may say, the tender age of some 25 years. At this period offering his whole future and life in the fight and struggle in the army of public service and continuing in the front rank until his untimely passing on yesterday.

When one's life is given in service to the many, it is fitting and proper that we should pause in our arduous labors to pay our respects and affection to them. Not that Senator HARRISON needs our praise, because his exemplary life and the deeds done are embedded in the hearts of the people nationally and are an inspiration to the youth that is coming on. What we may say will be of short memory, but his leadership and unselfish service to his country and humanity will live on forever.

Born under humble circumstances, yet, triumphant over every adversity. Realizing this, he worked faithfully and tirelessly to keep open wide the door for an equal opportunity to all men, to make it possible for a better and more abundant life, nationally, to maintain our national honor, to perpetuate our liberty and free institutions that our forefathers made such sacrifices for. Yet, realizing the change of times, he fought for progressive human betterment.

The beginning of life and its ending is one of mystery. Yet, death is no more mysterious than birth. Life during its existence must bow to the will of the Higher Being, which renders us helpless.

Conscious of all this but yet controlled by life's destiny, we still pause and wonder why, especially at present, he was not permitted to remain with us for a short period longer, to continue a rendition of his service in the guidance of this great Nation of ours under the present world-wide chaotic conditions.

We may erect statues of bronze, glittering with letters of gold portraying his

wonderful life and service, but time will efface them, but his works and deeds in behalf of his Nation and humanity will live on in the hearts of the generations to come.

PAT, we will miss you, that pleasant companionship, that statesmanship advice, yet, above all that magnetic power and influence that our great God endowed you with, more so thar all others of your attributes. But you have gone to be at home with your Maker, at peace and rest, severed from this world of care, suffering, and toil, to be with and associated with our Redeemer throughout eternity.

Those of us who knew you intimately, as it has been said:

Statesman, yet a friend of truth. Of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private ends.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, our friend, Senator PAT HARRISON, was my State's outstanding citizen and one of the country's real statesmen. Throughout his 30 years of service in the Congress he has consistently struggled for the uplift of the people, fair treatment for all citizens better standards of living, enlarged educational advantages, and the fulfillment of democratic ideals.

A consistent party man, but always a fair one; a fighter, but an honorable one, his life has been fruitful, his thinking clear, his purposes noble, his affections enduring. His love for his family was one of the strongest traits of his character. He was a firm believer in the God of his fathers.

If the young men of today will chart their lives along the course he set, America will continue to grow better and greater.

I extend to his widow, Mrs. Harrison, the known affectionate sympathy of the House of Representatives as she travels the lonesome trail. Her grief and that of her children will be great, but there is consolation in the knowledge that their beloved one was one of our country's immortals.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Ways and Means Committee this morning a motion was unanimously adopted that the committee adjourn for 3 days, until Friday morning next, out of respect to the memory of the late Senator HARRISON.

Senator HARRISON and I came to the House simultaneously at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress. Our relationship has always been of the most cordial nature, and out of it grew a most intimate friendship. Since I have been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, especially since I have been its chairman, my official duties and those of Senator HARRISON have run parallel to a very great extent.

For the past 10 years we have served together as conferees on many important bills in adjusting differences as between the House and Senate, and also as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which he and I alternated as its chairman for the past several years, and of which he was chairman at the time of his death.

In our various services together I was deeply impressed by his extraordinary abilities, his complete mastery of the subjects under consideration, his fidelity to duty at all times, as well as his uniform courtesy to all of those with whom he was associated.

I have never known a man in public life whose concepts of duty were higher than those of Senator HARRISON. You all know his ability as a great statesman, as a great legislator, but I may say that in his personal relations he was always extremely courteous, he was always considerate, and to me his friendship was one of the most precious things connected with my entire public career.

Many members of our committee this morning expressed a deep regret and feeling of keen personal loss in his death, and I know I express the feeling of each member of our committee when I say we feel that not only has the Congress lost a most valuable Member, but the country a most useful and outstanding statesman.

I hereby express to each member of his family—his widow and children—my deepest, most sincere, and profound sympathy in their great sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the dean of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the State of Mississippi has given to the country a great many outstanding and able men. Of all those with whom I have had the honor and privilege of serving in 34 long years, I have never known of anyone who excelled PAT HARRISON in fulfilling his duty to his State and Nation.

I have known Pat from the day he was sworn in. He and many other Members lived only two blocks from here at the Congress Hall Hotel. It was my good fortune to become really well acquainted with him. His main aim when he entered the House was to find how he could best serve his constituency and his country.

Whatever has been said about his attainments and activities does not really portray all his accomplishments. He was a broad and liberal-minded gentleman, always trying to aid the oppressed, the downtrodden, and the persecuted. In his passing the State of Mississippi and the Nation have lost a great patriot, an outstanding statesman, and a great American. I wish all of us could follow in his footsteps to emulate his aims in the interest of our Nation.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it always seems to me that at a time like this words offer very little expression. I came to the Congress the term after Senator HARRISON, and he was one of the first men I met when I came here. My connection with him from that day to this has been of intimate friendship. Not only did I serve with him in the House during the remainder of the period he was a Member here before going to the Senate but for many years it has been my fortune to be one of the conferees from the House Committee on Ways and Means meeting with the members of the Senate Committee on Finance in the final preparation of bills to be submitted to Congress. During all that time and in every one of those meetings Senator HARRISON has been the extreme example of courtesy to his fellow man. We have sat in the hot summer days, when it was a tedious task we were called upon to perform, but never did Senator HARRISON fail not only to do his duty to the committee but to exercise his privilege toward his fellow conferees.

Not only have I served officially with the Senator, but it has also been my pleasure to know him socially. This may not be a time to refer to sports, but it has been my privilege to play many a game of golf with the departed Senator. He was always the same genial friend and companion.

The Members from Mississippi have referred to the State of Mississippi losing its most distinguished citizen. I feel that the country has lost one of its outstanding men, a man whose name will go down in history as a great statesman in a period when great men were needed in carrying on government.

I join with the Mississippians, with the Members of the House and Senate, and with the people of this country in expressing my extreme sorrow at the passing of such a distinguished Senator and such a distinguished statesman as our lamented PAT HARRISON.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I knew Senator PAT HARRISON for a period of nearly 23 years. He was elected to the Senate the same year I became a Member of the House. During all that time I have had very clear evidence of his marked ability and his gradual rise to the rank of statesman. He possessed one particular characteristic that is essential for a man in public life—courage.

In this congressional life we have a casual floor acquaintance, we have a dining-room acquaintance, or we have a social acquaintance by meeting our colleagues at the festive board on various occasions; but where you really learn to know men in this House, where you really learn to love and respect them, where, incidentally, you find out why they came to Congress and recognize their real ability is during the long, grinding, exacting sessions of committees while you serve as conferees. During the many occasions on which I had the privilege of serving with Senator HARRISON, although we had sharp partisan differences, he was always fair and always courteous as we have found all the gentlemen of the South to be.

I shall forever cherish the memory of his friendship. He was brave to the last. During his recent illness, when he perhaps had a premonition that his race was run, he still bore up with a degree of courage that was manifest. No doubt he had in the closing days of his life occasion to think of the lines of Bryant's

famous composition, the last verse of which admonishes us all to—

So live that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi.

Like many of those who have preceded me today it has been my privilege for several years to serve as one of the House conferees on legislation under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and to meet Senator HARRISON with his fellow conferees of the Senate and to participate in the very laborious work of reconciling differences between measures on revenue, finance, social security, and various other subjects as passed by the respective houses. In this association I have had the privilege of knowing him most pleasantly, most cordially and have had an opportunity to form what I consider to be a correct estimate of his outstanding ability, his devotion to duty and his great value as a public servant; a man who possessed the highest attributes of Christian character and all the sterling qualities of manhood, a most accomplished legislator, one of the Nation's outstanding and most distinguished public servants.

I join with others in expressing a very deep sense of personal loss in his passing and in conveying our deepest sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Senator PAT HARRISON I have, as some of you know, sustained the loss of a close personal friend with whom, however, I seldom, if ever, agreed with respect to partisan politics, but for whom I had great affection and genuine regard. He was my friend.

We had many things in common. We were members of the same college fraternity and barnstormers at many a fratenity banquet.

As Americans we thought alike with respect to very many things, though the pressure of partisan political strategy may have made it seem we were as far apart as the poles. It was not so. He was always for America first.

PAT HARRISON was one of God's noblemen. So human, yet possessing those sterling qualities that made him what he was, qualified as, and admittedly a statesman, a knight, sans peur et sans reproche. No man can take his place.

I shall miss him beyond the power of any man's vocabulary to properly measure or express my loss, which, multiplied many times, is that of his State and the Nation.

In the death of such men as was he I am reminded again of the inscrutable providence of God, and there comes to my mind that poem of Longfellow wherein he says:

As a fond mother, when the day is o'er,
Leads by the hand her little child to bed,
Half willing, half reluctant to be led,
And leave his broken playthings on the floor,
Still gazing at them through the open door,
Nor wholly reassured and comforted
By promises of others in their stead,
Which, though more splendid, may not please him more;
So Nature deals with us, and takes away
Our playthings one by one, and by the hand
Leads us to rest so gently that we go
Scarce knowing if we wish to go or stay,
Being too full of sleep to understand
How far the unknown transcends the what we know.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for us who knew PAT HARRISON and loved him to realize that his vital, vibrant personality has gone from amongst us, that these Halls which echoed to his eloquence and witnessed his triumphs and defeats will know him no more.

PAT HARRISON was my personal friend. We were both graduates of the Louisiana State University, members of the same college fraternity there. I knew him before he entered the Halls of Congress, and in common with thousands of his friends I rejoiced in his growing stature as a great American, as a great statesman in this House and in the Senate. His services to his country recognized no State boundaries and knew no sectional lines. In common with the members of his own delegation and in common with thousands of his friends, I would like to add my tribute to this great American. We will miss him, the State of Mississippi will miss him, our Nation will miss him—how much none of us can tell.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I remember my first introduction to Senator HARRISON, the first time I ever saw him. I was a student at L. S. U.—the Louisiana State University—and saw a little commotion one day out at the campus billboard. A sign had been put up there announcing that PAT HARRISON was to speak to the college the following day, and the boys were all excited about it. I had never seen him. The next day he drove in on the campus and was talking to the boys—I did not get to meet him—and then went to the auditorium and spoke to the boys. His subject I shall never forget, though 25 years and more have passed. He advised those college boys not to ever become demagogic. He said:

Many of you coming from a class like this will enter politics; do not be demagogues.

Then he explained in simple forthright language what he understood a demagogue to be, and sat down. I never heard a speech like it before. I have never heard one like it since. I wish I might be able to hear again just such a speech, but that speaker went away yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have been very impressed by the eloquent tributes to Mississippi's most distinguished son, Senator PAT HARRISON. He was an outstanding Democrat and a leader of his party; but, more than that, he was one of our ablest public servants and a great American. We have lost an experienced and wise statesman in the midst of a crisis such as we have not faced since the birth of the Republic. His advice and leadership will be sorely missed in this national emergency. I am glad to join in paying this brief tribute to one of our greatest American statesmen.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the 151 years of our constitutional government, thousands of men, and in recent years women included, have been elected to the Congress of the United States, to the Senate and to the House, representing their States and their congressional districts. All of those of the past, and of today, have served their country with fidelity, but during that period of 151 years a small group stands out in history, as men who served in this body and who served in the Senate of the United States who were intellectual giants, outstanding Americans, occupying a place in the foremost pages of the history of our country. One of those men is the man whose memory we honor today. He was born in Mississippi. By his great services in the Congress of the United States he departs from life as one who occupies a position in the minds and in the hearts of Americans throughout the entire country, a member of that group of great statesmen and intellectual giants of American legislative history. I see PAT HARRISON from that angle, going down in history as one of those intellectual giants whose memory will always occupy a foremost page in the history of the United States.

PAT HARRISON'S earthly journey and duties are over but his spirit and his memory, like the memory of those great giants of the past, will always linger in the Halls of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the life, character, and public services of the late Senator HARRISON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 247):

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, a Senator of the United States from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a

copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 20 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee to attend the funeral: Messrs. RANKIN of Mississippi, WHITTINGTON, DOXEY, COLMER, FORD of Mississippi, MCGEHEE, COLLINS, SABATH, DOUGHTON, TREADWAY, SUMNERS of Texas, KNUTSON, CROWTHER, REED of New York, STEAGALL, BLAND, LEA, CULLEN, CROSSER, and COOPER.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remaining portion of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 24, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, June 24, in room 353, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3396 and H. R. 4035.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

675. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and the State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

676. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report of the Commission on case studies in distribution cost accounting for manufacturing and wholesaling (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

677. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill authorizing subsistence allowance provided for aviation cadets to be paid to messes in manner as prescribed by the act of March 14, 1940 (Public, No. 433, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 246. Resolution granting a gratuity to Regina Elizabeth Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5074. A bill to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4545. A bill to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 815). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 5127. A bill making an appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service for emergency repair and rehabilitation work in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 5128. A bill extending the dates for the beginning and completion of construction by Alabama Bridge Commission, an agency of the State of Alabama, of a toll bridge and causeway between Dauphin Island and the mainland at or near Cedar Point, within the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 5129. A bill for the development and conservation of the resources of the Pacific Northwest through the wide distribution of electric energy generated by certain Federal projects, for the improvement of navigation and the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 5130. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5131. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the late Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Army; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 5132. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to provide a simplified method of addressing and mailing certain franked mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 5133. A bill to relieve enlisted men in the armed forces the necessity of paying for necessary laundering of their clothing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5134. A bill to promote international understanding in the Americas by a mutual interchange of students between the various sovereign nations; to the Committee on Education.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution with reference to the use of skill and manpower of the Negro race in the defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Joint Resolution No. 27, relative to the stabilization of the coal industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 48, relative to proper aviation facilities, airports, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 167, relative to the State community property laws as applied to their income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 79, relative to an appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 5135. A bill to appoint Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a lieutenant, senior grade, in the United States Navy Medical Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5136. A bill for the relief of Walter J. Bittman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1499 By Mr. THILL: Petition of John F. Stratton, of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing the compulsory joint income-tax return for husband and wife under the Federal tax bill, and further imposition of taxes which would increase the tax up to 52 percent on moderate income groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1500. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Cottonseed Crushers' Association, Inc., Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 3753 and 3754, relative to cotton products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1501. Also, petition of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2675 and Senate bill 260, relative to opening the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1502. Also, petition of the Texas State Bottlers Association, Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with

reference to a special tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1503. Also, petition of ILWU 1-12, Merton Prow, secretary, North Bend, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 783, an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, eternal and unchangeable in Thy wisdom, holiness, and justice, we look to Thee for all good. We pray for the power of high decision, for the hunger that longs for the fullness of life, for the large delight of yearning for all that is fair and lovely, and for the silence that trembles on the tongue of immortal speech. We pray that false wealth may not cheat the soul of those eternal riches which make it sweet and strong in the midst of the world's stress and storm. Let us listen to the ideal for all: "Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exerciseth loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things, I delight, saith the Lord." In the holy name of our blessed Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 21, 1941:

H. R. 95. An act to amend section 6 of an act of Congress approved May 20, 1935, entitled "An act concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska";

H. R. 241. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Pitts;

H. R. 735. An act for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 859. An act for the relief of Arthur Gose;

H. R. 903. An act for the relief of James A. Mills;

H. R. 1532. An act for the relief of Bernard E. Warehime;

H. R. 2844. An act to provide for the transportation home of persons who have been arrested and subsequently released without conviction or convicted and placed on probation;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Roy Gard;

H. R. 3243. An act for the relief of John Klasek;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Nell Victoria Lea;

H. R. 4132. An act to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; and

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559).

On June 23, 1941:

H. R. 2742. An act for the relief of Phillip Christian Holt; and

H. R. 4107. An act to extend certain provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

ACQUISITION AND EQUIPMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20; and agree to the same.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

FRANCIS MALONEY,
MILLARD TYDINGS,
WARREN BARBOUR,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: The House bill defined the term "public work" to mean any facility useful or necessary for carrying on community life. The Senate amendments struck out the words "useful or" and restricted such definition so that it would be applicable only to communities with respect to which community life is substantially expanded by the national-defense program. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 5: These are clarifying amendments, merely transposing language and striking out a comma. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill authorized the Administrator, with the approval of the President, to acquire or construct public works in any area or locality in which an acute shortage of such works exists and which cannot be provided when needed. The Senate amendment extended such authority of the Administrator to those areas where such public works could not be provided without the imposition of an increased excessive tax burden or an unusual or excessive increase in the debt limit of the taxing or borrowing authority in which such shortage exists. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10: These are clarifying amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: The House bill authorized the Administrator to maintain and operate public works acquired or constructed under the bill. The Senate amendment struck out this provision as surplusage since adequate authority for this purpose is contained in section 7 of Public, No. 849, Seventy-sixth Congress. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This is a clerical amendment changing the subsection lettering. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: The House bill authorized the making of loans or grants or both to public and private agencies for public works and equipment therefor. The Senate amendment limited the type of private agency that could qualify for such loans or grants to nonprofit agencies. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Amendment No. 14 is a clerical amendment made necessary by the insertion of amendment No. 15. Amendment No. 15 provides that public works shall be provided on the basis of need and that in determining need no discrimination shall be made on account of race, creed, or color. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment Nos. 16 and 20: The House bill amended section 4 of such Public, No. 849 to provide for the termination of the powers granted in title II of the bill in the same manner and to the same extent as the powers granted under section 1 of such act terminate. The Senate amendments made no change in the substance of the House bill but rewrote such section 4 rather than amending it by reference. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 17, 18, and 19: These are clerical amendments made necessary by amendments Nos. 16 and 20. The House recedes.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I gladly yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the distinguished chairman will inform the House whether or not the criticism that was raised when this bill was before us by the gentleman from Virginia has been taken care of?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my distinguished friend that we have had a conference with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], and he has withdrawn all of his objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4784) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill is and the necessity for its immediate consideration?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be glad to explain that to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

In the last Congress we passed a law requiring secrecy to be maintained with reference to patents applied for in the United States if the inventions were primarily useful for national defense. This bill is an amendment in amplification of that law, to prevent, during the time that these applications are being considered, the filing of a patent in a foreign country, because that filing would give publicity to such inventions. It imposes a penalty and provides that, if application should be made abroad under those circumstances on an invention made in the United States, there could then be no patent issued by the United States to such inventor.

The War Department and the Navy Department are very anxious to have this bill passed very promptly. It has been on the Consent Calendar and on two occasions Members have asked that it be passed over because they thought it might interfere with the administration of export control, but since the last calling of the Consent Calendar, General Maxwell, administrator of the Export Control Division, has appeared before our committee and assured us that the bill is right as printed and that he has no objection to it whatever.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether the bill has been considered by the Committee on Patents?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes; it has been considered by the Committee on Patents and favorably reported. It has been on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SABATH. So it does not come from your other committee?

Mr. LANHAM. No. It comes from the Committee on Patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved July 1, 1940 (Public, No. 700, 76th Cong., 3d sess., ch. 501), be amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 3. No person shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States, except when authorized in each case by a license obtained from the Commissioner of Patents under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C., secs. 31 and 42), any person and the successors, assigns, or legal representatives of any such person shall be debarred from receiving a United States patent for an invention if such person, or such successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the authorization prescribed in section 3 hereof, have made or consented to or assisted another's making application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of such invention where authorization for such application is required by the provisions of section 3, and any such United States patent actually issued to any such person, successors, assigns, or legal representatives so debarred or becoming debarred shall be invalid.

"SEC. 5. Whoever willfully violates any order of the Commissioner made pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1940 (Public, No. 700, 76th Cong., 3d sess., ch. 501), or whoever with knowledge of such order, and without permission of the Commissioner, willfully publishes or discloses any information in respect of an invention to which such order relates, or files or causes or authorizes to be filed, an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in a foreign country in violation of the provisions of section 3 hereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

"SEC. 6. If any provision of this act or of any section thereof or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and of such section and application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 7. As used in this act—

"The term 'person' includes any individual, trustee, corporation, partnership, association, firm, or any other combination of individuals.

"The term 'application' includes applications, and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto or continuances thereof.

"SEC. 8. The prohibitions and penalties of this act shall not apply to any officer or agent of the United States acting within the scope of his authority."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "42" and insert "32."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REVENUE REVISION OF 1941

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report favorably (Rept. No. 830) a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1941."

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. How is the distribution to be made—through the folding room or the document room?

Mr. JARMAN. They are for the use of the committee. There are only 2,000 copies.

Mr. MICHENER. They go directly to the committee; and anyone desiring copies of the documents must make application to the committee?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Which committee is it?

Mr. JARMAN. The Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and such other special orders as have been entered the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] may address the House for 35 minutes. He had the time yesterday but the House adjourned without his being reached.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey and Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial, and also a resolution of the National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project, and to include therein an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with the W. P. A. appropriation bill recently passed by the House and to include two short editorial items therein.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Admiral Land regarding the situation of foreign-flag tankers; and also to include a release by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial which appeared in

the Mount Vernon Independence, Mount Vernon, N. Y., Friday, June 20, 1941, entitled "The Abuse of Democracy."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, if ever such a thing as a good war was waged, the one between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany is it.

It gives us in the United States the opportunity and the time to speed our arms production, to increase our aid to Great Britain, and to tell every Communist in the United States to go back to Russia and do his duty for the fatherland instead of sabotaging American ideals.

This war shows clearly why we must avoid the quicksands of European power politics. A year ago we were saddened by the fall of Britain's ally, France. Today, France fights on the side of Germany. Two years ago we thrilled to the heroic struggle of the Finns against the terrorism of "red" Russia. Today Finland fights on the side of the Axis. Yesterday we held abhorrent all that Communist Russia meant. Today we are told by some that she is our ally.

Let us not lose sight of our basic desires, to aid Great Britain and to defend the Western Hemisphere. Let us make no ill-considered promises to send nonexistent war material on nonexistent ships to a nation whose whole concept of life is repugnant to us. Let us, rather, use this precious time to aid Great Britain and to arm ourselves.

The people of the United States are not so gullible that they will believe that what we detested yesterday we must embrace today. The tiny percentage of Americans who have been hell-bent for the invasion of Europe, Asia, and Africa will now rapidly dwindle. They now have the unhappy choice of sending our boys to fight for a Communist Europe or a Nazi Europe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on the St. Lawrence seaway, written by a former Member of the House who served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for 8 years.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OLD SUBMARINES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the sinking of the submarine *O–9* is disturbing me, and I know it is disturbing many other Members of Congress and the American people. From certain press releases I have read and inquiry I have made I learn that the Navy is going to recondition some more old tubs which it seems to me cannot float in water. An investigation was announced by one of the committees of the House under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], but this matter, it appears to me, is too serious to be made a part-time job of a standing committee. It seems to me the Congress ought to know definitely what the Navy is doing with regard to submarines. We seem to be the only unlucky country in the matter of submarines, and we are getting nowhere. It seems to me the time is ripe for the Congress to know why the Navy insists on using reconditioned submarines when this has been proven to be dangerous and unsatisfactory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

LINDBERGH AND A NEGOTIATED PEACE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] in saying that this is indeed a good opportunity to encourage Communists to go back and take up the cudgel for their fatherland. I wish also however to refer to the ridiculous position of Mr. Lindbergh and his little handful of Lindberghians running up and down the country asking the people of the United States to get behind a movement to induce England to effect a negotiated peace with Herr Hitler and the Germans. He asks this at a time when the world can see what happens to Russia, a country that has been operating under a negotiated peace with Germany for some time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech which I delivered at Howard University, June 13, 1941, on the occasion of their commencement. I have submitted the speech to the Public Printer for estimate and find it exceeds the amount allowed. I submit herewith a letter from the Public Printer which shows that the cost of the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is $120. I ask unanimous consent that this matter be placed in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement submitted to the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a script of a radio program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Home News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from a patriotic Italian society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today at the conclusion of the legislative program and

after all other special orders have been disposed of, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio program given last Sunday night over WWDC under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the subject Our Home Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have written to the Indiana Farmers' Guide about farm labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

WAR IS HELL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, war has strange bedfellows, as, for instance, Russia, with communism, and Germany, with Hitlerism. Let them fight it out. We should not join up with either one at any time or at any place and endeavor to conduct a war across 3,000 miles of water, regardless of the motive of any other nation.

We should look after the Americas. I believe in America, as did Jefferson, Washington, McKinley, and Lincoln.

I did not believe in any foreign "isms." I do not believe this European-Asiatic war is America's war. I do not believe there is any emergency that should cause us to send our men to either Europe or Asia.

I do not believe there is any justification for naval convoys. I do not believe the residue of American resources should be taxed out of existence on account of a European or Asiatic war, nor do I think America should be wrecked to save them from harm or ruin.

I believe in peace by negotiation. I believe the sword of the spirit more trenchant than battleships, tanks, and bombs.

I believe that God and religion must inspire, guide, and guarantee peace among men. We should stay in America, where we belong, and attend to our own business.

To the American people may I say, Do not be stampeded into the idea that we should now go to war with Russia as an ally.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a eulogy delivered by Rabbi Bernard Bergman on the life of one of our former colleagues the Honorable MICHAEL EDELSTEIN; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be included in the eulogies that have been made on the life of Mr. EDELSTEIN last Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate that in this House there is a small group of intolerant men who seek constantly to traduce patriotic, loyal Americans and to impugn their motives.

I should like to direct the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to a newspaper account of a Lindbergh meeting held in Hollywood last week at which a capacity audience of 20,000 Americans was present. I should also like to stress at this time for the benefit of the gentleman from Alabama that these Americans are not solely concerned with crusading for the "four freedoms" everywhere in the world, but are primarily interested in preserving constitutional processes of government in the United States.

I also call your attention to two pertinent statements by Senator WHEELER:

The American people should tell President Roosevelt that they expect him to live up to his campaign pledges and keep this country out of the European war. They should write their Senators and Congressmen regarding their views.

Write today to President Roosevelt, at the White House, in Washington, that you are against our entry into the European war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], who just spoke about Mr. Lindbergh and bitterly condemned him, to the fact that many hope Mr. Lindbergh will not hear what the gentleman from Alabama said, because Lindbergh surely will feel grieved if he ever hears that the gentleman from Alabama does not approve of his views

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OFFICE OF BUDGET AND REPORTS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 288)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3782, a bill "Establishing an Office of Budget and Reports in the Navy Department, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the legislation which was presented for the consideration of the Congress was, among other things, to provide in the Navy Department a civilian to act as Associate Director of the Office of Budget and Reports, the Director of which would be a Navy officer with the rank of rear admiral. This civilian was to perform duties designated by the Secretary and act as Director during the absence or incapacity of that official and was to be an expert in budgetary and statistical matters who could furnish accurate information regarding the Navy to the Congress. This civilian was to give to the office the continuity of administration which cannot be obtained with constantly changing Navy personnel. The enrolled enactment places a line officer of the Navy in this position.

This change is so basic as to vitiate the purpose of the legislation, and consequently I do not believe that any real purpose would be served by giving it my approval in its present form.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks made this morning a letter from Mr. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, regarding the number of petroleum tank cars available for the handling of petroleum and its products.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Allen, Ill.	Englebright	Myers, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Miss.	Nelson
Arends	Green	Nichols
Arnold	Hall,	Norton
Bell	Edwin Arthur	O'Day
Bland	Hall,	O'Leary
Bloom	Leonard W.	Pfeifer,
Boehne	Hancock	Joseph L.
Bolles	Harris, Va.	Plauché
Boren	Hartley	Ploeser
Buck	Hill, Colo.	Poage
Buckley, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Randolph
Byrne	Hobbs	Rankin, Miss.
Cartwright	Holbrock	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Hook	Rockefeller
Chenoweth	Houston	Romjue
Clark	Howell	Satterfield
Claypool	Jacobsen	Schaefer, Ill.
Collins	Jenks, N. H.	Schuetz
Colmer	Jennings	Scott
Cooley	Jensen	Scrugham
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Sheridan
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Sikes
Crosser	Johnson,	Smith, Pa.
Crowther	Lyndon B.	Sparkman
Culkin	Johnson, Okla.	Starnes, Ala.
Curtis	Kennedy,	Sumners, Tex.
D'Alesandro	Martin J.	Sweeney
Davis, Ohio	Kleberg	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Thill
Delaney	Kopplemann	Tinkham
Dies	Lea	Tolan
Ditter	McArdle	Treadway
Domengeaux	McGehee	Wasielewski
Douglas	McGranery	Weaver
Doxey	McMillan	Whittington
Durham	Marcantonio	Wright
Edmiston	Merritt	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. Cox, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] has called up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4693.

The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9 and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(2) striking out the word 'unless' in clause (2) of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'where the loan, advance of credit, or purchase does not exceed $2,500, or has a maturity in excess of five years and thirty-two days, where the loan, advance of credit, or purchase exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000; except that such maturity limitations shall not apply if', and (3)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 11.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
P. M. BROWN,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill extended the authority of the Federal Housing Administrator to insure modernization and small home loans under title I of the National Housing Act from July 1, 1941 (when the present authority expires) to July 1, 1944. The Senate amendment provided for such an extension of authority to July 1, 1943. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Under existing law the maximum amount of any loan for the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures, or for new construction, which may be insured under title I of the National Housing Act is fixed at $2,500. The House bill increased this maximum limit to $5,000 for alteration, repair, and improvement loans, and to $3,000 for new construction loans. The Senate amendment provided for the same $3,000 limit in the case of new construction, but retained the present $2,500 limit in the case of existing structures except where an existing dwelling designed or to be designed for more than one family was involved. In the latter case the maximum amount of the loan, under the Senate amendment, was fixed at not to exceed $5,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Under the House bill the maximum term of improvement loans insurable under title I of the National Housing Act was increased from 3 years and 32 days as provided in existing law to 5 years and 32 days. The Senate amendment had the effect of retaining the 3-year-and-32-day limitation of existing law. The conference agreement provides in effect that the maturity limitation shall remain at 3 years and 32 days where the improvement loan does not exceed $2,500, and shall not exceed 5 years and 32 days where the improvement loan is between $2,500 and $5,000.

Amendment No. 4: The House bill authorized the Federal Housing Administrator to refinance and extend, under such terms and conditions as he might prescribe, any obligation with respect to which insurance is granted under such title I on or after July 1, 1939. The Senate amendment imposed the limitation that in exercising this authority the refinancing or extension of a loan should not be for an amount or term in excess of the maximum amount or term provided for in connection with the insurance of new loans. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7: These amendments were technical in character and clarified in certain respects the authority conferred upon the Administrator to deal with real property conveyed to or acquired by him in connection with the payment of insurance granted under such title I. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: The House bill provided in effect for the delegation by the Administrator of certain authority to any officer, agent, or employee he might appoint. The Senate amendment limited the Administrator's authority to make such delegations so that it would apply only to officers and agents appointed by him. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: The House bill modified the restrictions with respect to the insurance of mortgages on existing construction under title II of the National Housing Act by extending the authority of the Administrator to insure such mortgages from July 1, 1941, to July 1, 1944. The Senate amendment provided for extending such authority to July 1, 1943. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 10: The House bill extended from July 1, 1941, to July 1, 1944, the authority of the Administrator to include a portion of the foreclosure costs in debentures issued in connection with 90-percent small home mortgages. The Senate amendment extended this authority from July 1, 1941, to July 1, 1943. The Senate recedes.

On amendment numbered 11 (relating to a farm mortgage insurance system patterned after the provisions of the National Housing Act) the conferees are unable to agree.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the changes in this bill from what it was as it passed the House are of a minor nature. The report has the unanimous endorsement of the managers on the part of the House. I ask for a vote on the adoption of the report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we were in complete accord on the first 10 amendments. The eleventh amendment, which is referred to as the Senate farm-tenant rider, was reported in disagreement, so I understand that the adoption of the conference report will still leave in abeyance the debate and vote on the amendment which is reported in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. After the conference report is adopted, the matter in disagreement will come before the House.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11. Page 6, after line 14, insert the following:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 11. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting therein a new title to follow immediately after title I thereof to read as follows:

"'TITLE IA—FARM TENANT MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROVISIONS

"'DEFINITIONS

"'SEC. 11. As used in this title—

"'(a) The term "mortgage" means a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple; and the term "first mortgage" means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate, under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"'(b) The term "mortgagee" includes the original lender under a mortgage, and his successors and assigns; and the term "mortgagor" includes the original borrower under a mortgage and his successors and assigns, approved by the Secretary.

" (c) The term "maturity date" means the date on which the mortgage indebtedness would be extinguished if paid in accordance with periodic payments provided for in the mortgage.

"'(d) The term "State" includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.

"'FARM-TENANT MORTGAGE INSURANCE FUND

"'SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby created a farm-tenant mortgage insurance fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under section 13 as hereinafter provided. There shall be covered into such fund not exceeding 5 percent of the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, pursuant to the authorizations for appropriations made by section 6, as the Secretary may deem it advisable to cover into such fund.

"'(b) Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The Secretary may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of section 14. Such purchases shall be made at a purchase price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"'(c) All amounts credited to the fund shall be available for making payments required under this title.

"'(d) The Secretary shall include in his annual report a complete statement with respect to the status of the fund.

"'(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, such sums as when added to the sums covered into the fund under subsection (a) of this section will be adequate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES

"'SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure prior to June 30, 1944, as hereinafter provided, any mortgage offered to him which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided and, upon such terms as the Secretary may prescribe, to make commitments for the insuring of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 shall be insured and outstanding prior to June 30, 1942, and not to exceed $150,000,000 shall be insured and outstanding prior to June 30, 1943: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of the principal obligations of the mortgages upon property in any State insured under this title shall not be a greater percentage of such $350,000,000 than the number of tenant farmers residing in such State is of the total number of tenant farmers residing in the United States.

"'(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall—

"'(1) have been made by a farmer who owns no interest in any real property (other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence and from which he does not derive any substantial part of his livelihood) (A) as security for the purchase price, or part of the purchase price, of a farm upon which he is conducting, or proposes to conduct, farming operations, or (B) as security for the payment of an indebtedness incurred for the purpose of refinancing a mortgage covering a farm upon which he is conducting, or proposes to conduct, farming operations: *Provided*, That such mortgages shall not be accepted for insurance until rules and regulations with respect to the eligibility of mortgagors have been prescribed by the Secretary, with the approval of the President;

"'(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Secretary shall prescribe) not in excess of the reasonable value of the farm, and necessary repairs and improvements thereon, as certified by the county committee pursuant to section 16;

"'(3) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary, but not to exceed 40 years from the date of the execution of the mortgage;

"'(4) contain complete amortization provisions satisfactory to the Secretary requiring periodic payments by the mortgagor not in excess of his reasonable ability to pay as determined by the Secretary, such periodic payments to be made to the Secretary as collection agent for the mortgagee;

"'(5) bear interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"'(6) provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary, for the application of the mortgagor's periodic payments (exclusive of the amount allocated to interest) to amortization of the principal of the mortgage;

"'(7) contain such terms and provisions with respect to insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, variable payments, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Secretary may in his discretion prescribe;

"'(8) be accompanied by an agreement by the mortgagee (not binding upon the Secretary as an assignee) that he will accept the benefits provided by section 14 in lieu of any right of foreclosure which he may have against the mortgaged property;

"'(9) contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair, and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented; and

"'(10) contains a covenant by the mortgagor not to mortgage, lease, or otherwise dispose of his interest in the mortgaged property to any person until the Secretary has approved the acquisition of such interest by such person.

"'(c) The Secretary shall collect for credit to the fund a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title in an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. Such premium charges shall be payable by the mortgagor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Secretary under this title, at par plus accrued interest, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary may require the payment of one or more such premium charges at the time the mortgage is insured, at such discount rate as he may prescribe not in excess of the interest rate specified in the mortgage. If the Secretary finds, upon the presentation of a mortgage for insurance and the tender of the initial premium charge or charges so required, that the mortgage complies with the provisions of this section, such mortgage may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe. In the event that the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Secretary is further authorized, in his discretion, to require the payment by the mortgagor of an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Secretary determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges that the mortgagor would otherwise have been required to pay if the mortgage had continued to be insured until such maturity date; and, in the event that the principal obligation is paid in full as herein set forth, and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment, the Secretary is authorized to refund to the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charges theretofore paid.

"'(d) The Secretary shall promptly remit to the mortgagee under any mortgage insured under this title any sums collected by him as agent for the mortgagee. The Secretary shall promptly advise any such mortgagee of any default of the mortgagor.

"'(e) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this section shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of any holder thereof from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation of which such holder has actual knowledge.

"'PAYMENT OF INSURANCE

"'SEC. 14. (a) In any case in which the mortgagor under a mortgage insured under section 13 shall be in default for not less than 6 months, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefit of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon assignment to the Secretary of (1) all rights and interests arising under the mortgage so in default; (2) all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction; (3) all policies of title or other insurance and all surety bonds and other guaranties and any and all claims thereunder; (4) any balance of the mortgage loan not advanced to the mortgagor; (5) any cash or property held by the mortgagee, or to which it is entitled, as deposit made for the account of the mortgagor and which has not been applied in reduction of the principal of the mortgage indebtedness; and (6) all records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the mortgage transaction. Upon such assignment the Secretary shall issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of the mortgage shall be determined, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of default, the amount of all unpaid interest and the amount of all payments which have been made by the mortgagee for taxes, special assessments, water rates, which are liens prior to the mortgage, and insurance on the property mortgaged, and by deducting from such total amount any amount received on account of the mortgage after such default. If the collections from any mortgagor who is making variable

payments are less than the current periodic payment due under the insured mortgage, which deficiency is not covered by previous prepayments, and such mortgagor is not in default in his variable payments and has complied with all of the terms and conditions of the insured mortgage, the Secretary, in lieu of issuing debentures, as hereinabove provided, for the full amount of such mortgage, shall pay to the mortgagee the amount of such deficiency, less the amount of any such prepayments, which payment shall be advanced out of the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund for the account of the mortgagor. Such advance shall be repaid to the fund out of the first available collections received from the mortgagor, with interest thereon at the rate fixed in the insured mortgage.

"'(b) The Secretary may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instruments secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

"'(c) Debentures issued under this section shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form. Any difference between the value of the mortgage determined as herein provided and the aggregate face value of the debentures issued, not to exceed $50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Secretary to the mortgagee.

"'(d) The debentures issued under this section to any mortgagee with respect to mortgages insured under section 13 shall be executed in the name of the farm-tenant mortgage insurance fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Secretary by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. All such debentures shall be dated as of the date the mortgage was acquired by the Secretary and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was offered for insurance, but not to exceed 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature 3 years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the mortgage in exchange for which the debentures were issued. Such debentures shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. In the event that the Secretary fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on any debentures issued under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"'(e) In any case in which the mortgagor shall violate any covenant or condition of his mortgage, the Secretary may require an assignment of such mortgage, together with the incidents thereto as enumerated in subsection (a) of this section, in exchange for debentures to be issued in accordance with this section.

"'PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGES ASSIGNED TO SECRETARY

"'SEC. 15. (a) Upon accepting the assignment of any mortgage the Secretary shall ascertain whether or not the mortgagor desires to remain in possession of the mortgaged property. If the mortgagor does not desire to retain possession of the mortgaged property, or if the Secretary is unable to make the findings prescribed by the sentence immediately following, the Secretary may proceed to foreclose the mortgage: *Provided*, That foreclosure proceedings shall not be instituted if the mortgagor conveys to the Secretary full title to the mortgaged property subject only to the mortgage lien. If the mortgagor desires to remain in possession of the mortgaged property and if the Secretary finds that the mortgagor (1) has made reasonable efforts to meet all defaulted payments and to comply with the other covenants and conditions of his mortgage and (2) will probably be able to meet each of such defaulted payments within 5 years after such payments became due, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the mortgagor providing for the payment by the mortgagor of such defaulted payments, together with interest thereon, at such times not later than 5 years after the due date of such defaulted payments as the Secretary may deem to be within the probable future means of the mortgagor. Should any mortgagor with whom the Secretary has entered into any such agreement thereafter fail to meet any payments the Secretary may proceed to foreclose the mortgage: *Provided*, That foreclosure proceedings shall not be instituted if the mortgagor conveys to the Secretary full title to the mortgaged property subject only to the mortgage lien.

"'(b) Any property acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) shall be sold to farmers upon such terms as the Secretary may deem advisable.

"'COUNTY COMMITTEES

"'SEC. 16. (a) The county committee established under section 42 shall—

"'(1) receive listings of farms in the county from any person desiring to sell such farms to farm tenants;

"'(2) receive applications from farm tenants desiring to finance the acquisition of farms by means of mortgages insured by the Secretary under this title and advise such farm tenants of the available listed farms; and

"'(3) examine and appraise farms which farm tenants desire to acquire or the mortgage indebtedness upon which they desire to refinance by means of mortgages insured under this title.

"'(b) If the committee finds that an applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, that by reason of his character, ability, experience, and training he is likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a mortgage which may be insured under this title, and that the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the insuring of a mortgage with respect thereto will carry out the purposes of this title, it shall so certify to the Secretary. The committee shall also certify to the Secretary the amount which the committee finds is the reasonable value of the farm, and where advances are to be made by the mortgagee for the construction of repairs and improvements, the amount of such advances which the committee finds is economically justified on the basis of the income which can be realized from the operation of the farm.

"'(c) No certification under this section shall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the committee or any person related to such member within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity has any property interest, direct or indirect, or in which they or either of them have had such interest within 1 year prior to the date of certification.

"'(d) No mortgage made by any person or with respect to any farm shall be insured under this title unless certification as required under this section has been made with respect to such person and such farm by the committee: *Provided*, That no mortgage shall be insured with respect to any farm unless it is of such size as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient farm management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated. No insurance shall be granted under this title with respect to any farm in an amount in excess of the reasonable value of the farm and the amount of advances certified by such committee under subsection (b).'

"SEC. 12. Section 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting therein a new subsection to follow immediately after subsection (d) thereof and to read as follows:

"'(e) Mortgagors whose mortgages are insured under title IA may be granted loans under this title for (1) the construction of necessary repairs and improvements upon the mortgaged property, or (2) to enable such mortgagors to meet payments of principal and interest due upon such mortgages. Any such loan shall comply with all of the requirements of this title, except that the mortgage or deed of trust securing such loan may be junior to the mortgage insured under title IA.'

"SEC. 13. Section 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following words: *'Provided*, That, if the amount thus determined for any State or Territory, other than the Territory of Alaska or the District of Columbia, shall be less than $100,000, the allotment for such State or Territory shall be increased to $100,000, and the amounts determined for the remaining States and Territories shall be adjusted accordingly: *Provided further*, That the funds so allotted to any such State or Territory may be loaned to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally operated and occupied by him and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, in cases where the Secretary determines that such refinancing is necessary and will enable the borrower successfully to operate the farm, and that the borrower cannot obtain credit for such refinancing from any other Federal agency or federally incorporated lending institution. Such loans shall comply with, and be subject to, all the provisions of this title.'

"SEC. 14. Section 40 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by striking out 'or title II, or both', and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'title IA, or title II.'

"SEC. 15. Section 41 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) To delegate any of the functions and powers conferred upon him under this act to such officers or agents as he may designate and appoint.'

"SEC. 16. (a) Section 42 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting after 'title I' the following: 'or title IA.'

"(b) Section 42 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by striking out '5 days in a month' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '60 days in a fiscal year.'

"SEC. 17. (a) Subsection (a) of section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting after 'title I' a comma and the following: 'title IA.'

"'(b) Section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Nothing in title I or title IA of this act shall be construed to exempt any property acquired by the Secretary under said titles from taxation by any State or political

subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other property is taxed.'

"SEC. 18. Section 51 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting after the figure '51' the following: '(a)'; and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Each mortgage hereafter executed under title I or insured under title IA of this act shall contain a covenant that, if the mortgaged property shall, within 25 years after the date of said mortgage, with or without prepayment of the unpaid balance thereof, be disposed of by, or for the credit of, the mortgagor or his successors, by foreclosure or otherwise, for a consideration in excess of the cost of such property, as determined by the Secretary, there shall be payable to the Secretary, for the credit of the mutual insurance fund established under section 12 (a), a sum equal to 50 percent of such excess, less 2 percent of such excess for each year that has elapsed since the date of such mortgage. In computing the cost of such property, the Secretary may credit the mortgagor with the reasonable value of improvements made by him, less any waste or other impairment in value which he has caused or permitted.'

"SEC. 19. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (relating to restrictions upon the lending powers of national banks), is hereby further amended by inserting after the words 'National Housing Act,' appearing at the end of the third sentence, the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 20. The last sentence of paragraph 'Seventh' of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting, after the words 'National Housing Act,' the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 21. Section 35 of Chapter III of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia,' approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1152), is amended by inserting in paragraph 3 (a), after the words 'Federal Housing Administrator,' the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 22. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 12, sec. 1020 (d)), is amended by inserting after the word 'bonds,' where said word first appears, the following: 'and to purchase and make loans upon mortgages insured under title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'"

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I understand that under the rules the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour, to yield that time as he desires. This is a highly controversial matter—one which has been on several occasions discussed by the committees of Congress. It seems to me we cannot do justice to the subject in an hour's time. I wonder if we cannot agree on a longer period of time and an equitable distribution of the time between the proponents and the opponents of the measure.

The SPEAKER. Before that is done, the Chair suggests that the gentleman from Alabama has a motion to make, and this discussion may follow the motion the gentleman proposes to submit.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 11, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEAGALL moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 11 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 11. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting therein a new title to follow immediately after title I thereof to read as follows:

"'TITLE IA—FARM TENANT MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROVISIONS

"'DEFINITIONS

"'SEC. 11. As used in this title—

"'(a) The term "mortgage" means a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple; and the term "first mortgage" means such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate, under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"'(b) The term "mortgagee" includes the original lender under a mortgage, and his successors and assigns; and the term "mortgagor" includes the original borrower under a mortgage and his successors and assigns, approved by the Secretary.

"'(c) The term "maturity date" means the date on which the mortgage indebtedness would be extinguished if paid in accordance with periodic payments provided for in the mortgage.

"'(d) The term "State" includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.

"'FARM-TENANT MORTGAGE INSURANCE FUND

"'SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby created a farm-tenant mortgage insurance fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to mortgages insured under section 13 as hereinafter provided. There shall be covered into such fund, out of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 6 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, such amount, not exceeding 5 percent of the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by such section 6 for such fiscal year, as the Secretary may deem it advisable to cover into such fund.

"'(b) Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The Secretary may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of section 14. Such purchases shall be made at a purchase price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"'(c) All amounts credited to the fund shall be available for making payments required under this title.

"'(d) The Secretary shall include in his annual report a complete statement with respect to the status of the fund.

"'(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, such sums as when added to the sums covered into the fund under subsection (a) of this section will be adequate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES

"'SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure prior to June 30, 1944, as hereinafter provided, any mortgage offered to him which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided and, upon such terms as the Secretary may prescribe, to make commitments for the insuring of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $350,000,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 shall be insured and outstanding prior to June 30, 1942, and not to exceed $150,000,000 shall be insured and outstanding prior to June 30, 1943: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of the principal obligations of the mortgages upon property in any State insured under this title shall not be a greater percentage of such $350,000,000 than the number of tenant farmers residing in such State is of the total number of tenant farmers residing in the United States.

"'(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall—

"'(1) have been made by a farmer who owns no interest in any real property (other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence and from which he does not derive any substantial part of his livelihood (A) as security for the purchase price, or part of the purchase price, of a farm upon which he is conducting, or proposes to conduct, farming operations, or (B) as security for the payment of an indebtedness incurred for the purpose of refinancing a mortgage covering a farm upon which he is conducting, or proposes to conduct farming operations: *Provided*, That such mortgages shall not be accepted for insurance until rules and regulations with respect to the eligibility of mortgagors have been prescribed by the Secretary, with the approval of the President;

"'(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Secretary shall prescribe) not in excess of the reasonable value of the farm and necessary repairs and improvements thereon, as certified by the county committee pursuant to section 16;

"'(3) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary, but not to exceed 40 years from the date of the execution of the mortgage;

"'(4) contain complete amortization provisions satisfactory to the Secretary requiring periodic payments by the mortgagor not in excess of his reasonable ability to pay as determined by the Secretary, such periodic payments to be made to the Secretary as collection agent for the mortgagee;

"'(5) bear interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"'(6) provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary, for the application of the mortgagor's periodic payments (exclusive of the amount allocated to interest) to amortization of the principal of the mortgage;

"'(7) contain such terms and provisions with respect to insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, variable payments, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Secretary may in his discretion prescribe;

"'(8) be accompanied by an agreement by the mortgagee (not binding upon the Secretary as an assignee) that he will accept the benefits provided by section 14 in lieu of any right of foreclosure which he may have against the mortgaged property;

"'(9) contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair, and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented; and

"'(10) contains a covenant by the mortgagor not to mortgage, lease, or otherwise dispose of his interest in the mortgaged

property to any person until the Secretary has approved the acquisition of such interest by such person.

"'(c) The Secretary shall collect for credit to the fund a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title in an amount equivalent to not less than one-fourth of 1 percent per annum and not to exceed one-half of 1 percent per annum of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. Such premium charges shall be payable by the mortgagor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Secretary under this title, at par plus accrued interest, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary may require the payment of one or more such premium charges at the time the mortgage is insured, at such discount rate as he may prescribe not in excess of the interest rate specified in the mortgage. If the Secretary finds, upon the presentation of a mortgage for insurance and the tender of the initial premium charge or charges so required, that the mortgage complies with the provisions of this section, such mortgage may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe. In the event that the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Secretary is further authorized, in his discretion, to require the payment by the mortgagor of an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Secretary determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges that the mortgagor would otherwise have been required to pay if the mortgage had continued to be insured until such maturity date; and, in the event that the principal obligation is paid in full as herein set forth, and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment, the Secretary is authorized to refund to the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charges theretofore paid.

"'(d) The Secretary shall promptly remit to the mortgagee under any mortgage insured under this title any sums collected by him as agent for the mortgagee. The Secretary shall promptly advise any such mortgagee of any default by the mortgagor.

"'(e) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this section shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of any holder thereof from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation of which such holder has actual knowledge.

"'PAYMENT OF INSURANCE

"'SEC. 14. (a) In any case in which the mortgagor under a mortgage insured under section 13 shall be in default for not less than 6 months, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefit of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon assignment to the Secretary of (1) all rights and interests arising under the mortgage so in default; (2) all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction; (3) all policies of title or other insurance and all surety bonds and other guaranties and any and all claims thereunder; (4) any balance of the mortgage loan not advanced to the mortgagor; (5) any cash or property held by the mortgagee, or to which it is entitled, as deposit made for the account of the mortgagor and which has not been applied in reduction of the principal of the mortgage indebtedness; and (6) all records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the mortgage transaction. Upon such assignment the Secretary shall issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of the mortgage shall be determined, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of default, the amount of all unpaid interest and the amount of all payments which have been made by the mortgagee for taxes, special assessments, water rates, which are liens prior to the mortgage, and insurance on the property mortgaged, and by deducting from such total amount any amount received on account of the mortgage after such default. If the collections from any mortgagor who is making variable payments are less than the current periodic payment due under the insured mortgage, which deficiency is not covered by previous prepayments, and such mortgagor is not in default in his variable payments and has complied with all of the terms and conditions of the insured mortgage, the Secretary, in lieu of issuing debentures, as hereinabove provided, for the full amount of such mortgage, shall pay to the mortgagee the amount of such deficiency, less the amount of any such prepayments, which payment shall be advanced out of the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund for the account of the mortgagor. Such advance shall be repaid to the fund out of the first available collections received from the mortgagor, with interest thereon at the rate fixed in the insured mortgage.

"'(b) The Secretary may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instruments secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

"'(c) Debentures issued under this section shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form. Any difference between the value of the mortgage determined as herein provided and the aggregate face value of the debentures issued, not to exceed $50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Secretary to the mortgagee.

"'(d) The debentures issued under this section to any mortgagee with respect to mortgages insured under section 13 shall be executed in the name of the farm-tenant mortgage insurance fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Secretary by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. All such debentures shall be dated as of the date the mortgage was acquired by the Secretary and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was offered for insurance, but not to exceed 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature 3 years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the mortgage in exchange for which the debentures were issued. Such debentures shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. In the event that the Secretary fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on any debentures issued under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"'(e) In any case in which the mortgagor shall violate any covenant or condition of his mortgage, the Secretary may require an assignment of such mortgage, together with the incidents thereto as enumerated in subsection (a) of this section, in exchange for debentures to be issued in accordance with this section.

"'PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGES ASSIGNED TO SECRETARY

"'SEC. 15. (a) Upon accepting the assignment of any mortgage the Secretary shall ascertain whether or not the mortgagor desires to remain in possession of the mortgaged property. If the mortgagor does not desire to retain possession of the mortgaged property, or if the Secretary is unable to make the findings prescribed by the sentence immediately following, the Secretary may proceed to foreclose the mortgage: *Provided*, That foreclosure proceedings shall not be instituted if the mortgagor conveys to the Secretary full title to the mortgaged property subject only to the mortgage lien. If the mortgagor desires to remain in possession of the mortgaged property and if the Secretary finds that the mortgagor (1) has made reasonable efforts to meet all defaulted payments and to comply with the other covenants and conditions of his mortgage and (2) will probably be able to meet each of such defaulted payments within 5 years after such payments became due, the Secretary may enter into an agreement with the mortgagor providing for the payment by the mortgagor of such defaulted payments, together with interest thereon, at such times not later than 5 years after the due date of such defaulted payments as the Secretary may deem to be within the probable future means of the mortgagor. Should any mortgagor with whom the Secretary has entered into any such agreement thereafter fail to meet any payments, the Secretary may proceed to foreclose the mortgage: *Provided*, That foreclosure proceedings shall not be instituted if the mortgagor conveys to the Secretary full title to the mortgaged property subject only to the mortgage lien.

"'(b) Any property acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) shall be sold to farmers upon such terms as the Secretary may deem advisable.

"'COUNTY COMMITTEES

"'SEC. 16. (a) The county committee established under section 42 shall—

"'(1) receive listings of farms in the county from any persons desiring to sell such farms to farm tenants;

"'(2) receive applications from farm tenants desiring to finance the acquisition of farms by means of mortgages insured by the Secretary under this title and advise such farm tenants of the available listed farms; and

"'(3) examine and appraise farms which farm tenants desire to acquire or the mortgage indebtedness upon which they desire to refinance by means of mortgages insured under this title.

"'(b) If the committee finds that an applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, that by reason of his character, ability, experience, and training he is likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a mortgage which may be insured under this title, and that the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the insuring of a mortgage with respect thereto will carry out the purposes of this title, it shall so certify to the Secretary. The committee shall also certify to the Secretary the amount which the committee finds is the reasonable value of the farm, and where advances are to be made by the mortgagee for the construction of repairs and improvements, the amount of such advances

which the committee finds is economically justified on the basis of the income which can be realized from the operation of the farm.

"'(c) No certification under this section shall be made with respect to any farm in which any member of the committee or any person related to such member within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity has any property interest, direct or indirect, or in which they or either of them have had such interest within 1 year prior to the date of certification.

"'(d) No mortgage made by any person or with respect to any farm shall be insured under this title unless certification as required under this section has been made with respect to such person and such farm by the committee: *Provided*, That no mortgage shall be insured with respect to any farm unless it is of such size as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient farm management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated. No insurance shall be granted under this title with respect to any farm in an amount in excess of the reasonable value of the farm and the amount of advances certified by such committee under subsection (b).'

"SEC. 12. Section 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting therein a new subsection to follow immediately after subsection (d) thereof and to read as follows:

"'(e) Mortgagors whose mortgages are insured under title IA may be granted loans under this title for (1) the construction of necessary repairs and improvements upon the mortgaged property, or (2) to enable such mortgagors to meet payments of principal and interest due upon such mortgages. Any such loan shall comply with all of the requirements of this title, except that the mortgage or deed of trust securing such loan may be junior to the mortgage insured under title IA.'

"SEC. 13. Section 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following words: *Provided*, That, if the amount thus determined for any State or Territory, other than the Territory of Alaska or the District of Columbia, shall be less than $100,000, the allotment for such State or Territory shall be increased to $100,000, and the amounts determined for the remaining States and Territories shall be adjusted accordingly: *Provided further*, That the funds so allotted to any such State or Territory may be loaned to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally operated and occupied by him and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, in cases where the Secretary determines that such refinancing is necessary and will enable the borrower successfully to operate the farm, and that the borrower cannot obtain credit for such refinancing from any other Federal agency or federally incorporated lending institution. Such loans shall comply with, and be subject to, all the provisions of this title.'

"SEC. 14. Section 40 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by striking out 'or title II, or both,' and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'Title IA, or title II,'.

"SEC. 15. Section 41 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) To delegate any of the functions and powers conferred upon him under this act to such officers or agents as he may designate and appoint.'

"SEC. 16. (a) Section 42 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting after 'title I' the following: 'or title IA'.

"(b) Section 42 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by striking out '5 days in a month' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '60 days in a fiscal year.'

"SEC. 17. (a) Subsection (a) of section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby amended by inserting after 'title I' a comma and the following: 'title IA,'.

"(b) Section 50 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is hereby further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Nothing in title I or title IA of this act shall be construed to exempt any property acquired by the Secretary under said titles from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other property is taxed.'

"SEC. 18. Section 51 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting after the figure '51' the following: '(a)'; and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Each mortgage hereafter executed under title I or insured under title IA of this act shall contain a covenant that, if the mortgaged property shall, within 25 years after the date of said mortgage, with or without prepayment of the unpaid balance thereof, be disposed of by, or for the credit of, the mortgagor or his successors, by foreclosure or otherwise, for a consideration in excess of the cost of such property, as determined by the Secretary, there shall be payable to the Secretary, for the credit of the mutual insurance fund established under section 12 (a), a sum equal to 50 percent of such excess, less 2 percent of such excess for each year that has elapsed since the date of such mortgage. In computing the cost of such property, the Secretary may credit the mortgagor with the reasonable value of improvements made by him, less any waste or other impairment in value which he has caused or permitted.'

"SEC. 19. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (relating to restrictions upon the lending powers of national banks), is hereby further amended by inserting after the words 'National Housing Act,' appearing at the end of the third sentence, the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 20. The last sentence of paragraph 'Seventh' of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting, after the words 'National Housing Act,' the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 21. Section 35 of chapter III of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia,' approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1152), is amended by inserting in paragraph 3 (a), after the words 'Federal Housing Administrator,' the following: 'or which are insured pursuant to title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'

"SEC. 22. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 12, sec. 1020 (d)), is amended by inserting after the word 'bonds,' where said word first appears, the following: 'and to purchase and make loans upon mortgages insured under title IA of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.'"

Mr. STEAGALL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama if the proposed amendment is included in the bill as reported?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the motion is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. There are only two differences between the Senate amendment and the proposal now offered by me.

The Senate amendment, providing a system for the insurance of farm mortgages by the Farm Security Administration, provided that an assessment charge of not less than one-fourth of 1 percent should be levied against the mortgagor. The conferees on the part of the House report an amendment to that amendment to the effect that the assessment shall be not less than one-fourth of 1 percent nor more than one-half of 1 percent.

The Senate amendment provided that a fund for the protection of the mortgages insured should be established by taking not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated by Congress for loans to be made by the Farm Security Administration. The amendment agreed upon by the conferees and embodied in the motion at the Clerk's desk provides that not more than 5 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated for loans by the Farm Security Administration shall be used for the establishment of a fund for the protection of insurance liability.

These are the only changes made in the Senate amendment, which has been read at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have no further objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman refers to one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent. Is that based upon the principal of the loan?

Mr. STEAGALL. The provision is not less than one-fourth and not more than one-half of 1 percent of the amount insured.

Mr. WHITE. Is not that way out of line with the principles laid down in the Federal Housing Administration Act? Do they charge on the guaranteed amount the same percentage in the setting up of a fund to guarantee mortgages by the F. H. A.? Do they not take a less amount than one-fourth of 1 percent?

Mr. STEAGALL. No.

Mr. WHITE. Is this in line with the principles laid down in the Federal Housing Act?

Mr. STEAGALL. Under title I of the Federal Housing Act they assess one-half of 1 percent on the mortgages covering construction of new homes and three-quarters of 1 percent on mortgages covering loans for repairs.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the principle of this plan follows very closely the

principles of the Federal Housing Administration Act?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does.

Mr. WHITE. This is applying the same principle to farm-tenancy mortgages that you now apply to Federal-housing mortgages?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is right.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Has either one of these amendments ever been considered by a committee of the House?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Not the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. STEAGALL. No.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] is that the further reading of the motion to recede and concur in the amendment, with an amendment, be dispensed with. The gentleman from Alabama will then have an hour within which to answer questions.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. TARVER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the motion.

Mr. WEISS (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was some discussion before the amendment was read with respect to an extension of time. I made the statement that, although under the rule the gentleman from Alabama would have 1 hour to allot as he saw fit, it seemed hardly time enough within which to discuss such a very important and controversial matter. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama and myself cannot agree upon some extension of time. I have had several requests for time on this side.

Mr. STEAGALL. What suggestion would the gentleman make?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the time should be extended at least 1 hour, to provide 2 hours of debate. I have six requests for time already.

Mr. STEAGALL. How about 30 minutes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. To do the subject justice, I do not see how we could do it in one-half an hour more. When I say that an additional hour is the very minimum, this would only give each side 1 hour if the time were equally divided, and I wish, of course, the gentleman would equally divide the time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, I would like to yield the gentleman time. We spent some time here unnecessarily due to the objections that were made, but I want to be generous about it. Of course, the 1 hour of time does not contemplate any division or control of the time. I would be glad to yield the gentleman some time, and I will be glad to agree on an extension of time and leave some time at the disposal of the gentleman from Michigan. Would not the gentleman be satisfied with 30 minutes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Could we not agree on an extension of 1 hour and then we will equally divide it?

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, that is equivalent to setting aside the rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman would yield me 1 hour to dispose of as I saw fit, it would be the same thing.

Mr. STEAGALL. I would suggest that the gentleman agree on 30 minutes and let me yield him that time. I think this matter can be made clear to the House in 1 hour. There is another bill on the calendar that is very important, which the gentleman and I are interested in having considered because it is in the same category as this legislation, which needs to be passed by the House and the Senate before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This particular amendment does not have to be enacted before the first of the year. We have adopted the conference report, and I may say to the gentleman that five of the requests which I have are from Members who are not on the committee. I have not taken into consideration any of the committee members in this request.

Mr. STEAGALL. I would assume that the gentleman would preferably take care of the members of the committee with respect to any time that he might have.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask if the gentleman proposes to grant time on this side to those who are opposed to the amendment?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes. I have no intention of preventing a proper discussion of the amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Have requests been made of the gentleman for time on the part of those opposing the amendment on his side?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think we need 2 hours.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this comes from our committee and that our committee has had no opportunity to study it, does the gentleman from Alabama not think it fair to agree to an additional hour?

Mr. FULMER. And, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Alabama that this is a very controversial bill, having about 26 pages, and certainly it has not been considered by the committee. The House ought to know something about it, and I am sure that 2 hours' debate will not be long enough to get the real facts in connection with the bill before the Members of the House.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this is a bill which, if fully discussed in all of its ramifications, might necessitate more than an hour's time. I think, however, that the bill could be understood quite well, and I think gentlemen who are insisting on time here are all acquainted with the provisions of this proposed amendment, but in order that no one may be denied opportunity to discuss the matter, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to extend the time an additional hour, and I shall yield 30 minutes of that to the gentleman from Michigan. I desire to yield some time myself to the opponents of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the time on the pending motion be extended 1 hour. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The gentleman has kindly offered to yield 30 minutes of the 2 hours to me, I assume, to yield to others. We are no better off over here under that agreement.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not think the gentleman should expect me to yield more time to the opponents of this measure than I yield to the proponents. The time under the rule is 1 hour, and it is under my control as chairman of the committee. I have offered the gentleman an additional hour, 30 minutes of that to be controlled by himself. The opponents of the measure on my side ought to be heard. I have made certain commitments, and I must fulfill the obligations, and to do so, it seems to me, my suggestion of an additional hour's time, 30 minutes of that to the gentleman, is generous, and should be agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Would not the gentleman feel that if we had only an hour the opponents of the bill should at least have half of the time? I do not see how the opponents of the measure are any better off under the gentleman's suggestions. The strategy of it is that it gives the gentleman from Alabama an hour and a half.

Mr. STEAGALL. It is my purpose to yield to the opponents of the bill on this side. I have made certain commitments.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Has the gentleman made any commitments to those on the Republican side?

Mr. STEAGALL. No. I have extended the 30 minutes to the gentleman, and I have not any thought to yield to opponents on the Republican side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have made certain commitments, if an hour is to be within my control.

Mr. STEAGALL. If the gentleman has made commitments before his power to fulfill, I cannot help it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman bear with me for a moment? I may say that I have committed myself as far as I could to yield to Members on this side who are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Does the gentleman intend to yield half of his time to those who would support the amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and I might say to the gentleman if he will yield an hour to me to yield as I desire, I shall take care of the opponents and the proponents on this side of the aisle.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield half of the time to those in sup-

port of the amendment if we allow an hour?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not want to take the gentleman's time away from him. There is not any personal satisfaction in getting half an hour. I am trying to get the other half hour for the opponents of the measure. I am trying to get additional time for those who want to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I think it is only fair in a bill of this magnitude, involving $350,000,000, a matter that has been in controversy before this Congress for years, to yield the opponents of the measure a fair amount of time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. STEAGALL. I want to say to the gentleman——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia demands the regular order and insists upon it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I agree to yield the gentleman 1 hour's time with the understanding that he take care of all requests on the part of those who are opposed to the amendment, and permit me to use the hour at my disposal on behalf of those in favor of the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that is fair of the gentleman. I think that is a very fine solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that his time on the pending motion be extended 1 hour and that he may yield 1 hour of the 2 hours to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to be in turn yielded by him. Is there objection?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to have this thing understood by the membership. Do I understand that the gentleman from Alabama is yielding 1 hour to the gentleman from Michigan with the understanding that the gentleman from Michigan shall take care of those who are opposed to the amendment?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman from Alabama wants to put the House in such a predicament. I can understand the gentleman from Michigan if I were in his position, I would accept it, because it is a favor to him, but you do not want to make Democrats go to the gentleman from Michigan to seek time. I think the gentleman might relinquish 1 hour, the same as the ordinary procedure. The ordinary procedure is to relinquish one-half of the time to the ranking Member on the minority side. I think, if the gentleman from Alabama would ask unanimous consent to extend the time 1 hour, and relinquish 1 hour to the gentleman from Michigan with no contingencies, that would be the proper thing to do.

Mr. STEAGALL. This request does not come from the gentleman from Alabama, and I will say, in addition to that, all the gentleman from Alabama has asked is that this amendment be considered under the regular rules of the House. In response to a request by the gentleman from Michigan, I tendered 30 minutes of the time to be at his disposal. He said he had requests from those who favored amendment, I assume on the minority side. I suggested that I would permit him to take care of requests of those who were opposed and I would take care of requests of those who are in favor. Meantime I have made committals——

Mr. McCORMACK. I listened to the entire colloquy. The question of time is a matter that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Alabama can agree upon. From what I can see, I think the House desires the time extended 1 hour. My only interest as majority leader is this: I do not see how I can sit here and permit an agreement to be made whereby Democrats will have to go to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]—and I know he will not construe that in any sense other than I express it—or to any Republican to seek time in their own right. I think the gentleman from Alabama is making a mistake when he precludes himself from giving time to Democrats who desire to oppose the amendment. I think it is a bad precedent to establish.

Mr. STEAGALL. If the gentleman listened to the discussion I cannot see how he could have so misunderstood it. I have said I intend to yield on this side to those who are opposed, and I have made committals to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me see if I understand the gentleman from Alabama. I understood the gentleman yielded 1 hour to the gentleman from Michigan, with the understanding that the gentleman from Michigan would take care of those Members who are opposed to the amendment. If the gentleman yields 1 hour and then in turn intends to yield part of his time to Democrats who may be opposed, then I have been expressing myself upon a misunderstanding.

Mr. STEAGALL. I had no thought other than to yield, as far as I could, to Members who are opposed on this side. I have simply undertaken to accommodate the gentleman on the other side and I should like that he would yield to those over there who are opposed. I will yield some of the time to those who are in favor. I think if the gentleman from Massachusetts will let us, we will get along with this matter without any misunderstanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if the time is extended 1 hour, it is with the understanding that one-half the time is given to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is all right. I accept that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from Alabama to again state his unanimous consent request.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the request is that the time be extended for 1 hour and that one-half the time be under the control of myself as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the other half to be under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking minority member of that committee. I hope that will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama as just stated by him?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the Farm Security Administration is authorized to use anually $50,000,000 for farm-tenant loans. Loans have been made in the amount of approximately $70,000,000, upon which collections have been made above 97 percent.

I assume that the House is acquainted with the character of service rendered by the Farm Security Administration in connection with the tenant-loan program. Certain it is that under my own observation a great public service has been rendered in enabling farmers who have lost their homes, through no fault of their own, to get started along the road to home ownership and independent citizenship.

Under existing law the Farm Security Administration is authorized to lend annually $50,000,000, from funds appropriated by Congress, for the purpose of buying land, tools, implements, seed, building houses, and everything necessary to the management of a farm. This amendment seeks to relieve the Treasury of the United States of the risk involved in loans of this character by establishing an insurance fund supplemented by assessments against mortgagors of not less than one-quarter of 1 percent nor more than one-half of 1 percent for the purpose of inducing private investors to make such loans. The plan is to have these loans made by individual citizens and lending institutions, relieving the Government of the necessity of direct loans out of the Treasury; the Government would not be involved except in the establishment of a fund for the protection of insurance liability on the mortgages.

The plan follows that of the Federal Housing Insurance Administration which has worked so successfully and has met the approval of the Congress. The fund to be established for the protection of the insurance set up by this amendment would be raised first by an assessment against the mortgagor; and not more than 5 percent of the maximum amount authorized for loans by the Farm Security Administration would be made available for the establishment of the

insurance fund. The amount available under appropriations that have been authorized is $50,000,000 a year. Thus, the 5 percent fund would amout to $2,500,000, and added to that would be the amount realized upon the assessment upon mortgages. The first year mortgages to the amount of $50,000,000 might be insured; the second year, $150,000,000; and the third year, $150,000,000. The program is to run for only 3 years.

The purpose of this amendment is to relieve the Treasury of the responsibility of direct loans to tenant farmers and establish an insurance fund to insure such loans made by private interests. That is all there is in this bill, no more and no less.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The practical effect of it would be to transfer the loans from the Treasury of the United States to private bankers.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what is undertaken by this bill—banks, individuals, and other lending institutions. It is, of course, an experiment. It would run for only 3 years. We do not know just how well it would succeed, but we do know how the plan has operated successfully in the case of the Federal Housing Administration. We do know that the direct loans made by the Farm Security Administration have been administered with surprising success, and has involved no serious loss to the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman has referred to the very successful experience of the Federal Housing Administration in the insurance of mortgages on houses. Fundamentally, is not the insurance of a mortgage on a farm just as sound as the insurance of a mortgage on a house?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is, in theory, a safer security than a direct loan on a building because everybody knows there is constant wear, tear, and gradual depreciation in the value of a building. We hope the time will again come in this country when it is not unsafe to lend a citizen whose character and producing capacity have been tested and approved, as is required under the provisions of this proposal.

We believe that the insurance of these mortgages will enable a citizen with proper assistance to become a producer and a safer risk than where the lender relies merely upon the property itself as protection for repayment of a loan.

Mr. GORE. And will not the gentleman go a little further and state what has been the successful experience of the Farm Security Administration in the loans they have made to purchasers under the tenant-purchase program?

Mr. STEAGALL. They have succeeded, I would think, beyond anybody's expectation. As shown by the records down to this time their collections are above 100 percent. This is due to the fact that there have been some premature discharges of indebtedness. The actual figures show that more than 97 percent of the loans have been repaid down to this time.

In farming sections it used to be understood by supply merchants that when a farmer was unable to meet his obligations in any year because of unaccountable adversities for which he was not responsible that the merchants would have no trouble collecting his debt if he would back the farmer for 3 years.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I do not have before me the amendment the gentleman sent to the Clerk's desk, but I have the language of the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. They are the same except in two particulars.

Mr. TARVER. I understand. Just wait a minute, please. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in setting up the insurance fund the provision is contained in the proposed law that not exceeding 5 percent of the appropriation for the fiscal year beginning July 1——

Mr. STEAGALL. That is not in the provision now before the House.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman allow me to complete my question? The gentleman is aware of the fact that we have appropriated no money for the farm tenant land purchase program this next fiscal year but have simply authorized loans from the R. F. C. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment to appropriate 5 percent of the money that is to be borrowed from the R. F. C.?

Mr. STEAGALL. The advices that we had in conference were that the amount of $10,000,000 had been appropriated and $50,000,000 authorized. We changed that language so as to say "not more than 5 percent of the maximum amount authorized by Congress," which is the law now. As I understand it, we do authorize $50,000,000 to be lent directly.

Mr. TARVER. As a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations I am correctly advised when I say that no money has been appropriated in the agricultural appropriation bill for the farm tenant purchase program for the next fiscal year for making loans.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have not so stated.

Mr. TARVER. Is the gentleman proposing to appropriate here 5 percent of the money we are going to borrow from the R. F. C. for that program?

Mr. STEAGALL. The language is plain. It is 5 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated, which is $2,500,000.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the Federal Housing Administration insures loans on city property up to 80 percent in certain cases and 90 percent in others?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that in this bill you propose to insure 100 percent of the value?

Mr. STEAGALL. We do.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In addition to that, you insure the appraisal fees and the inspection fees as prescribed by the Secretary.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I say to the gentleman that we do not insure anything under this bill for which we do not make loans under existing law. This does not come out of the Treasury of the United States. This is a plan to insure these loans where a million dollars risked by the Treasury will take care of 10 times or more the amount of loans that can be made by direct appropriations.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that a 100-percent loan is safer on a long 40-year term at a low rate of interest as proposed here than a 75-percent loan would be on a short-term high rate of interest?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes. Before any of these loans can be made under existing law there must be a recommendation of a committee of citizens who certify to the good character and the producing ability of the applicant for the loan. The same plan applies to loans that would be insured. The Farm Security Administration will not make any safer loans than those to be insured under its provisions of this bill.

The Congress has gone to the rescue of the Federal land banks. We passed a $2,000,000,000 farm relief bill for the purpose of taking care of the farm situation in the United States. The farm-tenant program is simply a part of the effort to restore agriculture to its proper place and to give tenants an opportunity to become home owners and to restore the normal conditions that existed prior to the economic upheaval that brought about these maladjustments which we have sought to relieve by legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which this legislation is brought in here reflects upon the Congress of the United States. In my opinion, we subject ourselves to a great deal of criticism when we attempt to legislate as we are legislating in this particular matter.

I am informed that amendment No. 11, which is known as the Senate rider, has been in controversy before this House and before committees of this House for a good many years. If that is true, surely we should not attempt at this time to pass judgment upon the merits of this title. The matter should be referred to the proper committee of the House, which probably would be the Banking and Currency Committee; at least, it should be referred to a committee that would have the opportunity to hear witnesses, have some of the agriculturists come in and tell us wherein they would be benefited, and have at least a little testimony in explanation of the fact that we are creating a contingent liabilty of over $350,000,000 that might become an actual liability if this program is not successful.

We have at the present time a farm-tenant program. We set it up, as I am informed, as a sort of guinea pig; if successful we would continue it, but if it did not prove successful we could stop it. Now, before the experiment is complete,

we are asked to create a contingent liability further of $350,000,000 when the most that can be created of direct loans under the present scheme in any one year, as I understand it, is $50,000,000.

This bill does differ, and differs materially, from the Federal housing program. I want to call attention to one of the provisions of this bill which I believe is inequitable. It is found in the requirement for eligibility, but without this provision I concede that the bill would not accomplish its purpose. I refer to page 9 of the bill, subsection (b) of subsection (1). Reading the whole thing together, it is stated:

To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall have been made by a farmer who owns no interest in any real property except that which is pledged as the security for this loan—

In other words, in order for a man to be rehabilitated under this bill he cannot even hold a lease of the farm, and I believe that a great many of the needy so-called tenant and sharecrop farmers today, whom it is sought to rehabilitate under this act, would be ineligible because they have some interest in real estate. If they have a lease, it is a leasehold interest and is such an interest as would disqualify them under this plan.

I am not going to discuss this bill in detail, because there are others who know so much more than I do about it, but let me reiterate that this is no way to legislate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, no hearings have been held on this matter except by the committees which have been studying it in principle for years, and the principle has been defeated by committees of the House; yet we are asked, in view of the highly controversial nature of the matter, to pass this legislation practically unseen, and without giving adequate consideration to it. If this is defeated, I expect to make a motion to insist upon the disagreement; and if that is agreed to, I believe the matter will be presented in the proper way, and if the proper committees come in here with a compromise I am sure they will find a lot of support for the principle of it which they cannot find under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not this amendment identical with the original Lee bill which came over to the House during the last session of Congress, was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, receiving the consideration of that committee, and was repudiated by that committee, another bill being reported out known as the Jones bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been informed that this bill has the Lee bill as a background. Whether or not the two are identical I do not know. I presume they differ in some particulars, but the principle is the same, as I understand.

Mr. COOLEY. But the Lee bill did go to the House Committee on Agriculture, and I recall that it was not reported by that committee. As the gentleman pointed out, instead of this bill being passed by the Senate as a separate bill and coming to the House and going again to the Committee on Agriculture for further consideration, it has not received the consideration of the Committee on Banking and Currency or any other committee of the House, except the House conferees.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; it has not.

Let me make this statement: If conditions had been reversed and I had been sponsoring this amendment in the House, I probably would have done the same thing. The strategy was to take full advantage of the popularity of F. H. A., with the thought that many Members would rather vote for this amendment than be on record as having voted against F. H. A. That is why we reported this amendment in disagreement, so there would not be any question that we were not voting against F. H. A. We will have a separate vote on this question, and a Member can with a clear conscience vote against this on the principle that it has not been given adequate consideration by any committee of the Congress having jurisdiction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in favor of this amendment not for the reason that there are any people in my district who would be particularly affected by it but rather on the broad principle that it is about time that business should be given some opportunity to invest its funds.

At the present time the Federal Government has its farm program, and appropriations for it in the past have been made. It seems to me that if this program is successful and we follow the idea of making further and greater appropriations for it directly, we are never going to have private business again in the field of mortgages or the like.

Under the proposal now before us, we give the individual bankers or banking concerns an opportunity to invest the moneys they now have, and their deposits today, I am told, are greater than at any time in their history. They have no source of revenue from this money, and unless we provide an opportunity for this money in the banks to earn money we are not giving business a fair opportunity.

Under this plan, therefore, the idea is to permit loans by private corporations and banking concerns to the farmers. These loans will be insured by the Federal Government in the amount as stated in the bill not to exceed $350,000,000, $50,000,000 the first year, up to $150,000,000 the second, and not to exceed the authorized $350,000,000 the third year.

The suggestion has been made here that because the F. H. A. insures loans up to 85 or 90 percent and this bill provides for insurance for the full amount there is perhaps some defect in this bill. Coming from a city, as I do, may I say that there is far greater need to insure only up to 85 or 90 percent on city property than there is on farm property, because in a city the population fluctuates time after time. You may build a residence within a city and within a short time the whole neighborhood may change by reason of an influx of population of one kind or another. Therefore, it seems to me that this provision of insuring up to the full amount of the appraised value of the property, which is passed upon by a committee of three in the county in which the loan is to be made, is a salutary one, and one which will insure the very best results.

In furtherance of this amendment may I say that the history of the Federal Housing Authority has been such that, although the farm program has been more or less of an experiment in the past, I believe we can have a great deal of confidence in the administration of a program such as this, even though the amount of the contingent liability is a great deal more than the actual appropriation in the past.

For these reasons it seems to me that purely from a business point of view—purely from the point of view that it once again gives to the banking interests of the country an opportunity to make their deposits work—and without any great consideration of the technique to be followed in order to carry out the details of the act, I should be in favor of this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahome [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I find myself in disagreement with many members of the Committee on Agriculture, on which I have the honor to serve, and perhaps as well a majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle; but I am immensely interested in this legislation and I feel that we should consider its merits rather than the technicalities by which it comes before the House.

Some reference has been made to it, and I am sure there is some misunderstanding with reference to the legislation that came before the Committee on Agriculture last year. The gentleman from North Carolina awhile ago inquired if this bill was not killed almost unanimously last year by the Committee on Agriculture. I may say to the gentleman that I believe that is correct, as far as this particular bill is concerned. Of course, this amendment is in substance what was known as the Lee bill over in the Senate. At the same time, while the members of the Committee on Agriculture in the House were killing the Lee bill, they reported out of that committee favorably for consideration Senate bill 1836. I have before me the report on that bill. I do not believe a rule was ever obtained on the bill. If the Members will take time to look at that report, they will find that in substance the bill S. 1836, which was reported out of the committee, carries the same principle as this bill and is in effect substantially the same as this bill.

It seems to me that if this legislation is needed, while we have this bill before us at this time, we ought to lay aside our so-called prejudices in favor of our own

committee and pass the bill. And I may say here I am in favor of defending the legislative committees of this House as much as anyone else. I have served in a legislative body before and I know each committee has its own particular function, but on the other hand this bill is here now for consideration and it seems to me we ought to consider it primarily upon its merits rather than upon jurisdictional questions. In other words, if it is a good bill and if it merits the consideration of this House, then we ought to pass it on its merits rather than defeat it upon some jurisdictional question or send it back as was suggested by an able gentleman a while ago for hearings. Of course, that is the best way on earth to ultimately kill it, and I assume, as the gentleman said he was against the legislation, that is exactly what he had in mind doing.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the bill which the House Committee on Agriculture reported out last year had these two particularly important differences: First, the bill that was reported out would insure loans only up to 90 percent of the value, whereas this measure provides for insurance up to full value, and, furthermore, the bill that the House Committee reported out, provided for an insurance premium of 1 percent, whereas this measure provides for only one-fourth of 1 percent.

Mr. RIZLEY. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that there were those two differences in the bills, but I do not put the same construction on the significance of them as does my good friend from Nebraska.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman refer to page 9, subparagraph (b) of the bill. Does the gentleman think the leasehold interest would be an interest in real property, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman refer to the suggestions made by the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot agree with my distinguished colleague. I do not believe the language contained there would deprive a man who had an ordinary lease on a farm from becoming a purchaser of that farm.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What significance does the gentleman give to the language that, to be eligible, it must be made by a farmer who owns no interest in any real property? It does not say interest in the fee, it does not say he must hold it in fee simple, and it does not say he shall have title; and a leasehold interest is, of course, interest in property.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, before the mortgage is finally insured, the farmer, of course, is going to own that farm. But as I understood the construction that the gentleman placed on this language, it was to the effect that the farmer who had an ordinary farm lease on a crop rental basis would not be eligible under this law to mortgage the farm. Let me say to the gentleman that, as I understand this bill, it does not change the eligibility of those who obtain farm mortgages. This bill simply provides for the purchases of those mortgages or for insurance under the insurance provisions of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that possibly the language which follows in parentheses does permit the man who has a leasehold interest in a farm to purchase and mortgage that particular farm, but I am inclined to think he could not purchase any other farm.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, farm tenancy has long been recognized as a major national problem. Both of the major political parties represented on either side of this aisle have in their respective party platforms for many years promised prompt and effective action in an attempt to cope with the situation. But outside of high-sounding phrases incorporated in the platform not very much has been done about it by either party and the facts remain that the farmers of the United States are steadily losing ownership of their lands.

Year after year a percentage of all farms under rental continues to grow. Sixty years ago in 1880 about one-fourth of our farms were kept by tenants in 1900 at the turn of the century the figure was 35 percent; in 1910, 37 percent; in 1920, 38 percent; 192[illegible], 42 percent; 1940, 47 percent plus. Except in New England and a few of the South Atlantic States, tenancy increases throughout our Nation and no political regime or credit system has yet thwarted its determined growth. In 1935, according to statistics, the proportion of farm land under lease or rental to the operator ranged from 62 percent in South Dakota to 8 percent in Maine and Massachusetts.

Equities of the farm operators in all farm real estate range from an average of a little less than 30 percent in Illinois and Iowa and South Dakota to an average of over 70 percent in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. The census of 1940 clearly evidences a continuation of this trend.

As might be expected the percentage of tenancy among young farmers is much higher than among older farmers. But it is interesting to note that the number of young farmers has decreased and the number of middle-aged and older farmers has increased. About 55 percent of the farmers of Belgium are tenants. In Japan the percentage is about 30 percent; in Germany about 25 percent; in France 25 percent; and in Denmark only about 15 percent.

In the United States the most rapid increase now takes place in the richest lands of the Middle West, in banner farm States such as Iowa and Minnesota, where more than one-third of the farms are now run by tenants. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana the tenant increase is even more spectacular and so instead of this being a problem that was once claimed to be peculiar to the South and particularly the cotton section, it is rapidly spreading to all sections of the United States.

I recall that last year when a select committee of this House was designated to investigate interstate migration of destitute citizens that numerous witnesses testifying in Oklahoma as to the probable cause of the loss of farms and farm population in our State during the past 10 years, and particularly the loss of farms and farm population in the best agricultural counties in the State, considerable criticism was aroused when our Governor and others attributed a proportion of this loss, at least, to the New Deal program for agriculture through its successive AAA's.

The facts remain, however, that while it has strewed billions of dollars of public funds for alleged farm relief, farm tenants have increased. Its regime has instituted a memorable high of big farm profits. It has paid an appalling proportion of Federal benefits to owners of land rather than to the workers of land. While it has dropped a few unavoidable crumbs to tenants, the cream of the swag has gone and is going to big owners of big farms. If you do not think this is true, study acreage limitation benefits paid to growers of cotton, sugar, wheat, and cattle. The general force of the entire program, including conservation payments, has been to make rich farms richer and poor farms poorer and to increase farm tenancy.

The story of land tenure in the United States is not an inevitable story—its wrongs are not incurable. The Department of Agriculture has all of the necessary facilities for making surveys and the set-up to implement and carry on the policy expressed in the terms of this bill. It is entirely possible for the Department to carry on a scientific and educational research so as to present tabulations to all farm agents in every section of the country—farms that would be suitable for purchase and loans under the proposed program.

There can be no political democracy in any nation without economic democracy underlying.

By economic democracy I do not mean equal distribution of wealth, but a quality of economic opportunity—a free chance for economic betterment, for becoming economically free and independent. Only a citizenry economically free and independent can be free politically. The economically dispossessed will always vote for whatever demagogue is the immediate agent of relief, and this ultimately means a situation which will end political democracy. For the individual within a nation economic democracy requires the solution of the farm and employment problem so that all the people may again have the chance to become economically free and independent.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that, as one of the conferees I should state to the House my reasons that impelled me to vote amendment 11 in disagreement.

The fact that I voted the amendment be reported in disagreement is because I want it considered by the House, and is not primarily based upon hostility to its substantive provisions. No hearings have been had by the House, and I have not had any opportunity to consider it as I would wish. The reason for my action is based upon the fact that the Members of the House, in my opinion, have the right to consider new matters of this importance carefully and freely, and offer amendments if they so desire. Before I ever was appointed on conference I often thought the conferees frequently had too much authority if they desired to use it; and since I have been eligible to be appointed on conference I have not changed my opinion. I think all new substantive amendments in the other body should, as a matter of right, be considered by the House de novo in free debate and with the right of amendment. The Constitution of the United States provides—

all legislative powers herein granted are vested in the Congress of the United States, which consists of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Here the power is vested, and this power cannot be delegated. It is my humble opinion the functions of the conference should be to compose the differences between the House and the Senate on germane amendments to the bill, those that might have been considered or anticipated. The Senate amendment is entirely new matter, and, while analogous in a certain sense to the House bill, is certainly not germane, and could by no stretch of the imagination be anticipated. It sets up a new agency in another department of the Government. However, I think its general purpose is commendable. I think the method it seeks to pursue is superior to the method of the Bankhead-Jones Act. I believe it is always advisable to stimulate private enterprise to make loans rather than authorize direct loans by governmental agencies. The provisions of the amendment are far more favorable to the borrower than are the conditions under which loans are made by the Federal Housing Administration to home owners in the cities. Under the amendment, the loan will be made on the 100-percent appraised value of the property. Under the F. H. A., the loan is 90 percent of the appraised value. The proponents of the amendment say that unless 100-percent loans are made the amendment would be entirely ineffective. The insurance premium under title II of the Federal Housing Administration is from ¼ to 1 percent.

Under the Senate amendment, the premium here fixed is one-quarter of 1 percent. This, by amendment, has been changed to one-half of 1 percent. It is provided, however, here, that there will be an initial backlog of $2,500,000, which will probably carry the losses for several years. Since the bill has been considered here, that has been disputed, because it has been said that the appropriation out of which that $2,500,000 will be used as a backlog has not been made. However, the administration, if it is to be permanent, should be self-supporting, and I think it should have the right to increase the premium to the extent that it would take care of all actual and contingent losses and accumulate a surplus that would assure its solvency.

Mr. Speaker, I have been an earnest advocate of farm ownership and I would like to see some constructive measure passed that would stimulate this ownership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. SPENCE. The tenant farmer has a right to be a home owner and a farm owner under the most favorable circumstances. The National Government is deeply interested in this matter. We must keep him on the farm under the most favorable circumstances possible. We must keep him on the farm if we are going to have any success either in agriculture or industry. Farming is the great basic industry upon which is not only founded our progress, and our prosperity, but our very existence. I have a deep interest in seeing some bill passed that will accomplish the purpose of keeping the farmer on the land and making him contented and encouraging him to become a landowner, but this is too important a matter for the House not to consider it carefully and freely. It was for that reason that I voted this amendment in disagreement. I believe that the House has a right to consider matters of this importance free from the opinions of the conferees, and I hope the House will give careful consideration to this matter. If the Members of the House, after consideration, think it is a good amendment, they can vote for it. It is their responsibility, but I do believe this House should have the right to consider this amendment free from the ordinary limitations imposed upon the consideration of reports by conferees. I shall exercise my best judgment and shall cast a vote that I think will not only be to the best interest of the farmers but to the country as well.

If the amendment is workable it may be helpful. If it is not workable it will injure most those it is intended to benefit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and with the consent of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], I yield myself 5 minutes.

I have been among the many here who are interested in the farm-ownership question, and I have been ever since I came back to Congress. The situation in our section of the Northwest, particularly in my own district and that represented by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman GEHRMANN, had become particularly acute, because of the wave of farm-mortgage foreclosures. Federal land banks, the insurance companies, and many other firms and corporations which had mortgages on farms were proceeding to foreclose on those mortgages, and drive the farmers off their places. Many farmers were forced into the cities, where they were obliged to go on relief, and some, here and there, joined the great army of migrant farmers, which now numbers some 3,000,000 farm people scattered throughout this country who are out of work and searching for jobs.

Before the introduction of the Wheeler-Lee bill, both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN] and myself introduced our own farm-debt adjustment measures prepared with the collaboration of the farm organizations, endeavoring to find some way of adjusting the huge farm-mortgage indebtedness, stop foreclosures, and enable the dairy and other farmers to remain on their places. My own bill still awaits action by the Committee on Agriculture.

As you gentlemen know, no consideration was given to these bills in the previous session. Finally, in 1939, the Senate embodied the principles of the bills introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman GEHRMANN, and myself into another measure as an amendment, and it passed that body after 3 days of debate, by a vote of 74 to 8. I think that was the first time the farm-mortgage situation was really brought to the attention of both Houses of Congress in so forceful a manner. The Senate amendment failed to pass this House.

We have now this proposition before us. I am not here to say that this is a solution, a complete or perfect solution or the only solution that can be arrived at, but it is evident that it is the only bill that is going to be considered by the House of Representatives at this session which would stop foreclosures, and bring relief to farm owners, laboring under such indebtedness, and farm tenants.

Congress has passed many huge appropriation bills providing large loans. I noticed this morning a report that there had been loans from the Import-Export Bank of $130,000,000 to Argentina, for the purpose of stabilizing agriculture down there, and as a part of the loan, the Government of Argentina had purchased 326,000,000 bushels of corn at 20 cents per bushel in order to relieve the stress of Argentine farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I am just wondering how the gentleman thinks this bill will stop foreclosures?

Mr. HULL. I hope to get to that if I can get a little more time.

Mr. COOLEY. I am interested in getting the gentleman's views in that regard, because under this bill, as I understand it, a person must be completely divested of any interest in real property before he is eligible for consideration.

Mr. HULL. No. There is another provision in this bill, as I understand it, which includes another class of farmers—those in danger of losing their farms, by taking over of the mortgages by

the Secretary, under the provisions of this measure, and reloaning.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the bill says "other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence and from which he does not derive any substantial part of his livelihood."

Mr. COOLEY. That does not include farm land, does it?

Mr. GORE. It includes what the language includes—

other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence, and from which he does not derive any substantial part of his livelihood.

Therefore the gentleman's statement is not entirely correct.

Mr. HULL. I am sorry I cannot yield further, because I only have a little time, not sufficient to cover the subject.

In addition to the loans to foreign countries, which are proceeding elaborately, at the same time we have other loaning programs in this country. We have the so-called slum-clearance loans. I would like to remind some of our city brethren who do not seem to be as interested in farm debts as they are in their own problems, that we are paying out $28,000,000 a year in order to maintain the slum-clearance program and reduce the rent of those occupying newly erected dwellings. If I had time I think I could paint quite a picture showing how far this Congress has gone and how far it continues to go in expanding the credit of other people than farmers in our own and in other countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HULL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

As to this remedy, nobody knows exactly how it will work out or how fully it will meet the situation, but I do know that foreclosures in large numbers are still in progress out in the Middle West. The Federal land bank is foreclosing, along with other financial institutions. In my own district 962 farms were foreclosed upon and some of them were disposed of at from 25, 30, 35, 40, or 50 cents on the dollar. It did not include just a little farm here and there. It included some of the best dairy farms in our district.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman says the farm land bank is disposing of these farms at 40 and 50 percent discount. Will the gentleman tell me if the men who lose those farms are able to buy them at that discount?

Mr. HULL. Not under their regulations. I shall go a little further and say that along with the Federal land-bank loans are many Land Bank Commissioner loans under second liens. That Government fund originally amounted to $700,000,000 or more. Almost invariably where the land-bank loan is foreclosed and the Lank Bank Commissioner loan is a second lien, the Government loses out. The Land Bank Commission loses out on that second lien. If this process continues, and it apparently is continuing, it is only a matter of time when the Government of the United States is going to lose four or five hundred or the entire seven hundred million dollars it has out on Land Bank Commissioner loans.

Whether this is the exactly right remedy or not, whether it comes from the right committee or not, whether there is a jurisdictional question involved or not, I am not concerned as much as I am in having something accomplished by this Congress for the debt-ridden farmers. and farm tenants, particularly those in my own section of the country. This is the first opportunity which has come to this Congress to act on the question. After 7 years of delay, we should act now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my reasoned judgment that this amendment should be voted down and that the entire amendment in the form of a bill should be brought to either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Agricultural Committee so that a careful study of the matter may be made and a bill reported out that will actually achieve the objects which this amendment has in view.

I am in complete accord with the principle of this amendment, but I am convinced that the mechanics are so faulty that if it were put into operation it will fail completely to achieve its objectives and thus deal a very serious blow to the principle of insuring farm mortgages on any liberal basis.

I am not worried about the 100-percent principle. I am not worried about the 40 years which the mortgages are to run. I am not worried about the one-fourth of 1 percent, though I believe one-half or even three-fourths of 1 percent would be better; but I do believe an adequate fund ought to be set up in the beginning, as we did for the Federal Housing Administration, so that these mortgages would have a base on which to rest, and thus protect the Treasury of the United States, which must pay if the borrower defaults.

The primary objections to the measure are that there have been no hearings; that the amendment is too loosely drawn; that the provision for an insurance reserve is indefinite, in that it is dependent on a 5-percent assessment on a fund that is nonexistent; and, finally, I am opposed to permitting the other body to saddle an F. H. A. measure with such an important rider dealing with an entirely different class of real-estate mortgage.

For these reasons I shall vote against the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if many Members recall that about 2 years ago I took the floor and showed the great losses on the St. Louis apartment houses, on which the mortgages had been insured by the Government. I wish you would refer to those remarks before you portray a picture that the F. H. A. insurance policy has been a great success. At least they seem to have withdrawn doing much business of that particular character.

I think I already here once quoted an old Democratic philosopher and former Member of this House. I quote him again:

As we open this page on the book of public expenditure we descend into that bottomless pit of civil pensions and family gratuities.

Certainly we are embarked upon this dangerous voyage. The camel got its nose under the tent only a short time ago. As to this bill, you form a county committee. They select a farmer who has nothing but promise of making good. He must be removed of not less than the third degree of relationship, of consanguinity. The members of the committee could not recommend a father, no matter how promising; he could not lend to a grandfather; he could not recommend his great grandfather. He could not recommend a son, a grandson, or a great grandson. How foolish. Relatives would be banned although good prospects. It may be all right to pass a law available to everybody on an even break, but when you select a few it is quite a different proposition. It is favoritism in the highest degree and probably resented by other applicants. It ought to be.

Twenty years ago when I came into this House I had my baptism under the ship-subsidy bill. How you Democrats hated the very word "subsidy!" How you ranted against it. Then you resented a little tariff protection granted the manufacturer. You hated that. Now you love nothing more than subsidy, Instead of the hatred of that day you will this afternoon by this bill put in jeopardy the credit of the Government for another $350,000,000; and in the bill to follow you will put the Government's credit in jeopardy for another cool $1,000,000,000. This bill is the Commodity Credit Corporation Extension Act. I should think your faces would turn red.

I listened to one or two speeches lately and read others by a very prominent Democrat from Texas about the road we are traveling, and each time the entire House rose and applauded him. But when some of us were fighting for economy the recent past years he seemingly was for anything but economy. When I listened to the gentleman from Texas complaining of the road we have been traveling, I could only think, "Where have you been?" We Members who have been here some time and have fought these battles do not so readily forget. Forty years for a farmer to pay with no down payment! Perhaps I used this illustration once before, but I use it again:

"I bought a piano, so cheap, you know."

"How cheap?"

"Two dollars and fifty cents a month."

"For how many months?"

"I did not think to ask that."

Yes, if it can be had so cheap by the month what do they care about 40 years?

And you ask us to insure a proposition like this! I have not time to go into the details of this bill but it makes a good story. You form your county committee. They handpick their man, then they nurse him. The beneficiary does not pay for the nursing. The nurses probably call often to administer advice and succor. They pay no such attention to his neighbor. How must his neighbor feel? Is there no envy in his soul? They seek out the needs of the beneficiary and anticipate them for him, I suppose, under many other forms of loans. They will see that he gets well started. He must not fail to prove the experiment successful. Certainly with all that looking after he ought to get along. Even if he gets behind he will be carried along. Renew all loans and keep him current.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. To recite what we have done for the farmer is a long story. They will tell you this afternoon they have not lost much money in the Commodity Credit Corporation—that is, to amount to much; not over $26,000,000 in one report and a little over $67,000,000 in another. They will not tell you about 9,000,000 bales of cotton in storage, on which they will lose a tremendous sum. They will not stress the vast amounts owned and in storage not yet disposed of. Of course, there is much of human interest in these tenant cases. But, I repeat, do not select 1 man in my community, under our form of government, and let the other 40 who would be entitled to the same thing witness such favoritism. The banks of my district will not accept even a 90-percent insured mortgage. We cannot place one. They feel that if the Government is foolish enough to insure a 90-percent mortgage, they will not help or encourage such business. Certainly those banks would not take a 100-percent mortgage. No farmer in my section would profit by this bill. Yet the Government will take such a mortgage from a farmer who has nothing to contribute except the opinion of a committee that he might make good. Most farmers think they could also under such complete assistance. The whole thing, if it could be summed up in one word, could be summed up only by the word "screwy." I wish I could think of a word with a pleasanter and more agreeable sound to the ear. I cannot condemn this sufficiently. Do not think I am against helping the farmer. I approved of reasonable and proper mortgage lending, but not this.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The trouble with the farm-tenant program, as I see it, is that the farmer cannot get cost of production. I do not see how they can pay their loans unless they get fair prices.

Mr. GIFFORD. If I had time, I would go into some of the details. We have done so much already for the farmers. I wonder if there could not be one thing more that I might offer them so that I could get a little credit somewhere. Are there no more methods by which we can take further from the Treasury? Other classes of citizens should turn green with envy. I hope the gentleman from Texas, that great statesman, will often take the floor and give more warnings. At the moment I can only say to him, "Where you been?" "Where is you?"

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts suggested that we should get the Government out of business. If he believes that we should get the Government out of the lending business he can make a very long step in that direction now by voting for this amendment. This amendment will give to the farmer the same opportunity to own a farm that is now given to the city home owner.

The complaint has been made that we should bring in a new bill, that we should not offer this amendment and vote for it, but should send it to a committee of the House and bring in a new bill entirely. May I suggest to one who really harbors that thought that you are assuming a great responsibility if you are working in the interest of the farmer? It has been known for several weeks—2 or 3 weeks at least—that this amendment would be brought in, and any Member who had a better plan to propose had an opportunity during that time to get up his plan, present it to the House in lieu of this plan, and ask the House to adopt it. I say that one who takes it upon himself, who claims to be a friend of the farmer, to oppose this bill without offering something better is taking a great responsibility.

I can remember back in 1900 to 1910 if you were to suggest that the Government should help a farmer to own his home, you would immediately be met with the objection it is unorthodox, it is wrong. Later on, say, in 1910 to 1920, when it was proposed that the farmers be permitted to own their own homes from which they made their livelihood, the objection was made: It is socialistic; we do not want socialism in this country. Then later on in the twenties, when we wanted to buy farmers their homes and give them an opportunity to pay for them, it was stated: "No, no; that is unconstitutional; it will never do."

Now, after the constitutional question has been straightened out, and all of these other questions, they have a peculiar, new method of objection. It is the wrong method to pursue. Technically, it has been brought here in the right way. To my mind, that is a very weak excuse for one who really desires to help the farmers of this country.

The excuse has been made, further, that a 100-percent loan is too much. I concede that for a bank to make a short loan, or for anyone to make a short loan with a high rate of interest or a low rate of interest, a 100-percent loan is too much. There is no difference of opinion between us on that. But if you will make the terms long, 40 years, as proposed in this bill, and the rate of interest low, as proposed in this bill, a 100-percent loan is better security than a 75-percent loan would be on shorter terms and a big rate of interest.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country are honest, they possess character, and they will pay their debts if they are given the opportunity to do so. I cite as an example the R. E. A. Out of 652 cooperatives in this Nation that are owned solely and exclusively by farmers, there is not 1 that is in serious jeopardy today, and there are not 3 that are seriously delinquent today, out of the 652 owned exclusively by farmers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cite as an example the Federal Home and Farm Authority where farmers buy equipment to go with the R. E. A. that is provided them by the Government. They are paying their debts, they are paying their bills because they are given an opportunity to do so at the benefit of long-terms and low rates of interest. So, if you want to do the right thing by the farmers, if you want to help the family-sized farmer in this Nation, vote for the pending amendment and give that farmer an opportunity to own his own home.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is sometimes interesting for what he does not say rather than for what he says. What he fails to say, of course, is that there is no opportunity to amend this bill today.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield? That is a mistake. That cannot be true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not yield. This comes to us in the form of a report from the conferees, and if I am correctly advised on the parliamentary situation, and I will stand corrected if I am in error, no amendment can be offered today on the floor in the course of this discussion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield? I can correct the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. You can vote down the previous question; and if the gentleman has a bill that is better than this one, we would vote down the previous question and put his amendment in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will get to that, too. What my good friend overlooks is the fact that this is flashed before the House very suddenly. There have been no hearings on the bill. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] insisted that the bill be read at length for the very purpose of being advised of some of the provisions carried in it. The gentleman from Texas says, "Vote for this and lift the Government out of the business of money lending." He forgets that you create a vested interest that the Government must police so long as there is a single vestige of one of these mortgages on the books, and since they are written for a 40-year period and it comes out of your revolving fund, then how long are

you projecting the Government into the mortgage business?

There are some things that intrigue me in this bill. One is the setting up of county committees. If you will look on page 19, you will see what their duties will be. They shall receive listings of farms in the county from any persons desiring to sell a farm. So, if a person has a farm to sell, he goes to the county committee in the courthouse and there the farm will be listed.

To receive applications from those who desire to finance the acquisition of farms.

So they will have all the buyers listed in the county committee's office at the courthouse.

To examine and appraise the farms.

They will know all about valuations. And then—

To qualify the buyer of a farm.

So in every one of the 3,073 counties in the United States, taking out the metropolitan counties, there is a possibility of a 3-man group serving as a Federal real-estate agency for the next 40 years to come. Frankly, I do not like that kind of a proposition.

On page 21 you will observe that if you are the holder or the maker of an insured mortgage you receive a new degree of eligibility under the Bankhead-Jones Act, for then, under title I of the Farm Tenant Act, you can borrow money from the Farm Security Administration for two purposes: One will be for repairs and improvements and the other will be to pay the interest and principal on your mortgage if you are delinquent on the mortgage. You will then be eligible for loans of that kind. It becomes a great, never-ending circle, as I see it, and I cannot approve a provision of that kind.

Finally, on the bottom of page 21 you will find that the funds allotted to the States and Territories may be loaned to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage. Are we going to wash out the whole farm credit structure of the country through this new-found mortgage agency?

I fussed a great deal with the Federal Housing Administration, even in the days when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, about making loans on existing structures as distinguished from new structures, because the whole purport of the act as it was debated freely in the Well of this House was for the purpose of financing new construction to make jobs, since some 10,000,000 people were unemployed. We graduated from new construction to existing construction. We now graduate from farm acquisition under the original Bankhead-Jones Act to refinancing of the existing farm-mortgage indebtedness of the country.

How much does it involve? We commit ourselves here for only $350,000,000. Will that be the limit? Notice the first portion of this bill. We started out with a $2,000,000,000 limit for the Federal Housing Administration. This raises it to $5,000,000,000 of financing on home mortgages. So each year our obligations on the contingent liability of the country ascend by billions. Some day, if there comes a reallocation, a reshifting of realty values, I dread to think of what the impact of that force will be on the economy of the country.

This bill richly and eminently deserves to go back into the Committee on Banking and Currency or a similar bill to the House Committee on Agriculture for further study and further report. It will be far better, even if we do not pass any legislation in this session of the Congress, to take a little time before we commit this Government to another $350,000,000 of contingent liability.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated, when this bill (H. R. 4693) reached the Senate, this rider we are now discussing was put on it. It had very little consideration in the Senate. The provisions of the bill were not even printed in the RECORD. It has received no consideration at all here. We have brought it back in the brief time we have to discuss it in order to determine whether or not this House wants to legislate in that manner and pass this farm-tenancy-loan bill.

In the beginning, the United States Government confined its insurance operations to bank deposits. They were soon extended to cover the accounts in building-and-loan associations and savings banks. We then undertook the insurance of loans for the building and renovation of homes. Later we guaranteed loans made upon certain agricultural commodities. Still later we entered upon the insurance of certain crops. Now we are asked to enter what I consider is an entirely new field.

It must be remembered that this is the insurance of an enterprise. The farm is the farmer's workshop. That is his business. We are now called on to insure a business which I believe everybody must recognize has the broadest field of hazards and the highest degree of risk. Under the terms of this amendment the Government would not only insure skillful and efficient work but it would insure good management and sound judgment, something that has never yet been done. We are asked to insure against the vagaries of the seasons and the uncertainty of the weather. According to this bill, the Government insures against storms and floods and against freezes and drought. We are here insuring against the ravages of livestock diseases and the destruction and devastation of plant pests. We are insuring against the acts of God and the whims and frailties of man. This should not be engaged in.

If we enter upon this field of insurance, the insurance of a business under the most adverse and difficult and uncertain conditions, there is not a reason in the world why we should not insure every business, commercial, and industrial enterprise from one end of this country to the other, and guarantee their efficient and successful operation. If we are going to insure this farm-tenant enterprise, why should we not insure them all?

I should like to discuss some of the provisions and compare this set-up with the F. H. A., the organization to which they say it is similar. It does have some similarity to it, but it has many, many differences. I was one of the supporters of the F. H. A. law, and, for that matter, I helped to write it. I still believe in it, but it is very different from this proposition.

In the first place, under that act there is a limit on the insurance of any individual mortgage. Under this act there is none. Under that act, the limitation on the amount of insurance under a mortgage is 80 percent of the value of the property the mortgage covers, in most cases, and in some cases as high as 90 percent. In this bill it goes to 100 percent, something that we never have engaged in before, and for that reason it is unsound.

Under the F. H. A. act the maturity of the obligations cannot exceed 20 years, except in some instances, and then it is only 25 years. Here we have an insurance for 40 years. Under the F. H. A., the insurance premium ranges from one-half of 1 percent to 1 percent. Under this, even with the amendment which is offered by our distinguished chairman, the insurance premium is between one-fourth and one-half percent. The interest rate under F. H. A. may be 5 or 6 percent per annum; under this amendment it is only 4 percent. Why should the home owner be given only 80 percent insurance and be charged 5 or 6 percent interest while the farm tenant is given 100 percent insurance and be charged only 4-percent interest? Under this plan the insurance fund which is set up is of very doubtful origin. It is uncertain, under the terms of this bill, but the payments into it are certainly not sufficient to maintain it, and the act recognizes this when it says that in case there is a deficiency, in substance, an additional appropriation may be made to sustain the insurance fund.

This bill has never had any consideration anywhere to speak of. There has been talk about the bill that was reported by the Committee on Agriculture of this House last year. I have taken occasion to look at that bill and compare it with this one. That bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, but as already pointed out here by someone, under the provisions of that bill, not more than 90-percent insurance could be had as compared with 100-percent insurance here, and under that bill the insurance premium per annum was 1 percent rather than one-fourth of 1 percent. Ah, they say, they are analogous; and that is true. But the difference between them, in my opinion, is the difference between a sound mortgage plan and one that is inefficient and thoroughly unsound. No one can contend that insurance of 100 percent is as good an insurance risk as 80 percent. Nobody can contend that the insurance premiums which are paid into the fund will make the fund as good when that fund is only one-fourth of 1 percent as when the premium is 1 percent. The difference between the two plans is the difference between success and failure in the administration of them.

One of them is sound, the other unsound. There has been something said

here about the Government financing the tenant farmers on the basis of 100 percent. I simply want to read to you the provisions in the last Agricultural appropriation bill, which says this:

The loan by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be made to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of making loans to the tenant farmers—

With this provision:

Provided, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor.

And I want to ask you how they are going to finance the farmers of this country 100 percent under that provision, when it specifically says it cannot exceed 85 percent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the ranking minority member, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I think that every Member of this House wants to do something about the farm-tenant problem and wants to do something about better financing for farm owners and farm users, but this 18-page amended amendment, as nearly as I could get it from the Clerk's reading and the discussion that has followed, is not what the people have been led to think it is. It is unfortunate that printed copies of the amendment to the amendment are not available.

The provisions as we hear them have a strange familiarity to me. The term "insurance" that has been used so much brings back memories of the experience with what we called State insurance of bank deposits and a system of rural credits in South Dakota. Ours was built on the same idea—a pool into which each bank paid a small percentage fee to create an insurance fund. In time we got to calling it the bank guaranty law, and some of the banks advertised it as a bank guaranty law, although it was only a form of mutual insurance, like the first part of this proposal. We found in the final analysis that our law was a snare and a delusion, because the bad loans it encouraged broke the banks, and that forced farm foreclosures, and the round of foreclosures in turn broke our rural credits system, and that in turn broke the farmers in my State, who are paying a sales tax today to pay off $40,000,000 worth of State-guaranteed bonds.

I want to read from the portions of the amendment that we do have in printed form so that you can see what it does. This 19-page amendment, on which we are asked to pass approval without committee study, sets up a program of farm mortgaging starting off with a Government liability of $350,000,000. The plan has been spoken of as an insurance proposition, and the term "100 percent" has been used to describe the loans because the farm purchaser does not have to put up a dollar. But it goes further than that. These loans which the Treasury will guarantee can be for more than 100 percent of the actual value of the farm. Listen while I read subsection 2 of section 13, on page 10.

The mortgages can—

(2) Involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Secretary shall prescribe).

It is 100-percent insurance of the price of the farm, plus service charges, plus appraisal, plus inspection, and plus such other fees as the Secretary may prescribe. And this loan is to be made, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has pointed out, only to—

a farmer who owns no interest in any real property (other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence—

And so forth. Then after this mortgage is made to a farmer who has no equity in the place and who has no other real property, if the mortgage becomes in default and the insurance fund fails to cover the losses, the mortgage can be assigned to the Secretary, and the Secretary, as you will find on page 14, at line 15—

shall issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage.

Then what about these debentures? On page 16, in subparagraph (d), we find that—

Such debentures issued shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

In other words, this is not an insurance bill; it is a guaranty bill. I read further from the same page:

In the event that the Secretary fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on any debentures issued under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

And so forth. In other words, this bill, instead of being an insurance bill, is a guaranty bill, guaranteeing interest and principal at the expense of the taxpayers of loans made to propertyless persons in an amount equal to the full value of the farm purchased. Instead of being an insurance of a loan in which the home purchaser has at least a 10-percent equity, as under F. H. A., this is a Treasury guaranty of loans in which the mortgagor has no interest whatsoever for a loan which may and probably will exceed 100 percent of the price of the property.

Now, it has been said that this gives an opportunity for private capital to get into the lending business. What it does is to give holders of farm mortgages a chance to unload and get Government-guaranteed debentures with a higher interest rate than they can get on Government bonds. Of course, private capital will make these loans when fully guaranteed by the Government. It is said the Government will go out of the farm-loan business if this bill passes. If so, it will be going into the underwriter business, and some day there will be an undertaker. Does anyone think that some of these committees will not be careless in making these loans when they know that no part of the penalty for making a bad loan falls upon them? We know what happened when South Dakota and Nebraska went into the business of guaranteeing bank deposits and farm mortgages. The system put a premium on bad banking. The banker who was a good fellow made loans to anyone who wanted them and told his depositors their money was safe because of the State guaranty fund—the insurance fund, if you please. But when the bubble burst and our banks failed and the insurance fund ran out, our farmers lost their homes, and forced sales ruined the value of all farms and wrecked the whole rural-credit system. Today no man can claim to be a friend of the farmer in my section and ask for 100-percent loans guaranteed by the taxpayers. That is what this bill, this amended amendment, not now open to further amendment, proposes on a Nation-wide scale, and it should not be adopted on 2 hours' consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree on the floor of the House with my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], the very able ranking majority member of this committee; but when he recited the extreme hazards of insurance of farm mortgages, and talked about the uncertainty of weather, and about the ability and character of the man who gets these mortgages insured by the Government, I just wondered if the same hazards would not apply to the many billions of dollars that we are now lending through Government farm-credit organizations, and have been doing so for many years.

The main thing in this bill that we are trying to bring before the House is to add into a bill giving the city dwellers of this country $5,000,000,000 worth of Government insurance on F. H. A. mortgages an insurance provision for insurance of $350,000,000 of farm-purchase mortgages.

We come before the Congress and ask that the farmers, who you all have claimed to represent, be given the right to a plan that has been proven eminently successful in city mortgage financing in the total sum of $350,000,000—$50,000,000 to be used next year, $150,000,000 the following year, and $150,000,000 the year after that.

NOT AN EXPERIMENT

This bill is not an experiment; it is not new. It has been studied many times by Congress and Members here. This bill, practically as it is, passed the Agricultural Committee of the Senate a year ago, and it passed the Banking Committee of the Senate just about a month and a half ago. Two times it has passed the Senate. I had the privilege of reading the hearings on the same bill practically when it came before the House Committee on Agriculture during the last session, and was reported with changes to the House itself.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot get any time on this bill, and I am simply addressing the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The real question before the House Agricultural Committee was whether these farm mortgages should have full Government insurance. They had their hearings and they brought in a bill and said that farm mortgages were entitled to Government insurance.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WHITE. I withdraw the point of order for the present.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. You say that this is no experiment and that this is not new legislation. I ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the provision in section (b) on page 23 of the bill, whereby 50 percent of any increase in any of these mortgaged farms will go to the fund if it is sold otherwise or in any way?

PROTECTS GOVERNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Well, that is not a difference that I would quarrel about, because it protects the Government. If oil should be found on this farm in 5 years' time and the farm value increases 1,000 percent in value, with Government insurance having made possible the purchase of the farm for the farmer's use, I think the Government is entitled to have some share of that appreciation in value. I think that is illustrative of the care with which this bill was considered in the Senate and the House.

When we talk about the farm program, we all want to help all the farmers. The census figures show that 38.59 percent of the farmers of this Nation are tenant farmers. This 38 percent are entitled to our help too. The decrease in tenant farmers in 10 years has been 303,000. We have 191,000 fewer farms than we had 10 years ago. That is only a part of the picture because that means that hundreds of these tenant farmers are being forced off of the farms because in some ways our agricultural program is working in reverse, and is causing consolidation of these small tenant farms, to be farmed in large sections by tractors, using day labor instead of supporting on them these thousands of tenant farm families.

As pitiful as is the plight of the tenant farmers, the plight of the farm laborers that are thus being made, the Joads and Okies that are being forced off the land they love, is much worse. Our action in voting large farm benefits is in some places tending to force these men off the farms, forcing them onto the W. P. A. rolls, forcing them to go to California to seek day-to-day farm work, and is a problem that this Congress should help solve.

MIGRANT WORKERS INCREASED

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that in the 10-year period the total population of farm migrant workers increased by 1,000,000. Those are men who have been jarred loose from the soil, men who have no home they can call their own, who go from one crop to another seeking to make a living in their chosen profession of agriculture. I say to you that we have been very, very liberal in voting parity payments and soil conservation payments. We voted for the C. C. C. to terrace the farms, but do you know that about 38 percent of this farm benefit money is split before it reaches the tenant farmer? Of the 2,361,000 tenant farmers, as shown by the census this year, those men will get only 50 or 75 percent of their farm's share of the farm benefits that we voted to the farmers for themselves. The absentee land owners will get the 50 or 25 percent of those benefits voted by Congress in the name of the farmer.

So the millions of Joads who love the land move on and on, as greed, in many cases, to get all the tenant's share dispossesses them of even their meager living. I think it is time that the Committee on Agriculture, and I think it is time that this Congress should do something to turn this program around where it is running in reverse, and make it begin to work for the benefit of all the farmers, especially those who themselves till the soil.

PLAN MUST BE SOUND

No program is worth trying unless it is sound, but the F. H. A. program has worked under title I, where 95 percent of these loans are based solely on character. Their losses have been about 1½ percent. These are Government-insured loans.

In title II the two and one-half billion dollars' worth of city loans, the loss has only been forty-seven one-hundredths of 1 percent.

This farm-tenant purchase program is not an experiment. We have had this program under way for 5 years in laboratory experiment. Today, out of 21,000 loans made under the Bankhead-Jones Act, at an average of $5,556 per farm, they have now collected $2,811,000. The total delinquency on those loans that have been made is only $101,000, yet we can offset that $101,000 of temporary delinquencies with the prepayment on these mortgages that amount to $563,000.

INTEREST RATE FAIR

Now let us look at some of the other features of the bill. Is the 4 percent interest ceiling too low? You are loaning at 3½ percent in the farm credit institutions today.

Is the 40-year maximum time too long? I have heard that criticized. That maximum has been granted for many years by our regular farm-credit agencies. But the "crime" in this bill is that we say there shall be no down payment. I say that is the bill's greatest asset. We are writing in flaming letters that this bill is for the dirt farmer, and for him alone. We do not want any stock brokers, we do not want any corporation lawyers using this money to speculate in the value of farm lands as they are doing under your other agricultural credit set-ups.

Yes, under F. H. A. we loaned 95 percent on rapidly depreciating homes in cities; homes that have subdivider's profit; homes that have real-estate profits; homes that have architectural fees and contractor's fees and inflated labor costs, and still the plan worked. The losses were very small despite hazards. Now, on the land that the Lord has given, land that will not depreciate in the hands of a tenant who at last has the farm home he has prayed for, we are told that a character loan is unsound—that the farm is not sufficient security behind this. I say it will be worth more each succeeding year, as that farmer's love of land transforms it into a home that he can be proud of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this amendment for what I consider very sound reasons. In the first place, I object to the manner in which this bill is presented to the House. I have been very much interested in farm-tenancy legislation and helped draft the Bankhead-Jones tenant bill. Last year the Lee bill, which is the basis for this amendment, passed the Senate, came to the House Committee on Agriculture, and was there considered at great length. The bill was not favorably reported by the House committee, but that committee, then presided over by Hon. Marvin Jones, drafted a bill somewhat similar to the one we are now considering and reported it to the House. We were unable to get a rule during the last session of Congress. At the present session of Congress the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] reintroduced that bill and it is now before our committee. The Department has been called upon for a report. As you know, bills of this type are sent to the Department interested for report, and to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has not made any report on this pending measure, nor has the present Secretary of Agriculture, nor the present Administrator of the Farm Security Administration.

This bill is brought in here not having been considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, to which committee legislation of this type is usually referred, nor has it been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It has been considered only by the conferees of the House and the Senate on a bill amending the National Housing Act. We are today to be called upon to vote on a Federal Housing bill which contains 6 pages and a farm-tenancy bill containing 19 pages, with a very unsatisfactory explanation as to its provisions.

I should like to pause for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency just what is in this bill with reference to the refinancing of existing farm mortgages? There seems to be some uncertainty as to the provisions, and I do not

recall that the chairman in making his opening statement made any reference whatever to the refinancing provisions of this bill. I am seeking the information and I ask the gentleman to tell me what is contemplated in the way of refinancing farm mortgages.

Mr. STEAGALL. There is nothing in this bill to prevent the use of these funds to insure a mortgage. That will afford a tenant an opportunity to become a home owner. The source from which he gets the land or the source from which the loan is made is immaterial.

Mr. COOLEY. On page 9, I find this language:

(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall—

(1) have been made by a farmer who owns no interest in any real property (other than that covered by such mortgage or occupied by him as a residence and from which he does not derive any substantial part of his livelihood).

This language was pointed out a moment ago by the gentleman from Tennessee as being the language which would justify the refinancing of farm mortgages.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is in error. I did not point to that as justifying the refinancing of farm mortgages.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman had just made the statement when I answered his inquiry a while ago that in order for a man to be eligible for insurance under this act he must be entirely divested of real estate.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what I understand this language I have quoted to mean.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman surely does not understand that if he will read it.

Mr. COOLEY. Except he might own a piece of town property some place from which he does not derive a substantial portion of his livelihood.

Mr. GORE. That does not mean entirely divested.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me ask one question: Does this legislation contemplate the refinancing of existing farm mortgages, or is it really a farm-tenant act?

Mr. GORE. Let me read the provision. The gentleman cited page 9 and he read only parts of that section.

Mr. COOLEY. I have read all of that section.

Mr. GORE. Let me read:

or (B) as security for the payment of an indebtedness incurred for the purpose of refinancing a mortgage covering a farm upon which he is conducting, or proposes to conduct farming operations.

Mr. COOLEY. My question is still unanswered, I do not yet know whether or not it is contemplated to refinance existing farm mortgages; and I think the House is entitled to know.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is not a Member of the House who doubts my sincerity and my deep interest in constructive legislation in the real interest of farmers. About a year ago this bill known as the Lee bill passed the Senate and came over to the Agricultural Committee of the House at a time when Mr. Jones was chairman of the committee. We held hearings and went into this matter fully, after which a bill was drafted not nearly so drastic as this bill and not nearly so controversial. This substitute bill was reported by the committee to the House with a majority of one vote, I believe. The gentleman from Texas, however, although deeply interested, was unable to get a rule or get the bill considered by the House.

I wish to impress upon the membership that this is a very important matter, one in which I am deeply interested; but, Mr. Speaker, before you are going to be able to successfully make landowners out of tenants something has got to be done to stop the thing that is making thousands of tenants out of landowners.

For years we have been bringing legislation in here in the name of the farmer, however much of which after having been passed and on account of the manner in which many bills are administered, farmers do not get what they have been promised and in a great many instances these bills are helpful to those who are continually grazing on the farmers.

Let us take the Federal land bank. We have billions invested in loans on farm land, some of the best lands in the country and operated by some of the best farmers in the country, but thousands of these landowners are losing their farms and are going into tenant farming. The Farm Credit Administration and the land banks have been run in the interest of the investing public and not the farmer.

I believe the delinquency on farm mortgages, taking into consideration the commission loans along with the Federal land banks, will run from 20 to 40 percent; yet you propose to pick up a tenant that has lost his land because of these conditions or otherwise, even some of these folks who are migrating all over the country, and buy whatever land you can get hold of for whatever price you have to pay for it, build a two and one-half to five thousand dollar farm home on it, give him conveniences that farmers, who are operating under land-bank mortgages are unable to have, and who are trying to pay for their lands, then insure the whole business for 100 cents on the dollar, believing that these tenants can make a better go of it than landowners. It just cannot be done.

This bill should come before the proper committee. If and when it comes before the proper committee, we will work out a constructive bill along lines that will make it successful and of interest to the tenant farmers. Here you bring in a bill of 6 pages having to do with a Banking and Currency Committee matter, and 19 or 20 pages dealing with farm-tenant legislation that should have received consideration by the Agricultural Committee of the House.

Under this bill, after 25 years, if the tenant wants to sell out and there happens to be a profit, you propose to take away 50 percent of this profit from that tenant that you love so much today and put it into the insurance fund to guarantee somebody else. It is unfair to that tenant who perhaps has built up his farm and all like that.

I hope this amendment will be voted down. I am not going to take further time to go into this important matter. Give this bill a chance to come before the Committee on Agriculture, and we will call in those who handle or administer this legislation, we will get the real facts and work out a constructive bill. We want to work out a constructive bill in the interest of tenants and not a bill that will largely be in the interest of real-estate agents and the investing public. During the last session of Congress we tried to report a bill that would stop the thing that is making tenants out of landowners who are operating under the land banks, but it was defeated by the investing interests who have been grazing on these farmers. If you want to make landowners out of tenants, let us stop the thing that is making tenants out of landowners. Let us stop the monopolistic group who are continually grazing on farmers and see to it that farm products are properly distributed, and that they receive that which they have been promised—that is, parity prices.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainde. of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the additional minute granted the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] came out of my time, I must ask that I not be interrupted, because I want to bring out one point that has not been dwelt on this afternoon in the debate on the amendment to the National Housing Act which involves the underwriting by our Government of farm-tenant mortgages to the tune of $350,000,000.

Of course, we have a popular appeal here when we speak of farm relief. I do not censure my good friends and colleagues from Oklahoma and Texas for trying to get such a bill as this one through for the tenant farmers. They have to do it. You see, I have lived out there in the great Southwest with you gentlemen and I know what you are up against. Coming from a nonfarming region now, I am speaking here in the cause of trying to keep the Government of the United States from going deeper and deeper into private business and into activities in which the Government does not belong and should get out of as fast as possible. The guaranteeing of farm mortgages by the Government would be another clear encroachment on our system of free private enterprise.

Let us consider now what happens to these tenant farmers who, we are asked to believe, must receive constant and perpetual aid from the United States Treasury in order to subsist. We are not making Okies out of them, as suggested by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. We are making Jeeter Lesters

out of our tenant farmers. Jeeter Lesters exist in other places besides Tobacco Road. We are giving these tenant farmers such latitude and so much rope, not only in the guaranteeing of their mortgages and during the term of the loans but in the foreclosure itself, that many of them will become indifferent and say, "What do we care? We have a benevolent Government that is going to finance us not for 40 years, not for the regular term provided in this bill, but forever."

Why do I say that? Read sections (a) and (b) on pages 17 and 18. There we find that in the event of foreclosure the Secretary of Agriculture, after issuing debentures to the mortgagee to take up the mortgage, can then go to the farmer and say, "You have another 5 years to work this thing out." If the farmer cannot work it out in 5 years, the Secretary forecloses. Then what happens? The Government can sell the land only to another farmer. That is the express meaning of section (b) of paragraph 15. The Secretary can sell only to another farmer, mind you, perhaps a cousin, a brother, or the uncle of the defaulting farmer, or to his Aunt Maggie. And so it will go on and on ad infinitum and ad nauseum, forever and forever, and we will find our paternalistic Christmas-tree Government financing a shiftless tenant farmer for as long as that farmer wants to stay on the land, and, as usual, it will all be paid by the hard-earned money of our overburdened taxpayers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I can say very little in 2 minutes.

In my opinion the proposed amendment is absolutely unsound. I represent an agricultural district and I know that the farm tenants in Nebraska are not asking the Federal Government to embark on an unsound farm-loan policy. The farmers of Nebraska are more interested in seeing that the Federal Government takes the proper steps and necessary precautions to preserve our future security. The do not want to impair the financial stability of the Government by the passage of any unsound legislation.

This bill has been before the Committee on Agriculture and it was repudiated. This amendment provides for insured loans to the extent of 100 percent of the security. Those of us from the agricultural sections who are interested in doing something for agriculture know that any time you embark upon an unsound program, it will not last. Let us insist on a farm-tenant bill that is sound, that can have lasting results.

Let us have it properly considered by the proper committee, and reported in the regular manner. This amendment, line 6, page 21, provides that the man to whom a hundred percent loan has been made can also borrow additional money to take care of his defaulted interest. People are tired of seeing Uncle Sam forced to play the role of Santa Claus.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the measure upon which we will soon be called to vote is confusing and difficult. I have about made up my mind to vote "yes" on it, but I do not expect it to carry. Possibly it should be studied further by a committee where it can be dealt with after hearings and extended consideration. A measure such as this, profoundly affecting American agriculture, should certainly be studied very carefully. It is only because I fear no action at all will be taken to this effect if this particular Senate amendment is rejected, and knowing the great need for some such legislation, that I bring myself to the point of voting for it, although favoring its general principle and doubting certain provisions.

I do not expect the impossible in the realm of economics. It has been said that it is unthinkable from a business standpoint that farm loans can be insured up to 100 percent of the indebtedness. Gentlemen have intimated here today that this bill contemplates contravening all the laws of sound business and sound economic principles. Now, I have always been rather careful—although I understand most of the farmers' problems and have a very deep sympathy for farmers and want to do the best possible for them—not to attempt to lower the interest rate to the vanishing point, or amortize loans over an unthinkable period of time, or guarantee anything to debtors in such a way as to make the deal unsafe or unsound.

Yet when I look back over America's past I see so many laws and provisions of Government affecting agriculture, apparently written in the interest of the investor class, or the middleman, or the business group, I am inclined to think that during most of American history—at least that part which I can personally remember—the American farmer has gotten a raw deal. Up until very recently the American farmer has been truly the "forgotten man"—that is, forgotten most of the time except a little while before elections.

Out of all the cruel history of the past one example of economic oppression stands out prominently, such as exploitation and absentee landlordism in Ireland under the long period of English rule. Although an Irishman is very fond of green, there is a certain period of the history of his own people which makes him see red. I refer to generations of mistreatment of Irish tenants by English absentee landlords. That was very bad. However, I must call attention to one thing—if my memory of English and American history is correct, the British Parliament voted funds and made provision whereby Irish tenants could buy and own their homes at a low rate of repayment and interest charge, all amortized over a suitably long period of years, before any such privilege was extended to American farmers by the Government in Washington. When, prior to 1913, were farmers protected from Shylocks?

As I grew up on the farm in the Middle West, the expression "amortized farm loan" just was not in the dictionary. It certainly was not in law or in banking practice. My father and every other farmer who plastered his homestead with a mortgage borrowed the money for not to exceed 3 years, paying 8 or 10 percent interest on not to exceed 50 percent of the creditor's valuation of the farm. Of course, the mortgage had to be renewed every 3 years, or more frequently, and there was a commission to be paid for the renewal, which raised the interest rate above that specified in the promissory note. Could a man, with the best of farming skill and personal integrity, borrow money to buy a farm and amortize the loan over 20 or 40 years at half the interest rate prevailing? He could not, for in those days it would have been easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for the best farmer in the Middle West to get any such liberal loan on his farm home.

It was not until the new freedom, ushered in by Woodrow Wilson, nearly 30 years ago, that anything like reasonable credits and convenient repayment terms were extended to the American Farmer. It may be that some of these plans for bettering the lot of the farmer have not been altogether successful. However, their lack of success did not depend altogether upon a faulty economic principle. I for one would like to see a safe-and-sane program evolved for farmers' benefit—one which will promote land ownership. I agree with the chairman of the Agricultural Committee that we will never solve the farm-tenancy problem until we have gotten at the root of the evil and cured that which causes farm tenancy.

Considering one phase of the farmer's problem, that is, a comparison of his entire interest payments with his total crop cash income, a startling thing is revealed. Figures show that the farmer pays out on an average about as much in interest payments as he receives for his marketable crop. I believe statistics will verify this statement if both totals are averaged over any 5-year period since the turn of the century. In other words, if the total interest charge on all the farm mortgages in America is compared with the total cash received for all farm crops by the farmers of America, it will be seen that the total interest payment is about the same as the total cash received. Does that mean that the farmers of America as a whole are taking about all the cash they receive to make payments to their creditors? I do believe that it means just that. It seems that under our long-existent American economic system the farmer and his family on an average have just about broken even on cash income and outgo to creditors. Therefore, the farm means simply a place to live and something to eat as a reward for their efforts. Naturally a few farmers have done better than the average and some have done worse and that is the story of the profits of American farming.

I do sincerely hope, if this measure is rejected, or even if it is not, that the House Agriculture Committee will bring in a bill which will put the farmer on a better economic basis, not only as to home ownership but particularly as to farm prices.

For if we do the latter by assuring proper prices, the American farmer, being naturally a rugged individualist, will take care of himself quite properly in a businesslike way. I, too, wish to enable the tenant to become an owner by changing the conditions which are making tenants out of owners.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that my good friend from Texas has risen above his raising since he has gone to New York.

This works exactly as the Federal Housing Authority does in respect to the city dweller. It has the same mechanics. The folks back home are not asking through which committee this proposition comes in here. These boys can go down for 7 or 8 years and pay $1.50 a throw to get entertained by Jeeter Lester in Tobacco Road, but when the time comes to write something across the face of the sky that will give them a chance to live and breathe on Tobacco Road they take his reputation and they take his character away from him and leave him nothing but a brainless, shiftless creature. They do not even make him such a human being as exists on the face of the earth. Now when the time comes to write a law that will let him live and breathe and finally get a home, they cut him down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a class of legislation in which the farmers of the Nation are very much interested. Let me read you some telegrams which indicate the farmers' views on this measure:

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 19, 1941.*
Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that you give full and vigorous support to Bankhead amendment, H. R. 4693, providing insurance debt-burdened farmers.

LUVERNE FETZ,
Washington-Idaho Farmers Union.

PRESTON, IDAHO, *June 18, 1941.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman:

We earnestly urge you to support Senate amendment, bill H. R. 4693, as we believe that the majority of our farmers are in need of this amendment.

FRANKLIN COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS,
WAYNE S. EVANS.

DOWNEY, IDAHO, *June 19, 1941.*
Representative COMPTON WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the members of our cooperative, we urge your support to Senate amendment to bill H. R. 4693, providing aid in the form of insurance on mortgages for sorely distressed debt-burdened farmers.

DOWNEY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.
ELVIN CHRISTIANSEN, *Manager.*

BANCROFT, IDAHO, *June 18, 1941.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request you support Senate amendment, House bill 4693. This legislation provides needed assistance for large proportion our farmers.

BANCROFT GRAIN GROWERS,
L. C. ORMOND.

DRUMMOND, IDAHO, *June 18, 1941.*
COMPTON WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request your support Senate amendment to bill H. R. 4693.

YELLOWSTONE GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
H. A. FRANK, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein five telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the very able chairman of the committee, Mr. STEAGALL, and which has been so eloquently advocated by my good colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY.

I am for this amendment because it is intended to help the farm tenant and put him on a borrowing parity with his city cousin.

When we speak of farmers these days, we should differentiate between farm owners and farm tenants. I dare say that most of the Members from rural districts will find that there are more tenants than owners among their farmers. And farm tenancy in this country continues as an ever-growing evil. Most of the farmers dispossessed during the great agricultural depression of the twenties and the farmers cast out on the highways during the great debacle of 1931 and 1932 have not got back their farms. They and their sons comprise our unfortunate army of farm tenancy.

I point out that, whether we intended it so or not, most of the farm legislation passed under this administration has benefited the farm owner more than it has the farm tenant. It has helped the tenant to exist, but it has not restored to him the one thing that is the heritage of every honest American farmer, and that is the ownership of the good earth he cultivates. Our sole direct contribution to the solution of this problem has been the Jones-Bankhead Farm Tenancy Act, a good law, it is true, but unfortunately it does not help enough tenants at one time.

The amendment proposed would be a body blow at farm tenancy. It would be a real haymaker. Those who term it unsound will do well to consider that the Senate, after long consideration, has recommended and adopted this amendment, and that the principle involved in it has been heartily endorsed by the President of the United States.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do not speak before this body much, and I do not have much time now. I wish to compliment the two gentlemen from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY and Mr. MONRONEY] and all others who spoke in behalf of this bill. I believe that the sooner we can get the little farmers back on the farms where they can raise their chickens, their eggs, their hogs, their cows, their cream, their milk, and their butter, the better off they will be, the better off this country will be, and the better off you will be. I hope you vote for this tenant-farm-purchase amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, this measure has been under consideration by the Congress for more than 2 years. It was before the Committee on Agriculture of the House in June 1939. That committee made a report to this House which recommended the passage of a bill much more liberal in several respects than the one now before the House. The interest rate was lower and provision was made for direct loans out of the Treasury by the use of debentures in the event sufficient loans were not extended from private sources to afford the relief contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a letter dated June 7, 1940, addressed to Hon. JOSH LEE, United States Senator from Oklahoma:

MY DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your telegram of May 4, with respect to the Lee-Jones farm-tenant bill. I am in sympathy with the objectives of this bill and would be very glad if it received favorable consideration at this session.

Thank you again for calling this matter to my attention.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

This bill passed the Senate in 1939 in terms more liberal than are provided in the amendment now before the House. The bill as it passed the Senate provided for no assessment fee, and it also provided for direct loans. The same provision for direct loans from funds to be supplied by the Treasury was embodied in the bill that was reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture.

The legislation has been here 2 years. The gentleman from South Carolina, my good friend, says that if the matter is brought in the Committee on Agriculture will give it consideration. I ask how much longer it will take for the legislation to be brought to the House for consideration. It has been pending for 2 years with the endorsement of the President of the United States.

A great deal has been said here about the manner in which this legislation comes before the House. It does come in as a rider from the Senate, but it comes with the repeated endorsement of the Senate, not only of the committee, after extended hearings, but by reason of having passed the Senate twice.

During these 2 years there has been ample opportunity for the matter to have been considered in the regular way by this House. Now, when it comes before the conferees to be voted on, it has to be brought to the House for a separate vote. I favor the proposal, and I am advocating it because it came to me to pass on under the rules of procedure that govern the Congress. The House cannot prevent riders being put on legislation by the Senate. Some of the most important legislation that has been passed in the

history of Congress has been brought here in the form of riders put on House measures by the Senate. The Senate put a rider on an agricultural appropriation bill which conferred upon the President power to issue $3,000,000,000 of currency. Nobody then raised the question of how that provision got before the House. I voted for it and the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency voted for it.

Mr. Speaker, all there is in this controversy is the question of how this proposition comes before us. There would not be any controversy but for that. The House ought to vote for it while we have the opportunity. It is evident the House may not get an opportunity again soon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEAGALL) there were—ayes 38, noes 90.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 203, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—130

Allen, La.	Gilchrist	O'Brien, Mich.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gore	O'Connor
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gossett	O'Toole
Barden	Granger	Patman
Barry	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Patton
Beckworth	Haines	Pearson
Beiter	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Boggs	Harrington	Priest
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Richards
Boren	Healey	Rivers
Boykin	Hébert	Rizley
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brooks	Hendricks	Rogers, Okla.
Brown, Ga.	Hill, Wash.	Russell
Bryson	Hull	Sabath
Buckler, Minn.	Imhoff	Sacks
Burdick	Izac	Sanders
Burgin	Jackson	Satterfield
Byrne	Jarman	Scanlon
Byron	Johnson, Luther A.	Schulte
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Secrest
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Wash.
Capozzoli	Kee	Snyder
Chapman	Kefauver	Steagall
Coffee, Wash.	Kelley, Pa.	Sullivan
Cooper	Keogh	Tenerowicz
Cravens	Kerr	Terry
Creal	Kilday	Thomas, Tex.
Cullen	Lanham	Thomason
Cunningham	Leavy	Traynor
Duncan	Lynch	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	McIntyre	Voorhis, Calif.
Elliot, Mass.	McKeough	Walter
Ellis	Maciejewski	Ward
Fitzpatrick	Mahon	Weiss
Flannery	May	West
Folger	Mills, Ark.	Whelchel
Gathings	Mills, La.	White
Gavagan	Mitchell	Wickersham
Gehrmann	Monroney	Worley
Geyer, Calif.	Murdock	Wright
Gibson	Myers, Pa.	Zimmerman
	Norrell	

NAYS—203

Allen, Ill.	Andrews	Baldwin
Andresen, August H.	Angell	Barnes
	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Baumhart	Grant, Ind.	Pittenger
Beam	Guyer, Kans.	Plumley
Bell	Gwynne	Powers
Bender	Hall, Leonard W.	Rabaut
Bennett	Halleck	Ramsay
Bishop	Hancock	Ramspeck
Blackney	Harness	Rankin, Mont.
Boland	Harris, Va.	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hart	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Harter	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Heidinger	Rich
Bulwinkle	Hess	Robertson, Va.
Burch	Hoffman	Robinson, Utah
Butler	Holmes	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Hunter	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson	Jarrett	Rolph
Carter	Jenkins, Ohio	Rutherford
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Sasscer
Casey, Mass.	Johns	Sauthoff
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Shafer, Mich.
Clason	Johnson, Ill.	Shanley
Clevenger	Jones	Shannon
Cluett	Jonkman	Sheppard
Cochran	Kean	Short
Coffee, Nebr.	Keefe	Simpson
Cole, Md.	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Conn.
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Connery	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Cooley	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Costello	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Crawford	Kramer	Somers, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Kunkel	South
Day	Lambertson	Spence
Dewey	Landis	Springer
Dickstein	Larrabee	Stearns, N. H.
Dingell	LeCompte	Stefan
Dirksen	Lesinski	Stevenson
Disney	Lewis	Stratton
Dondero	Ludlow	Sumner, Ill.
Downs	McCormack	Sutphin
Drewry	McGregor	Taber
Dworshak	McLaughlin	Talle
Elliott, Calif.	McLean	Tarver
Elston	Maas	Thom
Engel	Maciora	Thomas, N. J.
Englebright	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Faddis	Martin, Mass.	Tinkham
Fellows	Mason	Van Zandt
Fenton	Meyer, Md.	Vinson, Ga.
Fish	Michener	Vreeland
Fitzgerald	Moser	Wadsworth
Flaherty	Mott	Welch
Flannagan	Mundt	Wene
Fogarty	Murray	Wheat
Forand	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Ford, Leland M.	O'Hara	Williams
Ford, Thomas F.	Oliver	Wilson
Fulmer	O'Neal	Wolcott
Gale	Osmers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	Paddock	Wolverton, N. J.
Gearhart	Peterson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Pfeiffer, William T.	Woodrum, Va.
Gifford	Pierce	Young
Gillie		Youngdahl
Graham		

NOT VOTING—99

Anderson, Calif.	Green	Norton
Arnold	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Day
Bland	Hartley	O'Leary
Bloom	Hill, Colo.	Pace
Boehne	Hinshaw	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bolles	Hobbs	Plauché
Buck	Holbrook	Ploeser
Buckley, N. Y.	Hook	Poage
Cartwright	Houston	Randolph
Celler	Howell	Rankin, Miss.
Chenoweth	Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Rockefeller
Claypool	Jensen	Romjue
Collins	Johnson, Ind.	Schaefer, Ill.
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Copeland	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scott
Courtney	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scrugham
Cox	Kleberg	Sheridan
Crosser	Knutson	Sikes
Crowther	Koppelmann	Smith, Pa.
Culkin	Lea	Sparkman
Curtis	McArdle	Starnes, Ala.
Davis, Ohio	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	McGranery	Sweeney
Delaney	McMillan	Taylor
Dies	Magnuson	Thill
Ditter	Mansfield	Tolan
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Treadway
Doughton	Merritt	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas	Nelson	Wasielewski
Doxey	Nichols	Weaver
Durham		Whittington
Eaton		Winter
Edmiston		
Ford, Miss.		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Cartwright for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Rankin of Mississippi with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Reed of Illinois
Mr. Pace with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Green with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Holbrock.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Davis of Ohio.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Dies.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Houston.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the various motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRICES PAID FOR THE NECESSITIES OF LIFE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 212), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life (hereafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of 5 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee——

(a) To make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to problems facing the purchasers of goods in the markets of this country; and

(b) To make recommendation to Congress with respect to legislation upon the foregoing subject.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall have power to appoint subcommittees to assist the committee in its work. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member thereof designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions vested in the committee.

(b) The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties.

(c) The committee shall have power to require the furnishing to the committee by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, of such information and reports as in the opinion of the committee are necessary to assist the commttee in carrying out its powers and duties under this resolution.

(d) In carrying out its powers and duties the committee or any subcommittee thereof may call upon any department, agency, or establishment of the United States, to perform clerical, stenographic, and statistical work and to furnish facilities and assistance to aid in such investigation.

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the railroad yardmasters union, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and I are each introducing today a bill designed to do five things:

First. Prohibit any and all aliens from holding offices in labor unions.

Second. Making it mandatory that all labor leaders shall have been actively engaged in the occupation represented for a period of 3 years or more before being eligible to hold office.

Third. All officers of labor unions must be adequately bonded.

Fourth. That a financial statement must be submitted yearly by all labor unions.

Fifth. A 60-day period be allowed in jurisdictional disputes for cooling off, during which time there would be no stoppage of production.

We all recognize American labor unions were originally organized to protect workers and better working conditions. However, during the present crisis a small group of selfish, unscrupulous labor leaders with communistic tendencies have crept into the labor picture and they are jeopardizing our national defense program and doing an injustice to organized labor. These individuals have no place in the ranks of American labor and they must be barred from further activity. Under the terms of this bill honest labor is adequately protected by a provision making settlements retroactive to the beginning of the 60-day period after arbitration concludes a settlement.

The railroad yardmasters union is sponsoring this bill and is anxious to lead the fight for its passage.

Under the terms of this bill we believe all undesirable, un-American labor leaders will be forced out of public office immediately, making way for honest upright Americans to lead labor in this time of national emergency. It would result in immediate harmony in our efforts to make America invincible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a radio address by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular order of business today, and following any previous special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a reader editorial of the day, in the Haverhill Evening Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an interesting address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RICHARD T. FRANKENSTEEN

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent example of Richard T. Frankensteen's attitude with relation to the condemnation of the North American Aviation strike is inspiring in that it was forthright and courageous, indicating clearly the exemplary patriotism of a responsible labor leader in an emergency. The denunciation of the wildcat strike, however, did not carry with it any reflection or opposition to the basic claims involved. Such criticism and persuasion as was expressed by Frankensteen centered upon the violation of the agreement which was intended to maintain uninterrupted the production of planes while the Labor Mediation Board considered the claims and grievances of the workers. Irresponsible and inexperienced local leadership was to blame for this hasty and ill-considered move, and since it is authoritatively stated by Frankensteen, I accept it as fact that communism reared its vicious influence to produce strife and stagnation, not for economic reasons but for political and violently anti-American reasons.

It is noteworthy that Frankensteen chose no middle course or compromise, but attacked all along the front at one and the same time. In the position he assumed was great risk and political danger. More than that, had he failed to carry through, radicalism of an extreme kind, known as communism, would have become firmly entrenched in a labor organization, and the name of Frankensteen might have passed out of the organization which he so ably helped to create and expand.

In the heat of battle let us not overlook the fact that the responsible and patriotic leaders of labor, beginning with Frankensteen and going straight down the line, contend that the demands of the strikers as to wages and hours and working conditions generally are warranted. It is generally conceded, too, by those who know that the shift of the airplane industry to the coast, and particularly its concentration in the southern part of California, was due to the cheap and exploited available labor. While the scale of wages and conditions as a rule are far below that of other localities, North American Aviation and several others are particularly and notoriously known as exemplars of anti-unionism and of exploitation. The Labor Mediation Board should speedily settle the questions and points in controversy and should establish a basic principle and a scale that will prevent repetition of the trouble in other plants which are sure to be disturbed unless the source of trouble is eliminated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the question of hospital care for World War veterans of the United States merchant marine, together with certain pertinent newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Senator WAGNER, of New York, and a statement by W. L. Batt, before the Labor Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an

article by the National Commander of Disabled American War Veterans. This article exceeds the authorized amount, and the Government Printing Office has given me an estimate of $112.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an article from the San Francisco Examiner commending Congress, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] for officially designating I Am An American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by myself to the Secretary of Commerce and his reply thereto including the answers to several questions I submitted to him concerning the proposed St. Lawrence project.

I have made the customary inquiry from the Government Printing Office to determine the amount of space in the RECORD that will be taken up should my request be granted and I find that it will require three pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the cost thereof will be $135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article which appeared in the publication Social Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of a resolution and petition from the citizens of Kewaunee County, Wis., on the subject of not sending American soldiers to fight abroad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio speech by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] for 35 minutes.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that order be transferred until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement from Amos Pinchot, and I have the estimated cost of this from the Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADRRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss a most important decision that this country must immediately make, and that is the policy we will follow in connection with the Nazi declaration of war upon Soviet Russia.

The general first impression was that this declaration of war would be beneficial to Britain, the United States, and all people who want to avoid the yoke of nazi-ism.

But let us analyze the matter further. To me these points have never been debatable, but if there was ever any doubt about it, the invasion of Russia makes it crystal clear that there can be no agreement with Hitler, there can be no appeasement. I am sure that Stalin and his communistic regime were carrying out their unholy alliance with Hitler in substantial conformity with their agreement. It is not that they liked their part, but they feared doing otherwise. But it served Hitler's purpose to breach this agreement, just as it has served his purpose to scrap sacred contracts with defenseless, peace-loving, democratic people. It served his purpose to disregard his pact with Russia just as he would break any agreement with this country should we ever be so foolish and naive as to make one with him.

The second point made certain by his further aggressive act is that Hitler is bent on world conquest. He and his military machine will stop at nothing short of subjugation of the British Empire, of the Western Hemisphere, and of this country. His attack on Russia is only an incident in his attempt to fulfill that big purpose.

The third point made clear by Hitler's Russian attack is that he hopes to immediately subjugate the one great power on the Continent of Europe that we have all hoped would eventually engage him in war and spell his doom. He hopes to overrun Russia immediately and then turn his efforts toward Britain and the Western Hemisphere.

The fourth point made clear by recent activities is that Hitler anticipated that his war on Russia would divide the people of this country and would cause the executives and Members of Congress to enter into extensive debates and thereby waste time while he seals his western door. This is plainly a part of his plan, as evidenced by his carefully worded proclamation, and especially by the propaganda message of Foreign Minister Von Ribbentrop.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How do you figure it will divide the people of this country? I am asking for information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I assume Hitler considered it would divide this country because if we rendered any assistance to Russia it put us in the very peculiar position of rendering assistance to a country that we have not thought very much of in the past. He undoubtedly thought that many people and interests in this country would be less eager to fight him if he forced Russia on our side. Hitler hoped to give the isolationists and appeasers something to talk about. He hopes to have them lull us to sleep.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlean yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman in favor of helping make the world safe for communism?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I am in favor of helping any country that wants to fight nazi-ism.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman really and honestly and truly believe down in the bottom of his heart that American mothers want to send their sons over to Russia to fight for Soviet Russia and the red flag and communism and world revolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have advocated nothing of the sort. I am not advocating sending any soldiers to fight for Russia, but I do say to the gentleman that certainly if you are in a scrap with a very able adversary, as I feel we are now or eventually will be in a scrap with Hitler, if we can get somebody on our side, we do not discuss with him what his religion, his color, or his belief before we welcome his assistance.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Andrew Jackson at the battle of New Orleans welcomed the pirate Lafitte, did he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is a very good analogy.

Mr. GIFFORD. And he was not defending piracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I only have 10 minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just assume that Russia and Germany have about equal strength, which do you prefer to fight us after they get through fighting each other?

Mr. KEFAUVER. At the present moment I prefer that Hitler get beaten by all means.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even if it brings us under Russia in the end?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would not bring us under Russia. Our immediate armed enemy is Hitler. As much as we dislike communism, we do not fear immediate armed aggression from that source.

Do not mislead yourselves by believing these masterful documents of propaganda were for the German people. They were for the consumption of the British and American peoples, and if we let ourselves be divided—if we do anything other than redouble our effort, we will be playing into Hitler's hands.

We in this country have no use for communism. I do not believe there is a Member of Congress who would embrace it as a system of government or who would subscribe to the philosophy for which it stands. But let us be practical. This is no time to embroil the Nation in an argument over ideologies. We cannot afford to let Hitler fill his storehouse with grain and oil and start this way while we are debating academic questions.

Why are we arming? Why have we appropriated billions of dollars for the manufacture of munitions? Why have we changed the course of American life and turned this country into an arsenal? It was not because we were afraid of Stalin; it was because we knew that sooner or later the chances were that we would have to fight for our own existence and that our enemy was Hitler and his power mad Nazi regime.

Communism has been a challenge to us, but in a different sort of way. It is not and never has been an armed challenge. We can deal with the communistic challenge by improving our democratic processes and by cleaning out the communistic agitators. If need be, this can be done later, but today is our chance to deal with Hitler.

Germany hopes to complete its conquest of Russia before we decide upon our policy. By coercion he has neutralized Turkey. By propaganda he hopes to cause us to miss a great opportunity to start him on his downward march to defeat and destruction.

Many of us would like to see Hitler and Stalin fight it out until both are exterminated, but we know that if the hands-off policy is pursued by Britain and by this country it will not turn out that way. We know that unless the scales are evened by military pressure upon Germany at this time that Hitler will soon have in his control grain, oil, and resources; that he will be in a position to carry on a more intense campaign of aggression against the English-speaking democracies. He would be able to point all of his strength westward without fear of eventual conflict with the Russian war machine.

I think Mr. Churchill was entirely correct in announcing the determination of his country to give aid to Russia and to accelerate British attack upon Germany at every possible point. I hope that this country will follow the same course. Now is the time to strike. By throwing in our weight we might put Hitler out of business this year. In any event, we would be bettering our chances of dealing with him later.

The sensible course for us to follow is to give Russia aid under the lease-lend program, and at the same time step up the amount of assistance we are giving to Britain, even to the point of sending over a substantial part of our Army and Navy bombers under the lease-lend program. One bomber in the hands of the British today would be worth 15 later on. We must be sure that these munitions of war reach their destination, and therefore it appears that now is the time to start using our Navy to protect our freedom of the seas, and for convoy purposes.

For the most part we in Congress have had little to say on matters of strategy. We have appropriated money and passed other bills to implement our defense. We have left the rest of the job to the President and the executive departments. This is ordinarily a proper course, but in this crisis I think it is a part of our obligation to speak out and express our views. The President represents the people. We represent the people. While each is a separate branch of the Government, however, in times like this we are and should work in cooperation as a team in charting the course of American destiny.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

AGRICULTURAL TARIFFS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some charts from the United States Department of Agriculture and also from farm organizations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the fact that on yesterday, today, and tomorrow hearings are being held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, in which suggestions are being made to lower the tariff on a great many agricultural products. Since the present administration has twice lowered the tariff on cheese I have spent considerable time trying to secure the definite facts and information in regard to this product.

Only 6.6 pounds of milk out of every 100 pounds produced in the United States go into cheese. I sincerely believe we should not do anything that might harm this industry any more than it has been harmed already. I never could see any reason why we should take a product that represents such a small part of dairy production and continually lower the tariff on it without asking for tariff reductions on other dairy products if tariff reduction could be justified on any of them. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any reason why we should lower the tariff on livestock and livestock products continually while we turn around and appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars a year to raisers of soil-depleting crops, especially when we know that livestock and livestock farming constitute a system of agriculture that comes more nearly to preserving the fertility of the soil than any system of agriculture we have ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to offer my opposition to the further reduction of agricultural tariffs, particularly in its application to livestock and livestock products.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his Baltimore speech in October 1932, stated:

> I know of no effective excessive high duties on foreign products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program.

In regard to the present consideration of agricultural tariffs, I wish to say that I was a cosigner and coauthor of the attached copy of letter to Secretary Hull:

MAY 28, 1941.

Hon. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The President has asked that we all try to work together during this declared emergency. In an effort to comply with his request, we are asking you if you do not think it would be a wise procedure for you to postpone the scheduled hearings by the committee on reciprocity which have been set for June 27, between this country and Argentina and Uruguay.

The hearings will be held at a very inappropriate time. Both Argentina and Uruguay should be cognizant of this situation. If they are really interested in the welfare of the Western Hemisphere and the benefits to be acquired for their own countries, they should be willing to subscribe to this postponement.

With wool, cheese, casein, meat, and other livestock products being subject to a reduction in tariff, there will be a rather widespread opposition evidenced at these hearings. If the hearings between these two countries, and our own were postponed until a later date, world affairs might be more settled than they are at present.

We sincerely hope you will give this letter due consideration in your deliberations on these hearings in connection with the proposed treaties. Our only desire in submitting this letter is to bring about unity on the part of everyone during these perilous times.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSHUA L. JOHNS,
WM. H. STEVENSON,
B. J. GEHRMANN,
MERLIN HULL,
THAD F. WASIELEWSKI,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
REID F. MURRAY,
HARRY SAUTHOFF.

It would have been preferable to have had these hearings at some future time.

My opinion is that legislation should be based on common sense and common justice. The first and second Canadian treaty, affecting livestock and livestock products, were not passed on either of these two premises.

When the first treaty was put into effect on January 1, 1936, the tariff was reduced 2 cents per pound on cheese and the price of cheese immediately dropped 2 cents per pound and this price went from 17 cents January 1, 1936, to 12½ cents on July 1, 1936. This decline in price took place right in face of declining storage stocks as there were 99,000,000 pounds of cheese in storage on January 1, 1936, and only 85,000,000 pounds of cheese in storage on July 1, 1936. The result was that 14 times as much cheese was imported in 1936 as was imported in 1935. Again in 1938, when the second treaty was made, the tariff was reduced another 1 cent per pound and the price dropped practically the amount of the reduction in tariff.

In 1939 there was practically three times as much cheese imported as was imported in 1938. In August 1939, due to drought in the milk-producing areas of the United States, prices advanced for dairy products and in October alone we imported 3,259,467 pounds of cheese, or over one-half the imports for the whole year. Is there anyone that wishes to question these statements of fact? The figures and source of this information follow:

Year	Imports of Cheddar cheese	Tariff	Increase in imports due to tariff reduction
	Pounds		*Percent*
1935	[1] 768,932	7 cents per pound.	1,410
1936	[1] 10,844,681	5 cents per pound.	
1938	[1] 1,815,333	do	349
1939	[1] 6,351,785	4 cents per pound.	

Source: U. S. Tariff Commission.

It is difficult to discuss this foreign agricultural situation without combining the discussion with the domestic agricultural situation.

In the campaign of 1932 in the Midwest we heard much about the inequities of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. All troubles could be, and were, saddled off onto this Tariff Act. While I never wholly subscribed to this Tariff Act, I maintain that the people have been deceived by the critics of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act—when this administration has never made one effort to repeal the act and while they have hidden behind the skirts of certain Smoot-Hawley schedules in the domestic agricultural program. For example, we have had very severe criticism of the Smoot-Hawley Act, but we have seen the administration on two different occasions lower the tariffs on livestock and livestock products as far as the foreign agricultural policy was concerned. According to the United States Tariff Commission, 65 to 70 percent of the Smoot-Hawley tariff schedules are still in effect. At the same time we have seen the domestic agricultural program maintain the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 42 cents per bushel on wheat and 25 cents per bushel on corn while they were spending $500,000,000 a year under the guise of soil conservation on these and other soil-depleting crops. The present administration cannot be opposed to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act when they will not only maintain 42 cents per bushel on wheat to implement this tariff by putting a domestic tariff now of 49 cents per bushel on domestically produced wheat and establish a quota of only 800,000 bushels of wheat and 4,000 tons of flour, which is really an embargo. It appears that the administration is willing to increase the production of a crop that happens to come under the province of their domestic program. In other words, the cross-purposes of the domestic and foreign agricultural programs of the present administration are that they implement the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates by domestic tariff rates of 3 cents per pound on cotton and 49 cents per bushel on wheat for soil-depleting crops when at the same time they have reduced the tariff by one-half on livestock and livestock products and by 42 percent as far as cheese is concerned.

Livestock farming is a system of farming that is associated with soil conservation, and it is not a good governmental policy to appropriate $500,000,000 a year under the guise of soil conservation when this could be universally accomplished by protecting a system of agriculture that is associated with real soil conservation. We must place our domestic and foreign agricultural program on a sound economic basis.

The present tariff is 7 cents per pound on foreign types of cheese, according to information that I have received from the United States Tariff Commission.

The following facts regarding Italian cheese industry should be considered. The Italian type of cheese has been an infant industry in this country and the annual production in this country is shown on page 14 of the United States Department of Agriculture Marketing Service, of which the following is an extract:

Production of manufactured dairy products in the United States, 1930–39

Product	1930	1931	1932	1933
All Italian varieties of cheese	8,573	3,493	3,795	4,759
All other varieties of cheese	7,029	4,851	4,010	4,076

Product	1934	1935	1936
All Italian varieties of cheese	5,517	10,628	11,361
All other varieties of cheese	4,676	5,890	7,234

Product	1937	1938	1939
All Italian varieties of cheese	13,520	16,461	20,509
All other varieties of cheese	9,171	11,055	11,941

The importations of Italian cheese are shown in the following table, obtained from the United States Tariff Commission:

Italian cheese importations

	Pounds	Amount
1936	26,578,000	$6,217,000
1937	26,401,000	5,933,000
1938	24,791,000	5,658,000
1939	23,805,000	5,785,000
1940	13,833,000	3,668,000
First 4 months 1941	472,000	113,000

Source: U. S. Tariff Commission, June 23, 1941.

Wisconsin, which produces one-tenth of all of the milk produced in the entire country and over one-half of the cheddar cheese of the country, has been making steady progress in the development of the Italian type of cheese. This is shown by the following table, which not only indicates the types of Italian cheese but the progress that this industry has made in Wisconsin from 1928 to 1940:

Annual production of Italian cheese (all varieties) in Wisconsin, 1928–40

	Production (pounds)
1928	903,000
1929	1,027,000
1930	1,001,000
1931	624,000
1932	620,000
1933	978,000
1934	1,968,000
1935	4,472,000
1936	5,906,000
1937	5,811,000
1938	7,238,000
1939	9,261,000
1940	12,450,000

Manufacture of Italian cheese in Wisconsin (pounds), 1935–40 [1]

Types (as reported)	1935	1936	1937
Asiago only	834,477	667,675	910,876
Asiago and Parma			
Asiago and Provoloni			
Asiago, Fontina, Salami			
Asiago, Bra, Modena, and Roman Spec			
Asiago, Provoloni, and Parma			
Provoloni only	2,090,678	3,096,396	2,075,520
Provoloni, etc	1,301,847	1,116,970	1,647,296
Provolette–Salami			
Modena		197,815	
Pasta-Filata		747,455	990,473
Grana			
Ricotta, Rifatti, Gorgonzola, and Blue Cheese			
Miscellaneous [2]	44,911	72,230	182,490
No name	200,569	7,922	3,850
Total	4,472,482	5,906,463	5,810,505

Types (as reported)	1938	1939	1940
Asiago only	432,655	859,666	512,327
Asiago and Parma	654,697		
Asiago and Provoloni	318,080		1,334,306
Asiago, Fontina, Salami			619,207
Asiago, Bra, Modena, and Roman Spec		170,655	971,558
Asiago, Provoloni, and Parma		222,000	
Provoloni only	2,185,447	1,022,933	3,700,373
Provoloni, etc	2,212,336	3,058,088	2,745,390
Provolette–Salami		53,377	
Modena	126,892		
Pasta-Filata	986,592	1,889,046	
Grana		373,586	
Ricotta, Rifatti, Gorgonzola, and Blue Cheese			48,153
Miscellaneous [2]	21,158	1,608,535	2,485,038
No name	300,451	3,308	33,995
Total	7,238,308	9,261,194	12,450,347

[1] From annual reports of Wisconsin dairy plants by the Wisconsin Crop Reporting Service. These types are as actually reported. Where more than 1 name shown, we had no information concerning the amounts of each individual type.

[2] Scamorze, Provolettine, Manteche, Provoloni Salami, dry Ricotta, fresh Ricotta, Provolette, fresh Incanestrato, fresh Burrini, fresh Caviocavella, Fiaschetta.

Here is the picture in regard to the Italian cheese situation. The United States produces approximately 20,000,000 pounds of this type of cheese a year, and Wisconsin alone produces around 12,000,000 pounds per year, and we have been importing from 13,000,000 to 26,000,000 pounds per year during the past 5 years.

We have been importing more of this Italian type of cheese than we have produced in this country and we have really an infant industry that needs protection. We have been obtaining 7-cent tariff and this is a relatively small amount of tariff for this industry. I sincerely hope that your honorable body will not lower this tariff, as the following table shows that Argentina has been furnishing an ever-increasing amount of our foreign exports of this type of cheese.

Cheese: United States imports for consumption from Argentine, 1935–40

Types	1935		1936		1937		1938		1939		1940 [1]	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Pounds		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Swiss or Emmenthaler							£15	£187				
Gruyere process							£39	92	29, 294	$5, 020	438, 485	$78, 267
Romano Pecorino	314, 664	$48, 952	100, 371	$17, 106	70, 019	$10, 152	92, 411	13, 697	299, 331	43, 736	1, 863, 543	309, 438
Reggiano or Parmesan	68, 520	10, 372	12, 478	2, 201	£1, 354	11, 804	167, 262	27, 974	374, 932	60, 763	709, 422	128, 403
Provoloni and Provolette	539	93	11, 986	10, 670	88	14	2, 763	£36	25, 584	4, 897	165, 317	26, 637
Roquefort	1, 037	240					390	72				
Cheddar			789	139							308	54
Blue mold									313	46	756, 909	161, 596
Edam and Gouda											189, 320	22, 364
Eryndza												
Cheese, n. s. p. f	1, 216, 182	151, 208	853, 575	118, 645	1, 048, 712	131, 724	1, 200, 356	163, 489	1, 627, 520	190, 095	2, 901, 308	320, 940
Total	1, 600, 942	210, 865	979, 199	148, 761	1, 180, 173	153, 694	1, 464, 736	206, 047	2, 356, 974	304, 557	7, 114, 612	1, 047, 699

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

I think it would be very appropriate if this committee would spend a little time in a real study of the dairy situation and realize what has taken place in this most important branch of American agriculture.

I wish to submit the following tables that show the domestic prices of butter and cheese for the years 1915 to 1940 inclusive:

Yearly average wholesale prices, at Chicago, selected commodities, 1915–40

Year	Butter [1] 92-score creamery, per pound	American cheese [2] per pound
	Cents	*Cents*
1915	28. 0	14. 7
1916	31. 9	18. 1
1917	41. 0	23. 5
1918	49. 5	27. 1
1919	57. 6	29. 9
1920	58. 7	26. 2
1921	41. 7	18. 4
1922	39. 2	19. 3
1923	46. 0	22. 2
1924	41. 2	18. 2
1925	44. 1	21. 5
1926	42. 8	20. 2
1927	45. 8	22. 7
1928	46. 0	22. 1
1929	43. 8	20. 1
1930	35. 3	16. 4
1931	27. 0	12. 5
1932	20. 1	9. 9
1933	20. 8	10. 2
1934	24. 8	11. 8
1935	28. 8	14. 4
1936	32. 0	15. 3
1937	33. 2	15. 9
1938	27. 1	12. 5
1939	25. 4	12. 8
1940	28. 7	14. 3

[1] Source: Agricultural Marketing Service (table 601, Agricultural Statistics, 1940).

[2] Wholesale prices on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange.

Source: Wisconsin Crop and Livestock Reporter, March 1941, p. 21.

You will note from this table that there has been a very low prevailing price for cheese and butter ever since the present administration gained control of the House of Representatives in 1930.

The table also shows that during the 10-year period, 1930 to 1940, cheese has averaged only 12.9 cents per pound, while for the 10 years previous to 1930 it averaged 20.2 cents per pound. This is for American cheese but it is an indication of what could be expected when tariffs are reduced on any type of cheese. It will also be noted that cheese averaged only 13.4 cents per pound for the past 8 years of the present administration.

Out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States, 29 percent is distributed as fluid milk, 42.1 pounds are made into butter, and 6.6 pounds are made into cheese, the rest going into ice cream, condensed milk, or other dairy products.

The continual lowering of the tariff on cheese has, in my opinion, been unfair and unwarranted. The fluid-milk interests have had State and Federal marketing agreements, which are really price fixing, for their product. The 42.1 percent of the milk has had the advantage of a 14-cent per pound tariff while the small group representing 6.6 percent have had to be subjected already to two tariff reductions. Is there any fair and just reason to ask this small group to be called upon to suffer from tariff reductions that are not even asked of the other producers in this same industry? The tariff on butter is 14 cents and it was 7 cents for cheese, which relationship is about fair, as we get about twice as many pounds of cheese out of 100 pounds of milk as we get pounds of butter. Why should any administration lower the tariff on cheese 42 percent and not make any effort to lower the tariff on butter? Is it because butter is universally produced and the cheese industry is confined to a relatively small area and over 50 percent is produced in one State—Wisconsin?

The whole tariff situation is a confusing one to anyone who tries to subscribe to a program of parity price for a domestic agricultural program. We have so many examples. For instance, the peanut crop. Here is a crop that has a tariff of 7 cents per pound and according to the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, when the peanut bill was passed, it was stated that it cost 3 cents per pound to produce them. The peanut bill also had a domestic trade barrier or a tariff of 3 cents per pound that certain domestic producers must pay if they are going to merchandise their wares domestically. Here we have a product that has a foreign tariff of two and one-third times the cost of producing the crop and a domestic tariff equal to the cost of producing the crop put on by the present administration. Then we have the same administration that is appropriating $500,000,000 for soil conservation and lowering the tariff on cheese about 42 percent, when the 7-cent per pound tariff to begin with was only one-third of the cost of producing the cheese.

It might be well for us to consider the fact that in the cheese-producing area of Wisconsin, the records show the highest percentage of delinquent farm loans by the Farm Credit Administration on January 1, 1940. The percentage was 50.2, or about twice the average for the United States. The butter prices have been maintained at comparative levels with cheese. This has been accomplished partly by the machination of certain Federal price-manipulating agencies that were supposed to be making America over when in fact they have been shoving America under.

To be fair with your committee, I wish to state that I think that the domestic manipulations of the butter prices have been a factor as well as the tariff reduction on cheese, in maintaining the low levels that have prevailed for this product during the past several years.

The following table shows the wide price variations received by farmers due to milk-marketing agreements, distance from markets for fluid milk, and the artificial trade barriers that have sprung up under the guise of health requirements.

DO YOU KNOW THE MILK PRICE VARIATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES?

The following official table is from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture:

Farm production and value, by States, 1939 [1]

State	Production	Value per 100 pounds [2]	Value of production
Maine	652, 000, 000	$2. 39	$15, 583, 000
New Hampshire	354, 000, 000	2. 46	8, 708, 000
Vermont	1, 392, 000, 000	1. 93	26, 866, 000
Massachusetts	804, 000, 000	3. 29	26, 452, 000
Rhode Island	145, 000, 000	3. 05	4, 422, 000
Connecticut	720, 000, 000	3. 15	22, 680, 000
New York	7, 465, 000, 000	2. 00	149, 300, 000
New Jersey	909, 000, 000	3. 38	30, 724, 000
Pennsylvania	4, 622, 000, 000	2. 40	110, 928, 000
Ohio	4, 588, 000, 000	1. 73	79, 372, 000
Indiana	3, 217, 000, 000	1. 60	51, 472, 000
Illinois	5, 227, 000, 000	1. 57	82, 064, 000
Michigan	4, 740, 000, 000	1. 54	72, 996, 000
Wisconsin	11, 973, 000, 000	1. 23	147, 268, 000
Minnesota	8, 160, 000, 000	1. 08	88, 128, 000
Iowa	6, 519, 000, 000	1. 08	70, 405, 000
Missouri	3, 452, 000, 000	1. 30	44, 876, 000
North Dakota	2, 068, 000, 000	.96	19, 853, 000
South Dakota	1, 785, 000, 000	.97	17, 314, 000
Nebraska	2, 728, 000, 000	1. 07	29. 190, 000

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Value average returns secured from milk utilized.

Farm production and value, by States, 1939—Continued

State	Production	Value per 100 pounds	Value of production
Kansas	3,121,000,000	$1.16	$36,204,000
Delaware	143,000,000	2.38	3,403,000
Maryland	875,000,000	2.47	21,612,000
Virginia	1,450,000,000	2.17	31,465,000
West Virginia	840,000,000	2.35	19,740,000
North Carolina	1,439,000,000	2.65	38,134,000
South Carolina	582,000,000	3.08	17,926,000
Georgia	1,224,000,000	2.57	31,457,000
Florida	279,000,000	4.39	12,248,000
Kentucky	1,886,000,000	1.59	29,987,000
Tennessee	1,936,000,000	1.64	31,750,000
Alabama	1,295,000,000	2.22	28,749,000
Mississippi	1,373,000,000	1.62	22,243,000
Arkansas	1,337,000,000	1.62	21,659,000
Louisiana	627,000,000	2.52	15,800,000
Oklahoma	2,487,000,000	1.35	33,574,000
Texas	4,227,000,000	1.81	76,509,000
Montana	696,000,000	1.55	10,788,000
Idaho	1,121,000,000	1.25	14,012,000
Wyoming	276,000,000	1.49	4,112,000
Colorado	1,067,000,000	1.32	14,084,000
New Mexico	268,000,000	1.80	4,824,000
Arizona	230,000,000	2.09	4,807,000
Utah	538,000,000	1.45	7,801,000
Nevada	113,000,000	1.56	1,763,000
Washington	2,001,000,000	1.55	31,016,000
Oregon	1,364,000,000	1.62	22,097,000
California	4,243,000,000	1.98	84,011,000
United States	108,558,000,000	1.63	1,770,376,000

Here is an example of disparity within an industry. This shows the disparity within the industry, and the cheese farmers of America should not be subjected to any further loss by any additional reduction in tariff on their product.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I have the privilege to represent, has 1 cow out of every 100 in the entire United States.

I have seen many newspaper articles in regard to these reciprocal trade treaties where it has been said the tariff was reduced on cheese upon the advice of dairy experts. This is the third year I have been here in Washington, and up to this time I have not been able to find out who the dairy experts were. I would in all seriousness at this time like to ask if this presently proposed reduction in tariff on cheese has been considered by any dairy experts at this time? If so, I would like to have them answer one simple question and that is, How much does it cost to produce 1 pound of Italian cheese in the United States? If you cannot answer this question, do you think the farmers producing milk for Italian cheese production should be asked to abide by the tariff reduction that has been made by anyone or any group who does not know what it costs to produce this cheese in our own country?

I wish to call your attention to a few other things in connection with this free-trade approach of the foreign agricultural situation.

The first is, 1940 and also in 1937 were the only 2 years that the supplemental or competitive agricultural imports exceeded our total agricultural exports. This is the first time I can find this situation has existed, according to available records, for exports and imports of agricultural products.

The State Department figures for 1940 show $517,000,000 worth of agricultural products exported. They do not mention the fact that $52,000,000 was appropriated out of the Federal Treasury and export bounties were expended, leaving a net export of only $465,000,000. This is in face of the fact that we imported $742,000,000 worth of agricultural products not produced in this country and $543,000,000 worth of supplementary competitive agricultural products.

A few years ago the producer received 55 cents of the consumer's dollar. This has been going down until the producer now only receives 42 cents of the consumer's dollar.

These imports have a declared value at the point of origin and the American public no doubt paid around $2,000,000 for the $868,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products in 1937 and a like percentage for the other years. How many men could be taken off the W. P. A. rolls and furnished jobs in the processing and producing of this five to eight hundred million dollars worth of competitive agricultural products that are being imported each year? It would take thousands of men to produce and process these imported products that are replacing the products of the farmers of our own country.

It is well for us to consider that it is stated that 92 percent of the new wealth produced each year comes from the soil. It is well for us to consider that 40 to 50 percent of the buying power of this country is in the hands of the farmers of this country.

Another fact that I wish to call to your attention is that the farmers of this country are going to be called upon to pay out a large percentage of their income in the form of taxes.

The present administration has distributed about $3,600,000,000 through its domestic agricultural program and this represents about $600 per farm for the 6,000,000 farms in the United States. However, the farmer's share of the increase in the public debt is evidently three times the amount of the payments that he has had under the so-called subsidies.

We now have a new tax bill and if the American farmer is going to pay his share of these taxes he is surely not going to do it out of any agricultural products produced in foreign countries.

Our Secretary of Agriculture is asking the cheese farmers to increase their cheese production by about 30 percent, while at the same time he has asked the American people to reduce the consumption of this incomparable product.

How this committee, or any other committee of this administration, can, under these circumstances, entertain for one moment the idea that the tariff on cheese should be reduced at this time is beyond my comprehension. Such a procedure would be unfair, unjust, and void of all common justice and common sense.

The following table shows the importance of the various farm crops produced in the United States and the importance of livestock and livestock farming in the United States:

The farm value of principal agricultural products produced in the United States arranged in descending order of value, year 1939, and percentage each is of total and cumulative percentage

Agricultural Statistics, 1940]

Product	Total value	Percent of total	Cumulative percent
1. Milk	$1,823,200,000	17.42	17.42
2. Corn, all	1,464,300,000	13.99	31.41
3. Hogs	1,103,700,000	10.55	41.96
4. Cattle and calves	939,800,000	8.98	50.94
5. Hay, all	641,600,000	6.13	57.07
6. Eggs	617,600,000	5.90	62.97
7. Cotton lint	524,000,000	5.00	67.97
8. Wheat, all	510,600,000	4.89	72.86
9. Chickens	370,500,000	3.54	76.40
10. Oats	276,800,000	2.64	79.04
11. Tobacco	269,900,000	2.58	81.62
12. Potatoes	248,200,000	2.37	83.99
13. Sheep and lambs	135,600,000	1.30	85.29
14. Cottonseed	113,500,000	1.10	86.39
15. Barley	111,700,000	1.10	87.49
16. Oranges	77,400,000	.74	88.23
17. Wool	71,200,000	.68	88.91
18. Turkeys	69,200,000	.66	88.57
19. Soybeans	67,400,000	.64	90.21
20. Apples	66,400,000	.63	90.84
21. Tomatoes [1]	57,400,000	.55	91.39
22. Sweetpotatoes	54,400,000	.52	91.91
23. Sugarbeets	52,700,000	.50	92.41
24. Peaches	49,900,000	.48	92.89
25. Grain sorghums	48,400,000	.46	93.35
26. Sweet sorghums	45,900,000	.44	93.79
27. Beans, edible	43,600,000	.42	94.21
28. Rice	40,400,000	.39	94.60
29. Grapes	40,400,000	.39	94.99
30. Peanuts	39,900,000	.38	95.37
31. Strawberries [1]	32,400,000	.31	95.68
32. Lettuce [1]	31,800,000	.30	95.98
33. Flaxseed	31,500,000	.30	96.28
34. Grapefruit	22,300,000	.21	96.49
35. Peas [1]	19,900,000	.19	96.68
36. Pears	18,700,000	.18	96.86
37. Lemons	18,000,000	.18	97.04
38. Beans, snap [1]	18,400,000	.18	97.22
39. Celery [1]	18,100,000	.17	97.39
40. Sugarcane sugar	16,500,000	.16	97.55
41. Cabbage [1]	16,400,000	.16	97.71
42. Rye	16,000,000	.15	97.86
43. Red clover	15,400,000	.15	98.01
44. Cantaloupes [1]	14,100,000	.13	98.14
45. Onions [1]	14,000,000	.13	98.27
46. Prunes	13,900,000	.13	98.40
47. Alfalfa seed	13,800,000	.13	98.53
48. Asparagus [1]	13,100,000	.13	98.66
49. Cowpeas	12,300,000	.12	98.78
50. Velvet beans	11,000,000	.11	98.89
51. Sugarcane sirup	10,700,000	.10	98.99
52. Cherries	10,300,000	.10	99.09
53. All others [1]	95,700,000	.91	100.00
Total	10,460,500,000	100.00	100.00

[1] Commercial truck crops.

Source: National Farmers Guild.

This table shows that livestock and livestock products represent over 51 percent of the value of the total agricultural products of the country. Why, once more I ask, should we have a continuation of a program that reduces the tariff on livestock and livestock products?

These present reciprocal trade treaties are unfair to the livestock and livestock products of this country, and I sincerely hope that you recommend that they not be extended.

If the administration will make reciprocal trade treaties whereby we exchange noncompetitive agricultural products for products not raised in this country, that will be reciprocity and not false reciprocity as we have under the present administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of the legislative program for the day and other special

orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WENE, for balance of week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. HARRINGTON, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. JACOBSON (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE), for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BLOOM, for indefinite period, on account of death in family.

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. COOPER), on account of official and important business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the coming of Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg to the American Colonies; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m. in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

679. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made under provisions of the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

680. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066); to the Committee on Claims.

681. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend section 392 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for separate appropriation accounts for administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, so as to modify the 1- and 2-percent limitations on administrative expenses and to provide over-all limitations in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 961. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1147. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa," approved August 7, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1304. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Nolan, Mingo County, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 176. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3625. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the city of Washington, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Washington, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 820). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3972. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 821). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4052. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 822). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4085. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4150. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4231. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4306 A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near Mount Vernon, Posey County, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4315. A bill to legalize the construction by the Big Creek Bridge Co., Consolidated, of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Nolan, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4642. A bill authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 828). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4732. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Department of Highways, Commonwealth of Virginia, to construct, maintain, and operate two free bridges across the New River, one at Bluff City and the other at Eggleston, in the State of Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Act of 1941"; without amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 4813. A bill to amend section 73 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 198. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain land located within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation, Mont., for certain land owned by the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, of Missoula, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3484. A bill to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits to certain Reserve officers, Army of the United States, disabled while on active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 212. Resolution to create a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life; without amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 325. A bill for the relief of Frank T. Been; with amendment (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 734. A bill for the relief of Kula Sanatorium; with amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Ernest P. Leavitt; with amendment (Rept. No. 837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Grunwald and Tudor and E. Deffebach, principals, and Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance in New York, as liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., insolvent, surety, upon contract with Interior Department dated May 12, 1928, and identified by symbols I-1p-129; with amendment (Rept. No. 838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3118. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3403. A bill for the relief of Louis M. McDougal; with amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of J. R. Giles; with amendment (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Lonnie Bales; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3872. A bill for the relief of Towne School District No. 6, Fractional Monroe Township, Newaygo County, Mich.; with amendment (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. F. A. N. Yeager; with amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 820. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; with amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 849. An act for the relief of Eben Vaughn Cleaves; with amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. S. 1027. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 5137. A bill to provide for a basic-data survey of the power development and natural resources of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 5138. A bill to amend the Wisconsin Chippewa Jurisdictional Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. L. 1049); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 5139. A bill providing for a quinquennial census of industry and business by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 5140. A bill to extend the times within which taxpayers shall be allowed a credit against certain taxes imposed by the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for contributions paid into unemployment funds under State laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 5141. A bill to extend the time during which orders and marketing agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, may be applicable to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5142. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the extent of damages suffered by landowners and water users on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, due to a break in the north canal of such project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 5143. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 5144. A bill granting pensions to veterans and dependents of veterans who served in the Moro Province between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5145. A bill prohibiting members of certain subversive organizations from being members of any labor organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5146. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with the construction of certain public works in connection with the War Department in the District of Columbia," approved June 15, 1938; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5147. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R 5148. A bill denying to certain representatives and labor organizations their status and benefits as such under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5149. A bill denying to certain representatives and labor organizations their status and benefits as such under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 5150. A bill authorizing the United States Maritime Commission to acquire, and to develop and use, certain port facilities in the port of Portland, Maine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY:

H. J. Res. 199 (by request). Joint resolution to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 248. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the St. Lawrence waterways project by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 33, 49, and 55, relative to the extension of flood-control works; to real-estate brokers and salesmen; and social security and old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5151. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eva A. Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 5153. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse St. Luke's Hospital; W. D. Salo, D. D. S.; Lloyd W. Howe, M. D.; Mrs. John F. Martin, nee Miss Bettie C. Homer, R. N.; and Mrs. Ruth Saam, R. N.; for services rendered and medical attention for Lt. David A. Foster, Infantry Reserve, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5154. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the legal guardian of Elmer White, deceased, for personal injuries which resulted in the death of Elmer White by being struck by a truck owned by the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5155. A bill for the relief of George Isaac; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5156. A bill for the relief of William Lintz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5157. A bill to reimburse F. E. Wester for labor and material used in the emergency construction of buildings and utilities at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Escanaba; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5158. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 5159. A bill to reimburse Otto Schulz for loss of personal property; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5160. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Frank Rublein and Paulina Rublein, husband and wife, for the losses sustained by them by reason of the death of their son, Ernest J. Rublein, resulting from the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5161. A bill granting a pension to Clara Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5162. A bill for the relief of James Franklin Smith and his dependent minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5163. A bill granting a pension to Steven E. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 5164. A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 5165. A bill granting a pension to Mary Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1504. By Mr. BOLLES: Resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Office of Production Management to use the resources of skill and man power of the Negro race in the defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1505. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of sundry residents of Vallejo, Solano County, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3853, to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1506. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the California Assembly, memorializing Congress to include the Los Angeles River and the construction of flood-control works in the San Fernando Valley as one of the Federal construction projects, and that Federal moneys be appropriated to provide therefor at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1507. Also, resolution of the California Assembly, memorializing Congress to make necessary amendments to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act so that California may make amendments in the Unemployment Insurance Act of California granting an exemption from the contribution and benefit provisions of the State act to real-estate brokers and salesmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1508. Also, resolution of the California Assembly, memorializing Congress to enact legislation on social security and old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1509. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Rev. W. W. Grant and numerous residents of Fredericktown, Ohio, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, as superseded by House bill 2475, to provide for the national defense by the control of moral conditions in the vacinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1510. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of J. E. Rains a' other citizens of Peabody, Kans., supporting House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1511. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Newton, of Reading, Kans., and 29 other citizens of Reading, Kans., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1512. By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota: Petition of the North Dakota Bankers Association, opposing imposition of a tax on bank checks and pledging wholehearted support and cooperation with the defense program, including sale of United States defense bonds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1513. Also, petition of the North Dakota Taxpayers Association, opposing amendment to Federal pay-roll tax law which extends the tax to farm labor, domestic help, and employers having one or more employees; urging a 20 percent reduction in nondefense expenditures; and urging that an Office of Economy for Defense be set up as an integral part of the Office of Emergency Management, such office to make a study of ways and means by which the expenditures for nondefense can be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1514. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the State of California, asking consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 49, that proper amendments be made in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, with special relation to real-estate brokers and salesmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1515. By Mr. SCOTT (by request): Petition of the Stone Masons, Union, No. 3; International Molders' Union, No. 1; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 8; Warehouse Employees Union; Seafarers International Union; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union B-1161; and Central Labor Union, all of Philadelphia, Pa., endorsing the Townsend national recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1516. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of Harry T. Murphy and others, of Armstrong and Indiana Counties, Pa., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1517. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, out of the things that limit and suppress life we would pass into the realm of that liberty in which is the true wealth of character; it is the truth which makes us free and in this region we find the real worth of man. We thank Thee for Him who loved the loveless, whose hands lifted the weak and in whom the quality of mercy was not strained. Almighty God, we pray that the Congress may be steady and like-minded, safeguarded against all allurements, wielding a power whereat our country shall never become an abject people nor tremble beneath a tyrant's heel. Thy love, O Christ, passeth knowledge; oh, would that in all its depth and length, its height, its breadth, and its everlasting strength might descend upon this confused and struggling world, which is feeling its way like a blind man along a wall. Lord Jesus, let hope revive beneath the lurid skies and faith discern the coming of the truce of nations. Through Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5166), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 849), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters from the Division of Immigration and Housing of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a very short article from the Washington Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE *O–9*

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today a resolution to create an independent committee to investigate the sinking of the *O–9* and other similar problems touched upon by this resolution. I intend no slight to the Naval Affairs Committee, but they have an investigation on now that will take up their time in studying questions of defense.

In view of the fact that there are many more old submarines which have been reconditioned, and in view of the sad experience we have had with reconditioned submarines, the Congress ought to know something about this phase of the defense program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement showing the steps necessary to be taken by a cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor before he can obtain repayment of an invoice he has paid.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I shall make in the Committee this afternoon and to include some tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5052) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to explain what this legislation will bring about?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished minority leader of the House I shall say the reason we bring this measure here today under unanimous-consent request is because on last District day the House adjourned.

The bill comes with the unanimous report of the entire District Committee, and it is necessary that the legislation be enacted into law prior to July 1.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It comes with the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; and in a brief explanation, in which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], ranking minority Member joins, the purpose of the legislation is to meet certain requirements of the present Social Security Act. The Federal law requires that all States, by July 1, have a provision showing that money expended erroneously or lost must be replaced or restored. The measure which we present simply brings the District of Columbia in line with the States on this provision.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 15:

"All moneys received by the Board pursuant to section 302 of the Social Security Act shall be expended solely for the purposes and in the amounts found necessary by the Social Security Board for the proper and efficient administration of this act. In lieu of incorporation in this act of the provision described in section 303 (a) (9) of the Social Security Act, the Board shall include in its annual report to the Congress, provided in section 14 (c) of this act, a report of any moneys received after July 1, 1941, from the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act, and any unencumbered balances in the Unemployment Compensation Administration Fund as of that date, which the Social Security Board finds have, because of any action or contingency, been lost or have been expended for purposes other than, or in amounts in excess of, those found necessary by the Social Security Board for the proper administration of this act."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of 12:01 o'clock a. m., July 1, 1941.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made yesterday before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WHAT NECESSITATES USE OF OLD WORLD WAR SUBMARINES?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the Northwest Aviation Planning Council, of Billings, Mont., with regard to Gen. William Mitchell, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a commencement address by Dr. MacLeish, Librarian of Congress. It exceeds two pages, and I have an estimate from the Government Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the location of a national-defense industry in southern Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BISHOP asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SHIPMENT OF HIGH-GRADE GASOLINE AND SCRAP IRON TO JAPAN

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Oregonian, one of the best articles I have seen on this subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it proper for the gentleman to put that article in his remarks at this point, or will it appear in the Appendix?

Mr. PIERCE. It will appear in my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. It will go in the Appendix.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, let me express and acknowledge my indebtedness to the timely and thoughtful gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for calling my attention to the fact that Mr. Lindbergh is liable to feel hurt at my constant disagreement with his philosophy. I had not thought of it. I checked on it, and, although my report is unconfirmed, I understand that he did become disconsolate and was in a pretty bad and shaken-up condition about it. However, on hearing that he was championed and protected here by that great friend of the workingman and of the common people, the gentleman from Michigan, he not only regained his composure but went to bed and got a good night's sleep and got up refreshed and happy the next day, ready to advise his American countrymen that the best way to deal with a mad dog is to pat it kindly on the head.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Journal-American concerning tax-free cigarettes for the members of the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from Fred A. Hulsebus, of Harlan, Iowa, to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE RECENT SUBMARINE DISASTER

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a resolution has been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] to appoint a special committee to investigate the recent submarine disaster. May I say to the House that the Navy Department has ordered a court of inquiry, which is the usual procedure? Just as soon as that court of inquiry has made its finding it will be submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and then the Committee on Naval Affairs will conduct an investigation in reference to the recent accident.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FLAHERTY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain correspondence between the office of The Adjutant General and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from Walter L. Rice, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co., a letter from Jesse H. Jones, a statement of the Reconstruction Finace Corporation, and a statement of I. W. Wilson, vice president in charge of operations of the Aluminum Co. of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep and sincere appreciation of the tribute paid me by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], and to assure him that I am always happy to learn that he is discovering something which will be of benefit to him. I am also glad to know that the gentleman is finally reaching the same conclusion as that reached by so many labor leaders, including certain C. I. O. leaders who called on me, that I am a real friend of labor, and I hope that the gentleman himself will ultimately discover that strikes and closed shops and violence are not just the best way to give us national defense. I say I appreciate the compliment, and the more because it comes from a gentleman who has shown himself, according to his own modest admission, as willing to defend American womanhood, even when the woman is traveling on a train and even at the risk of personal violence to himself. I appreciate the gentleman's compliment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the New York State Young Democratic Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein several articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the American citizens of Polish extraction, pledging support in the present emergency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial published in the Labor Record on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue for 3½ hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5166), the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, provides a total amount in cash appropriations of $882,183,825.29, and in contract authorizations of $14,900,000. The total is $22,072,145.80 less than the Budget estimates. Ninety-seven percent of the money provided in this bill is directly traceable to the national-defense program. So far as I know, with reference to these items there is no difference of opinion among the members of the committee. A very comprehensive report analyzing and digesting this large bill is available to the Members if they wish to avail themselves of it and follow the items in detail. The hearings are also available.

The Navy Department receives $742,465,145.39, the largest amount in the bill, and on page 5 of the report that total is broken down. It consists of $59,076,080 in deficiencies for the present fiscal year for purely operating and supply costs and $683,386,600 in supplemental amounts for the fiscal year 1942. Two items, one for aviation and one for ordnance, amounting together to $529,046,600 in cash and contract authorization, provide for 2,236 additional airplanes and their ordnance equipment and some additional plant facilities for planes and engines. This is a part of the general program sent to Congress recently by the President for the Army and Navy. These additional planes are for delivery in the

fiscal year 1943 and are anticipated to bring the total plane strength of the Navy, allowing for interim losses, to 10,400 by June 30, 1943. Other important items for the Navy provide $100,000,000 for auxiliary vessels under the act of May 24, 1941, which allowed an increase in auxiliary tonnage of 550,000, and this sum is toward 26 auxiliaries which have been taken over and estimated to cost, for acquisition and conversion, a total of approximately $151,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to punish the Committee by going all through this bill in detail. I wish now only to give such general information as I think will be of interest and helpful to the Committee. The report, bill, and hearings are available and the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule. I am sure the bill will be understood by the Committee before we come to vote upon the different items in it.

One of the large items in the bill is for the Office for Emergency Management. We provide the sum of $36,500,000, two and a half million dollars less than the Budget estimate of $39,000,000. We did that because we feel that certain reorganizations could be made and economies effected, and that the amount granted would give that large organization a good working fund and permit it to discharge the duties and yet not interfere with those duties. In that connection it is interesting to note that the Government has drawn into its service a great many representatives of labor and industry. They propose 311 $1-a-year men, and 1,291 persons serving without compensation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me how many of those dollar-a-year men are receiving $25 a day for expenses? I understand they do in some instances.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think in some instances where they are consultants, and are called here temporarily they can be paid $25 a day for the days they are employed. Where they are working here continuously at $1 a year or for no pay they are entitled to not more than $10 a day for expenses if they want it. I understand a large percentage draw no expense money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that in this appropriation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Could the gentleman separate the amount?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. Those dollar-a-year men are men whose salaries in industry range from $10,000 to $100,000 a year or more. Many of them have given up their private business and they are here serving the Government. The committee has provided that in some instances their per diem and traveling expenses to and from Washington should be paid by the Government.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If they are getting $25 a day that is pretty good pay.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, it is pretty good pay, but they are pretty good men, and as far as I am concerned I think the Government ought to pay everybody that works for it what he is worth. I would rather see that done than otherwise.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman feels that it would be better business?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do. We carry a provision in this bill which I think I should mention in passing, relating to within-grade promotions in certain administrative forces. We know that the House has passed recently what is known as the Ramspeck bill, and that it is now pending in the Senate. That governs promotions under the Classification Act. We assume, in due course, that bill will pass the Senate and become law soon after July 1, but if it should not become a law, there would be much confusion in the services if the different departments were permitted to proceed with promotions on their own initiative, and without any well-defined rule that would apply to each department, and there would be discriminations. So we put a prohibition against any promotions in this bill, wishing to hold the situation as it is until the Ramspeck bill becomes a law, and then the departments can proceed in an orderly way. So we need not be alarmed about this provision. It is merely put in here to act as a brake for the time being. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and I believe he feels that way about it.

We have in the bill some other general provisions which I want to mention briefly in passing, and which I am sure will be of interest to the Members, in title III. Section 303 is the so-called Communist amendment, which has been carried in each appropriation bill. Section 304 is the so-called alien amendment, which has also been carried in each appropriation bill. Section 305 is the Case amendment, which was adopted in the House on the military appropriation bill. Section 306 is the Pace amendment which was adopted in the House on the military appropriation bill.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In a moment. Those two amendments are carried verbatim, just as they passed the House. The Senate Appropriations Committee has eliminated them. The Senate has not acted on the bill. The press tells us that it is the purpose of the House leadership to bring up for consideration at an early date some bill which will deal with this subject of strikes in defense industry. The Committee on Appropriations felt it would be wise to carry these two provisions in this bill as they passed the House, in order that if anything should be worked out on the military appropriation bill in conference there would be a vehicle in this bill by which the same result could be accomplished. If it is ultimately decided to eliminate them entirely, as a matter of policy, from the military appropriation bill, it would be easy to follow that procedure in this bill. If something should be put into the military appropriation bill and there was nothing of that nature in this bill, we would have the confusion of some provision in one bill and nothing in the other. I say that in explanation of why these provisions are carried in this bill. Speaking personally, and I think for every member of the committee, I would express the hope that we would at an early date be given an opportunity in an orderly, orthodox manner on the floor of the House to consider proper legislation on that subject and pass it on a legislative bill, which, of course, is the proper and direct way to deal with the subject. It certainly is bad legislative policy to undertake to deal with fundamental questions of that sort by putting them in as limitations on an appropriation bill. I wanted to say that because I felt there were many Members who would be interested in these two provisions, and I wanted them to understand the position of the committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has referred to section 303, which places a ban on the use of any of this fund in payment of wages or salaries to any person committed to communistic doctrines. Is there any provision in the bill which would place a ban on the use of those funds for the use of any nation committed to similar communistic policies?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; there is not. We would not be able to reach that by this bill.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. I wonder if the chairman can give us any enlightenment as to the number of these dollar-a-year men, the companies who are paying their salaries, the amount of their salaries, and just what is the situation?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We have in the hearings a complete list of the dollar-a-year men, the concerns they work for, their previous connections. Their salaries are not shown. Their salaries were given to us in some cases, but they were not put into the hearings. The committee felt, as a matter of policy, it was not advisable to put into the printed hearings the private business arrangement of those gentlemen, and I think we do not have the information as to which of them are now presently carried on the pay rolls of their concerns. The gentleman is interested in the subject, and I wish he would get a copy of the hearings and refer to page 872. I do not know how many of those people are on the pay rolls of the concerns for whom they formerly worked.

Mr. BEAM. As expressed in the committee, I think the practice should be universally condemned of the Government going out and hiring these dollar-a-year men and then the concerns or corporations for which they are working continue them on the pay roll at the salaries which they received formerly, and in the end possibly paying them a very substantial bonus, without the country being advised and the Congress being enlightened in that respect.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate what the gentleman says about that; but the gentleman will know, of course, that in trying to coordinate and round out and get in motion this colossal industrial effort the Government has not resorted to the expedient of making political appointments to these positions, but has, without regard to political affiliations, reached out into private business and industry and commerce, trying to draw to the service of the Government men who, because of their outstanding experience and qualifications, should be employed. It seems to me that is commendable.

Mr. BEAM. I can appreciate the motivating factor which influenced the Government in this respect, and also the motivating factor which influences these men in accepting it; but, at the same time, I do not want them to pose as patriots, making sacrifices, if the real fact is that the concern with whom they are working is carrying them on the pay roll at the salary which they were receiving before their induction into the United States Government service.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions, I think I will yield the floor, and we can discuss the details further when we get under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the major portion of this bill there is complete agreement. Necessity for providing the funds for additional airplanes, for additional ordnance, for additional stores, and for building up the stores fund in the Navy, was apparent to the committee. Necessity of providing funds for additional Coast Guard cutters to replace those that had gone was apparent. The only item about which there might be controversy, to my mind, would be the item for the Office of Government Reports. I do not like it. I never have liked it. It has not been so much a governmental activity as it has been something in the nature of a political set-up.

There has been presented to us a lot of information with respect to the Office of Emergency Management. Some of these set-ups do not appeal to me particularly. The Henderson set-up does not appeal to me particularly. I wish to call to the attention of the committee a set-up appearing on page 829 of the hearings, where large salaries are being paid to people—much larger than they previously received. I will not go into the details of it for there are four or five pages replete with the story. Mr. Henderson himself is a man of very considerable ability. That he has been allied with groups whose first interest was not the United States has appeared on several occasions. On page 5543 of the Dies committee hearings his connection with the Spanish refugee relief outfit was established. On page 9 of the Dies committee annual report No. 1476, a document of the Seventy-sixth Congress, there is a list of those organizations constituting the Communist Party fronts, and amongst those outfits is the Spanish refugee relief committee. If Mr. Henderson is not subversive, he has at least been closely connected with them.

One of the worst set-ups involved in Henderson's outfit is the employment of Robert A. Brady, author of The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism. This is an absolutely communistic book. When we get back into the House I shall ask permission to place certain extracts from this book in the RECORD.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What position does Mr. Brady hold?

Mr. TABER. He is one of those birds in the price-fixing outfit under Henderson. He is getting a salary the equivalent of $6,250. The gentleman from New York I know is a strong administration man and has always supported the administration vigorously. So the gentleman may have a little picture of the man I am going to read what Brady has to say of Mr. Roosevelt:

> Mr. Roosevelt never condemned wealth as such, but only the ignoble, the selfish, the irresponsible wealthy, a perfect Nazi type argument which should be taken to read "only those who are caught with the goods are bad."

That is what this fellow Brady says about Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When was the date of that statement?

Mr. TABER. The book was printed in 1937. It is a very bad book. It is full of communism all the way through from cover to cover. The idea of employing this kind of bird on the public pay roll is beyond me.

I submit herewith a set of quotations from Brady's book:

[From The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism by Robert A. Brady]

Two highly significant factors intervened to accelerate this coagulating tendency, and to offset any such normal modification of program. The first of these was the advent of the depression, and the second was the announcement and first great successes of the Soviet 5-year plan. The first provided the quickening fire for the rise of social unrest; the second provided a striking symbol of success for the entire program of the left—a symbol which was rendered doubly significant by virtue of the fact that the very successes of the Soviet Union occurred simultaneously with the disastrous breakdown of capitalistic economic systems all over the world.

This program is recognizable at a glance as capitalism with all its assets (to the capitalist) and none of its liabilities. It is not, to be true, laissez-faire capitalism; it is monopoly capitalism become conscious of its powers, the conditions of its survival, and mobilized to crush all opposition. It is capitalism mobilized to crush trade unions, to wipe out radical and liberal criticism, to promote with the sum total of all its internal resources, economic advantage at home and abroad.

Determined to stamp out all opposition, it proposes for all Gleichschaltung (coordination). "This coordination," Goebbels explains, "only outlines what will be the normal condition of Germany. This Germany is to have only one goal, one party, one conviction, and this state organization is to be identical with the nation itself." In the name of this new Germany, said Sauckel, Nazi Governor of Thuringia at a meeting of his followers, June 20, 1933, "I command you now to show intolerance against all else. Henceforth there must be one political faith in Thuringia—national socialism. Discussion of matters affecting our existence and that of the nation must cease altogether. Anyone who dares to question the rightness of the national socialist world outlook will be branded as a traitor."

Sometimes this new capitalist state employs the mailed fist, oppression, repression, the terror; sometimes it resorts to blandishments, to emotional appeals and argument; always it promotes intolerance. Sometimes it utilizes the symbols of the people (Volk), the race, the community (Gemeinschaft); always it promotes the idea of "kultur." The sole question in the choice of instruments or symbols to be used is this: In the particular circumstances which is the most effective? The central idea of "kultur" is useful doctrine for the maintenance of power (pp. 42–43).

Control over the inner life of the worker leads by slow degrees to control over the entire culture—the worker's entire intellectual and emotional environment, the sciences and the arts. Once begun, there is no turning back. Since philosophy of life is at stake, the underlying tenets of the economic system are being weighed in the balance. The Communists teach that only those who produce should govern, and, since none except the weak and the disabled should live from the labor of others, the ideal is a classless society of producers-users. The Nazis seek to prove that the existence of separate and distinct social classes is not only indispensable but the necessary law of life and social organization. To prove their point they resort to arguments not unlike those advanced by the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, and, like Plato, they propose a socially stratified society, governed from on top, in which each belongs to that class allotted to him by virtue of his natural gifts and capacities, and in which complete harmony obtains so long as the point of view of each and every man in each and every class is controlled through appropriate education and propaganda (pp. 123–124).

As a flame or age separate chemicals in a retort, so some major divisive forces in modern society seem to be slowly separating the people of every nation into warring camps. Left and right, Popular Front and Fascist, "red" and reactionary, capital and labor—the terms vary with time and circumstance, but the cleavage remains the same—remains the same, but forever widens, forever deepens, forever sharpens the edge of hatred and brings nearer the threat of war—civil and international. However the divisive forces may be analyzed, the fact that this cleavage runs, like a widening geological fault, through all the layers of society is beyond question (p. 323).

Knowledge of the facts and a little reflection will show that the issue does not turn on fascism per se, but on that form of capitalism of which it is no more than the politically conscious phase. For better or worse, the deeper issue now being squarely faced is whether capitalism as a coercive political and economic system should be allowed any longer to survive (p. 324).

As all parties realize, the end result will be either the triumph of reaction and a new lease on life for capitalism, or else a victory for socialism and the extermination of the rich and powerful of bank, factory, bivouac, and cloister (p. 324).

There is no hope against all this except that of sweeping away the very foundations on which fascism constructs its brittle edifice. If the world-wide fascism trend of things is to be reversed, what is left of democracy must be reinforced and the sweep of the tide turned. But this means an erosion of Fascist foundations, not by humanizing business enterprise but by arraying together all those forces whose face is turned the other way.

Against an opponent who believes singly and solely in force and guile, force must be

massed. The hope of the people of the United States is to be found not in giving free reign to monopoly oriented and Fascist-inclined capitalism but in turning backs its fields, factories, and workshops to those who fought its war of freedom against a tyrannical power, and who built, with their muscles and brains, all the real wealth and all that there is in America which deserves the name of culture. But it will not come to them as a gift; they must learn that the only solution to recovery of their heritage lies within themselves (p. 355).

And then there is Mildred Edie Brady. Mrs. Brady is employed at $5,600. She is the wife of Robert. She was the business manager of a magazine known as Friday, which ties right into the Communist front. She was also the editor of a magazine known as Bread and Butter, which ties right into the Communist front.

Why the Government of the United States should employ folks who are not cooperating with it, putting them on the pay roll, is something that just does not appeal to me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield at this time. I have too many requests for time in debate on this bill.

The cut made by the committee in the Office of Production Management was made with the understanding that Mr. Coy, the man in charge of the administration of that outfit, that the duplication in their administrative expenses would be eliminated and that some of these other things that will not bear the light of day might be revised and cut down. I am hoping to see some of these things revised and cut down. If you will study the list on page 829 of the hearings, to which I have called attention, I am sure you will find a great many opportunities where substantial cuts could be made without in the least affecting real defense operations or anything that might provide the material Mr. Henderson might need to keep the price structure of the country from running completely wild.

I am not going to spend a lot more time on this particular thing because there is heavy demand for time from others on this bill. I shall extend my remarks and include a good deal more of this set-up than I have outlined to you here; and I am going to hope that these governmental outfits will take the statements I have made, and will make in extending my remarks, as the kind of criticism a real American would follow in straightening out this situation. When the item for the Office of Government Reports is reached, I shall offer the amendment to which I have referred, an amendment which has heretofore been offered; but I will not for the present take any more of the Committee's time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

PROPOSAL FOR A JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I arise to submit a few observations which I hope will have some helpful applicability to the critical situation now facing the Congress and the country, with special reference to revenues and appropriations.

There is no need on my part to refer to the abnormality of the times. Everyone who has eyes to see and ears to hear can detect in what is presently going on the seeds of great revolutionary changes in our American life. These are times of flux; these are times of stress. The very bulwarks of our Government are being warped and strained. These are times that call for strong men and not for weaklings—men with stout hearts and level heads to see that in the midst of violent pressures and repercussions and vagrant tendencies the future development of our Government is held within the realm of sound principles and within the four corners of the Constitution. The demand now is for statesmanship of the highest order, of unimpeachable soundness and virility, to steer the ship of state around two great perils which, to the discerning, appear to be altogether too near in the offing—the peril of national bankruptcy and the greater peril of the possibility of the loss of our traditional American form of government and our American way of life.

WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION'S FOUR CORNERS

It is with genuine heartfelt concern that I suggest the necessity, if our Republic is to survive, of holding the future development of our Government within the four corners of the Constitution. I think that a "back to the Constitution" movement, with every American having a part in it, would be an excellent thing at this time. Let the Constitution be made a topic of reading and comment around every fireside in the land. Let the Constitution be taught in the schools with more universality and zeal than it ever has been taught before, so that the rising generation may learn what it really means as the basis of free government and as a guaranty of their priceless rights and liberties. And, by all means, let us who are charged with the duties and obligations of membership in this body set an example to the country by living up to our responsibilities under the Constitution. Let us remember that among the fundamental provisions of the Constitution is the one which set up three separate, equal, and coordinate branches of government, each independent of the other. I know that in times of declared emergency it is necessary to delegate extraordinary powers to the Executive establishment, but Congress has done altogether too much of that sort of thing in recent years when there was no emergency. The result is that Congress has dropped to a very low estate in the estimation of the country. In deference to ourselves, to our constituents, and to the Constitution we all profess to love, we should retrieve our position as rapidly as it can be done, sensibly and sanely, and reestablish Congress, in fact as well as in name, as one of the three great coordinate and equal branches of government. Let us not delegate any more powers which Congress itself should exercise; but let us face our duties manfully and discharge them to the best of our ability, in the light and with the understanding that God gives us.

This leads me to a discussion of a problem in which we as Members of Congress are directly responsible—the problem of revenues and appropriations. In a sense this is peculiarly a problem for first-hand consideration of the House of Representatives because under the Constitution all revenue bills must originate in the House, and under immemorial practice all appropriation bills do originate there.

SOME STARTLING FIGURES

I invite the attention of the House to some startling figures in regard to our mounting national debt and our national expenditures: The gross public debt on June 11, 1941, was $48,524,967,328.02. The highest peak of the World War debt was registered on August 31, 1919, when the debt was $26,596,000,000. In other words, in the present emergency, short of war, without a shot having been fired, when we are theoretically at peace with the world, we already have a debt about $22,000,000,000 in excess of the peak of the World War debt. I am advised by Daniel W. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, that on a basis of present Budget figures, our national debt on June 30, 1942, the close of the next fiscal year, will be $61,168,000,000. Any additional revenues that may be created by an enlargement of the tax structure will reduce this estimate accordingly, but, on the other hand, it will be subject to incalculable increase by whatever additional appropriations, not now budgeted or in sight, it may be necessary to make during the next year in the interest of the defense of our country. The latest figures of the National Industrial Conference Board, which is cited as the highest authority, place the total wealth of the United States at $294,481,000,000, so it will be seen that the estimated public debt as of June 30, 1942, will be well over the equivalent of one-fifth of the total estimated national wealth.

THIS YEAR'S ENORMOUS TOTAL

So far at the present session of Congress the appropriations exceed $30,000,000,000. This is $51,000,000 in excess of the total wealth of 20 States as shown by the report of the National Industrial Conference Board, as follows:

Nevada	$651,000,000
Delaware	662,000,000
New Mexico	698,000,000
Wyoming	833,000,000
Vermont	858,000,000
Arizona	975,000,000
Utah	1,152,000,000
New Hampshire	1,197,000,000
Idaho	1,273,000,000
Mississippi	1,478,000,000
North Dakota	1,539,000,000
Arkansas	1,558,000,000
South Dakota	1,711,000,000
Rhode Island	1,903,000,000
Maine	1,981,000,000
Florida	2,052,000,000
Colorado	2,093,000,000
South Carolina	2,166,000,000
District of Columbia	2,552,000,000
Oregon	2,627,000,000
Total	29,949,000,000

The appropriations so far this year—$30,000,000,000—are almost two and one-half times the total of the appropriations required to run the entire Government

during the 20 years from 1890 to 1910, which were as follows:

1890	$395,430,284 26
1891	463,383,480 46
1892	524,381,815 60
1893	507,376,397 53
1894	519,535,293 31
1895	492,477,759 97
1896	496,982,585 01
1897	515,852,380 27
1898	528,735,878 33
1899	892,656,775 65
1900	698,912,982 83
1901	705,653,298 01
1902	730,241,862 51
1903	801,682,773 42
1904	752,741,659 25
1905	781,288,214 95
1906	618,191,283 26
1907	881,953,644 09
1908	919,163,823 18
1909	1,006,431,726 96
Total	12,982,473,918 85

In citing these astronomical expenditures I do not want to be construed as criticising in any degree the outlays for national defense. I have disagreed with many of the nondefense expenditures of the 12 years since I have been a Member of Congress and have voted against them but in a world where conscienceless aggressors are trampling on the rights of every innocent nation in their bloody path of conquest, common sense requires that we should prepare ourselves to meet any attack on the United States and the Western Hemisphere, which we are obligated, under the Monroe Doctrine, to defend. I am simply quoting the record of debt and spending, repellent as it is, in order to present the financial picture which we have before us, and as a factual basis on which I propose to predicate certain definite suggestions which I believe would result in a more satisfactory and more economical management of the Government's fiscal affairs.

FUNCTION OF JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

The primary idea I have in mind is that there should be created a legislative mechanism in the nature of a joint budget committee, which would survey the entire appropriation and revenue field and present to Congress at the same time the appropriations are presented a plan of taxation to offset, as far as possible or practicable, the appropriations to be carried in the appropriation bills.

Similiar ideas have been proposed with much persuasiveness and force by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, chairman of the Deficiencies Appropriations Subcommittee, and Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee. On January 3, 1941, the opening day of the present Congress, I introduced a House resolution for the creation of such an instrumentality under the name of the "House Committee on Fiscal Planning," which embodied essentially the same plan I now have in mind.

The joint Budget committee or House committee on fiscal planning, would be composed of 11 members, as follows: The chairman, ranking majority member; acting chairman of the deficiencies subcommittee, and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; the chairman, ranking majority member, chairman of the subcommittee on taxation and ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee; the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the House, and the minority leader of the House.

The function of the joint Budget committee would be to coordinate revenue and spending activities, and to introduce economies wherever it is possible and feasible to do so.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

With the indulgence of the House, I shall quote the text of my resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special House Committee on Fiscal Planning, to be composed of the chairman, ranking majority member, acting chairman of the deficiencies subcommittee, and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; the chairman, ranking majority member, chairman of the subcommittee on taxation, and ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee; the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Fiscal Planning is directed to make a study of United States Government finances with a view to coordinating revenue and spending activities and introducing economies wherever it is possible and feasible to do so in order to reduce the gap between Federal revenues and Federal expenditures and bring about an approach to a balanced Budget in the ordinary financial operations of the Government.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Fiscal Planning is directed to report its findings and recommendations to the House and such findings and recommendations shall be made public records and shall be published as House documents.

REVOLUTIONARY BUT NECESSARY

The procedure contemplated by this measure would be revolutionary, it is true, but it would be revolutionary in the right direction. I think almost any person with a business brain will agree that we now have exactly the reverse of the correct procedure. We go ahead and appropriate and then we bring in tax measures to pay the bill, and usually the tax laws are so insufficient that they do not begin to pay the bill, and the revenue they produce amounts to but little more than a token payment on the spending account.

Would it not be far wiser to decide first what the appropriations should be for certain purposes and then, when the appropriations are decided upon, to bring in at approximately the same time tax measures to foot the bill? That would be the business way. There are some pretty big business concerns in America, but not one of them makes a practice of spending without the slightest reference to its income. If it did, it would soon be in the bankruptcy court. The hard-headed business executive, before deciding upon an expenditure, checks up on his revenue to ascertain whether he can afford the outlay. This is something that Uncle Sam never has done up to date. There is absolutely no coordination between the revenue-raising and the appropriating functions of Congress. Each operates as independently as if the other did not exist.

HOW PLAN WOULD WORK

It is worth while to note how the joint Budget committee would operate. Let us consider some hypothetical cases. We will say that last year in all Government agencies the sum of half a billion dollars was appropriated for highways. The joint Budget committee might decide that $75,000,000 would be sufficient for the next year and in the revenue scheme provision would be recommended for that amount and no more. The joint committee might decide that we can do without a public-building program for a time and no more public buildings would be recommended. It might decide that we can get along with one-fourth of what we have been spending for reclamation projects, for flood control, and for rivers and harbors, and it might lead the way to economy along those and many other lines. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has stated publicly that a billion dollars a year might be saved in nondefense appropriations, but, generally speaking, the Budget estimates that are coming up to the Hill show no reductions large enough to be seen with the naked eye. If the House will create the proposed joint Budget committee, it will assist Secretary Morgenthau in his noble resolve to cut the cost of government.

SOME CENTRAL AUTHORITY NEED

Surely in a legislative body such as ours there should be some central over-all authority which would consider the levying of taxes to raise revenue and the appropriating of moneys as belonging to one interrelated problem. Otherwise you are certain to have one of two results, both of which are very bad, and it is difficult to tell which is the worst. Either you will have the piling up of huge surpluses that are a constant invitation to extravagance, or you will have gross shortages in revenue to meet the ordinary and necessary expenses of the Government, which means appalling deficits. To properly guard against one or the other of these dilemmas there must be a meeting of minds of those who formulate the bills to levy the taxes and those who formulate the bills disposing of the moneys so raised. At times in the past great surpluses have actually been piled up in the Treasury, an invitation to riotous extravagance. In recent years we have seen exactly the opposite manifestation, with appropriations 7 leagues ahead of revenues, producing staggering deficits.

LET US PUT SOME BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT

I plead with you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, to consider the advisability—no; not the advisability, but the dire necessity—of injecting some business into our appropriating and tax-raising system. I believe the committee I have suggested is the nucleus of something that is very much needed as an addition to our legislative machinery. I would not be presumptuous enough to say that it is by any means a perfect solution. It is more an idea than a plan. Probably wiser and more experienced heads than mine would be able to lick it into more workable shape than I have been able to present it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I appreciate the splendid statement the gentleman is making. In my own State of Kentucky and in many other States even the county fiscal agencies sit down at the beginning of the year and find out how much money they are going to get, then from that they proceed to expend the money, and they are not permitted under the law to go beyond that. I think the gentleman's plan is very much along the same line. In that way in Kentucky we are keeping the county revenue and the expenditures in line with each other.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his interesting contribution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It seems to me in this great body of men here that we could work out a plan as sensible as is used in the various counties throughout the United States to avoid heavy taxes and these very huge deficiencies year by year.

Mr. LUDLOW. I certainly think so. I hope the gentleman might find it possible some time to give the House the benefit of a complete description of the plan in Kentucky, so that we may all benefit by the pioneering that has been done down in his country.

I imagine that for a considerable time at least the Joint Budget Committee would confine its functions largely to nondefense expenditures, since estimates of the fighting forces for national defense are passing practically unchallenged; but when the emergency is ended and the situation reverts to something like normal, the committee would have an important over-all function in reference to all appropriations of every kind and character and the revenues incidental thereto. I believe the creation of such a committee, pointing in the direction of an ultimately balanced Budget, would be a tonic to business and an aid to the forces that must sometime be relied upon to bring about recovery, if there is ever to be recovery in America.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana has for a long time been a stanch advocate of having the Government, and especially the legislative branch of the Government, adopt something that approximates a sound, logical fiscal policy. The country is indebted to him for the serious thought he has given the matter. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if and when the day comes, and it will come, when we begin to demobilize these high-powered industrial efforts that we are making, there is going to be more need for some sort of a carefully laid out, well-considered plan which will control the expenditures and revenues and that without such a plan there is only one thing that can happen, and that will be confusion and fiscal calamity to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. LUDLOW. I certainly agree with every word the gentleman from Virginia has so well said. I want to add that in that day, if we will follow the sound, constructive leadership of the gentleman from Virginia, this problem will be worked out to the satisfaction of everybody and for the benefit of the country.

REAL PROBLEM CAUSED BY MECHANIZATION

A forelooking view of the post-emergency reconstruction era will not fail to take note of the difficulties that will inevitably be created by the widespread mechanization of our factories to speed up defense production of airplanes, tanks, and other munitions, all of which mechanization will be available for private production when the war is over. This means fewer jobs and a greater recovery problem. The national income for the present fiscal year is estimated at $92,000,000,000 as against $83,000,000,000 in 1929, an increase of $9,000,000,000, and yet there are more unemployed now than in 1929 and there will be an unemployment situation of terrific acuteness when the defense factories close down. If we act wisely we will do everything we can in advance to provide a cushion against that contingency.

PUBLIC OPINION AN IMPORTANT FACTOR

There remains but one point to be mentioned, and that is the authority the joint Budget committee would have to make its decisions effective. Frankly, I do not know what authority it would, or could have, beyond the power of publicity and the force of the public opinion that would rally to its support, but the power of publicity is at times tremendous and it has been said that public opinion rules the world, which may be putting it a bit strongly though it undoubtedly is a very vital and impelling force. I rather suspect that if the joint Budget committee should declare that in the public interest an appropriation for a certain purpose, roads, reclamation projects, or whatnot, should not exceed a certain amount its finding would be treated with great respect in Congress and in the court of public opinion. I sincerely fear that with the momentum our spending has attained unless we establish such a check as I have described we will be head-on for wreck and ruin. The joint Budget committee would suggest maximum appropriations on major items and, of course, there would be nothing to prevent the Appropriations Committee from conducting hearings in the usual way and reducing items as it may see fit. With such men as CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, chairman, and JOHN TABER, ranking minority member, of the deficiencies subcommittee, on the job there is no doubt that the interests of the country will be well protected.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill covers a lot of territory. Much of it is brand-new territory, as far as the Congress is concerned. It carries a total of $882,000,000 in addition to about $14,900,000 in contract authorizations. This is $22,000,000, or thereabouts, less than the Budget estimate.

The principal items in the bill are, first, an item of about thirty-seven and a half million dollars for the Executive Office of the President, including provision for the Office for Emergency Management and related activities and for the Office of Government Reports; second, $51,000,000 for the Treasury Department, primarily for the Coast Guard; and, third, $742,000,000 for the Navy Department, primarily for airplanes, ordnance in connection with those planes, auxiliary ships, and public works under the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

For the first time the Office for Emergency Management and most of the related agencies come before this Congress for consideration. A total of 12 of these agencies, including the O. E. M., are provided for in this bill. The requests for these 12 agencies amounted to $39,000,000, plus $3,000,000 for contract authorizations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point a break-down, showing, by agency, the personnel and dollars requested:

Office for Emergency Management—Statement of estimates—Budget for fiscal year 1942

	Personnel	Appropriation
Liaison Office for Emergency Management	565	$2,610,976
Office of Production Management	2,875	9,158,662
National Defense Research Committee	591	10,000,000
Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply	1,455	3,769,462
Office of Administrator of Export Control	578	1,000,000
Office of Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations	507	
Cash	$7,331,639	
Contract authorization	3,000,000	
		10,331,639
Division of Defense Housing Coordination	127	475,000
Division of Transportation	27	95,481
Office of Civilian Defense	264	900,280
Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related Defense Activities	367	2,800,000
Office for Agricultural Defense Relations	26	108,500
Division of Information	249	750,000
Total requirements for 1942 fiscal year	7,431	42,000,000
Less: Contract authorizations requested		3,000,000
Total cash appropriations requested		39,000,000

The members of the committee will observe that the total personnel requested amounted to 7,431. Of this total, 5,689 were to be on an annual basis, 140 on a per diem basis, 311 on a $1-a-year basis, and 1,291 on a basis without compensation.

The recommendation of your committee for the 12 agencies in question is thirty-six and one-half million dollars in a single appropriation item plus $3,000,000 in contract authorizations, a reduction below the Budget figures of two and one-half million dollars, the allocation of the reduction as between the 12 agencies being left up to the President through the Office for Emergency Management.

I have no doubt, and I am sure that your committee has no doubt, that this reduction can be put into effect without impairing the efficiency of any essential functions provided for.

Because the Office for Emergency Management and the 11 related agencies are

for the most part new organizations, I shall comment very briefly on each of them.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Office for Emergency Management has been set up as a liaison office between the President and the related agencies under the leadership of Wayne Coye, liaison officer. Its purpose is to coordinate and to eliminate duplication. Its purpose, also, is to afford central services for all related agencies. As a matter of fact, it does not furnish these services to the Office of Production Management, as the latter prefers to maintain its own staff.

This agency requested a personnel of 565 and an appropriation of $2,610,976. I am confident that this amount can be substantially reduced, particularly in view of the administrative personnel maintained by the Office of Production Management to the number of 326.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT

The Office of Production Management, the most important of the 12 agencies, has been set up under the leadership of William Knudsen, Director General, and Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General. Its purpose is the mobilization of our material resources and industrial facilities in the interest of national defense.

It requested a personnel of 2,875 and an appropriation of $9,158,662.

Its principal divisions are the Division of Production under John Biggers and William Batt, the Division of Priorities under Edward Stettinius, the Division of Purchases under Donald Nelson, the Division of Labor under Sidney Hillman, and the Division of Research and Statistics under Stacy May.

The National Defense Mediation Board, under William H. Davis, is also included under the Office of Production Management.

The agency reports funds made available for national defense, including appropriations and authorizations, the lend-lease bill, the President's emergency funds and British commitments, in the amount of $49,000,000,000. It estimates expenditure for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 amounting to $29,800,000,000, leaving a balance of $19,200,000,000 for expenditure for the fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945.

The country should derive real encouragement from the outstanding ability of many of those who have accepted positions in this agency in this emergency. The fact remains, however, that the agency still has no one authoritative directing head, being included in the Executive Office of the President.

NATIONAL DEFENSE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Hand in hand with the Office of Production Management is the National Defense Research Committee. This includes a number of nationally known figures in the field of science under the leadership of Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institute. Its purpose is that of scientific research in respect to all mechanisms of war except those covered by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The agency requested a personnel of 591 and an appropriation of $10,000,000. Its work is of vital importance.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY

The Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply has been set up under the leadership of Leon Henderson, who, as the members of the committee know, has had previous service with N. R. A., with the Securities and Exchange Commission and with the Advisory Committee for the Council of National Defense.

The purpose of this agency is to avoid unwarranted price rises, to facilitate the supply of materials for civilian use and, in general, to endeavor to avoid or minimize the disasters of inflation.

This agency requested a personnel of 1,455 and an appropriation of $3,769,462. An administrative break-down will be found at page 837 of the hearings.

The duties of the agency will be found in the Executive order of April 11, 1941, a copy of which is also embodied in the hearings. Among other things, the agency is instructed "to determine and publish after proper investigation such maximum prices, commissions, margins, fees, or other elements of cost or price of materials and commodities as the Administrator from time to time deems fair and reasonable." Also, "to formulate programs designed to assure adequate standards for and the most effective use of consumer goods." The Administrator is instructed "to take all lawful and appropriate steps to facilitate the observance" of his findings.

The scope of this agency is enormous. The legal authority for the duties intrusted to it is certainly open to grave question and has in fact been questioned on the floor of the Senate. The enforcement of the orders issued is apparently at present to be dependent on the force of public opinion and on certain so-called sanctions to be found in the National Defense Act, in the Selective Service Act, and other general powers of the Federal Government.

I believe that a proper control of prices is essential in view of the menace of inflation. Mr. Henderson hopes that the desired results can be obtained on the basis of cooperation by all concerned in what he describes as "the American way." I doubt very much if real price control can be obtained on any such basis. If it is really to be obtained, I am afraid that we shall have to resort to methods far removed from "the American way." It is to be hoped that the activities of this agency will not prove to be a stepping stone to those methods.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF EXPORT CONTROL

The Office of Administrator of Export Control has been set up under Gen. Russell Maxwell. Its purpose is the prohibition or curtailment of the exportation of supplies essential in the interest of national defense. It operates by means of requisition after a determination of necessity by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Army and Navy Munitions Board. It recommends to the President just compensation in the event of requisition.

The agency requested a personnel of 578 and an appropriation of $1,000,000.

OFFICE FOR COORDINATION OF COMMERCIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

The Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations has been set up under the leadership of Nelson Rockefeller. Its purpose is to coordinate the work of all agencies, both public and private, with a view to insuring economy and efficiency in respect to hemisphere defenses in reference to commercial and cultural aspects of the problem. To this end, it works in the fields of education, radio, moving pictures, the press, travel and, in general, in any and all fields tending to improve our long-run commercial relations with Latin America. The agency requested a personnel of 307 and an appropriation of $7,331,639, in addition to contract authorizations in the amount of $3,000,000.

DIVISION OF DEFENSE HOUSING COORDINATION

Members of the committee are familiar with the Division of Defense Housing Coordination under Charles Palmer inasmuch as this agency has been before the Congress for appropriations previously. Its purpose is the coordination of the work of all agencies in the field of defense housing.

Mr. Palmer reports that programs of housing have been recommended to the President for 136 localities in 47 States. He also reports greatly improved cooperation between the agencies taking part in these programs.

The agency requested a personnel of 127 and an appropriation of $475,000.

DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION

The Division of Transportation has been set up under Ralph Budd. Its purpose is to insure adequate transportation facilities of all kinds for defense requirements as well as adequate warehousing facilities for strategic and critical materials.

The agency requested a personnel of 27 and an appropriation of $95,481.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The Office of Civilian Defense has been set up under the leadership of Mayor LaGuardia, of New York. Its purpose is to serve as a channel of communications between national and State agencies through State and local defense councils and to furnish information and advice concerning the national-defense program and the utilization of local defense councils.

Examples of the work contemplated are to be found in plans for auxiliary fire forces, air raid protection wardens, and similar precautionary plans.

The agency requested a personnel of 264 and an appropriation of $900,280.

Mayor LaGuardia stated frankly that the request was based on guesswork and that he would operate on whatever funds Congress saw fit to make available. Whether or not a million dollar set-up is essential for this work at this time seems to be open to question.

COORDINATOR OF HEALTH, WELFARE, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

I call attention particularly, Mr. Chairman, to the Office of the Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related

Activities, which has been set up under Charles Taft. Its purpose, as its name implies, is to coordinate the health, welfare, and related activities in connection with the national-defense program. Among the related activities are included recreation, nutrition, education, and social protection.

I emphasize in passing the enormous amount of money that is being expended in one way or another for recreation in this connection. The armed forces have come to us for appropriations, among other things, for swimming tanks on an island in the Atlantic Ocean, handball courts, tennis courts, golf courses, moving-picture auditoriums, and other recreational set-ups. They have stated that they do not want the Y. M. C. A. or other service organizations within the posts or cantonments.

On top of that comes the agency to which I am now referring, telling us that it will require no less than $14,000,000 for construction work for recreational purposes outside the posts or cantonments.

On top of that we have the Nation-wide drive of the United Service Organizations, seeking to raise $10,765,000 from the public generally, much of which will be devoted to recreational activities outside of posts and cantonments.

Certainly it was not like this in the olden days during the last war. I frankly think the Federal Government is exceeding its proper bounds in this activity and in other activities assigned to this agency which properly belong to the States and localities.

Take the matter of nutrition, included in the list of "related matters." The duty of this agency in this connection is defined as—

> Promoting the health and vigor of the population as a defense measure through improved scientific knowledge of human nutritional requirements and its widespread dissemination and application.

This may be a highly laudable objective, but it should not, as I see it, require a large new Federal set-up in addition to existing organizations, both public and private.

Take the matter of social protection. The duties in this connection are defined as—

> First, to assist in protecting the armed forces from prostitution; second, to prevent additional girls and young women from being drawn into prostitution; third, to rehabilitate prostitutes and other sexually delinquent women and girls.

I think this is a pretty large order for any Federal bureau under Uncle Sam to undertake. In the last war the problem was dealt with, and dealt with effectively, from my observation, through the commanding officers of the several camps and the local authorities. I very much doubt if the Federal Government, through this set-up or any other set-up, can do anything which the local authorities and the commanding officers cannot do just as well or better.

This particular agency asks for a very large set-up, a personnel of 367 and an appropriation of $2,800,000. There are 73 people on the rolls getting $4,600 or more. There is the Coordinator, Paul McNutt. There is also the Assistant Coordinator at $9,000, and an Associate Assistant Coordinator at $7,000, and an Assistant to the Assistant to the Administrator at $4,600. There is a Director of Recreation at $9,000. There are two Assistant Directors of Recreation at $5,600 and $4,600, respectively. There is a Director of the Division of Social and Legal Protection at $7,000. There are two Associate Directors of Social and Legal Protection at $5,600. There are 64 others at $4,600 or more. Many of these appear to be qualified chiefly as social workers.

You will find $1,265,000 allocated to special and miscellaneous projects, for many of which it would seem that adequate provision should already be available through public and private agencies already in existence at this time.

I do not like to single out a particular agency. It does seem to me, however, that almost every day someone is coming to the Congress and seeking under one cloak or another to extend the supervision of the Federal Government into the field that properly belongs to the States and the local governments. I believe we have an example of this here under the cloak of national defense. I personally do not believe any such large or expensive organization is necessary in this connection.

OFFICE FOR AGRICULTURAL DEFENSE RELATIONS

Another of the agencies that came before us is the Office for Agricultural Defense Relations. This is under the leadership of former Governor Townsend, of Indiana. Its purpose is said to be to assure an adequate supply of food for the United States and those countries who feel as we do about the international situation. Also to assure an adequate supply of agricultural raw materials for the national-defense program and to serve as a liaison office between the national-defense agencies and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under the direction of Mr. Townsend, is it the purpose to increase the amount of food produced in the United States?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He told us that the purpose was to assure an adequate supply of food for this country.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does he cooperate with the other agencies of the Government that are trying to cut down the acreage and reduce the amounts of production of food?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I suggested that we had apparently plowed under too much, and I do not think he fully met the observation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There was testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency when we considered the Commodity Credit Corporation bill that the purchases for the benefit of England were being made by the Surplus Marketing Administration, the same agency that makes purchases for relief and school lunches. It seems to me they have a duplicate function there.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois may be correct. It is a small set-up, of 26 people and a $108,500 appropriation to start with, but it seems to me to be an absolutely unnecessary cog in the picture and an agency whose duties could well be absorbed by other personnel in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not appreciate that this set-up provides jobs for a lot of important politicians.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that I think as we heard the testimony that seemed to be the chief justification, if any, for this particular agency.

DIVISION OF INFORMATION

The twelfth and last of the related agencies is the so-called Division of Information under Robert Horton. The purpose of this agency is defined "to provide central informational service to the several agencies in the Office for Emergency Management."

Mr. Horton asks us for a personnel of 249 and for an initial appropriation of $750,000. He stated frankly that this division has been set up like a big newspaper office. So, apparently, we have reached the stage where even a few expert newspaper men with each agency are not sufficient. We have got to have a gigantic newspaper office set up in connection with an important agency of government here to manufacture news for the legitimate newspaper offices throughout the country.

Just to give you a little idea of this proposed set-up, if you will examine the testimony you will find that it includes a director's office, an assistant director's office, a number of consultants, a correspondence unit of 35, a production branch of 28, a prices branch of 12, a civilian branch of 9, an economics branch of 14, a news-reel and still-photo section of 14, a periodicals and publications section of 22, a radio section of 16, a visual education section of 24, and a field force of 40. This gives a salary and expense roll of $570,000, in addition to other obligations amounting to $180,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Horton is planning a newspaper office and then some. I see no justification whatever for any such set-up. I think it affords an excellent example of the economy we have been practicing under the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make just two general observations in leaving the Office for Emergency Management and related agencies.

First, as I have said, I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that the suggested reduction of $2,500,000 can be effected without loss of efficiency. Con-

sidering that the Office of Civilian Defense is asking for almost $1,000,000, that Mr. Taft's set-up is asking for $2,800,000, that Governor Townsend's set-up wants $108,000, that Mr. Horton's set-up wants $750,000, and that the Central Administrative Service of O. E. M., under Wayne Coy, is asking for almost $2,611,000, in addition to the administrative service requested by O. P. M. in the amount of $576,000, I am confident that efficiency will not be impaired by the proper allocation of this reduction.

Second, I want to suggest, and suggest very seriously, that history is repeating itself in connection with this set-up in the Executive Office of the President. What has happened is this: Congress has given the President certain general powers. It has also turned over to him certain emergency funds for allocation largely within his discretion. The next step has been a series of Executive orders setting up agency after agency, all of them within the Executive Office of the President, and emergency funds have been allocated by the President to these agencies. The agencies have functioned with these funds until the end of the fiscal year. Then they come to the Congress for increasing appropriations during the next fiscal year. And immediately we have been met by the cry that this or that agency is already a going concern, that people are already on the pay rolls, that we cannot stop the agency or lay off personnel now. History is repeating itself. The Chief Executive is, in effect, appropriating. The Congress is reduced to the function of rubber stamping.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the sums appropriated for the Office for Emergency Management and related agencies, provision is made for the Office of Government Reports, which has also been set up in the Executive Office of the President. This agency is under the leadership of Lowell Mellett, formerly with the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and said to have severed his connection with the latter in part because of his disagreement with the policy of these newspapers in opposing the President's "court packing" plan.

The ostensible purpose of the agency is to serve as a clearing house for those desiring information from the Federal Government, and to keep the President posted as to public opinion in respect to various Federal programs.

A request for sample copies of reports made by the agency has not been complied with.

The real purpose appears to be political. No less distinguished an observer and writer than Arthur Krock has termed the agency an "adjunct of the Democratic National Committee," and has indicated that the heads of publicity agencies in the Federal Government are frequently passed upon before appointment by Mr. Mellett.

An article appearing recently in the Washington press stated that the salaries of this agency exceeded the average for the entire Federal service by more than $1 a day for each workday throughout the year, and that there was an utter lack of uniformity in fixing salaries, especially those of State directors.

The agency asked for an enormous set-up of 414 people, 94 of them in the field. If we add this total to the total of 249 requested by Mr. Horton in the Division of Information under the Office for Emergency Management, we find that we are asked to appropriate for no less than 663 persons in these two agencies alone.

No agency, in my opinion, has been consistently weaker in presenting its justifications for appropriations or less coherent in informing your committee as to its activities.

The bill carries the sum of $1,015,000 for this agency. This is, I think, the largest appropriation ever made to this agency with one exception. Personally, I have long believed that the existence of this agency was without justification.

Mr. Chairman, the second major item carried by the bill is the item of about $51,000,000 for the Treasury Department, $47,000,000 of which, together with $13,000,000 reappropriated from the lend-lease funds, are to be used for construction of 13 vessels for the Coast Guard.

Attention is called to the fact that the amount available for the promotion of the sale of defense bonds for the fiscal year 1942 has been increased from $4,292,000 to $9,800,000.

I appreciate fully the advisability of private purchases as compared with bank purchases in view of the threat of inflation. I have always questioned, however, both the wisdom and the ethics of, in effect, forcing the purchase of these or similar Government bonds by widows and orphans, in the light of the disastrous fiscal policy of the past 8 years. The naintenance of a large force in the Treasury for this purpose does not appeal to me.

The third major item carried by the bill is the item of $742,000,000 for the Navy Department. Of this total, $482,000,000 is for additional planes to the number of 2,236; $47,000,000 is for ordnance in connection with these planes; $49,000,000 is for public-work construction under the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and $100,000,000 is for the acquisition and alteration of 19 auxiliary vessels.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Committee to the cost of acquisition of these vessels.

If the members of the Committee will consult the tables at pages 385 to 386 of the hearings, they will find that in respect to 11 of the vessels substantial construction subsidies have been recently paid by Uncle Sam. They will find further that in respect to every one of the vessels for which data has been furnished the acquisition cost, which is now to be paid to the owner of the ship, exceeds the cost of construction, including the construction subsidy, if any, by an average of approximately 17 percent. In other words, the owner of the ship is apparently to receive from Uncle Sam the amount in full which he chipped in to construct the ship, plus the amount in full of the subsidy which Uncle Sam chipped in, plus 17 percent, plus any operating subsidy that may have been paid in the meantime.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. One example of this is afforded by the Moore-McCormack Lines, which within the past 18 months, put up $6,500,000 toward the construction of 5 of these ships. Uncle Sam put up $5,800,000 as construction subsidy, and is now apparently to pay the lines $20,600,000 for the 5 ships. In other words, it appears that the Moore-McCormack Lines are to receive the $6,500,000, which they advanced, plus $14,100,000, plus any operating subsidies that have been paid in the meantime—all within the period of less than 18 months.

There may be some explanation of this matter, but, offhand, it looks very much like just one more example of big business with both hands in the Federal Treasury, under the present administration.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is a long story of the information service, a terrific expense, all set up by Executive order. They would get the money any way if you did not appropriate it, would they not, by the same method by which it was set up?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That depends on how much the Congress appropriates for emergency funds to the President, and under what conditions.

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot understand how the Appropriations Committee could let such a mess get by, and I wanted to pay my respects on this matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in closing I may perhaps call attention to the matter of morale stimulation by the Navy Department, for which $75,000 is provided for purposes defined on page 394 of the hearings. Among the purposes are speeches, sound trucks, motion pictures, and, you may be interested to learn, entertainment of commentators. This is, of course, a small item but open to question.

Members of the committee will be particularly interested, I think, in the work provided for in this bill under the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Communications Commission, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. This is described on pages 261, 142, 241, and 92, respectively, of the hearings.

The bill is a large one. It covers a lot of ground. I am confident that the suggested reduction is fully justified. I believe that the total carried by the bill could have been safely reduced considerably more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the concern expressed by my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] over the financial instability that we face is very impressive. Coming from the majority, I would say that it is very encouraging, even though somewhat belated. I wish that I might have some

hope that his suggestion, if not his plan, would come into reality. For myself, I express the thought that the legislative proposal, meritorious as it appears on its face, will have little efficacy about it so long as the fundamental philosophy of the present administration continues to set up the program that the administration follows. I call the attention of my friend, for whom I have the highest regard, to the fact that after some 8 years it seems rather hopeless to expect any fundamental change. I call his attention to the fact that the objectives which he has in mind have been the objectives of the minority for the last 8 years. As this false philosophy of spending for prosperity has been advocated by the administration, we of the minority have tried to be cautioning, but despite the warnings we have sounded, there has been a headlong plunging by the majority into this condition that confronts us today.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Certainly.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman would not leave the impression on the House, I am sure, that the germ of the economic proposal which I have lately presented to the House is the exclusive property of his side of the House? I say to the gentleman that it has been championed much more forcefully, more impressively, and more ably than I could do it, for years by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], but he has not been able to arouse much interest, and I may make that stricture apply to the gentleman's side of the House. I do not think the gentleman's side has backed up the gentleman from Virginia very aggressively, or the proposal probably would have made more headway. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is an expert in appropriation matters, agrees with me, I think, that it should be an over-all central authority to visa these estimates, and also to take into consideration the tax bill, so that there might be some less farfetched association between revenues and expenditures.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman, apparently I have been misunderstood. If he construes my remarks to be in any way critical of the suggestion that he made, he is mistaken. Only a spirit of humility prevented my paying a compliment to those of the minority who have sponsored similar proposals, and my desire to be commendatory to the gentleman prompted me to emphasize particularly that portion of the contribution which he presently made. I am in no way critical of the suggestion. I am expressing my concern and my hopelessness as I think of the merit and the sound common sense of my distinguished friend's proposal. I am disturbed because I see it thwarted by the continued fallacies which are clung to by the administration presently in power. Would that the common sense of my friend, whom I intended to compliment, might prevail.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I may have misunderstood the gentleman. He knows my affection for him and how highly I esteem him as a very able, conscientious, and industrious member of the Appropriations Committee. I understood him to throw out the suggestion that there had been no economy urged on this side of the Chamber at all, and I wanted in justice to my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] especially to say that this is no new proposition and that I have no patent right to it, because he has been advocating the same proposition for years. Nor has the gentleman from Virginia stood alone among Democrats. There are many earnest, able champions of economy and sound fiscal policy on our side of the center aisle. There should be no politics in connection with the Nation's finances. Spending cuts clear across party lines, and neither side of the Chamber is entitled to exclusive praise or exclusive condemnation in the evolution of our taxing and appropriating program.

Mr. DITTER. I wish the defensive statement of my friend were sound. I wish his position were tenable. I wish the record of the majority could sustain the contention of my friend. But, as we all know, such is not the case. The responsibility for the spending spree which has brought us to our present dilemma rests squarely at the door of the majority. May I further answer the gentleman from Indiana by saying that, lest the record were in any way incomplete, I should pay the same compliment to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that I have paid to my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]. I extend to both of them the sympathy that I have tried to express over the hopelessness of the effort they are presently putting forth. I realize their sincerity. I realize how they are approaching this in the spirit of common sense, and I regret deeply that their common sense does not prevail; that instead the false philosophies that they are criticizing by the suggestion continue to be the guideposts of the administration. Again I compliment my friend from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman. Let us hope that the effort will not be altogether hopeless.

Mr. DITTER. May I say that I am confident the minority will be very happy to join with our friend from Indiana and our friend from Virginia and thus stimulate them by our association in the hope that their common sense will prevail.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I had hoped to get to the bill, but I cannot refuse to yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield to me first?

Mr. DITTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not decided as to which of the two gentlemen I shall yield to. Having heretofore yielded to my friend from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], I feel that I should yield to him first.

Mr. LUDLOW. I simply wanted to interpose at this time in order to pay compliment to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. He is without a peer as a friend of economy.

Mr. DITTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, lest the record be incomplete again, may I pay the same compliment to my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] that I paid to both the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Virginia. I tender to him the same cooperation of the minority that I have tendered to the other two gentlemen.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I do not think in the short time at my disposal I can pay the gentleman the expression of confidence that he has paid to me, but I would like to ask the gentleman in all seriousness, while the majority is sinning, possibly, in asking for too much, and bringing out bills for great amounts, would it not be a good idea if the minority, for which the gentleman speaks, would take a very firm stand and vote against those large appropriations, and set an example for the erring majority?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the gentleman. It would be poor policy indeed for the gentleman from Kentucky to suggest that the responsibility rests with the minority to correct either sins of omission or commission with which the majority is chargeable. In those things that have to do with national defense it is almost an expression of weakness on the part of the majority to suggest that the minority should shoulder the burden. I am not thinking so much of the present appropriations.

I am thinking of the past record of the majority. I am thinking of the record since 1933, and I would say that the hope for the future, in fact, the hope for the immediate present would be the greater were that record of the past more encouraging.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have never felt that a man could excuse his own sin by saying somebody else did it first.

Mr. DITTER. Such was not my purpose. The recommendation of my friend from Kentucky indicates that he would prefer to shift a burden from the shoulders of his party to that of the minority. Let me remind my friend that as his party has sought and secured power it has had placed upon it a corresponding degree of responsibility.

Mr. O'NEAL. I want to ask the gentleman if he believes the minority is exculpated because the majority is sinning, and therefore they are justified in voting these extravagant appropriations because the majority proposes them?

Mr. DITTER. I am willing to let the record be the answer to that question. I would simply say to the gentleman from Kentucky, would that the entire majority had the same sense of concern and responsibility that he at all times has. I feel that whether they were sins of omission or commission they would long since have been corrected just as they would have been corrected had the will of the minority prevailed.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further at this point. I am sorry, but I must continue, and if op-

portunity presents itself I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

I wanted to use this bill to indicate that we have not departed, to any great extent, from that original false philosophy of spending. In other words, time has done little in the way of correcting the abuses with which the majority is properly chargeable.

I think both the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Kentucky will agree with me that national defense is being used today as a cloak; that a great number of agencies which otherwise might not have even an excuse for their existence, much less for their expansion, are turning to national defense and using it as a vehicle for vastly expanding their activities. With each of those activities there must, of necessity, come increased personnel, and in connection with that increased personnel it is evident that Federal pay rolls go up. As Federal pay rolls go up, appropriations are bound to be boosted and the bill of the taxpayer made the heavier.

I insist, were there a real genuine sense of concern about our financial situation, the best evidence of that concern would be a refusal by the administration to permit these agencies to put on the convenient garb of self-defense. In other words, the administration could push the door closed instead of holding it open. The administration could discourage rather than encourage the expansion of Federal activities. Orders to curtail, even though distasteful, would be much more convincing that economies were desirable than the acquiescence in ever-expanding ventures at the expense of the Government. That responsibility does not lie here in the House; it lies where the administrative agencies were born. They were born, not here in the House, not in the other Chamber. They were born in the executive branch of the Government. They have been nurtured by the executive branch of the Government. They have grown to be big children, not as a result of the pats of the Congress but by the coddling policies of the executive branch of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. May I just point out an example. I am thinking of the price-control set-up. We are told at the present time that prices have to be controlled in order to prevent inflationary prices. I want to go over part of the personnel in that set-up. It is headed first of all by a man, a brilliant individual, who is to get $12,000 a year, Mr. Leon Henderson, long known here in Washington since the New Deal came into power. But the staff of associates is an imposing and impressive one. On it is Mr. John E. Hamm, who is a deputy administrator at a salary of $8,000 a year, a boost of $3,500 a year since 1936. It is interesting to note, incidentally, that Mr. Hamm is a cousin of the administrator, with this boost of $3,500 in his pay. Then there is Miss Harriet Elliott who is to receive $8,000 a year as an associate administrator. Her previous salary as Dean of Women at the North Carolina University was $4,320 a year. Then there is Miss Laura May Davis, who is employed as an expert adviser on consumers' relations, at a salary of $4,600 a year. Her previous employment had been at some junior college at $2,900 a year. They follow along one after the other. I have not singled these out because I have any personal grudge against these individuals. I point them out one after the other—salary boosts of exorbitant sums—and all in the name of national defense, as examples of the attitude of administrative agencies to feather their own nests.

No matter how many agencies such as the gentleman from Indiana suggested, no matter what legislative machinery we set up here, it will mean nothing if we permit the administrative agencies backed by the power of the executive branch of the Government to carry out policies of this kind. You cannot reach it by legislative machinery, so long as the legislative branch of the Government permits the executive branch to exercise unlimited power. Power thrives on power. We must get at the fundamentals. We must go back to first principles. The Congress must assert its power and assume its responsibility. Administrative agencies must be brought under reasonable restraints instead of allowing them to run wild. "Congress shall have power" should be the slogan instead of accepting the substitute that administrative agencies may exercise extraordinary powers. If this were done the suggestion of the gentelman from Indiana would hold out a real hope to a wearied, yes, and a worried, taxpayer group. And remember that group will be larger than ever when the new tax bill is passed.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is no difference between the gentleman and me as to the responsibility of Congress. Does not the gentleman believe that the setting up of this congressional committee to coordinate revenues and expenditures would be an assertion of congressional responsibility, notice to the taxpayers that we intend to have something to say about handling it up here?

Mr. DITTER. I would answer my friend by saying that I probably would be a little more convinced that there was some hope were he to assure us that his plan had the benediction and the blessing of the White House. In other words, if the gentleman presents the matter to the White House, to the executive branch of the Government, and the executive branch of the Government were to say, "This new policy of hope, this new philosophy has my benediction and blessing," I would feel more encouraged.

Mr. LUDLOW. I desire to say to the gentleman that I am obliged for his suggestion that I get the benediction of the White House and that I will give it careful consideration.

Mr. DITTER. As I see it, Mr. Chairman, when the philosophy of spending is repudiated by the administration we will be able to resort to the timely suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana. But first things must come first. The spenders must be deposed before the savers can operate. The efforts for economy mean little if the specialists in extravagance are aided and abetted by the administration in power.

The appropriation bill before us provides for a number of activities. Many of them have come into being as a result of Executive orders. Some of them are justifiable. The wisdom of creating others is open to question.

The acceleration of the defense program and the uncertainty of world conditions will undoubtedly have some effect on our domestic economy. One of the agencies which will effect it is the price-control organization.

The Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply was created by Executive Order No. 8734, dated April 11, 1941. It is headed by Mr. Leon Henderson, who is still a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Its function is supposedly the regulation of prices in order to prevent inflation, but it has no real power to prevent price rises in any lines of activity.

The request for funds for the fiscal year 1942 is $3,769,462, as against $806,412 for the fiscal year 1941. Mr. Henderson asked for a staff of 1,395 persons during the fiscal year 1942—1,005 to be in Washington and 390 in the field. This represents a tremendous increase in personnel. Thus, in the executive staff the number will increase from 71 to 133; in the price division from 133 to 251; in the office of the General Counsel the number will increase from 92 to 163; the Civilian Supply Division will double its staff, increasing from 52 to 119; the Civilian Allocation Division will more than double its staff, rising from 49 to 109; the Consumers' Division will increase from 97 to 149; the Administrative Division will increase from 117 to 141; and the field service will rise from 199 to 390. The increase in the office of the General Counsel, as previously mentioned, will be from 92 to 163. The size of the office of the General Counsel is very surprising. It should be remembered that the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply has no legislative foundation and can prosecute no one for price schedules that it issues. This was admitted in a memorandum from Mr. David Ginsburg, the General Counsel, to Mr. Leon Henderson, dated May 8, 1941. In this memorandum Mr. Ginsburg stated:

> The price schedules direct buyers and sellers of the designated commodities to comply with specified "ceiling" (maximum) prices. It has been objected that the price schedules are issued without authority because they are not authorized by any statute. In considering this objection it should be noted that the price schedules are not termed "orders" and do not purport to carry penalties for infraction. Penalties can be imposed only by Congress. In the event of refusal to comply, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply has stated that it will make every effort to assure (a) that the Congress and the public are fully informed; and (b) that the powers of the Government are fully exerted in order to protect the public interest.

Mr. Henderson introduced this memorandum in the hearings of the Senate

Committee on Agriculture on May 29, 1941. It is hard to see what a legal staff of 163 will do in an agency that has no legal authority and no legal sanction.

Another division of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply that should be viewed critically is the Consumers' Division. This is the former Consumers' Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission that was headed by Miss Harriet Elliott. Miss Elliott is associate director of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply and still controls this Division. The staff of about 149 persons, at a cost of $436,000 a year, will be used primarily as a propaganda agency. Its main function apparently will be to make the public like the reduced supply of consumers' goods that will be a consequence of national-defense production. It is alleged that this Division will watch consumers' interests in price fixing. It would seem that the main task of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply would be to watch the consumers' interest in price fixing. Therefore it is highly dubious whether the Consumers' Division can serve any real purpose. The Consumers' Divisions in typical New Deal establishments—such as the late N. R. A., the present Bituminous Coal Division, and in the Department of Agriculture—serve no useful purpose and only function to justify to the public the higher prices they are charged as a consequence of the activities of the price-fixing agencies. Practically never do these consumers' divisions enter any real and effective protest against price increases that would adversely affect the small domestic consumers.

A large number of people on the staff of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply are being paid much larger salaries than they ever received before. I have already referred to several increases. One of these is Mr. John E. Hamm, who is Deputy Administrator, receiving a salary of $8,000 per year. Since 1936 Mr. Hamm has been employed at the Russell Sage Foundation at a salary of $4,500 a year. It is quite apparent that this is a tremendous increase in salary.

Mr. David Ginsburg is employed as general counsel with a salary of $8,000 a year. His last employment had been at the Securities and Exchange Commission at $5,000 per year. It is interesting to note that Mr. Ginsburg graduated from Harvard Law School in 1935, and appears to have had little if any practical legal experience in private practice.

Mr. Robert S. Holmes is employed as a senior economist at $5,400 a year. Previously he had been employed at the Securities and Exchange Commission at $4,200 a year.

Then there is the case of Carl H. Neibyl, who is employed as senior economist at a salary of $4,600 a year. His last previous employment was as associate professor at Carleton College at $2,200 a year.

Mr. F. T. Ostrander is paid $4,600 as senior economist, and his previous employment was in the research division of the Treasury Department at $3,600 annually.

Mr. James A. Perkins gets $5,000 as business economist. Previously he had been employed at Princeton University at $3,800 a year.

Mr. Dickson Beck had been content to get $2,750 as a lecturer in economics at University of Pennsylvania, but now he gets $4,600 a year as senior economist.

There is also the case of Constant Southworth, who had been employed in the State Department at $4,600 a year. He now receives a salary of $7,600 per year.

Mr. Herbert Wachsmann had been employed at a salary of $3,600 by the Kensbey & Mattison Co., but he is receiving $5,600 a year now.

Mr. Donald Wallace, who had been an associate professor of economics at Williams College at $4,725, is now getting $6,500.

Miss Caroline Ware is paid $6,500 a year as head economist. Her previous salary at Sarah Lawrence College had been $4,400 a year. It is interesting to remember that Caroline Ware is the wife of Gardner Means, who has been one of the most rabid New Dealers practically ever since 1933. He is now employed as fiscal analyst in the Bureau of the Budget.

These are but a few of the instances in which extraordinary increases in salary have been provided. Under circumstances such as these it is difficult to see how any economies in government can be effected, nor do they present any convincing evidence of a desire on the part of the executive branch of the Government to do so. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is still a fair guide.

During the course of the hearings Mr. Henderson made an admission to which I believe attention should be directed. I refer to his statement that compulsory price controls cannot be effective unless controls are exercised over all other factors entering into our economy. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if prices are to be controlled, we must inevitably contemplate a program which would include similar regulations on wages and earnings, with little if anything left of a free economy.

It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, that the people should be informed of the incidents and consequences of a plan—and which incidents and consequences have such far-reaching and important potentialities, which will reach into every home—before the elaborate machinery for such plan is put in operation.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am persuaded that attention should be directed to the possible adoption of a plan of compulsory savings as these gigantic control agencies are set in motion. Mr. Henderson disclosed that some form of compulsory saving at the wage source may be inevitable. This would mean that such sum, as would be determined by the Government, would be withheld from the wage earner and credits established as economic experts of the administration saw fit. The ultimate results which are possible under a plan of this kind on the continuance of a free economy can easily be contemplated. But, Mr. Chairman, aside from the question of the results of the plan or its possible need, I believe the people should be apprised of the details of projected plans and the consequences of the course they are urged to accept. There can be no hope for unified action unless such action is predicated on a complete disclosure of facts and upon a frank statement of that which may be expected to develop under policies pursued.

Although there is considerable talk about cutting down on nondefense appropriations and expenditures the present appropriation bill certainly does not indicate that such a policy is being practiced. On the contrary it appears that the defense emergency is being used to continue and expand nonmilitary functions and even establish new activities. Nearly every agency in the Government is trying to justify at least some of its activities as being necessary for national defense and thereby get additional funds. Some agencies are establishing new divisions and units to handle the so-called defense work. Projects which have been turned down by Congress in the past are now revived and funds requested for them. A deficiency appropriation bill is a good place to notice these trends since it cuts across so many of the agencies.

On March 25, 1941, the House passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of a sum not exceeding $1,500,000 to the Office of Government Reports. The bill became law with the approval by the President on June 9, 1941. Under that authorization $1,444,333 was asked in this bill for the fiscal year 1942.

The request is an increase of nearly $400,000 over the current fiscal year and $600,000 over the fiscal year 1940. For this year $750,000 was appropriated in the Relief Appropriation Act and $300,000 more was allocated by the President from his emergency fund. In 1940 only $830,000 was made available to the Office of Government Reports.

The Office of Government Reports functions through three operating divisions: Field Operations, Press Intelligence, and Information Service. The Division of Field Operations supposedly serves as a contact between the Federal Government and State and local governments and citizens. The Division of Press Intelligence is a large press-clipping and digesting service. The Information Service puts out the Government Manual and serves as a central clearinghouse of information about the Government for the public.

The 1942 estimates provide for 323 persons in Washington and 199 in the field, or a total of 527. This is compared with 320 in Washington and 94 in the field, or a total of 414, during the current year. Most of the increase is in the field service.

Under the present set-up there are only 34 field offices since in some cases 2 States are grouped together under 1 field office. For 1942 it is planned to open 14 additional field offices making a total of 48 in all. This will result in the appointment of State directors in 10 States at salaries ranging from $4,500 to $6,500. Great increases in the clerical staffs of the field offices will also result.

In theory the State directors are supposed to report to the Washington office about the activities of the Federal agencies in the State, help coordinate them,

and act as the general Federal contact man in the State. It seems, however, that in most cases the job of the State director is primarily political. Since the Office of Government Reports is a part of the Executive Office of the President the field offices of the organization provide unusual opportunities for subtle political work.

It is planned to have the State directors and the Washington staff travel a great deal in 1942. The estimate for travel is $90,386 as compared with only $25,000 in 1941, an increase of 360 percent. Fifty-six thousand and seventy dollars is for the State directors, or about $1,200 a year, or $100 a month. More than 6 percent of the total appropriation for the Office is for travel.

Even during the present fiscal year the Washington office has done considerable traveling. Arch A. Mercey, who is listed as a consultant, spent, in the period July 1, 1940 to April 30, 1941, $482.63 for transportation and $364.78 for per diem and incidental expenses. An Elinor Dodds, with a salary of $2,000, had spent in the same period $173.21 for transportation and $636.47 for per diem and incidental expenses. And Eleanor Herring, of the legislative section, with a salary of $3,200, spent in the same period $387.90 for transportation and $700.05 for per diem and incidental expenses.

The travel-allowance estimate could well be cut in half or even retained at its present level without any great hardship.

It is difficult to justify the expenditure of nearly a million and a half dollars for the type of work the Office of Government Reports is doing. The great expansion of the field service contemplated is unnecessary.

But another factor deserves consideration. Although Mr. Lowell Mellett denies that the Office of Government Reports exercises any control over the information being put out by the Government agencies now and that he has any intention of engaging in censorship, the fact remains that the Office of Government Reports is a central office immediately under the President and can well become a censorship agency.

The office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel deserves attention.

This outfit was placed in the Department of the Interior by Reorganization Plan No. II, effective July 1, 1939. But by the provisions of the act extending the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until April 26, 1943, which was approved April 11, 1941, it was made an independent agency. The Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Under the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act, as amended, it is the duty of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel to appear in the interests of the consuming public in any proceeding before the Bituminous Coal Division and to conduct such independent investigations of matters relative to the coal industry and the administration of the act as he may deem necessary to enable him properly to represent the consuming public in any proceedings before the Bituminous Coal Division.

The Counsel's office has requested an appropriation of $295,000 for the fiscal year 1942. This is an increase of $121,294 over the amount appropriated for 1941.

The justification submitted for the 70-percent increase in the appropriation for the Counsel's office is that the work has been increased greatly due to the fixing of the minimum prices for bituminous coal, effective October 1, 1940. It is planned to establish 5 field offices and expand the personnel from 54 to 84, an increase of 56 percent.

This all makes a pretty good story but should not be taken too seriously. Price-fixing laws often result in rather anomalous situations. The purpose of the Bituminous Coal Act is to stabilize the coal industry through the fixing of minimum prices based upon cost of production. The act is a victory for the miners and the high-cost producers. Almost as a gesture the Consumers' Counsel was set up to look after the interest of consumers. Actually the Consumers' Counsel has had little influence or power.

Furthermore, it is questionable whom the Counsel represents. Only somewhere between 15 to 30 percent of the coal produced in the United States is used by domestic consumers and the balance is used by industrial consumers. The thought of consumer protection is to look out for the little fellow. The big consumer is pretty well organized and generally prefers to make his case directly.

During the past year or more the Acting Consumers' Counsel has been Mr. Paul Sifton, of New York. Sifton was formerly in charge of the administration of unemployment compensation in New York State and was largely responsible for the terrible mess which the New York system was in a few years ago. He was brought to Washington by Elmer Andrews to serve as his deputy administrator of the Wage and Hour Administration. After Andrews was relieved of his job Sifton ended up in the Consumers' Counsel office. He is well known in left-wing circles and has been a member of the American Labor Party.

The problem of our relations with the nations of Central and South America is to be studied and solved by a new agency.

This office is asking for a direct appropriation of $7,331,000 and contract authorizations of $3,000,000. Of this sum $831,639 is for the normal operating expenses of the office, and $6,500,000 is for so-called special projects. Before these appropriations are considered in detail a word concerning the establishment and operation of the office might be advisable. The office was established by Executive order in August 1940 as an adjunct of the Council on National Defense. It is headed by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, and it carries on work that is of a varied nature and of varied quality. The most important work that it has done has been in the field of promoting American trade and commerce with Latin America. It has done considerable to promote American exports to Latin-American countries and has also done a great deal to remove the influence of Nazi and Fascist agents in Latin-American trade. It has been the habit of many American exporting firms to employ as agents in these countries German and Italian nationals who are more interested in spreading the propaganda of their home land than in promoting the best interests of the United States. The profits that they would derive from carrying on export business for American concerns were used in many instances to promote anti-American propaganda. It is generally believed that this office has done a great deal to eliminate the employment of such anti-American agents who are financed with American funds.

In addition to this work the office is attempting to improve the opinion of Latin-American countries of the United States and Americans through propaganda. A very large portion of the funds appropriated for this establishment is being used for a cultural division covering art, literature, music, drama, and the dance. As will be seen from ensuing discussion over half of the appropriations for this establishment are wasted on these projects that will yield but little. In fact, it probably is not inappropriate to call the Cultural Division of the office the new W. P. A. It has all the marks of the W. P. A. white-collar cultural projects.

Only about one-seventh of the appropriations for this office are to be used for regular personnel and their operating costs. The remaining part is to be spent on special projects and on outside contracts. Consequently it is difficult to envisage at the present moment exactly what type of a set-up is going to be carried on by this office during the next fiscal year.

The total expenses of the office for 1941 are estimated at $3,332,000. Of this, $3,050,000 was for special projects. At present there are 189 persons on the pay roll at a cost of $261,252, and the request for 1942 is for 246 persons at a total annual cost of $800,139.

There are a number of divisions of the office that seem to perform a useful service. The Commercial Development Division, with a present staff of 21 persons at a cost of $24,000, and a requested staff of 23 persons to cost $72,623 for 1942, has for its direct purpose promotion of American trade with Latin-America in cooperation with the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Commission. A Finance Division has a staff of 7 and contemplates the same during the next fiscal year. The expenditure for this Division in 1941 was $5,000, and the request of 1942 is for $20,753. This increase, of course, is a consequence of the operation of the present staff on a 12-month basis rather than on the shorter basis of the current fiscal year.

There is a so-called Special Division charged with the task of collecting information on German commercial agents and the activities of American commercial agents that might be of use to the totalitarian countries. This is but a small division of 18 persons. The request for 1942 is $50,000. The Legal Division is asking for an appropriation of $39,000 for 1942 with a staff of 10 persons. The Economics and Statistics Division has a

staff of 9 with a pay roll of $28,560 a year. These divisions seem to be the ones that do most of the constructive work, yet they spend but a small portion of the money.

Of the many covered in the special projects only a small portion bear upon the above-mentioned activities; $750,000 is to be used for commercial relations and $150,000 for legal relations. In addition $200,000 is to be used to pay the fees of the American Association of Advertising Agencies in making a market analysis of all of Latin America for the benefit of American exporters.

There is a cultural relations division with a present staff of 68 and a pay roll of $46,772 a year. For 1942 this division proposes to have a staff of 76 with a pay roll of $160,134 a year. This cultural division will expend more than $2,100,000 of the money for special studies. Some of these projects are positively unique. A pan-American institute would be set up with a budget of $357,000 a year. This would primarily be a center of higher studies on Latin America, to be created in Washington; $150,000 would be used for spreading propaganda in American schools relative to our Latin-American relations, to revise textbooks, and to create study programs; $13,000 would be used to improve the teaching methods of Spanish and Portuguese in the United States. The mere sum of $300,000 would be used for fellowships to bring Latin Americans to this country and to send Americans to Latin-American countries. The logic of bringing Latin Americans to this country to study and to be filled with American propaganda seems to be apparent, but it does not seem to the advantage of this country to send Americans to Latin-American countries. They could do but little for Latin America, which is the main purpose of the fellowships. Consequently it would appear that this item could readily be cut in half because there would be no reason for sending citizens of the United States to Latin-American countries.

Another small item of but $50,000 would be used to translate the prose and poetry classics of Latin-American countries into English. Again there is but little reason why we should have the benefit of their classics because we do not need to be made conscious of them; it is Latin-American countries that must be made conscious of what a fine country the United States is, and how these countries should be dependent upon us and not upon Germany and Italy. Again, we have an item of $25,000 to translate into English scientific articles and books written by Latin Americans. In the whole realm of natural, scientific, and social sciences it is doubtful whether there is any important scientific works that have ever been written by Latin-American scholars. There is another little item of $125,000 to publish a magazine to constitute a Pan-American cultural review to be published in English, Spanish, and Portuguese.

There are many more funny items like these, but we cannot afford to enumerate them all at the present instant. There is one last item, however, that deserves mention, that is $50,000 for the exchange of musicians with Latin-American countries. Thus says the justification book:

> Each of the American republics has at least one eminent composer who should be known, not only by his works but personally in the United States.

It is proposed to bring all such composers from Latin America to the United States for an annual junket. There is really some reason for wondering whether there are many eminent composers in all the countries, including such important sovereign states as El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

All told, the office of the Coordinator of Cultural and Commercial Relations among the American Republics will spend about $3,000,000 a year on publicity if Mr. Rockefeller and his staff have their way. The office is not content with one publicity division, it has two. There is one entitled "Public Education Division." This has for its task the dissemination of propaganda within the United States concerning the operations of Mr. Rockefeller's office. Also it has for its task the spreading of proper propaganda in this country concerning the good-neighbor policy. In 1941 this publicity division had a staff of 14 with a pay roll of $19,000. For 1942 it is asking for a staff of 17 persons and a pay roll of $59,500. The other publicity division is entitled the "Communications Division," and is more ambitious. Its function is the dissemination of news and propaganda among all the Latin-American countries. It had a staff of 49 in 1941 with an annual pay roll of $66,500. In 1942 it is asking for 57 persons with a pay roll of $191,191. It will have a radio section with a staff of 9 and a pay roll of $39,000. There will be a movie section with a staff of 10 and a pay roll of $37,000. The news section will have a staff of 17 persons at a cost of $57,000 a year. Travel is to be promoted by a staff of 4 at a pay roll of $10,000. What is more, sports are to be promoted with a staff of 5 and a pay roll of $15,900 merely for personnel purposes.

In addition some $3,000,000 of the fund allocated for special projects will be used for publicity work. Some of the money for publicity will be utilized in a satisfactory manner. One of the important tasks will be a survey of totalitarian propaganda in Latin-American countries. This is a task that apparently can well be undertaken, but it will not be done by the Government itself, but by contact with Professor Cantrell, of Princeton University; $100,000 will be paid to him to make this survey of such propaganda. Sad to say, although this worthy project is to be undertaken, there is an unusual aspect to it. Not only is the office going to survey Nazi propaganda in Latin America but they are going to survey in the United States the opinion concerning Latin America. It is most unusual for any Government agency to make a direct public-opinion survey of views held within this country. It is doubtful whether any Government agency has ever attempted to do such a thing before. It seems strange that a Government agency in this country would attempt to make a survey of what the public is thinking, apparently to be used solely for the purpose of changing that thought.

Apparently the reason why these surveys are being made outside the Government is that thereby the regulation Congress has enacted for the method of doing public business can be avoided, that is, civil-service laws, the Budget and Accounting Act, and many other laws passed for similar purposes. It is notorious that these projects, done through the purchase of services of private agencies, are wasteful but nevertheless it is done in order to circumvent legislation that Congress in its wisdom has enacted.

Of the money requested for special projects $600,000 will be used for motion pictures. What is strangest is that $120,000 will be used to produce pictures to be shown inside the United States relative to Latin-American countries.

For the dissemination of news $1,000,000 of the fund for special projects will be used. Special news services, a magazine, pamphlets, especially of the President's and Mr. Hull's speeches, and wired news services will be established. Thus not only are we to have a cultural review, but we are to have a monthly magazine, a pictorial magazine, and a news letter.

Radio, of course, is not to be neglected; $700,000 is to be spent for this from the funds for special projects. The logic of expenditures on news, radio, and motion pictures has some relevance at the present time, but the expenditure of well over $250,000 for promotion of travel seems to be rather far-fetched; $100,000 is to be spent among womens' clubs in the United States to stimulate travel. Further, $300,000 is to be spent for the interchange of newspaper editors, radio commentators, and other interested groups. Requested in this appropriation is $100,000 for the exchange between the United States and other American republics of sports and athletics teams. All in all, the scheme appears to have been carried to extremes although its general purpose may be worth while.

As will be recalled, the Office for Emergency Management is the free title covering a large number of agencies that have been set up as a part of the defense program during the past year. Some of the parts are remains of the National Defense Advisory Commission; others were set up as adjuncts to the Council on National Defense, and some of the parts were just created by the President and placed under the O. E. M. Some of the agencies that are designated as part of the O. E. M. apparently serve some useful purpose in the defense program, but others serve no useful purpose and are solely devices to publicize the defense program and to arouse the war consciousness of the American people.

The Office of Civilian Defense is a new one. This office was originally the Division of State Relations of the Defense Commission. It is now headed by Mayor LaGuardia. During the fiscal year 1941 the estimate of expenditure was $120,679, but for 1942 the request is for $900,280, which is almost an eightfold increase. The personnel in 1941 was 134 persons and the request for 1942 is for 264, or almost double. It is very interesting to note that when Mr. LaGuardia testified

before the Appropriations Committee he demonstrated a complete ignorance of the functions of the Office, the appropriation that was being requested, the staff he had, and the staff he would need. Thus, in reply to a question by Representative WIGGLESWORTH, the following exchange of remarks took place:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it your opinion that this personnel will be adequate to do the job as you visualize it, or must we look forward to requests for substantial expansion?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. I hope not. I do not allow for a large personnel. I hope not, and I hope I will not get into bad habits because I am in Washington 3 or 4 days a week.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. How many have you now?

Mayor LAGUARDIA. I do not know how many. In my office I have just a few.

At the very beginning of the hearing Mr. LaGuardia gave further evidence that he did not know much about the office when he admitted that he had not even prepared the estimates for it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Gentlemen, as you know, I have been in this office for a very few days. It is a new activity, and, therefore, we have had no actual experience upon which to base any definite amount. The figures were prepared by the Office for Emergency Management, based on past experience of other similar Government agencies. I am still a budget maker, and not a budget breaker. I have a budget of my own at home, and so all I can say is that whatever the committee appropriates, I will live within it.

The present plan is to have a central headquarters here in Washington, but it will be decentralized, and will have offices in each of the Army corps areas. There are nine corps areas and we will have an office at the headquarters of each corps area.

The whole purpose of the office is more clearly evidenced in a number of remarks in Mr. LaGuardia's testimony. It is quite evident that the office is going to be used solely as a device to frighten the people on the dangers of invasion and war, thus making them war-conscious.

Mr. LaGuardia talks much of the need for additional fire protection and air-raid wardens and the like. The likelihood of the need for such is quite remote, consequently through publicizing such matters the office is aiming primarily at frightening the people. The following quotations from Mr. LaGuardia's testimony are relevant:

Gentlemen, we have learned from observation and from the experience of Europe that the entire technique of war has changed. There is no longer any such thing as a war zone where fighting can be localized. We have seen that every city becomes a target for the enemy's attack. There is no such thing as a front-line trench and, therefore, your entire civilian population is exposed to the dangers of war. All rules heretofore recognized for the protection of the rights of noncombatants are entirely ignored and eliminated by reason of new weapons of attack.

In addition to that work, you must train the population, and that will require time. In other words, the people in the cities, villages, and towns must be trained to stay where they are told to stay when the alarm comes. The natural tendency, particularly among people of our country, where they have not been disciplined to do some particular thing, is to run out when an alarm is given to see what is happening. Now, if everybody runs out in the street, they become targets for bombs that may be dropped there, and the loss of life will be terrible. That happened in London on several occasions. Therefore, in each city, they must classify the buildings to see whether it would be better for the people to stay in them in the event of an alarm. Wardens will be assigned to blocks in the city, and in the event of an alarm, they will clear the streets of people, keep the vehicles moving on the street, and will warn the people to take shelter in the nearest available shelter provided. You will have these wardens there to control the movement of the people and to clear the streets, and they are also trained to take care of the injured. That force will be very large, and it will take some time to train them in each city. I expect that New York City will need about 175,000. Of course, we have a population of 7,500,000. Now, we will start with the nucleus of a force. In New York City, we have recommended that all the city employees be trained for that, and along with them we will take volunteers as they come in.

Now, gentlemen, you may say, "Why all this precaution, when we will not be subjected, even if we get into the war, to any sudden or repeated attacks, such as the English cities have suffered?" That is true, unless the British Fleet should be captured or destroyed, or unless that fleet is crippled or weakened. Unless some potential enemy gets a base from which to attack us, we will not have long, repeated, or continuous attacks such as London and other English cities have had. However, if we do get into the war, it is certain that we will have short, sudden, and surprise attacks. There is a definite reason for that. The first reason is that the morale of the civilian population would suffer; second, that it detracts from the main objective of the war, and detracts from your necessary war production of offensive arms. It has a definite military value. That being true, it is only reasonable to expect that we will have short, sudden, and surprise attacks.

Mr. LaGuardia did let us in to something; he told the committee that it was estimated that quite a bit of additional fire-fighting equipment would be needed in order to put out fires caused by incendiary bombs. He estimated that this additional equipment would cost $2,000,000 for each 1,000,000 of population. He said this would be required for the whole population on the eastern seaboard as far west as Pittsburgh. This would mean, for a population of about 50,000,000 people, a cost of $100,000,000. He said this additional cost must be borne by the Federal Government, and a request would ultimately be made for the funds.

The justification for this office is exceedingly weak. It tells practically nothing concerning its functions, structure, and organization. The request is for $900,280, and but three pages of material are presented in the justification.

Another new agency carries the title "Health, Welfare, and Related Defense Activities."

This office is headed by Mr. McNutt, with Mr. Charles Taft as coordinator. The expenditure for 1941 is estimated at $580,000; the Budget estimate for 1942 is $2,800,000. In 1941 it had a personnel of 224 persons, at a cost of $257,000. For 1942, 367 persons are being requested, with a pay roll of $981,000. The main divisions of the organization are recreation, family security, nutrition, education, social protection, and health. It is quite apparent that the purpose of this office is to insure that the "social gains of the New Deal" will be promoted through the use of the national-defense emergency. The work of this agency is almost an integral part of the Federal Security Agency. It is very thoroughly tied in to their set-up at many points.

Supposedly, the purpose of the agency is to attempt to take care of social problems resulting from the shift in population consequent to both the civilian and military aspects of the defense program. These problems are quite apparently the task of local governments, and not of the Federal Government. Through the use of this agency the Federal Government will be trying to push its way into the whole realm of local government and to continue its control after the present emergency is passed. This organization, to a large extent, is a collection of social workers who are riding the crest of the defense emergency wave. It is difficult to see why there needs to be a Recreational Division. This Division in 1941 had a staff of 85 persons, with an estimated pay roll of $349,000. The Budget estimates for 1942 provide for 125 persons, at a cost of $409,000. Repeatedly in the hearings there was a wail from Mr. Taft because there was no regular recreational set-up in the Federal Government. One can well imagine that after this emergency is over the staff of this office will do its best to make certain we will have a permanent Recreational Division in the Federal Government.

As previously pointed out the total request for 1942 is $2,800,000, but in the budget for this agency almost half of this expenditure is covered by one item entitled "Special and Miscellaneous Expense" of $1,350,000. Thus, for almost one-half of the expenditures no real break-down is presented. When questioned about this Mr. Taft admitted that almost all of it was for medical research supposedly for the Army. According to the justification more than $1,265,000 will be spent on contract services for such research, apparently most of it to the Public Health Service. It seems strange that if the Army needs this medical research why it does not ask for it directly. In the hearing there is no evidence submitted of the Army's request for such research.

It is alleged that a large part of the expenditure for the whole item of this Division is necessitated by the recreational problem of military camps. If there is a problem of recreation for the Army, it would seem logical to include it in appropriations for the War Department and not in this agency. The problem of recreation for the military personnel is certainly a part of Army morale and why it should not be supported from the regular Army appropriations is very difficult to see.

Still another division, that of information, presses its claims for funds.

As a part of the Office for Emergency Management there is a Division of Information headed by Mr. Robert W. Horton. This division of information is probably the largest and most expensive information establishment in the Federal Government with the possible exception of the Department of Agriculture. According to the justification, an appropriation of $750,000 is requested for the fiscal year 1942, and the expenditures for 1941 will be $201,185. At the very outset it should

be pointed out that these figures are grossly inaccurate for two reasons, both of which will be explained later.

During 1941 this office had a staff of 201 persons and for 1942 it is asking for a staff of 249. This Publicity Division supposedly is to cooperate with the various other establishments in the defense set-up in producing publicity for them. For example at present there is a staff of 9 persons working with the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply and in 1942 it is anticipated they will have 12 persons engaged in this activity. There are 21 persons working with the Office of Production Management and it is expected 28 will be so employed in 1942.

In addition to speeches and press releases every other possible method of publicity is being used by this Office of Information. For example in the radio field there are 13 people employed this year and next year they hope to have 16. Among the radio programs they anticipate for next year are the following: (1) Four 13-week series of transcriptions on national-defense topics—in this program 300 impressions of the transcriptions are to be made for dissemination to radio stations; (2) twelve 10-minute radio programs a month to be produced in the studio of the Department of the Interior—350 impressions of these programs are to be made; (3) monthly network programs which are to be recorded and 350 impressions of the recordings are to be disseminated. In the field of news reels 12 persons are now employed and 14 persons are to be so employed next year. In this field also $25,545 worth of contract and reimbursable services are provided for.

Visual-education activities are to be increased rapidly also. Twelve persons were employed on this project in 1941 and it is anticipated that 24 persons will be employed in 1942. In addition $70,995 in contract services for the production of motion-picture shorts for visual education are to be provided. There is to be provided $13,300 for contract services for lay-out designs for posters. Apparently as a part of this remarkable program of visual education Mr. Milton Caniff, who is the cartoonist who draws Terry and the Pirates, is employed to draw cartoons on the need for air-raid shelters and how to act in them. Thus Mr. Horton testified:

> I have only two people in that category, and they are off the pay roll at the moment. I have at the moment a man—you are perhaps familiar with Terry and the Pirates, one of the most popular cartoon strips published. Mr. Milton Caniff, who is the artist, and creator of that, is working with us at the moment without compensation in connection with an educational campaign that Mayor LaGuardia's agency is going to start on protection from bombs and how to act, live, and be in a bomb shelter, and what to do when the bombs fall.

In the Periodical and Publication Section 18 persons are employed at present and 24 are requested for next year. In addition to the press releases and speeches produced, one of the major publications of the Periodical Section is a weekly entitled "Defense." This is but a weekly reprint of the press releases produced. Forty thousand copies of this are being printed each week, of which only 10,000 are paid subscriptions at 75 cents a year. Mr. Horton stated before the committee that he believed that the publication would be self-sustaining if 20,000 copies were subscribed for. Mr. Horton demonstrated profound ignorance or a lamentable lack of frankness to the committee when he made this statement, for apparently, from his own words, it appeared that he did not include the cost of franking the publication:

> Mr. LUDLOW. How nearly is it self-liquidating?
>
> Mr. HORTON. It now has a circulation of 40,000 per week. We figured that on 20,000 we will be self-liquidating. As I say, there has never been a week since January that we have not picked up at least 200 and it has run up to four and five hundred
>
> Mr. DITTER. Is it sent out under frank?
>
> Mr. HORTON. It is.
>
> Mr. DITTER. Do you include the cost of the frank in estimating whether it is a self-liquidating project or not?
>
> Mr. HORTON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. DITTER. In other words, a charge is made on the cost side for the franking privilege?
>
> Mr. HORTON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. DITTER. Such as you would have to pay if you were mailing it, in the cost of postage?
>
> Mr. HORTON. That is delivered through the Government Printing Office. We get no credit for any of the money, but it does go back into the Treasury, and that is what I am interested in.
>
> Mr. DITTER. What I mean is this: Do you take into consideration the factor of the cost of postage which you would have to pay if you did not frank it?
>
> Mr. HORTON. That is correct.
>
> Mr. DITTER. Do you include as one of the factors of cost the postage that you would have to pay if it were not franked?
>
> Mr. HORTON. So far as I know, the cost factor is estimated by the Government Printing Office, and we are charged accordingly, not only for the printing but for the entire distribution
>
> Mr. DITTER. The Government Printing Office would not include the postage in the cost of distributing it.
>
> Mr. HORTON. The Government Printing Office distributes it. The Superintendent of Documents disposes of it in the customary way, whatever that is.
>
> Mr. DITTER. I would say, unless you have some information to contradict it, that you do not include the cost of postage in your cost of this publication.
>
> Mr. HORTON. I personally have not included the postage rate. The Printing Office, as I say, has estimated the over-all cost, and we pay them whatever it is. I think it is somewhat high, but we pay the price that they name.

Concerning the publicity activities in the field of press releases, Mr. Horton testified that in the month of May 197 press releases were issued, consisting of 794 pages, and that the total number of mimeographed pages put out that month was 3,960,000. This would mean that approximately 8 press releases are put out per day. On this basis it is very difficult to see how this tremendous staff is required; and, in fact, Mr. Horton did not do very well in attempting to justify the necessity for such a staff for the number of press releases put out:

> Mr. HORTON. As I said a moment ago, the preparation of the press releases is purely incidental in the process of getting out information. For instance, let us say in connection with a press release announcing the reduction of 20 percent in the production of automobiles. That does not take very much mimeograph space. But I handled that myself. The preparation of that from the point of view of conferences with Mr. Knudsen, with people in the automobile industry, and so forth, and the clearance of it, required several days, during which I, as the man handling that particular release, had to discuss it with these people. They are very particular as to what should be said or not said. They go over it word for word, almost as you would draft a bill in Congress.
>
> But when you finally see the press release, it is not a particularly impressive document, and you might say that somebody could sit down and bat it out in a few minutes. But it is the background of the thing which takes the time and which requires the tact, which requires judgment. These men who cover these activities, each of them, lives with the organization for which he is working.
>
> For instance, the priorities man attends all the priorities staff meetings. He attends practically all conferences held on priorities, because the only way anyone can understand that thing is to live right there with it. There is probably no one in the Priorities Division who knows that set-up as well as, or who knows as much about priorities, as the man out of my office who covers it.
>
> It is not a question of Mr. Stettinius saying, "We want a press release announcing that we are going to have a priority on aluminum." The man who covers priorities discusses that sometimes for days, because it comes slowly. There is the whole problem of how it is going to be presented; what you want to say; how you want to say it. Lawyers get mixed up in it; and when you get lawyers mixed up in a matter you have additional complications, if I may say so.

As was stated earlier, the figure of $750,000 for publicity for the Office for Emergency Management is exceedingly misleading for two reasons: The first reason is that this is but a part of the cost of Mr. Horton's own office. There are a number of items carried in the appropriation for central administration of the Office for Emergency Management that quite apparently are a part of the cost of this Division. Thus, there is an appropriation for 300,000 feet of negative raw stock of $10,500; 10,800 flash bulbs at $1,620; press release material, $122,400. The total of these items is almost $135,000, which must be added to the $750,000 in this appropriation, bringing the item to at least $880,000. In addition, a number of other establishments under the O. E. M. have their own publicity staffs; consequently, Mr. Horton's office does not cover all of such work.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Horton denies that any of the other divisions of the O. E. M. have publicity staffs, but the appropriation hearings and the justification book of the O. E. M. show that Mr. Horton was ill-informed or was deliberately trying to mislead the committee. The following exchange between Mr. Horton and members of the committee is in point:

> Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Horton, what would you say of this proposition? We have noticed that practically every one of these divisions of the O. E. M., and the O. P. M. also, has a set-up that is quite elaborate in some cases for purposes of disseminating information. What is that situation?
>
> Mr. HORTON. So far as I know, the information, so far as it is given to the public, goes through the Division of Information. There is no information disseminated to the public by the individual agencies themselves.

Mr. WOODRUM. What is the necessity of their having individual information services?

Mr. HORTON. There is none, so far as I know.

Mr. WOODRUM. Is there some distinguishing feature about them?

Mr. HORTON. Not that I know of. I did not know that they had any sums in their budgets for information.

Mr. LUDLOW. You deal with news.

Mr. HORTON. News and factual presentations, and also we issue pamphlets and other material such as O. P. M. and the various agencies feel should be published.

Mr. TABER. What is your relationship in comparison with the Lowell Mellett agency?

Mr. HORTON. There is no relationship that I know of, sir.

Mr. TABER. Do they do the same kind of work that you do?

Mr. HORTON. No, sir. It is not my understanding that they do. My understanding of what their operations—and I am not entirely familiar with them—is that O. G. R. is an organization which reports to the President on the activities and functioning of Federal agencies in the field, and serves in various ways as a liaison between some State and Federal operations in the field.

One of the largest publicity outfits in the whole of the O. E. M. is in the Office of the Coordinator of Cultural and Commercial Relations Among the American Republics. The amount of money spent by this organization for publicity is stupendous, and it is hard to put all the pieces together. For example, there is a Communications Division with 49 persons and a pay roll of $66,000 in 1941; in 1942 it is asking for 56 persons with a pay roll of $191,000. From the justification this Division deals entirely with the dissemination of publicity in Latin America. In addition there is another division bearing the euphemistic title "Public Education Division for Publicity Work Within the United States." This office employs 14 persons with a pay roll of $19,000 in 1941; 17 persons are requested for 1942 with a pay roll of $59,500. In addition to the regular staff of the Office of the Coordinator there is a request for so-called special projects totaling $6,500,000. Of this $6,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942, according to the justification, at least $3,150,000 will be spent on publicity activities in Latin America and in the United States.

Another agency that has its own publicity staff is the Office of the Administrator of Export Control which, according to the justification, has a public-relations section with a staff of 26 persons in 1941 and a pay roll of $14,733; in 1942 it is likewise asking for a staff of 26 persons, with a pay roll of $40,460.

The Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Related Activities admits to having an information unit with a staff of 3 persons and a pay roll of $8,660, and there is good reason for believing that there are other persons engaged in publicity activities in this establishment. Consequently it appears that of the total appropriation requested for 1942 for the O. E. M. of $39,000,000, at least $4,000,000, or more than 10 percent, will be used for publicity and propaganda purposes.

As we examine this colossal set-up of Federal agencies, we cannot help but be impressed with the tremendous program which is contemplated. I cannot avoid the conclusion that duplications and overlaps are causing confusion rather than contributing to order and efficiency.

To attempt to separate the essentials from the nonessentials in the limited time afforded to the committee to which the bill was referred would be a herculean and even an impossible effort. In the final analysis these many agencies are the creatures of the executive branch of the Government for the most part, and it must assume the responsibility for their continued lives and activities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common knowledge that the attendance in the Committee is not very heavy at this moment, but convinced as I am that an intellectual quorum is present I beg leave to inflict myself upon it for 10 minutes; and I confess at the outset that I shall not discuss any feature of the pending measure but rather another matter which has always been deep in my heart and in which I know the Members of the House take an equally deep interest.

The membership of this body, Mr. Chairman, includes a great many men who have had experience in the military services, many men who have seen action or who have gone through training periods, who have had an opportunity to watch and to measure the morale of troops. Collectively the veterans in this House have come in contact with thousands and thousands of soldiers and sailors and have a real conception of the value of morale in any military unit. It is with that idea in mind that I beg leave to set before you an example of morale in a body of American soldiers which has come to my attention and which I think is worth mentioning in public.

I have in my possession, and I beg leave to include it as a part of my remarks—it is not a long document—a report of the Judge Advocate of the Twenty-seventh Division, New York National Guard, commanded by Maj. Gen. William N. Haskell, stationed since last October 16 at Fort McClellan, Ala., not far from the thriving little city of Anniston. There are somewhat in excess of 18,000 men in that division. Roughly speaking, 12,000 of them were New York guardsmen at the time of induction, and in January last 6,000 recruits reached the division, all from the State of New York. They joined up and after preliminary training became a part of the outfit, a complete division of 18,000 men plus. They have been in the Federal service almost 8 months, and this report of the Judge Advocate General dated June 7, 1941, covers the discipline of the division for that period. I am not going to read it all, but I want to point out some high lights contained in it.

In that 8 months' period, with 18,000 men, there have been but 12 courts martial. Three of those courts martial were for military offenses and in those 3 courts martial there came 2 acquittals; so that literally in that entire body of men only 1 man was convicted of a major military offense. It may be interesting to you to know that the offense was the swiping of a Government automobile and going on a joy ride. That was the extent of his sin. It was a military offense.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman think it would rather disrupt the public service if they put everybody in Washington in jail who had committed an offense like that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We can draw many parallels between civilian life and military life in the United States from what is contained in this report.

There were nine nonmilitary offenses in the period. The most serious was the stealing of a civilian automobile, which resulted in a conviction, confinement, and dishonorable discharge. The others were petty thievery. The worst of them, two or three, resulted in conviction, dishonorable discharge, and confinement. That is the entire record of the courts martial.

There have been only 10 cases in 8 months of the slightest kind of individual disturbance between a soldier of that division and the civil authorities in the neighborhood. None of them had serious results.

In the month of May, which is the last month for which there are complete reports, out of the 18,000 men plus there were only 14 cases of venereal disease, an amazing record. During this entire period there has been no such thing as what might be termed as mass disturbance engaged in by soldiers, that is, 8 or 10 or a dozen soldiers raising a little row on Main Street in the neighboring town. There has not been one single instance of that kind. Only one complaint has been lodged by a woman, charging misconduct toward her on the part of a soldier. That case is now under investigation.

The guardhouse population during that 8 months, with 18,000 men, has averaged 3 men daily. There has been only 1 deserter from the entire division.

Last Christmas time 8,000 men of that division were given a furlough for 6 or 7 days. Those 8,000 traveled from Alabama to their homes in the State of New York, on their own. Every one of the 8,000 turned up on time at the end of the furlough. Not one was late. In the Easter vacation a somewhat smaller number were given a furlough and not one of them was late, not one man was A. W. O. L.

I mention these things to show something of life in the Army today. Men of military experience in this body know that if a training schedule is unwisely planned, if it does not convince the soldier that he is learning something every day and is making progress, he begins to believe that the work or the time he is spending on it is not worth while. Men of military experience in this body know that if the discipline imposed upon the American soldier is of the constant "bawling out" kind it does not go down very well. Men of military experience know also that under ordinary circumstances good food, good clothing, and

decent shelter, except in time of emergency, are very important matters in the maintenance of morale. Those things all have to be planned and executed by officers. I have heard it said there was no such thing as a bad regiment unless it had a bad colonel, and I believe that to be pretty nearly correct.

Here is a typical American outfit, officers and men—all of them citizen soldiers. I have given you the high lights of its morale and its discipline. I think it should bring encouragement to everybody. I have looked into the records of other divisions and find many of them presenting a similar picture, although let it be said that the Twenty-seventh New York Division is just about "tops." Here you see the morale, discipline, and spirit of the American soldier today. I think the parents and their friends at home should know about this more fully. If they did we would have fewer requests for legislation to circumscribe the liberties of the American soldier.

Mr. Chairman, the complete text of this report from the Judge Advocate is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
TWENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE,
Vicinity Cortner, Tenn., June 7, 1941.

Subject: Report on discipline of Twenty-seventh Division.

To: The commanding general, Twenty-seventh Division, vicinity Shelbyville, Tenn.

This report encompasses a survey of the discipline of the Twenty-seventh Division from October 15, 1940, the date of its induction, to date, and deals only with the personnel of the Twenty-seventh Division. It does not take into consideration personnel of other commands who were within the scope of this division's courts-martial jurisdiction pursuant to an agreement between the commanding general of the Twenty-seventh Division and the corps area commander.

There were 12 trials by general courts martial, which included:

(a) Three that involved strictly military offenses; and

(b) Nine nonmilitary.

Of the three trials involving strictly military offenses, two resulted in acquittals and the third involved the wrongful use of a Government vehicle for the purpose of a joy ride. Immediate action was taken in the latter instance, and the conviction and punishment made known to the command so that it would act as a deterrent.

The nine trials involving nonmilitary offenses dealt with various larcenies of moneys and property from soldiers and civilians. The most serious involved the theft of a civilian automobile. This soldier was dishonorably discharged and given a 2-year sentence. Another case involving aggravated moral turpitude concerned a soldier who, while mail clerk, stole moneys from the mails. Notwithstanding restitution by this soldier of all stolen moneys, he was given a dishonorable discharge and confinement. The only other case which resulted in the dishonorable discharge of a soldier involved a series of petty thieveries from other soldiers over a period of time. An investigation of the offender's background and actions while in the service indicated that he lacked salvage value, and thus was not deserving of a suspension of the dishonorable discharge. The others of this group of trials involved petty thieveries which, in each instance, either did not justify a dishonorable discharge or, where a dishonorable discharge was meted out, permitted a suspension thereof. An example of the latter type concerned the stealing and sharing of small sums of money taken from a prostitute and three waitresses by a group of soldiers. The youth and good military records of these offenders, coupled with the fact that the soldiers made complete voluntary confessions, resulted in and justified a suspension of the dishonorable discharge meted out in each instance of conviction by the court.

An aid to discipline of this division was the cooperation between civil authorities of the communities in the vicinity of Fort McClellan. In the early months of this division's active service there were instances of soldiers arrested by civil authorities in surrounding communities for disorderly conduct. These soldiers were turned over to this command by the civil authorities for punishment. The conditions encouraging this type of offense resulted from the presence in the surrounding communities of houses of ill repute and places selling liquor illegally to the soldiers. Faced with this situation, expeditious and decisive action was taken by the commanding general. Entire sections of communities, and certain buildings, public hotels, and restaurants were placed "off limits" for the soldiers. This drastic and dramatic action brought the situation to the attention of the civil population and impressed upon it that for its best interests its cooperation was necessary. As a result, such cooperation was immediately forthcoming in curtailing and destroying the vice dens, gambling joints, and speak-easies in the vicinity of the fort. Since then there have been not more than 10 soldiers arrested in the past 5 months for offenses committed in nearby communities. There have been, in all, comparatively few instances involving the civil authorities concerning the personnel of this command. In one instance a soldier was held on suspicion of murder in December 1940 by the civil authorities at Birmingham, Ala., but, upon arraignment, he was released on the ground that there was no evidence, and the facts disclosed that this soldier was not only innocent of the charge but that there was no murder committed. Recently, an intoxicated soldier, on return from furlough, had an altercation on the train with a civilian. This case is under investigation and will be appropriately dealt with.

In general, it is evident that the disciplinary methods of this command has effectively minimized offenses committed by soldiers in civil communities. Except for a few cases of minor mischiefs, the conduct of the soldiers when away from the fort has been exemplary.

The excellent disciplinary status of the Twenty-seventh Division is reflected by the following:

1. There exists a respect and a cordial relationship between the soldiers and the military police. Occasions of disobedience to their orders and requests have been rare.

2. The venereal-disease rate for the division has been extremely low, indicating a proper compliance to and heeding of all orders and instructions relating to personal hygiene. At the present time there are 12 cases of syphilis and 2 cases of gonorrhea.

3. There have been only five instances brought to the attention of the command of soldiers failing to pay their just and due debts. However, in each instance a mere interview with the soldier resulted in prompt payment. The comparatively few cases involving checks on overdrawn accounts were satisfactorily disposed of in a similar manner.

4. There have been no instances of mass disturbances or riots involving any soldiers of this command.

5. There has been only one complaint by girls and parents of girls involving seduction or sex crimes by soldiers of this command. The one instance referred to occurred recently and is now under investigation.

6. There has been only one instance of homosexuality brought to the attention of the command. Immediately upon its discovery, the soldier was given a blue discharge by a board of officers.

7. At no time were there more than 10 men of the Twenty-seventh Division in the guardhouse on 1 day, and on numerous days there were none. An approximate average per day would probably be 3 men.

8. Despite the fact that the vast majority of the soldiers of this command have been granted no furlough for the past 6 months, namely, since December 1940, there has been only 1 case of desertion and but a small absences without leave. A striking comparison is had between the absence-without-leave cases in this division on the present maneuvers and those of the other 2 divisions; also on these maneuvers. With a personnel of about 19,000 men in the Twenty-seventh Division, there were only 45 absences without leave on June 5, 1941, whereas another division of approximately the same strength had 268, and the other division of about 12,000 men had about 240. This reflects a discipline in this division of such high degree that, in spite of the arduous duties of the present maneuvers, there was only approximately 1 case of unauthorized absence per battalion. An almost amazing further example indicating the foregoing was the fact that of the approximately 8,000 soldiers of this division that went home on furlough during Christmas, not one of these men failed to return at the proper time. Likewise, there were no unauthorized absences resulting from the Easter furlough permitted a number of men of this command.

In general, efforts are being made to continue and further, even more, the disciplinary status of this command, so that it will reflect credit not only on itself, but also upon the Army.

DAVID MARCUS,
Lieutenant Colonel, Judge
Advocate General's Department,
Division Judge Advocate.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say may not be so pertinent to the appropriation carried by this bill. I have always contended that progress in our defense program has not been deterred entirely because of strikes. My contention in this regard has recently been fortified and reinforced by the criticism of the Aluminum Trust made by Secretary Ickes. According to the press reports, which have not been denied, Mr. Ickes made the following statement before a senatorial committee investigating the progress of defense:

Interior Secretary Ickes told a Senate committee Monday if history records the present war as lost it may be because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America.

"It is as perfect a monopoly as ever devised by man," he declared during the questioning by Chairman TRUMAN (Democrat), Missouri.

"We could get more aluminum if we weren't too polite," Ickes added. Ickes said the Aluminum Co. "would prevent the dissemination of the facilities of aluminum, regardless of the consequences to the United States, in order to get all the aluminum sources under its control."

Asked by Senator CONNALLY (Democrat), Texas, if the Government had contemplated taking over the Aluminum Co., Ickes said he "didn't know."

"The company uses many cunning methods," Secretary Ickes added, "It all adds up to obstruction."

Secretary Ickes said the Office of Production Management had "underestimated" the aluminum shortage, and commented that "underestimating seems to be a habit with them."

That shows the laboring man is not entirely responsible for the stoppages and for the slowness of the progress of our defense program. It may be charged to other sources. Profits may have something to do with it.

I now call the attention of the Members of the House to the dollar-a-year men. I do not want the Members to understand that by bringing this matter up I mean that they are not rendering a patriotic and good service, but I do think the country is entitled to know who some of these dollar-a-year men are.

I recall we had some man-sized scandals in connection with the dollar-a-year men in the first World War. Later, I think it was under the Hoover administration, a certain dollar-a-year man who, it appears for patriotic reasons, refused $25,000 a year and took advantage of his position with reference to wheat and bought wheat at $2.20 per bushel which was the fixed price, and when the lid was taken off the price immediately went up to over $3 per bushel and this gentleman made a profit of over $11,000,000. The whole matter was aired in the Federal court in Spokane, Wash. Of course, he thought by refusing the $25,000 he would be throwing dust in the eyes of the Government and his operations would be unnoticed. I do not want to see such scandals as that follow this administration. I want to see us come out of this mess clean.

I call your attention to some of these gentlemen. On page 872 of the hearings we find W. Ray Bell, consultant, textile unit, president, Association of Cotton Textile Merchants.

We find Charles W. Boyce, assistant consultant, pulp and paper, vice president, Northwest Paper Co.

Remember, these men have to do with representing the United States Government in the purchase of commodities from concerns with which they have had to do, in the past, at least, and that is putting it mildly.

Sydney Buckley, chief of cranes unit, machine tool section, president, Shepard-Niles Crane and Hoist Corporation.

We drop down here to F. B. Cliffe, consultant, aluminum and magnesium, assistant comptroller, General Electric Co. Those big institutions are pretty closely tied in together.

Here is Joseph V. Dunn, special adviser, shipbuilding construction supplies branch, engineer, American Telephone & Telegraph Co. I want you to bear in mind that a number of these dollar-a-year men employed in connection with shipbuilding matters come from telephone companies. I do not know whether or not there is any particular significance in that, but at least it is something to think about. Why should these special advisers come from these particular classes of business?

Then we find D. C. Everest, consultant, pulp and paper, president, Marathon Paper Mills Co.

Then we find William L. Finger, consultant on rubber, Rubber Manufacturers Association.

Then we find William H. Harrison, chief, shipbuilding construction supplies branch, vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

We find Blake D. Hull, special adviser, shipbuilding construction supplies branch, chief engineer, Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

Then we find William V. Kahler, special adviser, shipbuilding construction supplies branch, chief engineer, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

Then we find Charles W. Kellogg, consultant, heat, light, and power, Edison Electric Institute.

Then at the bottom we find Charles A. Simmons, technical expert, used-tool unit, president, Simmons Machine Tool Corporation. Here also is Henry R. Luce, consultant, $1 per annum. He is the chairman of the Time magazine. You all know how active the Time magazine is in relation to its advocating war. What is he doing in there?

It seems to me that gentlemen working for a dollar a year for the United States Government, where the Government is making contracts with his concern, may turn out to be the most expensive employees the United States Government has ever employed. We are taking out of the taxpayers' pockets every day billions of dollars. This country is going to be financially broke when we get through with the situation. It will result in either repudiation, inflation, or confiscation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. I am interested in the list of dollar-a-year men. I find in the index of the hearings that they are shown at page 872, but all the copies of the hearings I have examined skip 33 pages, from page 862 to page 895. I should like to inquire what the gentleman is reading from there.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am reading from pages 872 and 873 of the hearings.

Mr. BENNETT. I have not been able to find a copy that has those pages.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have them listed here in this copy. That is what I am reading from.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman is making a very interesting and instructive statement. I would not want to be understood for a moment to be questioning or challenging the patriotism or good faith of these able industrialists who are down here at a dollar a year, but, just as the gentleman has stated, it is most unfair to ask a man to sit in judgment when his own personal interests are in conflict with the interests of the Government.

Out in the Northwest we have the raw material, by the untold thousands of tons, of alunite and magnesite to make aluminum and magnesium, and we have the electrical energy to do it. If the Aluminum Co. of America is an absolute monopoly, which it is, and it has its men sitting in this group at a dollar a year, that might account for the fact that there has been nothing done in the way of development of either the alunite or the magnesite, which would make up the 600,000,000 pounds of shortage of that critical and important material. I should like to have the gentleman make a comment on that statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Every statement the gentleman has uttered is 100-percent true. He now, as he always does, analyzed the matter perfectly. This is the unfortunate thing about it, that we do not have more Ickes in this defense set-up. I believe he is the first man that has come out and hit right from the shoulder the big trust and monopoly in this country between the horns that, in my opinion, has done more to arrest the progress of this defense program than almost anything up to date. Referring to these dollar-a-year men, it is extremely unfortunate that they have worked their way into the governmental service at this critical time. They are human. Regardless of how patriotic they may be it will be mighty hard for them to act impartially where their own concerns are parties to agreements with the Government in the expenditure of public funds. Such should not be permitted under any circumstances. You cannot serve two masters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot refuse to yield to my good friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman read the editorial appearing in the United States News under date of June 27?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under date of June 27? This is the 25th.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; June 27. It is out now. I suggest the gentleman read that before he talks any more about the Aluminum Co.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I have not read it, but I tell the gentleman one thing, I do not care what is in that editorial. It cannot square the record of this trust. It is easy to write articles.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course the gentleman does not care.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the history of the Aluminum Trust. I know it is one of cruel monopoly. That it has exacted tribute from every housewife for years and has grown to monstrous proportions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not care what the truth is.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say this to my distinguished colleague. I know no paid writer can change the facts. Nor can he.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will put it in the RECORD so the gentleman can read it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman made the statement a few moments ago that we are headed for cancelation or inflation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Or repudiation.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Or repudiation; yes. Under the circumstances, is

it not possible that if we did not do these things we might be under the necessity of annihilation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is possible. That might occur regardless if we do not quit giving away our defense materials to several other countries.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to point this out. While we are taking billions of dollars out of the taxpayers of this country preparing for defense we want to see that they are used honestly and efficiently. That is my point. That is why I am bringing these matters to the attention of Congress, so that they can be looked into. I do not want to see hundreds of millionaires made out of this war at the expense of the masses of the American people.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, on February 3, 1933, I made a speech in this Chamber which envisaged the present war in Europe. In detail I exposed the methods of disloyal and seditious organizations which were attempting to involve the United States in advance in that war.

I now charge that President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull have been dominated and controlled by these organizations, and as a consequence have brought the United States to the brink of war not only in Europe but also in Asia; not for American interests but for alien interests.

My speech of February 3, 1933, was as follows:

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to handle without gloves those who would denationalize the United States.

The time is here to unmask those disloyal and seditious organizations and individuals who are attempting to destroy the independence of the United States, to subvert her national integrity, and to involve her in advance in the next European war.

The time is here fully to disclose to the American people the iniquitous intrigue against the public safety and the sovereignty of the United States.

One of the fundamental policies of the United States in relation to her foreign affairs was to refrain from interference or participation in the political affairs of Europe.

In 1917 the United States entered the World War, in violation of this fundamental policy. It is clear that the present economic prostration of the United States, her increasing social disorders, and the menacing challenges to her institutions are due in large part to the abandonment of this traditional and salutary policy.

The activities in the United States of the agents and sympathizers of the European belligerents and of American international banking and business interests had much to do with promoting the public opinion which in 1917 hurled us into the European cataclysm and thereby precipitated our present ruin.

These activities were accompanied by a vast expenditure of money and the dissemination of unlimited propaganda. These same methods are now being employed by those disloyal and seditious organizations and persons who would denationalize the United States and involve her forever in the affairs of Europe, a continent of political instability, militaristic policies, and financial irresponsibility.

The manipulation of public opinion by high-cost organized propaganda from sources which do not represent the general public will has become the poisoned cup from which the American Republic will perish.

The ballot in the United States has become a negligible factor in expressing public opinion and in influencing national legislation and party platforms.

In 1916 the American people voted against entry into the European war. Early in 1917 the United States entered the war.

Since 1920 the American people have voted repeatedly against political interference or participation in the political affairs of Europe. They have again and again expressed themselves decisively as opposed to political internationalism. Notwithstanding, they have seen party platforms and elected and appointed American officials repeatedly nullify their expressed will. This has occurred because the public opinion which writes party platforms and influences Government officials is subtly manipulated by high-cost propaganda, emanating from disloyal, seditious, and alien-minded sources, and from sources of self-interest and personal gain.

The subtle and high-cost propaganda which initiates Federal legislation and directs American policies is the "invisible government" of today. It is cynically agreed in Washington that cost alone limits the delivery of public opinion in any direction upon any issue.

It is the preeminent duty of the Congress of the United States to preserve American independence, to safeguard American nationality, and to keep the United States out of war.

The Congress can perform this duty only by throwing the bright light of publicity upon the foul intrigue now being perpetrated against the American people. The activities and vast expenditures of the disloyal and seditious organizations which are now poisoning American public opinion at its source demand complete exposure. Their purpose and methods should be disclosed. Their expenditures for the pollution of the pulpit, the platform, institutions of learning, and the press of the country should be uncovered. Those who are being paid should be named and identified.

The foreign policy of the United States is a political question, and these subversive organizations have a political platform concerning the foreign policy of the country which places them within the scope of a congressional investigation.

Their platform, briefly stated, consists of four planks:

First. The entry of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations.

Second. The entry of the United States into the League of Nations.

Third. The disarmament of Europe, but first the disarmament of the United States.

Fourth. The destruction of American neutrality by an affirmative commitment under the so-called Kellogg-Briand Pact.

The Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations is a political court, which was inevitable on account of its subordination to the League of Nations, and which was demonstrated again recently by its decision on the proposal for the economic union of Germany and Austria. It is the bureau, organ, political instrumentality, agent, and servant of the League of Nations. The judges of the principal European powers are selected for their mastery of crafty European diplomacy.

For the United States to join this Court would be to submit her questions to European decisions and to become involved for all time in the political affairs of Europe. To join this political Court would be an intermediate step toward joining the League of Nations, and is so asserted by the internationalists.

The League of Nations is a British conception and not an American conception. In Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915: Supplement; the World War, published by the Department of State, we find, on pages 64 and 65, a letter written to Secretary of State Lansing from The Hague on September 7, 1915 (which was long before the United States entered the war), by the Minister in the Netherlands, Dr. Henry van Dyke, in which it is reported that Sir William Tyrrell, secretary to Sir Edward Grey, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, stated to Dr. Van Dyke "that he thought a 'league of nations' should be formed to prevent the recurrence of such a war as this."

The League of Nations is a European political mechanism—the pawn of the principal European powers—bankrupt morally and physically by its conduct in relation to Japan, financially by default of its guaranteed loans, and intellectually by its abandonment of reality for the pursuit of vain futilities.

The League of Nations exists for the enforcement of the Versailles Treaty. The Versailles Treaty was a treaty of force—of hate, oppression, and chaos. It has already been vitally amended by agreement. It must be further vitally amended by negotiations or it will be by war. It would have been an eternal dishonor for the United States to have signed the Versailles Treaty as originally proposed. Should the United States now join the League of Nations, she would be involved without choice in the next European war. The decision would not be hers.

Should the European nations disarm upon the insistence of the United States, the United States would be morally committed to intervention in the next European quarrel.

Any affirmative commitment under the so-called Kellogg-Briand Pact would destroy American neutrality, which has been the priceless heritage and safeguard of the United States since the founding of the Republic, and inevitably would mean war in support of one group of the belligerent European nations in the next war. The United States should remain the great neutral Nation.

The largest and most formidable promoters of the subversive, disloyal, and seditious movement against American independence and American neutrality are (1) the so-called Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which has an endowment of $10,000,000, supplemented by the endowment of $125,000,000 of the Carnegie Corporation, and (2) the John D. Rockefeller interests and the Rockefeller Foundation, with an endowment of $165,000,000.

These organizations not only are spending vast sums of money directly to involve the United States in Europe but they are also subsidizing many other organizations and activities having the same purpose. The interlocking directorships and memberships of many of these organizations are significant.

The question of paramount importance at the moment is, Shall the Congress of the United States and the American people allow its foreign policy, its independence, and its neutrality to be dictated by $300,000,000 of Carnegie and Rockefeller money? Shall American independence and neutrality be put upon the auction block, like merchandise, to be bought and paid for?

Andrew Carnegie was alien-born and alien-minded. What he thought of American independence and what his plans and aims were may be seen from the following statements which he made at various periods of his life:

In "An American Four-in-Hand in Britain," written by Andrew Carnegie and published in 1883, we read:

"O Scotland, my own, my native land, your exiled son returns with love for you as ardent as ever warmed the heart of man for his country. It's a God's mercy I was born

a Scotchman, for I do not see how I could ever have been contented to be anything else."

In an address delivered at Grangemouth, England, on September 14, 1887, Mr. Carnegie declared:

"If I have any aspiration in the world, it is that during my life I may do something * * * to bring about the union of the two great branches of the same people with which I have the honor and the privilege to be connected."

In his book, "Triumphant Democracy," published in 1893, Mr. Carnegie stated:

"Briton and American being now fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax the colonists without their consent were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens, and, therefore, only did their duty, the question arises, Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties, and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

"I cannot think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a reunion of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship."

There follow six reasons, and then Mr. Carnegie goes on to say:

"Some day, therefore, delegates from the three now separated branches will meet in London and readily agree upon and report for approval and ratification a basis for the restoration of an indissoluble union of indestructible states.

"Let men say what they will, therefore; I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state, 'The British-American Union.'"

In an article written by request for the London Express, October 14, 1904, entitled "Drifting Together—Will the United States and Canada Unite?" Mr. Carnegie had the following to say:

"Canada's destiny is to annex the Republic, as Scotland did England, and then, taking the hand of the rebellious big brother and that of the mother, place them in each other's grasp, thus reuniting the then happy family that should never have known separation."

In "The Life of Andrew Carnegie," by Burton J. Hendrick, published in 1932, we read that in December of 1868 Andrew Carnegie drew up a memorandum as a plan of life in which appeared this statement:

"Settle then in London and purchase a controlling interest in some newspaper or live review and give the general management of it attention."

Later in the book it is stated that Mr. Carnegie in after years became "the proprietor of 15 or 20 organs of public opinion, for the most part in England and Scotland."

As may be seen from his own statements, Mr. Carnegie never believed in American independence, American sovereignty, American neutrality.

When in 1910 Mr. Carnegie determined to enter the American political field and to dictate American foreign policy, and established for this purpose a $10,000,000 endowment, he chose to name it the "Carnegie Endowment for International Peace," and not the "Carnegie Endowment for the Abolition of American Independence." For the Washington headquarters of his political activities there was chosen a site just across the street and half way between the White House and the Department of State, whose policies he was determined to dictate. The lobbyists of his endowment have always had ready access to and have constantly frequented both of these Government establishments, where the foreign policy of the United States is largely fixed. It can be proved that nearly all the agitation and vast expenditures made for the propaganda for American adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations were directed and managed by this organization. The inclusion in both the Republican and Democratic platforms last year of identical planks favoring entry of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations and for the surrender of American neutrality were the direct results of the activities of this organization. Never before have identical planks on a highly controversial issue been adopted by the two political parties except in the case of the prohibition planks adopted by both parties between 1920 and 1930, which planks were dictated by the Anti-Saloon League. The exposure of the propaganda methods and the vast expenditures of this organization by two congressional investigations brought about the downfall of the tyranny of prohibition. A congressional investigation of the propaganda methods of the Carnegie Endowment and of its allies will insure preservation of American independence and American neutrality.

Until 1920, due primarily to the World War, the activities of this endowment were astutely directed largely to the promotion of arbitration, a sound American policy. Since 1920, with increasing intensity, this endowment has sought by every means, by vast expenditures for publicity and for subsidizing, to involve the United States in the political affairs of Great Britain and Europe.

The methods employed by this endowment, with its vast financial resources, are varied. It organizes and finances international clubs; it publishes international literature; it establishes "international mind alcoves" in libraries, even for children; it imports foreign propagandist speakers and lecturers; it pays American professors and students liberal amounts, which go under the name of honoraria, for the promotion of the political policies of the endowment. It sends American economists and social scientists to Europe, and particularly to Geneva, as guests of the endowment, thereby placing them under obligation upon their return to be propagandists for what the endowment advocates and to instruct their pupils as to the desirability of the entry of the United States into the League of Nations. It finances the organization of public mass meetings throughout the United States on Armistice Day to preach the political platform of the endowment. It has set up in Geneva an American committee of the League of Nations Association and distributes political literature. In relation to this activity we read on page 65 of the 1932 yearbook of the endowment:

"Literature of various international American and British organizations is on display, and a staff of assistants is ready to make plans and give information to the many visitors who come in for advice."

On pages 66–67 of the yearbook we learn that the endowment supplies funds to the Geneva Institute of International Relations and to the National World Court Committee; also that it appoints and finances an American "to act for 1 year as American representative of the endowment and the League of Nations Association in Geneva." On page 67 there appears the following concerning this American representative:

"He is maintaining contact with officers of the League and is a member of the committee in charge of the Geneva Institute of International Relations. This involves correspondence from Geneva with committee members in the United States and Great Britain."

The endowment finances a national student forum on the Pact of Paris, and on page 70 of the yearbook we read:

"The national committee in charge of the National Student Forum is composed of approximately 300 State and city superintendents of education, high-school principals and teachers, editors of educational publications, and leaders in educational and religious organizations. In each State there has been organized a working committee of superintendents and high-school principals which promotes the work of the forum in the high schools of the State."

The yearbook goes on to say that—

"In 1931–32 it is hoped to assist 5,000 high schools and to reach approximately 300,000 students."

The endowment maintains in England an international house, known as the Dunford House, where internationalists, American and English, and others devoted to the theory of free trade, meet regularly.

The endowment finances international relations clubs. On page 78 of the yearbook we read:

"At the close of 1931 there were 319 clubs in the United States, an increase of 99 since the last annual report was written. These new clubs are distributed throughout 37 States."

And on page 79 we read:

"Some of the clubs listen regularly to broadcasts on international subjects by the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations."

Paid representatives of the Carnegie Endowment attend conferences of these clubs, which organize League of Nations assemblies. On page 85 of the yearbook it is stated that—

"A party of British students and their faculty advisers came to the United States as guests of the endowment to attend a British and American students conference, held at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, July 12–19, 1931."

On page 86 of the same publication it is stated:

"There are 15 active clubs in the British Isles. As authorized by the directeur-adjoint of the Centre Europeen in the summer of 1931, Mr. Norman H. Poole, secretary of the British Universities League of Nations Society, is now in charge of the International Relations Clubs in the British Isles, reporting directly to the executive secretary at New York in order that the club work may be carried on under one head throughout the world."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does the gentleman know whether the Carnegie Foundation advocates the recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States?

Mr. TINKHAM. Not that I know of.

The president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the chairman of its executive committee, and the director of its first political propaganda division, known as the division of intercourse and education, is Nicholas Murray Butler, who is also chairman of the advisory council of the League of Nations Association, Inc., and whose attitude toward his country I have no hesitation in designating as disloyal and seditious.

The director of the second political propaganda division, known as the division of economics and history, is James Thomson Shotwell, an expatriated British subject.

We descendants of old Americans refuse to submit to these dictators of the foreign policy of the United States, whose purpose it is to denationalize the United States, to destroy her independence, to involve her in European political affairs by entering, first, the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations, and then the League of Nations, and to abolish her neutrality.

We descendants of those who established civilization upon this continent, fought the Battle of Bunker Hill, died at Valley Forge, saw the rising of the sun at Yorktown, and drew up the Constitution of the United States; we whose ancestors flew the American flag upon the seven seas in 1812, are ready here and now to fight again the battle of the

Republic, without quarter and without cease, by all the means that lie within our power, to expose the plotters against American independence, American sovereignty, American neutrality, and American safety. We accept the gage of battle which has been flung in our faces.

Nicholas Murray Butler states he is for peace. There will be no peace on the American continent unless he retires to England or fights the second Battle of Bunker Hill.

The Congress of the United States can save the American Republic by an investigation of its enemies, who are plotting against its independence, its neutrality, and its safety.

If no action is taken at this session upon the resolution which I am introducing today, I shall reintroduce it in the next Congress and press for its adoption. [Applause.]

Mr. TINKHAM submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas certain organizations, foundations, endowments, and associations are attempting by disloyal and seditious propaganda and vast expenditures of money to influence the foreign policy of the United States and have a political platform which is a menace to the independence and neutrality of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Speaker is authorized and directed to appoint a select committee, to be composed of five Members of the House, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. The committee is authorized and directed to investigate the political activities of all organizations, foundations, endowments, and associations which have attempted or are attempting to influence political opinion and political action by any means whatsoever, with reference to the foreign policy of the United States.

"Said committee shall have the power to subpena witnesses, administer oaths, send for books and papers, to employ a stenographer, and to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee.

"The committee shall, as soon as practicable, report to the House the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable."

Let me add that the so-called Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Carnegie Corporation of New York have been liberally financing the so-called Union Now movement, the outgrowth of which is the organization known as Federal Union. This organization, Federal Union, is a disloyal and traitorous organization. It would destroy the independence of the United States and restore the United States to the British Empire.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, one day last week Germany and Russia were more or less supporting one another in accordance with their pact of August 1939, which was probably the spark that touched off this war. The next day, for reasons which I shall not go into and which only history will judge, Germany, in spite of a nonaggression pact, opened an attack upon Russia and by so doing changed, at least to a considerable extent, the entire outlook of the situation.

I have asked for this time because I believe that at this moment it is of paramount importance for Members of the American Congress, as well as the American people, to do some straight thinking about the situation and to try to foresee certain things which are going to happen in the United States. I think there are two or three things we can lay down, in the first place.

I am reluctantly compelled to say that it seems to me that this latest action on the part of Mr. Hitler is very substantial further proof that the people who have been saying for a long time that the German purpose under Hitler's domination was to attempt control of the world have been right. It is a fantastic thing, but it seems to me events are proving that something like that is so.

In the second place, I am inclined to think that Mr. Hitler knew when he took this action the effect it would inevitably have upon the United States. I think it will have that effect, and I do not see how it can be avoided, nor am I sure it should be. I think that effect will naturally be to make the United States even less ready than it might otherwise have been to participate actively in this war.

But what I hope it is not going to mean, and what I think it is the duty of every Member of Congress to see that it does not mean, is any weakening of the resolution of the American people and their Government to oppose, on their own ground and in their own way, the movement and philosophy that Hitler and his cohorts represent, as well as the movement and philosophy that Stalin represents.

I think it goes without saying that the conquest of Russia by Hitler will immeasurably strengthen him. It will mean that the danger of a further spread of Hitler's power will be greatly increased. Most experts seem to think that is what is going to happen. I do not know. But there are two or three things I do know are going to happen, and I wanted to discuss those with the House.

In the first place, after a period during which the Communists in America have bitterly attacked the administration and the President's foreign policy and acted accordingly, we are probably going to see a complete change in the Communist Party line, so that instead of doing that they will now start in telling what a great man Winston Churchill is and President Roosevelt, and supporting, in one way or another, as soon as they can get around to it, a program of aid to Britain as well as the Soviet, and, furthermore, attempting once again, as they did up until the signing of the pact with Hitler in 1939, to infiltrate into American organizations and to "cooperate" with them.

Regardless of what our attitude may be about the struggle going on in Europe, the first thing I want to say today is that we should not lessen, the American labor movement should not lessen, the American progressives should not lessen, their determination to prevent any person actually under the domination of the Communist Party from obtaining a position of influence or of power in any American organization.

I said that was the duty of American progressives and the American labor movement, of all who think along these lines, and it is. We ought to have learned by this time that an internationally controlled group like this, whose purposes, policies, and actions are determined by the welfare of the Soviet Union, can never be relied upon to serve the interests of American workmen, or any other American interest.

But there are other people besides the progressives, who have a duty to perform today that is going to be somewhat more difficult, because here is something else that is going to happen. You may recall a few years ago that there were certain organizations which called themselves "anti-Communists" organizations, but which actually in effect were pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi organizations under a convenient name. Since the signing of the pact between Stalin and Hitler in 1939, those organizations, like the Communists, dropped that; had nothing to say in criticism of Russia or communism, but on the other hand, spoke either not at all or favorably of them. We shall now witness, coupled with opposition to the foreign policy of the administration and opposition to aid to England, a group of bogus, not sincere, "anti-Communist" organizations which will call themselves that, but which, in effect, will be efforts to change the thinking of the United States so as to make it more ready to accept the philosophy of fascism, which is basic to Hitler's movement.

To my mind the essential thing for us to do is to continue as resolutely as we can with efforts that we have made to preserve democracy, to make democracy successful from every single standpoint. I have already said in speeches, and American labor knows it only too well, that the condition of the worker in the Soviet Union has been very far from that condition of freedom which was held out to him. And it is also true that no business or industrial organization can expect fascism or nazi-ism will leave them better off or more free than they would be under a system such as they have in Russia. I believe that the net result of any system of dictatorship is bound to be the enslavement of the people, and what America seeks to serve is the freedom of the people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan, but I desire to go on with my speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of any industrial concern in this country that has failed to cooperate with the defense program?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What has that to do with my speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought it had something to do with it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think it has the slightest bit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I withdraw it; and if the gentleman does not want it in there, he may take it out.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am trying my best to make a fairly well-balanced speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well, cut it out. It is all right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in connection with things that I may say, I believe that we in the House have got to be very careful about one

thing. Feeling runs high at present, and it is easy to confuse a person who is basically against the institutions of the United States and its democratic form of government, who is against attempts to solve all problems by constructive action, and whose loyalty really belongs to a foreign leader—it is easy, if we are not careful, to confuse people like that with people with whom we merely disagree about our problems and about their solution. If there ever was a time when it is well for Members of Congress not to make this mistake, that time is now, because, after all, the thing which we want to preserve is freedom and liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is terribly important for us to be right about these things. It is terribly important for us to not let ourselves be pushed around, in effect, by an action taken by the German dictator on his own motion. We must not let our thinking run along lines where it ought not to run—that is, in the direction of becoming "soft" toward nazi-ism, because Hitler has attacked Communist Russia. I am not talking about going to war, nor am I advocating sending a lot of matériel to Russia, with the very grave danger that it may fall into Hitler's hands. I am talking about acting in a way that will be for the best long-run interests of the United States.

I am not talking about going to war. Far from it. Indeed, I wonder whether we do not now have to be deeply concerned over the consequences of a complete victory for either side, and whether it is not more than ever important for us to try to bring about a peace, if it can be done on any decent basis. But I disagree with the gentleman who preceded me the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] fundamentally, when he said that the President and the Secretary of State were under the domination of organizations that do not have the best interest of the United States at heart. I think such a charge is ridiculous, without foundation, and I regret that the gentleman made it; and what I most of all want to see is a united America doing its own thinking, and carrying on her work of strengthening the defenses—military, economic, and spiritual—of our democracy. That defense must be directed against economic problems and bad conditions, against unemployment, against confusion or hopelessness, and it must be directed against people in our country, no matter who they may be or how respectable they may be, who seek to make us ready to accept any type of totalitarian system. At the same time we must pursue our course in foreign policy, calculated first of all to make the United States invulnerable in the Western Hemisphere, to take a very realistic view of all that defense of our hemisphere implies, and in our relations with foreign powers to do everything we can to promote freedom of democracy and free government, and to prevent world conquest by anyone.

May I close by saying that I deeply regret an action that the House took on a day last week when I was absent. I think the House did an injustice to a certain individual and I said so before I left. I am speaking of David Lasser. I regret that, because I think it was an undignified thing for the House to do and I do not think it acted on good evidence—certainly not on anything like all the evidence. This kind of personal legislation is, in my judgment, a most dangerous thing. It has been condemned broadly in the press as the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun indicates:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 22, 1941]

FATE WINS ANOTHER SKIRMISH WITH MR. DAVID LASSER

Most of us have an occasional bout with Fate. Sometimes we go down; sometimes we survive. But the encounters are rare, and they are not, generally speaking, particularly personalized. Fate doesn't seem to have a special grudge against us as individuals.

Mr. David Lasser's case is different. Fate, acting through the Congress of the United States, has just shot Mr. Lasser's W. P. A. job from under him. It wasn't a tremendous job, as such things go. It paid $4,400 a year. But the Congress of the United States devoted precious hours to it, and today Mr. Lasser is once more the victim of the mills of the gods.

Yet the chances are that Mr. Lasser was as wholehearted, as enthusiastic, and as devoted a servant of the people as any in Washington. Mr. Lasser has always been a wholehearted devotee of his job. His job, in fact, has always been to him an opportunity. Maybe that's why Fate singles him out for its recurrent attacks.

Back in 1928 he devoted himself to the cause of Mr. Herbert Hoover. But Fate, discovering Mr. Lasser's devotion for Mr. Hoover, proceeded to erase Mr. Hoover. Along came technocracy. Mr. Lasser saw the light and devoted himself to technocracy. Fate heard about it and erased technocracy. Mr. Lasser devoted himself to the cause of the Interplanetary Society, whose ambition it was to send a rocket to the moon. Fate, in alliance with the gravitational force, erased that cause.

His head bloody but unbowed, Mr. Lasser teamed up with the unemployed and organized the Workers Alliance, the one big union of W. P. A. workers. The Dies committee proved to Mr. Lasser's satisfaction that he was being used as a cat's-paw of the Communists. Being a patriot, he rebelled, which is to say he was out of a job again.

That was the last heard of him until it transpired that he was on the W. P. A. pay roll at $4,400 a year, devoting himself, we may be sure, with wholehearted zeal to this new cause. But Fate wasn't through with him, and the congressional action of Friday was the result.

Fate has thus won another skirmish with the man she most delights to torment. But don't jump to the conclusion that Mr. Lasser is licked. Where he goes from here we have no means of knowing, but it is dollars to doughnuts that in a few months, despite all the dark powers, Mr. Lasser will have found a new cause and will be giving it all he's got. Some will pity him, but not we; we have a hunch he'll lick Fate yet.

Mr. Lasser personally may not be so important. But the principle involved is. To the extent the House acts in extreme fashion like this—and against the wrong people at that—to the extent it takes action that certainly savors of censorship of ideas and punishment of people—not for disloyalty to our country but simply for being distasteful to the House—to that extent we are falling short of the kind of considered action the times demand of us.

Never, perhaps, was so much demanded of the Members of an American Congress. But not the least of our duty at the present time is the duty of thinking things through as we go along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM.] I had intended this afternoon to offer an amendment to this deficiency bill to take care of the recent flood damages in the middle Rio Grande conservancy district. Unfortunately the parliamentary situation is such that that matter is not yet ready. The Bureau of the Budget has net yet had a chance to finish with it.

I do appreciate the courtesy of the Committee in giving me a chance to make this statement and to express the feeling of the people in the district of their debt of gratitude to the various governmental agencies, which have been helping with the flood. I want to mention the Reclamation Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farm Security Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Indian Service and the present very sympathetic attitude on the part of the Bureau of the Budget. We hope we are going to have some relief. Water in the arid States can be our greatest friend or our greatest enemy. This year we happen to have too much of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall probably vote for this deficiency bill, but with my fingers crossed, because I think many more cuts might well have been made.

Spreading administrative expenses in payment of salaries larger than the beneficiaries ever received before and involving so many other things, among others relating to people of questionable Americanism, can but eventually "kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

Promises and pledges at such a time as this from some people are not wholly to be relied upon, sad but true as that may be, if experience is to be the test.

Appropriations for nonessentials for defense should be pared to the bone and the bone scraped. They have not been so pared.

We all know that production has bogged down. Deny it—who dares who tells the truth.

Congress has provided the means. The end sought and promised has not been achieved or accomplished. Who is to blame? Do not ask me. You know.

It is not our money we are spending so lavishly. Do not forget it. There will be a day of reckoning. See your next tax bill.

One other thing that intrigues me is the fact that when and if Mr. Hitler stands on the shore of Bering Straits, what a changed attitude will be immediately reflected by those in the far West so unsympathetic with us of the East, who have had to live under the threat of his promised program to attack us so long.

Unity, yes; but, like charity, it begins at home. It is not far from the Straits to Washington and Oregon and Wyoming and Minnesota and on eastward. It is time for the folks who live West to think East. They will get a chance to do it unless all signs fail. If we are going to build ships, let us do it in Washington and Oregon and/or the west coast, for toward that area this man Hitler is looking today as his next jumping-off place after he cleans up Russia.

Some of my far western friends will sing a different song when Hitler threatens them instead of New England.

As they say in the Farmers' Almanac, "about this time look for" a white rabbit pulled out of the White House hat. It is overdue. How rabbits do multiply. A sucker is still born, or perhaps better, "yet" born, every 1½ minutes, and the American people had better wake up if they are ever going to do it. If ever a people were sold down the river, we are it.

We are in the war and we have a dictator, beneficent or not, as time may tell. He wished it on himself and the people have only themselves to blame. It is their Government to lose or to save. I am for saving it.

BIGGER AND BETTER BOMBERS AS AGAINST THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

It must be apparent to everybody not deaf, dumb, and blind this morning that we better move defensively as rapidly and expeditiously as we can in order to establish our air bases at the earliest moment and to make possible communication with our eastern, western, and far northern outposts by air and sea and highway.

We should have long ago constructed the Nicaraguan canal.

Be that as it may, what we need now is action—the delivery of more airplanes, the completion of more defensive air bases in Alaska and Greenland and elsewhere, more tanks and the roads over which to roll them, and, of course, the air bases to the south. All of this means it is our first business to stop strikes in defense industries. Let us define a defense policy and stick to it.

We do not need the St. Lawrence waterway for defense.

Moreover, social gains and business as usual are things not to be considered. The potential power the St. Lawrence waterway might develop we can easily generate by steam through the installation of proper machinery in a thousand idle plants scattered all over this country. Everybody knows it.

Then the argument that we need shipyards in the Great Lakes for national defense is hoist by its own petard. To build shipyards in the Great Lakes is to invite attack upon that section of our country. It does not make sense for 40 other reasons, all good.

Why should we have to learn everything the hard way? Why cannot we profit by the costly experience of others? Keep the shipyards on the coasts and away from the center of our country.

Look at the Maginot line and the dream of France to fight by phalanx behind a stone wall—or in or out of a trench. That day has gone. France learned that to its everlasting sorrow. Now we are trying to hide behind the Navy as a first line of defense. It just cannot be done that way any more. Believe it or not.

SHIP SUPPLY BOLONEY

We do not need the St. Lawrence waterway as a source of supply for ships. We better wake up to realize that what we need is planes, and tanks, and ammunition, more and bigger and better bombers. The day of the ship is sinking in the West.

NOT NEEDED AS POWER SUPPLY

We do not need the waterway as a source of water power or energy.

There is hardly a manufacturing town in the United States in which there is not a factory or plant that could be utilized for the development of power—if there were a scarcity, which there is not—if existing facilities were developed and used. We still have coal and oil and wood. They should be utilized before billions of the taxpayers' money is spent on the St. Lawrence project, especially at this time.

NAVY NOT THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

I agree that in all probability we shall always need, and must have, the Navy to control the sea. We should, however, now know that as our first line of defense the Navy has lost its traditional place. If the war across the seas has made anything plain, it seems to me that is it.

Those who insist that this is not so will join the Frenchmen who constructed the Maginot lines. It does not take a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, to venture such an assertion. It is axiomatic. The sooner Congress realizes this truth and declines to be rushed off its feet into a program of spending more and more money for the construction of a limitless number of ships, so soon to be obsolescent; the sooner it realizes that the battles of the future will be fought in, and defended from attacks made in the air the sooner it insists that every necessary step be taken to insure, to guarantee, and to procure the manufacture and delivery of the maximum number of Army and Navy planes and tanks for our defense, the quicker we will be adequately prepared to defend ourselves.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY BOMBERS FOR A SHIP

Then, again, few people realize that a capital ships costs more than $100,000,000, for which sum we could buy 250 bombers. Is there anyone in his right mind who will contend that we should not have the 250 bombers instead of 1 ship?

It is almost a crime to waste money on a shipbuilding project in the middle of the United States when for the cost of 1 ship we can build 250 bombers.

Then, my friends, for what the canal will cost we could build more than all the bombers we might ever need for defense. We need bombers, not ships, today. So long as there is coal and oil and wood we can generate steam to make electric power in abundance, in abandoned and unused but available plants all over this country.

Then, again, you cannot successfully fight airplanes from the deck of a ship. I know, if you ask me. I have seen it tried. One destructive bomb will cripple the biggest and best of boats.

TO EUROPE AND BACK

Such bombers as I am talking about could fly to Europe and return, each carrying a load of at least 20 tons of explosives. Think that over.

I concede again that we need the Navy, and shall always need it, and it should be the best and most powerful fleet afloat. But only the most obtuse can fail to know that the part it has played strategically in warfare as of days of old it will never play again.

MORE PLANES

What we need is more and more planes. We need bigger and better bombers. We need faster pursuit and attack planes. The energy, brains, and ability of America should be concentrated, directed, and devoted to the relief of our desperate need for and in respect to these defensive armaments.

We ought to realize the fact that a new weapon for warfare has appeared, as one does in every crisis in world history. There was the Roman short sword, and gunpowder, and the British ship of the line, and now comes the bomber, which has already made the history books obsolete, changed the strategic geography of Europe and Asia and Africa, and is changing the strategic geography of this hemisphere.

It has rewritten the tactics of attack and defense, revised the art of war, opened up the new high battlefield of the stratosphere, and has disturbed the political balance of the world.

The erstwhile protecting moats of the Atlantic and Pacific no longer offer a defense against this engine of devastation and destruction which passes unhindered from continent to continent over land or across the seven seas.

As sea power once did, so air power will, inevitably, if it has not already done so tentatively, concentrate dominion within those few nations that shall have the brain, the vision, and the courage to break away from the traditional order, recognize the facts and threat of the future as well as of the present, and devote time, energy, and resources to the development and production of everything their resources can command to gain and retain the control of the air.

In such a race for supremacy in the air the United States has nothing to fear if it will only wake up and get out of the cradle where it now "lays itself down in peace to sleep."

We have the men, the women, the brains, the resources, if we will but use them.

In the face and eyes of facts, it is a wasteful extravagance—and that is a modest and very polite characterization of the project—for us to spend a nickel on the St. Lawrence waterway in order to build ships that will be obsolete before they are ever in the water.

DAY OF SHIPS SINKING IN THE WEST

It seems to me—

Says Major Seversky—

suicidal to make navies and an outmoded naval strategy the foundation of American national defense. Those who insist upon leading America in that direction are heading us for disaster. They assume a fearsome responsibility before the judgment of history.

Why now talk about the St. Lawrence waterway?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 6 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not so essential that I impose my wisdom upon the House this afternoon, but there is a matter that I think ought to be made a matter of record. That is a question that will arise as the result of the administration of the so-called Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

Sunday of this week will mark the seventy-sixth anniversary of the birth of a great crusader against monopoly, the late Hon. William Edgar Borah. It will be 76 years ago Sunday that he was born in Fairfield, Ill., and from the time that he finished his law work at Lawrence, Kans., and then lived on the fringe of the frontier in Idaho, Senator Borah was a relentless crusader against monopoly. But I can see now some monopoly problems that will arise as a result of the administration of O. P. A. C. S. It would be interesting indeed to know the observation of Senator Borah if he were here today.

I examined Mr. Henderson's testimony at considerable length. They are going to set up a division for civilian supplies. After the priority division gets its share for national defense, the rest of it must be rationed and allocated to civilian needs.

Then there is the price division and the consumers' division. Mr. Henderson realizes that he has got a bear by the tail. He realizes first of all, I think, that when he sets a ceiling on the price of hides or cotton yarn or any one of a thousand and one commodities he cannot be sure that the gentlemen down in the Department of Justice who have been relentlessly crusading against monopoly in the Antitrust Division will not entirely ignore every agreement that is made by the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, and despite such an agreement start out for the purpose of bringing them to bay by means of a very handy instrument which we call an indictment in the Federal court.

I notice in the hearings Mr. Henderson said he did not want anything like the Madison oil case to bob up in his face. Members will recall that case at Madison, Wis.

When the United States put the oil companies on trial up at Madison, Wis., one of the things set forth in their defense was a letter signed by Mr. Ickes in his capacity as administrator at the time it was written, to the effect that they had a right to make certain prices, set certain ceilings, establish certain agreements, but of course when the N. I. R. A. was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court it was fair to assume that that provision which nullified the act of 1890, as amended, and all so-called antitrust legislation upon the books, once more resumed its legislative force. But they continued to perpetuate the idea long after N. I. R. A. had been sent into oblivion. Mr. Henderson recognizes that fact as he deals with the question of imposing price ceilings, affecting price balances and price stability over a tremendous range of commodities. I am informed that he has had some consultations and conferences with the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice. I am not informed as to exactly what happened therein.

I doubt very much in the light of the activities of Thurman Arnold up to date that he will agree to anything. I had some businessmen from Chicago in my office yesterday morning. They are purveyors of a commodity on which Opacs thought there ought to be a price ceiling. That commodity happened to be hides. They agreed that 15 cents would be all right although they had some commitments to sell at 17 cents a pound.

There is, however, no assurance that if the packers of the country eventually should agree on a price rate of 15 cents a pound that Mr. Arnold would not rush in with an indictment and say: "Wait a minute. That may be all right according to Mr. Henderson's view in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, but the law of 1890 and the Clayton Act are still upon the law books of the land and in consequence we are going to bring you into Federal court and make you stand trial for having violated the law."

It is a tremendous proposition. It is going to be administered by 1,400 people for whom they are asking an appropriation of $3,769,000 for the fiscal year 1942. I say they ought to be very careful to develop a little bit of cooperation between the various departments of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never think of that word "cooperation" but what I think of a youngster in the country out in Illinois who bought his first Ford many years ago. He was, of course, the cynosure of all the other country boys. One of them came to him and said:

"How do you like your new Ford?"

"Swell."

"Does it steer easy on a country road, on a gravel road?"

He said it did.

"Did you ever try to steer it with one hand and put your other arm around your girl?"

"Yes."

He asked: "Well, can it be done safely?"

"Yes."

"Well, can you operate it safely and also kiss your girl?"

"Well, you can if you have a little cooperation."

It seems to me if this thing is going to be properly administered so that there will be no extraordinary dislocations in it and so they will not be hauling the business structure of the country into Federal court, if they are going to establish a price ceiling through Mr. Henderson's effort, there must certainly be sufficient cooperation that Mr. Arnold will not still have a crack at them. It will be interesting to see what happens as time goes on. Mr. Henderson realizes what a tremendous job he has. He stated in the hearings that there would be an increase in the price level. He said it would be miraculous if the price level and cost of living did not go up. Well, it would indeed be miraculous and I believe that everybody who has any knowledge whatever of the economic forces of the country realizes full well there is going to be a rise. He said also that you cannot have rigid price control without complete control over all elements of cost. Now if they forsake a basic pattern and just develop price stability and balance a relationship of price in one category as against another, and finally decide that there is no other way to deal with this matter except a rigid economic control of prices, then it will be the function and responsibility of Mr. Henderson's newly created division also to reach down into every component of cost that goes into a price; and that means what? That will mean control of wages. That will mean control of the cost of raw materials, and there will be no single commodity of any kind in the United States of America that can ever escape. Then we shall have embraced a wholly undemocratic process within our own democracy. It is going to be worth going miles to see if Mr. Henderson can do it, and I wish him well in his undertaking.

The three principal divisions in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply will be the Supply Division, which will deal with stimulation of production of civilian supplies of all kinds and the allocation of supplies after defense needs have been provided.

The Consumer Division will, no doubt, be on the alert for consumer protection, and the Price Division will deal with the business structure of the country in reaching agreements on price ceiling and price relationships, which is expected to prevent the spiralling and the dislocations which we experienced during the World War. The general scope of Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply is, of course, all set out in the Executive order of April 11, 1941. Already some question has arisen concerning the authority which it enjoys by virtue of this Executive order and I assume that when the first tests of strength arise this question of authority will, no doubt, be raised. I feel, however, that one of the most important things before it is the question of reaching a suitable agreement with the Department of Justice in respect to any price agreements which may be made so that businessmen in the country, who in the utmost good faith are willing to cooperate with the Office of Price Administration should not be harassed and annoyed and threatened by the Antitrust Division. Let it be fully understood in advance what their rights are with respect to all agencies of Government before they are asked to commit themselves in the matter of price ceiling. This is but equity and fairness and common sense.

I am merely suggesting it to the attention of the Congress today in connection with the appropriation for this agency because it will become one of the most potential and far-reaching Government instrumentalities which has even been created. It will reach into every element of the economic life of this country and the time to avoid unnecessary frictions and misunderstandings is in advance before the huge mass of regulations which must be issued will have taken on that rigid cast which can only be disturbed by compelling the citizens of this country to resort to expensive litigation.

Insofar as the hearings disclose, this matter was not discussed before the committee. At sometime in the near future the Congress as representative of the ople will be called upon to look into this matter and I trust that a satisfactory and agreeable working arrangement can be contrived between the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Justice.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the committee for inserting section 303 in this act. I read a portion of it:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

This should be a general provision of law and should apply to all agencies of the Federal Government. The United States should not employ anyone who is a member of any subversive organization.

I am sorry there is no item in this bill for the United States Housing Authority, because if there were I should offer an amendment providing that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of Bernard Ades.

Mr. Chairman, on June 12 I informed the House that Bernard Ades, a former Baltimorean now residing at Arlington, Va., is employed with the United States Housing Authority. He is a leader affiliated with Communist groups. With so many worthy people seeking employment, why should the Government employ people like that? That money is paid in taxes by people who hate and despise Communists. I called the United States Housing Administrator, Mr. Nathan Straus, and asked for Ades' immediate dismissal.

Ades was Communist candidate for Governor of Maryland in 1934 and received approximately 800 votes. Tampa, Fla., authorities also became acquainted with Ades in the summer of 1932, when he was taken into custody and while police investigated his activities on behalf of Communists.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. May I say that the gentleman is to be commended for bringing to the attention of the officials of this Government the employment of this man Ades. The mere fact he ran for Governor of the State of Maryland on the Communist ticket a few years ago, then slipped away and sneaked in from some other State, should be sufficient reason for the authorities to get rid of him without offering any amendment on the floor of the House.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

From the Federal Supplement, Volume 6, at page 470, in re Ades, I quote Circuit Judge Morris A. Soper:

He belonged to the Communist Party, and believed that it is difficult in the courts of this country to secure full recognition of the rights of laboring men or members of inferior races, because judges and other officials are usually chosen from the ruling or favored classes, a belief not commonly held in a country where officials are elected by the people or chosen by their representatives.

He was suspended from the practice of law by the supreme bench of Baltimore City and was reprimanded by Judge Morris C. Soper, circuit judge of the United States District Court, for inciting race prejudice. In 1931 and in 1933 he led a riot in the Maryland Legislature, and on March 7, 1932, caused a riot near the Japanese Embassy.

The people of Maryland were shocked when they learned that this man Ades is now in the Government employ. I have voted consistently for all amendments prohibiting members of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist Parties from receiving jobs from the Federal Government.

In view of these facts, I again congratulate the committee for this provision and ask that it be included in all the appropriation bills.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STRATTON. Does the gentleman see any point in withholding this money from a handfull of Communists in this country, yet aiding two or three hundred million Communists over in Russia?

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I am not for aiding Communists anywhere. I am glad the isms are fighting each other and I hope they destroy each other.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this deficiency appropriation bill which provides the salaries for many Government employees, I want to call the attention of this committee to a yellow sheet that I hold in my hand which ridicules and maligns the so-called Dies committee. It deliberately misrepresents the record of that committee.

This yellow sheet is signed by one Hugh Miller, who I understand is on the pay roll of the Bituminous Coal Commission. It is in the nature of a brickbat thrown at the Dies committee. Whether it is deserving or not we will let the House decide.

This yellow sheet is dated June 13, 1941, 1410 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. It is headed "Washington Committee for Democratic Action"—democratic action as interpreted by, sanctioned by, and approved by, Stalin and all of his followers—that is the only kind of democratic action such a committee stands for.

This yellow sheet reads in part as follows:

Our old friends, the Dies committee detective agency extraordinary, are at it again. This time they are spending your, and other taxpayers' money to question Government workers as to their private activities and beliefs.

It reads also:

Normally, everyone would be anxious to cooperate with a congressional committee—and the first reaction would be to answer questions asked. But the record of the Dies committee speaks for itself. That record shows that misrepresentation has been consistently employed by the committee to make its points, and very little attention has been paid to facts. The committee's record clearly shows that it is not interested in fair play or in an objective presentation of the facts. To answer questions put by Dies' agents at your home or office is to put you in a completely defenseless position. What they report on your answers only they themselves know.

Ridiculing, maligning, and misrepresenting.

The concluding paragraph reads:

In conclusion, don't be too alarmed if the Dies agents drop in for a chit-chat. It is perfectly all right merely to remark on the weather and bid them good day.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of the contents of this yellow sheet what else can we expect from Government employees, and this sheet was sent out to hundreds of Government employees, when Government officials high up have set the example to these employees by ridiculing, maligning, and misrepresenting the committee?

On the letterhead I notice the name of Harry C. Lamberton as counsel for this Washington Committee for Democratic Action, the same Harry C. Lamberton I exposed 2½ years ago as an official for the then League for Peace and Democracy, who when the league was indicted by the Dies committee for being Communist inspired, Communist controlled, and having Communist objectives, answered by putting on a drive here in the District among Government employees for membership.

Mr. Chairman, it is time this House cleaned house.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

THE BATTLE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the campaign of 1934, repeatedly on the stump throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, the attention of the voters was called by me to a statement attributed to Bainbridge Colby, who at one time was Wilson's Secretary of State. He was reported to have said in 1934:

So completely has the administration turned its interest and its energies away from business recovery that it is openly charged, and indeed admitted, that a substantial number of the President's immediate advisers are not desirous of business revival, feeling that

to prolong the depression will produce a better psychological background for the prosecution of their revolutionary designs. The overturn of our institutions, including the Constitution, is their avowed goal.

Because I publicly repeated this statement many times and charged that Roosevelt and his associates were following a course which, in the end, would destroy our Republic, I was bitterly criticized, branded as an unfair partisan and a crank.

Subsequent events have shown that Bainbridge Colby and Dr. Wirt, who exposed the subversive influences in the New Deal, were right.

Today, in an editorial in the June 27 issue of the United States News is found proof that Roosevelt and his New Deal friends are in a position to celebrate the accomplishment of the purpose indicated by Colby in 1934. This editorial is by David Lawrence, who was for long a supporter of Roosevelt and his administration. Lawrence's sense of honesty, his fairness, his traditions as a newspaper man, force him to the conclusions which he expresses in this editorial, which is as follows:

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON—CONTEST BETWEEN GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP GROUPS AND LIBERAL CONSERVATIVES IS BREAKING DOWN MORALE—MR. ICKES AS A RECKLESS CRITIC OF INDUSTRY BRINGS DISCORD

(By David Lawrence)

The Battle of the Atlantic is the more spectacular and hence we have been inclined to give less thought to the Battle of Washington. Yet the first cannot be won unless the second is ended—and ended at once lest America's industrial operation be impaired to such an extent that the race against time will be lost.

What is the Battle of Washington? It is the continuance under the eyes of the President of a conflict between two schools of thought—the radical and confiscationist group who may not admit it publicly but who are moving us gradually toward a system of state capitalism, and the liberal conservative groups who believe that with honest and efficient regulation by the Government in certain areas of human endeavor the system of individual effort, with risk capital supplied by the savings of the citizens, can be maintained.

The battle is not just an academic debate. It reaches into the heart and soul of our defense effort. It is like a cancer gnawing away at efficiency every day and causing a steady disintegration of enthusiasm and initiative. Unless this battle is ended by an enlightened public opinion which must demand its immediate cessation, we shall make a flop of our aid-to-Britain policy and will find ourselves with such a disorganized and demoralized economy that no moderate group from either school of though will have the upper hand and the collectivists with their cruel philosophies of life will come into power in America.

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE FOR AIR OF DISTRUST

Let us at the outset clear the air of the charges and countercharges about patriotism. Each side considers itself patriotic and unquestionably is devoted to America's interest. But unhappily the administration keeps in power men who breed distrust and hate. The appointment of Harold Ickes as petroleum coordinator is one of the most unfortunate episodes of the war period. It is unfortunate because, except for Mr. Roosevelt's friendship for the Secretary of the Interior, there was no good reason why public authority should be vested in a man who is temperamentally unfitted to win the cooperation of the public.

An example of Mr. Ickes' recklessness was given in his testimony before a Senate committee last week. Although aluminum is essential to national defense and everything that can be done ought to be done to encourage its production, Mr. Ickes lambasted the Aluminum Co. of America as unpatriotic and uncooperative. He went so far as to say that if this war is lost the defeat may well be attributed to the Aluminum Co. of America.

ARMY AND NAVY UNDERESTIMATED AIRPLANE NEEDS

Now the facts about aluminum are not difficult to obtain. The Aluminum Co. has produced most of the aluminum for this country. It has, of course, been a successful company. That makes it, in Mr. Ickes' eyes, a monopoly. By his own testimony he refused to grant the company the electric power it asked for at Bonneville Dam this year and gave as his excuse that he didn't want to foster monopoly. In time of emergency other branches of the Government are doing their utmost to get production wherever they can. This is no time to stop and argue about monopolies or politics. Yet Mr. Ickes has held up the expansion of the aluminum program of the national-defense effort by his petty politics.

There are a lot of destructionists of the Ickes type around the Government. They spread distrust. They disseminate attacks on the dollar-a-year men. They give the impression that in America as in Soviet Russia there must be political commissars alongside of all administrators so as to watch them.

The Aluminum Co. did guess wrong about the amount of aluminum needed. But it guessed wrong because the Army and the Navy guessed wrong. And for that matter the administration itself guessed wrong when it didn't foresee after the invasion of Holland and Belgium in May 1940 that the United States must sooner or later supply vast quantities of tools and weapons for Britain's battle against Hitler.

Yet, as it will be recalled, the President wanted to send Congress home in June 1940 and as for the airplane program it never really reached real proportions in Government planning until about April 1941. Was it the business of the Aluminum Co. to increase its capacity fourfold on the theoretical chance that the Government might want more planes? It had already increased its capacity by 200 percent over its 1939 production, and by July 1942 will have increased it by 300 percent, using its own capital.

As recently as last January the Aluminum Co. took the estimates of the War Department and doubled them, and felt that there would be enough aluminum for national defense. As recently as May 14, too, an official of the Aluminum Co. testified that there was enough aluminum for the then existing defense needs. Mr. Ickes says this was incorrect, and he implies that the official in question did not tell the truth. Maybe Mr. Ickes didn't stop to look at the contracts awarded but was depending on the fantastic guesses about aluminum requirements that float around Washington these days.

It takes 80,000 pounds of aluminum for a bomber of the type now being planned. Will 6,000 bombers be built in 1942? It would be a wonderful achievement if that could be done. It would take 480,000,000 pounds of aluminum to do that job in 1942. But by July 1942, aluminum production on the North American Continent will be up to 1,200,000,000 pounds, and this does not count in the extra 600,000,000 pounds planned for the new plants which are to be owned by the Government and managed under lease by private companies. The latter quota cannot be attained unless a better reallocation of electric power is worked out. This isn't the business of the Aluminum Co., but of the electric-power industry which has been harassed by the Government these last few years when it should have been permitted to expand.

COURTS WILL DECIDE QUESTION OF MONOPOLY

But that America will have enough aluminum to keep abreast of airplane production does not need to be doubted. Meanwhile, Mr. Ickes joins the chorus of saboteurs who for 3 years have been trying to ruin the Aluminum Co. and drive it out of business. An antitrust suit has been going on in the Federal courts ever since the outbreak of the war. The verdict has not been rendered by the judge who has it under advisement, but Mr. Ickes nonchalantly convicts the company just the same. The company executives have spent months upon months in the courtroom. Can any company do intelligent planning when the sword of persecution is hanging over its head? Why is it so important to break up the business of the principal aluminum producer right now?

In fairness to Mr. Ickes it must be said that he did not initiate the antitrust suit. The chief lawyer who for nearly 2 years conducted the case for the Department of Justice resigned only last month to become vice president of an aluminum company just helped materially by R. F. C. money into a position of competition with the Aluminum Co. of America. Every man has a right to take whatever job he wants to improve his personal position. But it is unfortunate that a prosecuting attorney steps into the office of a rival of the defendant when that rival is being aided by Government funds.

VITALITY OF OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM IS BEING SAPPED

The President is to be admired for his loyalty to friends, but the public interest demands that he put aside friendships and end the Battle of Washington. Mr. Ickes told a Senate committee he wanted the Government to reserve the right to continue to operate alumnium plants after the war emergency is over. He said these plants and facilities should be retained so as to help keep prices down. Is that the kind of tactics which will breed confidence? Isn't Mr. Ickes waving the red flag of Government ownership at industry? How much enthusiasm can anyone have for the defense program when New Deal officials are brandishing weapons of destruction over the heads of private business?

The next target is the steel and oil industries. The case of aluminum is merely an example of what sort of an attack is launched as a preliminary to the extension of a system of governmental control and operation. It begins to look as if the way is being paved for national socialism with the war emergency as the excuse.

Even the Members of Congress are asleep at the switch in this battle. Many of them are so busy running errands for their constituents that they have failed to perceive the nature of the controversy going on in front of their very eyes.

Congress has a major obligation in the international crisis. It is, in simple terms, to preserve unity in America by demanding the removal of those public officials who are using the defense program to feather their own nests in their lust for power. Those who would harass American business by threats of prosecution or by reckless charges at a time when an all-out effort for defense is needed must be summarily eliminated from the scene. The Battle of Washington is sapping the vitality of the American economic system, and it is the duty of the Congress to insist that Government management of the defense effort be cleansed of its intemperate protagonists.

Yes; the battle in Washington is on. It has been on for several years. Various

victories have been proclaimed by Roosevelt. Do you remember when he said:

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government, this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy, such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

He is now using those powers, of the return of which he boasted, to shackle the liberties of the people. He has packed the Supreme Court, which today is his tool. He has listened to the Communists in the C. I. O., and his wife has, without rebuke from him, openly given them aid and encouragement.

He has deceived us time and again. He has made promises which he has not kept, and by fraud and deception he is now taking us into a war which the American people do not want.

To Congress alone is the power granted by the Constitution to declare war. Nevertheless, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in utter disregard of the constitutional provision, is carrying on an undeclared war. By evasion and subterfuge he has usurped the functions of Congress. By the appointment of puppet judges he has taken over the judicial power, and today he is denying to the people of America the "four freedoms" which he proclaims are essential if liberty and freedom are to exist and which he pretends he desires to carry to the four corners of the earth.

He should be impeached.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, fiscal year 1942, $87,600.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 2, after line 19, insert the following:

"Reporting hearings: The unexpended balance of any appropriation available for obligation during the fiscal year 1940 for stenographic reports of hearings of committees other than special and select committees is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses to enable the Office of Government Reports to perform the functions prescribed by the act entitled "An act authorizing expenditures for the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President," approved June 9, 1941 (Public Law 107, 77th Cong.), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting service; lawbooks, books of reference, directories, periodicals; newspapers and press clippings; and purchase (not to exceed $750), operation and maintenance of passenger-carrying automobiles, fiscal year 1942, $1,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, lines 12 to 23, inclusive, strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering the Congress the opportunity to save $1,000,000 on the Office of Government Reports. I do not believe it serves a useful function. I believe every bit of the information they have available is contained in either the Congressional Directory or in the documents that are prepared and gotten out by the different departments. An enormous amount of information service is provided in each department that can very well be done away with.

For the operation of clipping items and that sort of thing they are spending at least double what it costs private establishments to do that work with fewer people. Why they need to do it is beyond me.

The Office for Emergency Management has an information service that costs $700,000 or $800,000, and there are all sorts of agencies of that character set up all the way through the Government, so many economists, so many professors, and so many writers in almost every agency at high prices, way beyond what they ever got in private industry or in the schools. It is perfectly ridiculous.

Under the circumstances, I can see no way to get rid of this cancer without cutting it out. I am offering this amendment to save $1,000,000 on this bill and at the same time get rid of that cancerous growth of publicity and alleged information agencies that are very largely duplicating other activities of the Government at this time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Government Reports only very recently was ratified by legislative action. Until the last 3 years appropriations for this activity had been carried by allocations from funds in the relief bill, but within the last 30 or 60 days the regular legislative committee of this House considered and reported to the House a bill for the Office of Government Reports and authorizing an appropriation of not to exceed $1,500,000, and that bill was debated in the House, passed by both bodies, and signed by the President on June 9 last.

The Budget estimate was for $1,444,000. The committee has trimmed that down to $1,015,000. We have saved $429,000, we hope. This gives that agency slightly less than it had for this current fiscal year.

It seems to me that in view of the emphatic and deliberate action taken by the Congress in establishing the agency, it certainly would be most inconsistent now to withhold the appropriation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a part of the Executive Office, answerable directly to the President of the United States?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. It was at his request that the legislative committee reported the bill, the House passed the bill, and the Senate passed the bill. Heretofore the President of the United States has never refused to approve any appropriation the Congress has desired for the legislative branch of the Government. Why should the Congress deny the President of the United States the tools to do the job we put on him?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 22, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

National historical parks and monuments: For an additional amount for administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement, including not to exceed $1,050 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles, fiscal year 1942, $18,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall charge appropriate fees for the parking of automobiles in the Mount Rushmore National Memorial area: *Provided further*, That the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission shall cease to exist or function on June 30, 1942.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 23, which reads:

Provided, That hereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall charge appropriate fees for the parking of automobiles in the Mount Rushmore National Memorial area.

That it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is directly contrary to the fundamental Rushmore Act.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in order that the RECORD may be complete, I desire to state that the basis for my making the point of order against the language to require the charge of a parking fee within the Mount Rushmore Memorial area is that such a proposal violates language in the basic Rushmore Act which reads:

No charge shall ever be made for admission to the memorial grounds or for viewing the memorial.

That language was carried in the Mount Rushmore Act of February 25, 1929, and repeated in the act of June 15, 1938. All the private contributions that were made in the early stages of matching the Federal contributions, amounting to around $90,000 and all subsequent

Federal appropriations have been made on the basis of the promise explicit in those statutes.

The language which was stricken out by the Chair on the point of order I raised would have changed that basic law and would have broken faith with the private contributors and with the understanding on which appropriations have been made. Certainly, few will contend that should be done without an opportunity for interested persons to be heard. To prevent such a thing being done is exactly why, I presume, that the House rules include the rule on which the point of order was based.

It is the policy of the National Park Service, I know, to establish fees of some sort in connection with areas that they administer. That is responsible for the language that was suggested in the Budget estimate and carried in the bill. The language as drawn, however, not only would have changed the basic Rushmore Act without an opportunity for a legislative hearing, but would have been impractical of operation.

Mount Rushmore Memorial embraces 1,800 acres, much of which strings out in the fashion of a parkway over many miles of mountain road approaching the memorial from several directions. Collection of a fee from every car that should park for a few minutes somewhere along the climbing mountain road would be required under the language proposed, as well as from cars immediately at the foot of the mountain carrying the sculptured figures. Collection of a fee from every car that stopped at the studio grounds a quarter of a mile below the figures would practically deprive people of the opportunity to view the memorial at close range because the memorial is several miles from any town, and people just do not walk out there. They go by car.

These things suggest some of the practical difficulties involved in applying the language that was proposed. In addition, there is the fundamental question of whether any fee should be charged for the opportunity to see and catch the inspiration from the heroic heads of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt sculptured on the mountain. Most of us have thought that funds spent at Rushmore were an investment in patriotism. Rushmore was to tell this and future generations something of the character and spirit of the men who gave life and form to the American Republic. To put a tin cup in front of the visitor at this patriotic shrine would be like putting a streetcar conductor's coin purse in front of a visitor as he comes under the spell of the Great Emancipator in the Lincoln Memorial downtown.

These considerations impelled me to make the point of order. Now, then, if in keeping with national-park policy, a method should be found to gather in some funds in order that the memorial may be more or less self-sustaining, I would suggest that consideration be given to placing a small charge on the use of the stairway, consisting of several hundred steps, that leads from the studio up the mountainside to the figures themselves. Such a fee, if charged per person, would probably yield as much as a charge per car for parking, and no one would be obliged to pay it unless he cared to use the stairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

Restoration, capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938, fiscal year 1941, $4,500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 46, line 11, strike out "$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,637,455.51."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a report of the Judge Advocate of the Twenty-seventh Division, United States Army, be included as a part of my remarks made in the Committee of the Whole on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein excerpts from books and documents to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein certain quotations from David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by Clarence Budington Kelland, at Clinton, Conn., on May 22, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 30, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and all legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times, when the American taxpayer is being called upon to bear a far heavier load than at any other period in our history, it is a poor occasion to authorize the construction of a project whose benefits are so questionable and whose cost is so extravagant as the St. Lawrence seaway.

Many Illinois and Midwest shippers and consignees have been misled by loose statements to the effect that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway will make an ocean port out of the port of Chicago. As a result, some favor the seaway, believing that they will soon see the smoke of large oceangoing vessels from all parts of the globe. We propose to show here how completely shippers have been fooled by such propaganda; and that to talk of the St. Lawrence seaway making an ocean port out of the port of Chicago—any more than it now is—is a myth, pure and simple. When the shippers are given the true facts they will be in for a rude shock.

At many points between Montreal and Lake Ontario, the St. Lawrence River is unnavigable. A series of canals and locks have existed for many years to afford ships passage around the unnavigable parts of the river. These canals and locks furnish a 14-foot channel at the present time. The proposed St. Lawrence seaway would deepen these locks and canals—or build new ones—13 feet more to 27 feet. At first glance the average shipper would reach the conclusion that such a plan would permit the *Berengaria* or the *Queen Mary* to dock at the port of Chicago. The fact is that it is farcical to talk about a 27-foot channel making any material increase in the number of oceangoing boats using the Great Lakes.

A 27-foot channel is so shallow that only 30 percent of the world oceangoing tonnage could navigate it; and but 5 percent of the world oceangoing tonnage able to navigate it would be American vessels. In other words, 95 percent of the benefit would accrue to foreign-owned vessels.

The following statistics assembled by the Brookings Institution in 1929 are very pertinent, especially in view of the fact that the tendency since that time has been to build oceangoing vessels of deeper drafts.

First. A 27-foot waterway would only accommodate 15 percent of the passenger-cargo vessels engaged in United States overseas trade.

Second. A 27-foot channel could only be navigated by 19 percent of the cargo vessels or tankers engaged in our intercoastal trade.

The fact is that every man familiar with marine shipping knows that the proposed seaway would only take care of tramp vessels, and the great majority of these would be foreign owned.

Foreign-owned tramp vessels would prove a questionable asset—to say the most for them—for shippers or consignees in or out of Chicago. It is impractical to rely upon them. They give no regular service. A shipper cannot know when a tramp vessel will appear to pick up his freight. Furthermore, he cannot know when the freight will reach its destination after it is placed on board. The tramp vessel may visit a score of ports in foreign countries looking for business before reaching the port to which the freight was consigned from Chicago. In the meantime weeks and even months may have elapsed since the freight was loaded. It is well established that the day of the slow tramp vessel appears to be nearing its end. The speed-up in business and industry and the superior service given by large shipping companies operating upon regular schedules are writing the obituaries for tramp vessels. Consequently we may expect a constant diminution in the number of tramp vessels year by year.

The ocean-going freighters that now use the 14-foot channel are nearly all tramp vessels. Concretely, what have this 14-foot channel and tramp vessels meant to Chicago shippers and consignees, and what more may they expect from an increased depth of 27 feet and a continuance of tramp vessels?

Let us examine the records of the past in order to get an idea of what we might expect from a 27-foot channel and more tramp vessels.

My able colleagues from Cook County, Ill., Congressmen DEWEY and PADDOCK, have taken a keen interest in this subject and have furnished me with very illuminating figures regarding shipping at the port of Chicago. These tabulations concern freight moving by water in and out of the port of Chicago. In order to get representative figures we have taken an average of 5 years—1934 to 1938, both inclusive. We have not used the year 1939 at all, because war was declared in August of that year and water-borne traffic has not been normal since the declaration of war.

From the tabulations assembled, it will be seen that overseas traffic in and out of the port of Chicago is a negligible factor. It is only equal to 8 percent of the Canadian traffic in and out of the port of Chicago, and equal to only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the domestic—lakewise—traffic using the port.

If the 27-foot channel doubled the amount of overseas traffic in and out of the port of Chicago, the result would be that the overseas traffic would only be 1.4 percent of the domestic traffic. If it tripled the overseas traffic—which is beyond the widest stretch of the imagination—it would be but 2.1 percent of the domestic traffic; and if by most extraordinary circumstances it quadrupled the overseas traffic, it would equal but 2.8 percent of the domestic traffic.

It is safe to say that it would never come to pass that a 27-foot channel would even triple the overseas traffic on the Great Lakes. It is extremely doubtful if overseas traffic would be doubled. As we have already pointed out, shallow-draft vessels only will be the beneficiaries of a 27-foot channel. Substantially all vessels engaged in overseas trade with drafts shallow enough to navigate a 27-foot channel are tramp vessels. Consequently, all that a 27-foot channel would mean to Chicago shippers would be that a few additional tramp vessels—and most of them foreign owned—would be able to navigate the Great Lakes.

In addition to what we have just shown, there are at least two other factors that should be considered.

First. Because of long Canadian winters, ice conditions prevent the navigation of the canals adjacent to the St. Lawrence during 42 percent of the year. Consequently, the few tramp vessels that could navigate a 27-foot channel could not even give shippers service during almost one-half of the year.

Second. No major harbor in the Great Lakes is of sufficient depth to accommodate vessels requiring a 27-foot channel. That would mean that the proposed 27-foot channel would be useless to every Great Lakes port unless an enormous amount of money would be invested in harbor dredging. The same is true of parts of the St. Clair River, the Detroit River, the Lake St. Clair Channel, and the St. Marys River and locks. The cost of performing such dredging operations would be staggering.

The fact of the matter is that the St. Lawrence seaway project is not a bona fide seaway project at all. It is a power project masqueraded as a seaway plan in order to gain the support of people who believe that they are sponsoring a seaway. Everything points to that conclusion. It is beyond the realm of common sense that a government would spend a billion dollars to accommodate a relatively few tramp vessels that could not possibly increase the overseas tonnage beyond 2.8 percent of the domestic tonnage in and out of the port of Chicago.

The cost of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway has been the subject of varied estimates. At the outset let it be remembered that final costs of construction work of this kind invariably exceed the original estimates. The experience of other waterway projects in the past justifies this statement. For example, the estimated cost of the Chicago Drainage Canal was $16,000,000. Its actual cost was $53,000,000. The estimated cost of the Panama Canal was $160,000,000. Its actual cost was $375,000,000.

The 1926 Joint Board of Engineers estimate of costs was $426,757,000. But such estimate did not include the following:

First. Necessary harbor improvements: This item was not included at all in the 1926 report. The Niagara Frontier Planning Board has used a conservative figure of but $7,500,000 per harbor for each of the 13 harbors on the Great Lakes, or a total of $97,500,000. This is truly conservative when it is considered that the Brookings Institution adopted a figure of $25,000,000 for each of 10 harbors. In 1933 Senator WAGNER's minority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted a figure of $25,000,000 for each of 8 harbors. The engineering department of the city of Buffalo has estimated that complete improvement of Buffalo's harbor alone would cost $46,890,000. This item was not included at all in the 1926 estimate.

Second. Allowances for contingencies: The 1926 allowance for contingencies was 12½ percent, but this included engineering, legal fees, and so forth, which would amount to at least 7½ percent, leaving but 5 percent for contingencies. A figure of 5 percent for contingencies is perfectly absurd in the light of the experience of previous waterway projects which we have previously referred to. The excess cost of the Chicago Drainage Canal over and above the original estimate was 230 percent, that of the Suez Canal was 130 percent, and that of the Panama Canal was 130 percent. In view of this a schoolboy would appreciate that a figure of 5 percent for contingencies is utter nonsense.

Third. Interest during construction: This item was not included at all in the 1926 report. The invested capital during the long period of construction would be producing no revenue, and the United States would be operating with borrowed money. By every sound accounting principle, the Government should be entitled to 3 percent on the investment during the period of construction. It is difficult to understand how this item could possibly be omitted.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board has reached the conclusion that the probable first costs of the seaway would be at least $565,372,000. In reaching this conclusion a charge of padding the figures by the Planning Board could not possibly be made for the following reasons:

(a) The board added only 5 percent for contingencies to the 12½ percent contingency figure of the 1926 estimate. It is almost unbelievable that contingent costs will remain at 17½ percent.

(b) The board adopted a figure of but $7,500,000 per harbor for harbor improvements for each of 13 harbors, or a total of $97,500,000. Compare that with an estimate of $250,000,000 by the Brookings Institution and $200,000,000 by the minority report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In addition to the costs just referred to—usually referred to as first costs—there are further huge items that will have to be added which will accrue after construction—interest on amortization of bonds and operation and maintenance during amortization period. These items, according to the calculations of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, amount to $655,216,000.

The combination of the items of first costs, $565,372,000, and the later items, $655,216,000, produced $1,220,588,000. That is a long way from the estimate of $426,757,000 filed by the joint board of 1926; and the estimate of $1,220,588,000 is manifestly a fair and representative estimate.

There has been an attempt to justify this project on the grounds of national defense. It has been pointed out previously that, instead of aiding defense, construction of this project would hinder it by diverting thousands of men and enormous amounts of material from vital defense production.

Until the St. Lawrence seaway became a "defense measure" football, nobody ever considered that the work could be completed in less than 4 years; and a 4-year period is far beyond the dreams of most authorities on the subject. The booklet published by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board states, page 32:

> Almost every authority agrees that it would take at least 8 years to complete the project.

To say that the seaway could be completed in any period of time less than 4 years is the height of nonsense. The magnitude of the project in itself is sufficient evidence that the work could not be completed for at least 4 years. For example, the new Welland ship canal is 30 miles long. It will have to be dredged 2 additional feet over a 28.6-mile length. Much of the channel goes through rock which is very difficult to dredge. In the Detroit-St. Clair section the St. Clair River is 40 miles long, Lake St. Clair 17 miles long, and the Detroit River 31 miles long, a total of 88 miles. The substantial part of this 88-mile stretch will have to be dredged extensively. The St. Marys River, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron, is 63 miles long and will have to be dredged. There are 49 miles of canals in the St. Lawrence River section that will have to be dredged, and numerous locks rebuilt. Locks will have to be rebuilt at St. Marys Falls. Dams will have to be built and building machinery and equipment installed for the power project.

A schoolboy would know that under the best of conditions a project of this kind could not be completed in 4 years.

Furthermore, there are at least 10 major harbors that would have to be dredged extensively in order to serve deeper-draft vessels. Most of the harbors are municipally owned. If the Federal Government would pay the entire cost of dredging each harbor—which is highly improbable—there would be a myriad of legal questions involving the power of a municipality to turn its harbor over to the Federal Government for reconstructions. In many cases legislative authority would have to be given. If the cost would be pro rated between the municipalities and the Federal Government, there would be endless haggling over the basis of the proration. There would also be more legal difficulties concerning the authority of a municipality to reconstruct its harbor or to participate with the Federal Government. The time consumed in all of these operations would drag on and on.

The long Canadian winters furnish another difficulty that must be reckoned with. Streams in that country are covered with ice during long periods of the year. Naturally, construction work would be held up during all of that time.

Due to the war there is an acute shortage of skilled labor, engineers, materials, and machinery. That in itself would be an insuperable obstacle to the speedy completion of the seaway. If there were no war, it would be difficult enough to complete the job within 4 years; but under present conditions completion in 4 years of 200 lineal miles of dredging, the building of numerous locks, dams, and buildings, and the manufacturing and installation of machinery is impossible.

Since a destroyer has a draft of 9 feet 8 inches, it is possible, with the present 14-foot channel, to build destroyers in Great Lakes shipbuilding yards and navigate them to the Atlantic Ocean. If the combined facilities of the Great Lakes shipbuilding yards were concentrated upon the construction of all the destroyers now needed for the United States Navy, they would in all probability have more of a job on their hands than they could do.

There is reason to believe that Canada has been high-pressured into this scheme at a time when her natural inclination would be to avoid such a strain on her resources needed so badly in the war effort.

Article VIII of the St. Lawrence agreement would relinquish our sovereignty over the waters of Lake Michigan which lies wholly within the borders of the United States. Any additional diversion of water into our great midwestern lakes-to-gulf waterway would be subject to international arbitration.

The St. Lawrence waterway would cause a loss of part of our coal market with resultant loss of jobs in the Illinois mining regions already sorely hit. Neither agriculture nor manufacturing in Illinois, with rare exceptions, would benefit from the seaway, while our great tax-paying transportation systems would be given another competitor.

In short, the disadvantages of this St. Lawrence seaway project at this time outweigh its advantages, and the measure should be defeated.

Composite of domestic and foreign shipments, receipts, exports, and imports from and into the port of Chicago for the years 1934 to 1938, both inclusive

DOMESTIC TONNAGE (LAKEWISE)

	Tons
Lakewise receipts	44,778,718
Lakewise shipments	6,015,668
Total	50,794,385

Average annual receipts and shipments of domestic tonnage for 5-year period, 10,158,877 tons.

FOREIGN TONNAGE

	Tons
Canadian imports	2,023,909
Canadian exports	2,096,341
Total	4,120,250

Average annual Canadian imports and exports for 5-year period, 804,050 tons.

	Tons
Overseas imports	202,100
Overseas exports	153,032
Total	355,132

Average annual overseas imports and exports for 5-year period, 71,026 tons.

Average annual Canadian imports and exports are equal to 8 percent of the average annual domestic tonnage (lakewise).

Average annual overseas imports and exports are equal to approximately 0.7 percent of the average annual domestic tonnage (lakewise).

The following is a break-down of the foregoing composite:

	Tons
Year 1934:	
Lakewise receipts	5,685,338
Lakewise shipments	1,370,353
Canadian imports	358,097
Canadian exports	111,703
Overseas imports	54,607
Overseas exports	27,190
Year 1935:	
Lakewise receipts	7,931,330
Lakewise shipments	781,757
Canadian imports	355,187
Canadian exports	74,304
Overseas imports	62,718
Overseas exports	10,196
Year 1936:	
Lakewise receipts	11,282,971
Lakewise shipments	964,526
Canadian imports	410,058
Canadian exports	47,614
Overseas imports	48,444
Overseas exports	65,294
Year 1937:	
Lakewise receipts	13,807,234
Lakewise shipments	1,125,334

Year 1938:	Tons
Canadian imports	710,856
Canadian exports	292,870
Overseas imports	21,087
Overseas exports	17,357
Lakewise receipts	6,071,844
Lakewise shipments	1,773,698
Canadian imports	189,711
Canadian exports	1,569,850
Overseas imports	15,245
Overseas exports	32,995

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I made my speech earlier in the day, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks made today I may include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects, and in one to include a portion of an article by Gorham Munson in the University Review of the University of Kansas City, and in the other to include an article by Blair Moody in the Detroit News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HESS, for an indefinite period, on account of Government business.

To Mr. COLE of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. PACE (at the request of Mr. TARVER), for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4590. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m. in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

682. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 1, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Norfolk Dam, North Fork River in White River Basin, Ark. and Mo., requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted June 20, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

683. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Weymouth Fore River, Mass., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 291); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5166. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TRAYNOR: Committee on the Territories. S. 1289. An act authorizing the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. to convey to the United States its railroad right-of-way and other railroad properties in Alaska, for use as a public highway, tramroad, or tramway, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1488. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of John L. Savage, an employee of the United States, to service under the government of the State of New South Wales, Australia, and the government of the Punjab, India" (act of June 29, 1940, Public, No. 678, 76th Cong., 3d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota:

H. R. 5167. A bill to define the termination of the Philippine Insurrection for pension, and other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DITTER:

H. R. 5168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., for highway purposes and for ornamental park purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5169. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 3 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5170. A bill providing for Federal assistance to certain State militia organized to replace the National Guard called into active Federal service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 5171. A bill to amend section 392 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for separate appropriation accounts for administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, so as to modify the 1 and 2 percent limitations on administrative expenses and to provide over-all limitations in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5172. A bill to create a commission to investigate and report to the Congress the necessity, practicability, and feasibility of constructing a vehicular crossing or crossings of the Potomac River between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia, and to determine the location or locations of such crossing or crossings, and the type of

such crossing or crossings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. J. Res. 200 (by request). Joint resolution authorizing the purchase of the bust of Gen. John A. Logan, executed by Adelaide Johnson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Res. 249. Resolution creating a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the sinking of the submarine *O–9*; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolutions Nos. 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5173. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Anton Seles; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 5174. A bill for the relief of certain firms and persons furnishing supplies and services to certain selective service local boards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 5175. A bill for the relief of Edward Workman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 5176. A bill for the relief of Otto Rudolf Nemeth; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5177 (by request). A bill for the relief of Irving Cowen; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1518. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of the General Assembly of Missouri, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appropriations for strategic military mileage and also of access roads or other roads designed for the exclusive use of the armed forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1519. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 55, of the State of California, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation on social security and old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1520. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Kalamazoo District National Farm Loan Association, Kalamazoo, Mich., pertaining to legislation affecting Federal land-bank bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1521. Also, resolution of the Cass National Farm Loan Association, of Cassopolis, Mich., pertaining to legislation concerning regulation of value of money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1522. Also, resolution of the Cass National Farm Loan Association of Cassopolis, Mich., urging continuance of present 3½-percent interest rate on farm loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1523. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strikes in defense industries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Creator of all intellect, Fountain of all wisdom, who hast given to man the gift of reason and hast blest him with a vision of Thy purpose: Grant, we beseech Thee, unto these Thy Servants to whom the affairs of our Nation have been entrusted such enlightenment of mind and inspiration of spirit that they may think through the problems of this present time and make decisions pleasing in Thy sight, which will ever contribute to the maintenance of the safety, honor, and welfare of our people.

Again, we beseech Thee, O Lord, by the same wisdom, to bestow upon the people of America clarity of mind to lay to heart the gravity of their present problems, to unify themselves in purpose and method, and steadily to advance in the paths which Thou dost reveal to them. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

PRESIDING OFFICER FOR THE DAY

The SECRETARY (Edwin A. Halsey). The Vice President being out of the city, and the position of President pro tempore being vacated by the death of the beloved Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, under paragraph 2 of rule I, the duties of the Chair fall upon the Secretary of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ADAMS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journals of the calendar days of Friday, June 20, and Monday, June 23, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journals were approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 20, 1941:

S. 158. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act;

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 774. An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., by means of an underpass, to cross New York Avenue NE., to extend, construct, maintain, and operate certain industrial sidetracks, and for other purposes;

S. 913. An act to authorize the refusal of visas to aliens whose admission into the United States would endanger the public safety;

S. 1300. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to the making available of conservation materials and soil-conserving or soil-building services;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes; and

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.

On June 24, 1941:

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 54, sec. 842), and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 81. Senate joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation of the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5166. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4590. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the orders of the 20th and 23d instant, the Vice President, during adjournment of the Senate, signed the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 4973. An act to amend the act of May 22, 1918 (40 Stat. 559); and

H. R. 4107. An act to extend certain provisions of title X of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant, the following messages from the House were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

On June 23, 1941:

Resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Pat Harrison, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to resolution of the House, the Speaker had appointed Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. DOXIE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COLMER, Mr. FORD of Mississippi, Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. SABATH, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. CROWTHER, Mr. REED of New York, M. STEAGALL, Mr. BLAND, Mr. LEA, Mr. CULLEN, Mr. CROSSER, and Mr. COOPER members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

The message also informed the Senate as follows:

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference; and

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, 11, 93, and 94 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 9, 13, 17, 21, 80, 97, 98, and 100 to the bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

On June 25, 1941:

The message informed the Senate as follows:

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program;

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 to the bill:

That the House had passed the bill (H. R. 4784) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and

That the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Act of 1941," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

On June 23, 1941:

H. R. 3537. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4911. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

On June 25, 1941:

H. R. 4784. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

THE LATE SENATOR HARRISON, OF MISSISSIPPI—MESSAGE OF SYMPATHY

The SECRETARY laid before the Senate the following telegram, which was ordered to lie on the table:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 22, 1941.*

Mr. WALLACE,

The President of the Senate:

Our heartfelt sympathy to the relatives and friends of Mr. PAT HARRISON.

SWIFT JEWEL COW BOYS.

ISSUANCE OF OIL AND GAS LEASES ON CERTAIN WYOMING LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 178 to laid before the Senate.

The SECRETARY laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 178) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands, which was, on page 2, line 17, to strike out the word "month" and insert "months."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill was passed unanimously by the Senate. It went to the House of Representatives and was there amended by the alteration of the word "month" to the word "months." It provides for the settlement of certain controversies over certain oil lands, about 1,500 acres in extent, in the State of Wyoming, and it adds a substantial fund to the Federal oil royalties. The bill was passed without opposition in each House. I desire to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, it was understood—and I shall see that there is a compliance with the understanding—that no business would be transacted today; but in view of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming that the action proposed is merely the correction of a word, making plural the word "month," I have no objection to the motion being made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have here a letter from Secretary Ickes, in which he points out that the total estimated royalties to be received by the United States under this bill will amount to $1,165,000. Inasmuch as this measure will put money into the Treasury, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary Ickes may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 24, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am pleased to learn that the bill S. 178, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands in the Lance Creek Oil Field, Wyoming, which you introduced and actively supported, has passed both Houses of Congress.

Should the bill become law, it would avoid long, expensive, and vexatious litigation in this Department and in the courts over the validity of certain oil placer claims. In my judgment, the compromise sought to be effected by the bill is in the interest both of the United States and of the claimants.

Under the bill, the United States will receive more than $70,000 as royalties on oil and gas produced prior to January 1, 1940, and, based on an estimate made in the Department in October 1940, it will receive approximately $245,000 as royalties for the period between January 1, 1940, and July 1, 1941. It was also estimated that the total future production from proven sands in these lands would be in excess of 8,000,000 barrels of oil, on which royalties at 12½ percent would be approximately $1,165,000.

As you know, 10 percent of these royalties would be paid into the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts, 52½ percent would be paid into the reclamation fund, and the remaining 37½ percent would be paid to the State of Wyoming, to be used in the construction and maintenance of public roads or for the support of public schools or other public educational institutions.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SECRETARY laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1941."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The SECRETARY laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, ETC.

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1941, amounting to $38,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 70);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1941, to remain available to June 30, 1942, for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $1,100,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 72);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1942, in the form of proposed amendments to House bill 5049, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, amounting to $199,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 73);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department, fiscal year 1941, amounting to $600,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 74);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1941, in the amount of $386 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 75);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $47,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 76);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Maritime Labor Board, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $105,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 77);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with law, a schedule of claims amounting to $96,630.37 allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 78);

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, in compliance with law, an estimate of appropriations for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $30,771.43, as covered by certificates of settlement, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 79);

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, in compliance with law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, which have been submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury and require an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $265,296.04 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 80);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of $4,539.62 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 81);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Treasury Department to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of $19.49, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 82);

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal years 1941 and 1942, amounting to $1,052,520, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations and proposed authorizations for the expenditure of $47,000 from Indian tribal funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 83);

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $1,940,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 84);

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $400,560 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 85); and

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, fiscal year 1942, for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, in the amount of $6,500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 86).

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

Two letters from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 392 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for separate appropriation accounts for administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, so as to modify the 1 and 2 percent limitations on administrative expenses and to provide over-all limitations in lieu thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL CLAIMS ACT OF 1922

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

CASE STUDIES IN DISTRIBUTION COST ACCOUNTING FOR MANUFACTURING AND WHOLESALING

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission transmitting the report of the Commission on case studies in distribution cost accounting for manufacturing and wholesaling (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Secretary, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the SECRETARY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 33

"Joint resolution relative to the extension of flood-control works in the Los Angeles River and the construction of such works in the San Fernando Valley

"Whereas recent storms have resulted in a recurrence of serious floods in the San Fernando Valley in California; and

"Whereas such floods will continue to occur annually unless adequate works are constructed to control the flow of storm waters; and

"Whereas such floods constitute a serious menace to the health, safety, and welfare, and further interfere with the operation of numerous defense-industry plants in the San Fernando Valley and vicinity thereof; and

"Whereas such floods and their consequences can be avoided by the carrying out of plans for the construction of flood-control works, including the straightening, rectification, and deepening of a portion of the Los Angeles River channel and the construction of works and a channel or channels extending from the Los Angeles River to the San Fernando Reservoirs and the Hansen Dam: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to include the foregoing flood-control works and rectification of the Los Angeles River channel in connection therewith as one of the Federal construction projects, and that Federal moneys be appropriated in sums sufficient to provide therefor at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator or Member of the House of Representatives from California, and that the Senator and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 49

"Joint resolution relative to real estate brokers and salesmen

"Whereas real estate brokers and salesmen are not exempt from taxation under the Federal Social Security Act and are therefore subjected to tax by the California Unemployment Insurance Act; and

"Whereas it is administratively difficult to determine the amount of benefits a real estate

broker and salesman is entitled to have under the Unemployment Insurance Act of this State; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of the State of California to exempt real-estate brokers and salesmen entirely from the contribution and benefit provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act of this State; and

"Whereas this is not possible unless and until proper amendments are made in the Federal Unemployment Tax Act provisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to make the necessary amendments to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in order that the State of California may make amendments in the Unemployment Insurance Act of this State granting an exemption from the contribution and benefit provisions of the State act to real-estate brokers and salesmen; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall immediately be dispatched by the Chief Clerk of the Assembly to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 55

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation on social security and old-age pensions

"Whereas under the present Social Security Act there are many inequalities due to the varying rates of old-age assistance paid in the different States, and such differences in payments have caused much dislocation and confusion among our senior citizens; and

"Whereas many elderly people migrate to the States paying the higher rates of assistance, which increases the tax burden in such States in order to meet the expense of caring for such large numbers of elderly people during the period they must reside in such States to qualify for old-age assistance; and

"Whereas many different State laws are being constantly changed and thereby add to the inconvenience, expense, and confusion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature of this State hereby endorses the following recommendations of the congressional subcommittee on social security and old-age pensions of the house conference on unemployment and respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States of America to take the necessary steps at once to enact legislation to put them into effect.

"This committee believes that the establishment of an old-age-pension program which will not only protect against want and insecurity for the older people of America, but will also be means of maintaining a balance between the power to produce and their power to consume is vital to the welfare of the United States.

"While the committee believes major emphasis should probably be placed upon old-age pensions it recognizes the absolute necessity of continuing and extending the program of aid to dependent children, widowed mothers, the blind and the disabled. We believe that it is not our function to endorse any bill but instead to recommend a general policy to be adopted; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly send copies of this resolution to the President, Vice President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge the legislation set forth in this resolution."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Assembly Resolution 58

"Resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Office of Production Management to use the resources of skill and manpower of the Negro race in the defense program

"Whereas Congress has appropriated many billions of dollars for national defense, and numerous plants to which orders have been given by the Government refuse to grant employment to Negroes, even though they may be highly trained; and

"Whereas in this vital program of production for defense, many millions of capable Negroes are for the most part jobless and dependent upon their communities, and at the same time possesses the skills and arts and the willingness to make a sizeable and worthwhile contribution to the defense effort now engaging the full resources and capacities of the country and our industries; and

"Whereas this discriminatory policy against 13,000,000 American men, women, and children because of color must necessarily reduce and restrict the amount of all-out aid and the unstinted support and effort necessary for the speedy and complete success of such program; and

"Whereas these men who are able and trained to make a decided contribution plead that they may be given an opportunity in the national-defense program to serve America with their hands as well as their hearts and that the Government and American industry recognize such plea in view of the extensive supply of skill and manpower that it represents; and

"Whereas it is manifestly unfair to a group of hard-working citizens whose loyalty has never been questioned that they should be forced to beg for the right to participate in the defense program and the privilege to serve their country; and

"Whereas if America is to be saved from Hitlerism, it must be willing to give up racial prejudice in order to enlist the full support of all of our peoples to give without stint their productive labor in the battle for democracy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly, That this body memorialize the Congress, the President of the United States and the Office of Production Management to avail themselves of the skills and willingness of the Negroes of our country to participate in the all-out program of production for defense and to remove all restrictions of industry against the employment of Negroes in such companies where defense contracts have been awarded in order to utilize the full capacities of all our manpower in industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Office of Production Management and to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member of such Congress."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 167

"Whereas there is now pending before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States a proposed measure which would deprive the citizens of Texas of their rights under the community property laws of this State as applied to their income-tax returns and payments; and

"Whereas insofar as income-tax payments are concerned, such measure has the effect of repealing, nullifying, and destroying the Texas community property law provided for in the State constitution and heretofore assumed to have been adequately safeguarded against Federal encroachment and nullification under terms of Texas entrance into the Union: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That each Member of the Texas delegation in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and in the Senate of the United States be urged to use his best efforts against the passage of any such measure to the end that the people of Texas may be protected in the property rights under which this and other States have lived for so many years; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Representatives from the State of Texas in the Congress of the United States and to the two United States Senators from Texas to the Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes

"Whereas it has been proposed by the Treasury Department of the United States, as appears in a statement of the Assistant Secretary before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on April 24, 1941, to raise approximately $3,600,000,000 of additional revenue primarily by drastic increases in income-tax rates and by substantial reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; and

"Whereas income and death taxes have been relied upon as sources of revenue for the respective States of the Union from times long antedating the entering of the Federal Government into these fields and the ever-growing inroads upon such sources have already reached such proportions as to impede the several States in the maintenance of their tax structures; and

"Whereas the joint burden of Federal and State Governments upon these sources of revenue has reached a point which threatens seriously to destroy the incentive to industry and thrift and to dry up the very sources upon which both the Federal and State Governments must depend during the critical financial period now confronting them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorialize Congress against the adoption of the proposals above outlined, hereby representing that, although the general court approves the policy of financing the cost of the defense program by increased taxation rather than by borrowing, nevertheless it requests that Congress refrain from raising the necessary additional revenue in direct competition with the States in the manner proposed, thereby stifling every incentive to industry, enterprise, and saving at a time when these attributes should be encouraged to the utmost if our entire financial structure, both State and National, is not to collapse; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to the Members thereof representing this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 48

"Resolution memorialing the Congress of the United States to investigate the lack of proper aviation facilities in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to properly protect the mining and shipping of copper and iron ore and the transportation of forest products, and the establishment of suitable facilities to guarantee such protection

"Whereas the products of the copper and iron mines of the Upper Peninsula of Michi-

gan, and the lumber products of said territory, are of vital importance to national defense; and

"Whereas vast quantities of coal are being delivered by boat to said copper- and iron-mining districts for use in such mining; and

"Whereas the Portage Canal and the Sault Ste. Marie Locks, during the year 1940, carried more tonnage than the entire tonnage of the Panama Canal for the same period; and

"Whereas present airport facilities in that territory are inadequate for use by military combat aircraft; and

"Whereas there are thousands of acres of State- and county-owned lands readily adaptable to aviation needs, such as bases, aerial gunnery bases, aerial gunnery ranges, and training centers; and

"Whereas the Michigan College of Mines now has a student pilot-training program in progress and Houghton County has now acquired an additional 400 acres of land to be added to its present airport at Calumet; and

"Whereas there is now an aviation training school at the Calumet Airport, from which 110 fliers will receive their secondary papers this spring, and at which school there are now 6 United States airships and 4 United States fliers training said students; and

"Whereas the products of the aforesaid Upper Peninsula of Michigan can be of little or no value to the national defense of the United States unless said copper, iron, and forest products in shipment are fully protected from points of origin to their destination, and the copper and iron ore docks are fully safeguarded: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to thoroughly investigate the lack of proper aviation facilities to safeguard the mining and shipping of iron, copper, and forest products in and from this territory and the desirability of establishing a sufficient number of suitable airports and other facilities to guarantee such protection; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the Senate on May 26, 1941."

A resolution of the Traffic Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A paper in the nature of a memorial from James Cochran, of New York City, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Vinson bill, relative to labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions from several citizens of the United States, praying that the United States keep out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of the North Indiana Conference of the Methodist Church embodying the report of the special committee on the state of the Nation, with special reference to peace and participation in foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by I. L. W. U. 1-12, of North Bend, Oreg., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 783) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, relative to graduates of medical and dental schools, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the American Society of Mammalogists protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 260, to open the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz., to prospecting and mining; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A petition from a citizen of the United States, praying for the elimination of the 18 months lay-off clause in connection with employment under Work Projects Administration; to the table.

Resolutions of the eighth annual convention of the American Newspaper Guild at Detroit, Mich., and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of pending antilabor legislation; to the table.

Petitions and resolutions of sundry citizens and organizations of the United States, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, Oberlin, Herndon, and Cedar Bluffs, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association, signed by W. B. Brasfield, secretary-treasurer, Wichita, Kans., embodying resolutions adopted by the annual convention of that association, favoring the imposition of a sales tax of 5 percent on articles classed as jewelry and opposing a floor tax on such articles; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Hays, Haven, New Cambria, Salina, and Stafford, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of House bill 2475, to provide for the common defense in relation to the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. MEAD:

A resolution of the Parliament of Community Councils, New York City, N. Y., protesting against any discrimination because of race, creed, or color in the employment of workers in industries engaged in producing defense materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Parliament of Community of Councils, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for low-cost insurance for trainees and enlisted men in the military service; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Parliament of Community Councils, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the pay of trainee soldiers to $42 per month; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Parliament of Community Councils, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 220) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution of the Parliament of Community Councils, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing that free stamps or official envelopes and paper be furnished to enlisted men in camps at the discretion of the commanding officer; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution of the Parliament of Community Councils, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 990) to protect the integrity of the democratic process by requiring disclosure of persons writing, publishing, and circulating scurrilous literature in connection with political campaigns; to deny the use of the mails to such literature and to prohibit its importation into the United States, in default of such disclosure; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in my section of the country particularly there is substantial opposition, I might say overwhelming opposition, to the whole St. Lawrence seaway project. The New Hampshire Legislature, which has recently adjourned, passed, before adjourning, a joint resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project. I ask that the joint resolution of the New Hampshire Legislature be incorporated in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering the advisability of the completion of the St. Lawrence River seaway development as an international project; and

Whereas the claim that the United States needs this seaway for defense is not supported by the facts but has inspired the charge that the military, naval, and air hazards involved in the project are all out of proportion to the industrial or commercial benefits that might accrue; and

Whereas the waterway would be ice-bound for 5 months of the year and during that navigation season would provide an easy target for bombing and afford an opportunity for sabotage in the locks and dams of the ship channel; and

Whereas the project would provide no tolls but would permit free use of the waterway for foreign shipping, threatening to ruin New England economy, the railroads, the Atlantic coast shipping, and deluging the Great Lakes region with cheap foreign products, undermining American labor, industry, and agriculture; and

Whereas the imperative demands of national defense require urgent use of men, materials, and money in the construction of planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions which would be seriously affected by divergence to an uneconomic seaway project; and

Whereas the waterway could not be placed in full operation before 1948 and would thus not become part of immediate national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That it is the sense of the general court that the use of the St. Lawrence River for the establishment of a deeper seaway is a wasteful and unwarranted project in the present national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of this State and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate.

CHARLES H. BARNARD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WILLIAM M. COLE,
President of the Senate.

Approved June 13, 1941.

ROBERT O. BLOOD, *Governor.*

RESOLUTIONS OF FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA—WELFARE OF YOUTH CALLED TO MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a set of resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at its

meeting on June 13, 1941, with respect to the welfare of the youth called to the military service of the United States.

The SECRETARY. The resolutions presented by the Senator from Colorado will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas the welfare of our youth in the service of the United States is a matter of intense and increasing concern to us: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm the action taken at the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at Atlantic City in December 1940, as follows:

"Whereas the National Selective Service Act, now in operation, will call up millions of young men for training in military camps and naval stations; and

"Whereas during the World War the Selective Service Act of 1917 set up effective procedures on the part of our Government for protecting the young men in the national service from being exploited by the liquor traffic and by commercialized vice, prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to any man in the uniform of the Army or the Navy of the United States, and throwing a zone of 10 miles around the training camps as a protection against organized vice: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we call upon the President of the United States and upon the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to take such action as will secure the fullest possible moral and health protection for our soldiers and sailors."

The president and general secretary of the council are requested to send promptly a copy of this action to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of War and the Navy, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, with the request that this action be presented to the Senate and to the House and spread upon the Journals of the two Houses.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, ON IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED ON THE MAHONING RIVER

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, an emergency has arisen in the Mahoning Valley of Ohio, where about 10 percent of the entire steel production of the United States takes place, due to the shortage and uncertainty of the water supply. Flood-control reservoirs have been authorized for that area; but, because of the increase in population and the increase in steel production, it has become necessary that these reservoirs be constructed at once as multiple-purpose reservoirs, the funds for which may be derived from House bill 4545 for water-supply and sewage-disposal purposes, and House bill 4911 for flood-control projects.

The cities of Youngstown, Warren, Niles, and Campbell, and the boards of county commissioners of Trumbull County and Mahoning County, Ohio, have adopted resolutions to call this matter to the attention of Congress. As typical of these, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point, and ask to have referred to the Committee on Commerce, the resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Youngstown on June 16, 1941.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolution authorizing and directing MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Member of Congress from the Nineteenth Ohio Congressional District; ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio; and HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio, to act concurrently or separately as the agent of the mayor and of the City Council of Youngstown, Ohio, to request the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and/or any department, bureau, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government to allocate Federal funds and to construct the Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs in the Mahoning Valley for the purpose of protecting the people of the United States, and more particularly the people of the Mahoning Valley, from the ravages of floods; to provide for the more adequate disposal of sewage; to provide a better water supply for certain of its cities, to enable their people and industries to better cooperate with the Federal Government in this time of national emergency by providing for their industries a better water supply for use in making steel, and by providing more adequate community facilities for their national-defense workers; and providing further that this resolution shall be an emergency measure

Be it resolved by the Mayor and the Council of the City of Youngstown, Mahoning County, State of Ohio, That:

Whereas the city of Youngstown and other governmental units located in the Mahoning Valley, Ohio, are faced with great difficulties in securing for their citizens and industries an adequate water supply due to the density of the population, the magnitude of their industrial development, and the smallness of the drainage area; and

Whereas the Mahoning Valley steel industries produce 10 percent of the Nation's total steel tonnage; and

Whereas the steel industries of the Mahoning Valley are producing at their maximum capacity and will continue to produce at their maximum capacity during this emergency, thereby using abnormally large amounts of water; and

Whereas all of the defense industries of the Mahoning Valley are dependent for their supply of electricity, at least principally, on the generating facilities of the public and private utility plants of the Mahoning Valley, and particularly the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation being equipped to generate its own electricity on a 30-cycle circuit, thus making it impossible to purchase electricity from public utilities operating on a 60-cycle circuit during periods of low-water condition in the Mahoning River; and

Whereas the influx of national-defense workers, both in the Ravenna Ordnance Works and in the basic steel industries and allied industries located in the Mahoning Valley, has placed additional burdens upon the existing public facilities, which public facilities are now proving themselves to be inadequate so far as water supply is concerned; and

Whereas it is necessary to construct additional homes and to provide for a safe domestic water supply in certain of the cities located in the Mahoning Valley; and

Whereas the additional sewage discharged by these homes will greatly increase the already aggravated pollution problem of the Mahoning River, resulting in unhealthful conditions to the residents and the 75,000 workers in the great steel and allied industrial plants of the Mahoning Valley; and

Whereas the construction of the Berlin and Mosquito Creek reservoirs would make necessary a 50 percent treatment of the 40,000,000 gallons of raw sewage dumped daily into the Mahoning River in Ohio, rather than a 98 percent treatment as presently required because of the low flow, thus resulting in tremendous public savings; and

Whereas the present water supply for the said industrial establishments has proven itself to be entirely inadequate and insufficient as to quality and quantity of water, thus tending to curtail the steel output of the district; and

Whereas the cities of the Mahoning Valley have often been visited by destructive and damaging floods which have caused the suspension of the steel mill operations, railroad traffic, loss of life, and the evacuation of hundreds of residents from their homes in the years since 1913; and

Whereas the city of Youngstown has built at its own expense and is now operating a reservoir known as Lake Milton to prevent floods and to secure a more adequate water supply for its industries, and it has constructed together with the city of Niles another reservoir known as the Meander Creek Reservoir to improve the domestic water supply of the cities of Youngstown and Niles at an approximate cost of $12,000,000; and

Whereas it is impossible as a practical matter for the municipal corporations of the Mahoning Valley to build other reservoirs at this time because (1) they are still paying for the present reservoirs; (2) Ohio has a constitutional 10 mill tax and debt limitation on local governments which is being entirely consumed in carrying forward the regular and statutory functions of government; (3) the benefits to be derived from the proposed Berlin and Mosquito Creek Reservoirs are for all governmental divisions, including the State of Pennsylvania, and hence no one local government is willing to assume the financial burden involved; and (4) under Ohio law private corporations cannot build these reservoirs and take the water from the riparian owners; and

Whereas the Federal Government is currently considering the desirability of expanding the present steel-making capacity of the entire United States, steps should immediately be taken to safeguard the existing steel-producing facilities of 10 percent of the Nation's output: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Messrs. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Member of Congress from the Nineteenth Ohio Congressional District, ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio, and HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio, are hereby authorized and directed to act as the agent or agents, concurrently or separately, of the mayor and of the council of the city of Youngstown, and in cooperation with the other political subdivisions of the Mahoning Valley, to make a formal request of the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and/or any department, bureau, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government to allocate funds and to construct the Berlin and the Mosquito Creek Reservoirs under any existing or contemplated laws of the United States, in the section of northeastern Ohio known as the Mahoning Valley; be it

Resolved further, That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, welfare, and safety, the emergency being the necessity of bringing at once to the attention of the President of the United States and Congress thereof, and Government officials connected with national defense the threatened shortage of water in this Mahoning Valley, and the resultant distress and danger to the defense preparations, as well as to the citizens of our valley and city, should stoppage result in our steel and industrial plants, through the threatened shortage of water, which could be relieved by the construction of the proposed reservoirs, and, as such, this resolution shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its passage and approval by the mayor.

Passed in council on the 16th day of June 1941.

ARTHUR GUNDRY,
President of Council.

Attest:

JOHN LEMON, *Clerk.*

Approved this 16th day of June 1941.

WILLIAM B. SPAGNOLA, *Mayor.*

CONTINUATION OF W. P. A.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations a telegram I have received from the Board of Supervisors of Summerhill Township, Beaverdale, Pa., relative to the appropriation necessary to complete a work project there; also, a telegram received from the Council for the Borough of Portage, Cambria County, Pa., stating the need for the continuation of the W. P. A. I have received similar telegrams from the Council for the Borough of Cassandria, Cambria County, Pa.; the Council for the Borough of Summerhill, Cambria County, Pa.; the Board of Road Supervisors of Portage Township, Cambria County, Pa.; the Council for the Borough of East Conemaugh, Cambria County, Pa.; the Council for the Borough of Daisytown, Johnstown, Cambria County, Pa.; and the Council for the Borough of Lilly, Cambria County, Pa. I ask that these telegrams also be made part of the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAVERDALE, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

United States Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of Road Supervisors of Summerhill Township, Cambria County, Pa., urge you to use all influence to get further appropriation to complete project OP 65-1-23-732 bridge at Beaverdale, Pa. If incompleted, streets left impassible. Beaverdale unincorporated; population, 3,000; mining only employment; three mines closed for 2 years; one mine now started, all mechanical; 150 men on this project, many of them 40 to 60 years; no other work.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
SUMMERHILL TOWNSHIP,
ROY H. PLUMMER,
FRANK FRANK,
MICKEY SIBERT,
ARTHUR E. SHANNON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A., operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow. Letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

COUNCIL FOR THE BOROUGH OF
PORTAGE, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A., operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow. Letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

COUNCIL FOR THE BOROUGH OF
CASSANDRIA, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A., operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow. Letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF SUMMERHILL,
CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A. operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow; letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

BOARD OF ROAD SUPERVISORS OF
PORTAGE TOWNSHIP, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A. operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow; letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF EAST
CONEMAUGH, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A. operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow; letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF DAISYTOWN,
JOHNSTOWN, CAMBRIA COUNTY.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *June 25, 1941.*

Senator JAMES DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

This municipality protests order closing W. P. A. operating projects now unfinished. Hardship to taxpayers and distress to workers will follow; letter with full details follows. Kindly review this letter. Your influence to countermand this order is requested and will be appreciated by the taxpayers and W. P. A. workers in this district.

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF LILLY,
CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

The following reports of committees were filed during adjournment of the Senate:

On June 23, 1941:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4965. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 476).

On June 25, 1941:

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 337. A bill to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books; without amendment (Rept. No. 477).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were filed during adjournment of the Senate:

On June 23, 1941:

By Mr. CONNALLY (for Mr. MCCARRAN), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harlan F. Stone, of New York, to be Chief Justice of the United States, in place of Charles Evans Hughes, who has retired as of July 1, 1941.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Guy McNamara, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas (Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 22, 1941.)

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of customs, vice Webster J. Oliver, resigned;

James E. Mulcahy, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice John J. Kelly, resigned; and

Mathias F. Correa, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice John T. Cahill, resigned.

On June 25, 1941:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph A. McNamara, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont. (Mr. McNamara is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 22, 1941); and

Al. W. Hosinski, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana. (Mr. Hosinski is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 29, 1941.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS (REPT. NO. 479)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, who is unavoidably detained from the Senate on official business, I submit, in the form of a report, the first of a series of recommendations of our committee for remedial legislation to aid small business enterprises, as provided in the authority of the committee under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress.

This report deals primarily with a bill to be known as the Federal Reports Act of 1941, which proposes to coordinate Federal reporting services and minimize the burden of furnishing information to governmental agencies.

This bill has practically the unanimous approval of small businessmen, the President of the United States, and the heads

of Federal agencies charged with obtaining information from business enterprises. I believe that this legislation meets with your approval also.

Our committee urges that the Congress give prompt and immediate consideration to our recommendation as a measure which small businessmen urgently need and as one which will reduce the burden of all business enterprises as well as bring about a substantial saving in expense to the Government.

The SECRETARY. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. MEAD (for Mr. MURRAY), from the Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business, reported a bill (S. 1666) to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burdens of furnishing reports and information to governmental agencies, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

STABILIZATION FUND AND ALTERATION OF WEIGHT OF THE DOLLAR—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. TAFT presented the views of the minority of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 475.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. On behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably with amendments House bill 5049, the annual appropriation bill for the government of the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 478) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. In the same connection, I also send to the desk to have printed in the RECORD a notice in writing of a motion to suspend the rule and to submit certain amendments to the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SECRETARY. The notice submitted by the Senator from Louisiana, together with the amendments intended to be proposed by him, will lie on the table.

The notice in writing is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 65, line 3, after "*Provided*", insert: "That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation, together with $25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, may be used during the fiscal year 1942 as a revolving fund for the purchase of food stamps from the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the food-stamp plan of that Department for the distribution of surplus commodities, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, said revolving fund to be reimbursed from time to time from the proceeds of sale of such stamps: *Provided further.*"

Page 71, line 24, after the figure "$32,627", insert "*Provided,* That the commanding general is hereby authorized to receive, also, the compensation to which he may be otherwise entitled as State Director of Selective Service for the District of Columbia under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940."

Page 78, line 4, after the words "at its expense", insert "*Provided further,* That fees from parking meters shall be deposited to the credit of the highway fund of the District of Columbia."

Page 88, after line 22, insert:

"Hereafter when any Capital Transit Co. street railway operation shall have been ordered abandoned by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have ordered the removal of abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of removing such abandoned tracks and regrading the track area, and, if the street or bridge in which the said tracks have been ordered abandoned is not being paved, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of paving the abandoned track areas, which cost, however, shall not exceed the cost of repaving such abandoned track areas with the type, character, and thickness of the paving of the adjacent roadway left in place, and, if the roadway of the street or bridge is being paved at the time of removal of said abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay one-half of the actual cost of paving the abandoned track areas, irrespective of whether the paving is of the type, character, and thickness as that existing at the time of said removal. The Commissioners of the District are authorized to settle, in conformity with the principles herein set forth, any claims it now has, or in the future may have, for the paving of abandoned track areas, upon such terms and conditions as to time of payment or payments as the Commissioners may determine."

Page 107, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 11. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to extend for not to exceed 60 days the time for payment of any installment of taxes on real property and tangible personal property and other taxes payable in September 1941."

Page 107, after line 2, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 12. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed, if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. OVERTON also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5049, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 20, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 287. An act to authorize the use of certain lands for military purposes at the Fort McPherson Military Reservation, Ga., and the Fort Du Pont Military Reservation, Del.;

S. 346. An act to authorize the President of the United States to dispose of certain public vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming;

S. 992. An act to amend sections 4613 and 4614 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to include captures of aircraft as prizes of war;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed title in certain lands of Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, to the county of Montgomery, State of Ohio, for highway-widening purposes;

S. 1421. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. a small piece of land at Veterans' Administration Facility, Roanoke, Va.;

S. 1469. An act to amend the act of April 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 156; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 34, sec. 842), and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to permit travel by a ship of Canadian registry between American ports; and

S. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to invite the governments of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to participate in a meeting of the national directors of the meteorological services of those countries, to be held in the United States as soon as practicable, in 1941 or 1942; to invite Regional Commissions III and IV of the International Meteorological Organization to meet concurrently therewith; and to authorize an appropriation for the expenses of organizing and holding such meetings.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1659. A bill to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1660 (by request). A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act, approved May 20, 1926, as amended June 21, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1661. A bill to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for defense purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1662. A bill to extend the time during which orders and marketing agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, may be applicable to hops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1663. A bill providing for the relinquishment and transfer of certain property to the heirs of Lillie Lela Moore; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1664. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1665. A bill to provide for two additional clerical assistants for each Senator from any State having a population in excess of 6,000,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. MEAD (for Mr. MURRAY), from the Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business, reported original Senate bill No. 1666, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1667. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1668. A bill for the relief of Albert D. Howell; and

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of James Franklin Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1670 (by request). A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. DAVIS introduced S. J. Res. 87, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and appears under a separate heading.)

POST-WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Library, and on which I desire to speak for a few moments.

The SECRETARY. The joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in the midst of a titanic world struggle and in the midst of our unprecedented national activity occasioned by the war and our defense measures, there is a concern which has gripped the consciousness of America beyond that of any other. It is a concern for the issues and problems which we as a Nation must face when the war is over and we attempt to return to the pursuits of peace. Newspaper headlines, editorial comments, magazine articles, books, radio commentators, commencement speakers, and the daily words of the man on the street all attest a great and growing anxiety about the shape of things to come after the war.

"After the War, What?" "How Will the War Affect Civilization?" "Post-War Changes in Schools Urged," "Planning Is Urged for Post-War Reconstruction," "United States Must Provide Post-War Leadership," "Research Must Save Us Another Post-War Depression," "War and the Future. Theme of University of Virginia Institute," "Antioch College Conference on Post-War Aims," "Just Wait 'Till This War Is Over," "The Next Depression Will Make the Last Look Like a Picnic"—these and countless other similar expressions are read and heard with every day's experiences. Back of these themes there lies a memory and a fear, a memory of the conditions which we faced at the conclusion of World War I, for which we had made no preparation, and a fear that the chaos predicted after the present conflict shall have subsided will compel us to abandon many of the cherished possessions and institutions commonly called the American way of life.

I have the confident hope that this need not and will not come to pass if, while we are arming and steeling ourselves for defense against armed aggression, we marshal the forces of our best minds and spirits in the defense of institutions which will bear the strain of attack in a reconstruction period. Surely we are competent to do this. Just so surely are we patriotic and unselfish enough to join in a common enterprise of such magnitude.

Giving much thought to this need, in the April issue of Moose Magazine, in an article which was made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wrote:

> A wartime boom holds within itself the seed of its own collapse. The greater the boom, the more certain will be the coming of depression which will make the last one seem like a pygmy. * * * The great need of the present hour is sufficient national intelligence to provide for a gradual and orderly recovery of the normal activities of peaceful pursuits after the peak of defense production shall have passed.

On May 1 I addressed a letter to Hon. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, saying:

> As we look forward a few years, possibly there is a service of scholarship which the Library can render the Nation in gathering together in one collection important studies of the post-war era. Various research organizations are now preparing these studies. As they are published, would it not be advantageous for them to be gathered in one collection in the Library of Congress, so that they may be more easily available to scholars who desire to study and appraise them?

The Librarian of Congress has given informal assurance that such a task could be undertaken in a measure if the appropriations called for in its budget for the Legislative Reference Service were allowed. However, consultation with the Librarian and members of the staff, as well as with leaders throughout the Nation representing business, labor, and education, now convince us that this problem is one which transcends all lines of partisan policy and is one of greater magnitude than could be undertaken or accomplished without additional staff and financial support. Furthermore, it is a project in which all of America should be enlisted.

Hence I am this day introducing in the Senate a joint resolution which would create a joint congressional bipartisan committee to sponsor and encourage a project in post-war studies with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and to sanction the formation of an auxiliary committee of American leaders, representing business and industry, education, labor, finance, and the professions, to promote interest among our citizens, to make known the findings of experts to all governmental agencies and the Congress and to scholars, and to secure through subscription the necessary funds to implement it.

Mr. President, in offering the joint resolution which I have just sent to the desk, I wish to make a few remarks explaining its purpose. It calls for the creation of a joint congressional bipartisan committee, composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives, to foster and encourage the study of data bearing upon post-war problems, both national and international, through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. In this way it is hoped Congress may be provided with basic materials for intelligent action on the problems of post-war reconstruction. The objective also is to have in one place all the findings of research on these post-war problems, so that those interested in any particular problem can find the material accessible.

Mr. President, under this joint resolution there would be set up in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a section to be known as the Post-War Studies Section. It shall take such steps as are necessary to learn of and collect the findings of all research in this country and abroad upon post-war issues, classify such research whether in progress or completed, notify researchers of possible duplications of effort, and discover gaps in such research to the end that they may be satisfactorily covered.

As soon as practicable, the Post-War Section should prepare for Congress a series of studies bringing together in usable form the results of the researches. These studies shall not in themselves advocate any specific policies, but shall analyze the problems to be faced, synthesize the results of research, and point out the alternative policies. The Legislative Reference Service is the logical agency to do this work for Congress, because it is thoroughly established as nonpartisan in character, and it has access to all the research agencies, both public and private, that shall be undertaking this trend of research. Thus the Legislative Reference Service, when augmented by this special section, should prove to be a general clearing house for all the research which shall be done in this country or abroad, public or private, in the field of post-war studies.

Speaking of peace and power politics, 1941, at the American Association of School Administrators Convention, held in Atlantic City, President Isaiah Bowman, of Johns Hopkins University, said:

> The problems of peace are infinitely more difficult than the problems of war.

At the same convention Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, issued a challenge to our educational institutions for their responsibility of ultimate victory. He said:

> Finally, what of the future? Has education any responsibility to begin now to prepare not only to win a war in the common defense of democracy, but to win a peace for humanity as well? I think it has. It seems to me that we must in the schools and in the colleges begin now to look ahead to the world reconstruction which must follow upon a democratic victory. * * *
>
> An educational program for the common defense must face in two directions at once. It must prepare us for united, skilled resistance to aggressive, expanding, threatening dictatorship. But it must also sharpen our wits and deepen our understandings of ways in which to bring about more rapid solution of the social and economic problems of the machine age.

As we face the continued problems of human relationships—of management to labor, business to government, and government to the whole fabric of our complex society—we must give our very best to the solution of our social and economic problems, for our best is none too good. Again I wish to say it is not too early to begin this far-reaching and significant enterprise. For its proper solution all of our citizens are called upon to render their utmost in devotion to the exalted principles which make us proud to call ourselves Americans.

Mr. President, I wish to have included as a portion of my remarks a comprehensive statement of the problem of post-war issues presented by Mr. W. L. Batt, of Philadelphia, Deputy Director, Production Division, Office of Production Management, before a subcommittee of the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, on June 24, 1941. This will indicate some of the thought now being given to this subject on the House side.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF W. L. BATT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PRODUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1941

When Mr. VOORHIS invited me to come before you and present my views on the necessity for immediate consideration of House Joint Resolutions 55 and 76 I was glad to accept, for I believe that the problem which these resolutions are designed to meet is one which merits the most serious attention of all thinking people. It merits consideration now—today—else we shall one day find ourselves at the doorstep of a post-war economic crisis with no previous thought or plan for its solution.

I want to say as strongly as I can that in my opinion it is almost as important to plan effectively—today—for the peace which must come after this war is over as it is to plan effectively—today—for our national defense.

What I have to say this morning bears not so much on the particular provisions of the two resolutions before you as on their timeliness. The text of resolutions such as these is best perfected by thoughtful discussion between Members of Congress itself familiar with legislative procedure.

In regard to the provisions of the resolutions, I only want to say that I feel the establishment of one commission is better than the creation of two, and that such a commission should be of relatively small size. I have found in my own experience that a large group too easily becomes unwieldy and often falls of its own weight. Then, too, I would not personally favor the creation of an economic commission which, in its individual membership, represents special groups of society, as such, whether they be Government, farmer, labor, business, or consumer. Our economic thinking today should not be in terms of special-interest groups. The problems of business are the problems of labor, and the problems of Government are the problems of the consumer and the farmer. I should rather see a commission composed of members picked, not because they are representatives of groups but because they are free and intelligent thinkers, men of imagination, initiative, and daring; men whose experience and background have made them familiar with the problems of particular groups but whose vision enables them to think in terms of the whole economy of the United States, not just one phase of it. They should represent the people as a whole, for that is the way this problem must be considered.

In a large sense the only lasting solution to the problems this country will face when the war is over must come through the voluntary decisions and policies of all those engaged in individual enterprise. This battle must finally be won by what I have termed "management's secret weapon"—and by that I mean the much more extensive and planned use of facts and figures about its own business, its own industry, and the whole economy in which it operates. While I do not believe that total economic planning tied up with political control can ever be successful in a democratic country, I do believe that in the future—to a far greater extent than in the past—we must have a more intelligently planned utilization of the productive machinery of our Nation. The body of thought created by the work of such a commission as these resolutions envisage could conceivably be the Dutch boy's finger in the dike that will stem the flood of post-war maladjustments.

To some these maladjustments may not seem so real as they do to me. But I have been saying for some time that, as a result of the colossal world revolution now going on, and of which we are a part, we face the perfectly plain, inescapable, and inevitable fact that when this war is over, no matter who wins, the world will not resemble the old world of 1939. I need not elaborate on the differences if the Nazis and their satellites come out on top. But what if Britain wins? Will it be the same old story of the World War all over again, with the same old British Empire under the same leadership restored to a position of world dominance? We need only look to recent developments for a clear enough indication that the answer to that question is "No."

But some say, "Britain is at war and war breeds fundamental changes, but we are not at war; we are only building up our country's defenses." Stated simply, that is true. But in building up our defense high enough and fast enough to be as safe as we can in a dangerous world, we are already doing many things that will affect our economy almost as much as active participation. Let us remember that the most violent disturbance to our own national economy during the World War took place not while we were participants but before. It was during 1915 and 1916 when our export trade was twisted and distorted and our eventual allies were placing huge munitions orders in our industrial plants that we whirled down the road to inflation; that commodity prices increased by 100 percent and more and that wages and the cost of living doubled. It was then that we began to change from a debtor to a creditor Nation. I need not remind you that we had not yet fully adapted ourselves to the economic changes generated during the last war before the present war broke out. Certainly those adjustments would have been more readily made had we planned for them during the war period.

Are we not now engaged in a program which will have still more profound effects on our Nation and its relationships to a world whose make-up we cannot even clearly imagine? I think so.

Once again our export picture has undergone a complete change as a result of the war to date. Our normal peacetime sales abroad of agricultural and consumer goods have been almost entirely replaced by war matériel. Cotton and tobacco and typewriters and apples are not being sold abroad now, but in their place airplanes, machine tools, and army trucks—and materials like iron and steel and copper needed by British war industries.

While this is going on, our own defense program is tending to make us more than ever self-sufficient, reducing our dependence upon purchases abroad. When this emergency is over, and we are trying to convert our defense factories into producers of consumer goods for sale abroad, we shall find that we require fewer products and materials from abroad than ever before. And you know that foreign trade must work both ways. We cannot sell to other countries unless we in turn buy from them. Specifically, the more manganese and tungsten and chrome we produce domestically the less we buy from foreign producers and the fewer dollars they have with which to buy our cotton and apples and electrical appliances. Out of sheer necessity we acquired a chemical industry during the World War, and we are likely to acquire new industries and new sources of materials out of this emergency. Once it is over will we repeat the old formula of subsidies of one kind or another to maintain war-stimulated domestic production? Will we put up another Smoot-Hawley tariff to close our markets to foreign goods, and thereby close foreign markets to our goods?

This is only one of an array of vital problems that this war and our national-defense program are creating for us. Industrial problems: What to do with the new manufacturing capacity we are creating. Labor problems: Where to find jobs for the men we are training for the production of wartime materials. Political problems: Who is to own and operate the plants that the Government is building or paying for in one form or another. Financial problems: What to do about the Federal debt incurred by necessarily huge spending for defense. Monetary problems: What about the gold base when we own most of the gold in the world. All these and many more will present staggering difficulties.

Distinguished from these future problems are the day-to-day overwhelming difficulties which present themselves to the men now working on the defense program. How and where to manufacture sufficient aluminum and magnesium; how and where to obtain adequate supplies of power; how to allot shipping space and priorities for all materials and products. Such problems alone are enough to tax the men who are engaged in the immediate and urgent task of arming the Nation. The others—more complex and long range—are those for which these men have little time. Moreover, the men who are working directly with the defense program have one and only one supreme task—to get the required equipment produced in the least possible time. We should not ask them to be concerned about the long-term implications of how they get it. What then must we do? Let me repeat to you what I said in a speech last December:

"It seems to me essential that we immediately create a small group of the ablest men in the country who would be charged with studying these long-range problems and working out solutions in advance. They ought to be set off in a corner by themselves, instructed to forget all about the immediate problems of procuring war matériel, except as it affects the future national economy. They should set to work now on the preparation of an industrial demobilization plan. Nations have spent decades preparing plans for the conversion of a peacetime economy to a wartime economy. So far as I know, nobody has seriously undertaken the preparation of plans for the opposite process—converting a wartime economy back to a peacetime economy. That might involve the discovery and development of new processes and new products for civilian consumption that could be manufactured on the same machines that now are turning out or preparing to turn out products that are useless in times of peace; plans for the absorption of our newly trained labor in peaceful pursuits; the fundamental policies of

foreign trade in a world that will be vastly different from that with which we have ever dealt before.

"This group would need to employ inventors and research scientists, trade experts, and fiscal experts, men of practical knowledge and great vision. They should devote their entire time to the formulation of the best plans that could be evolved for the utilization of our entire resources for the improvement of our standard of living, for the protection of our national economy from the repercussions not of war but of peace, for the conversion of the processes of economic waste to the processes of economic usefulness.

"It is immensely important that we try * * * to make out at least the type and possible shape of the problems we shall meet face to face in the future. And when we discover that these problems will be many and varied and of tremendous significance to our future well-being, then we must meet the next challenge of duty, which is to undertake immediately the formulation of plans for their solution. This was entirely ignored during the World War, and we have not yet rid ourselves of some of the problems that might have been solved before the war was over, if we had had the foresight to do it. In the meantime, a new war has come along that will create changes of far greater importance. The men who are devoting their time and efforts to the solution of our armament problem have no time for worrying about the disarmament problem. If we wait until the end of the war, it will be too late.

"There is, in Washington and elsewhere, a general recognition of the importance of planning for post-war adjustments. But as far as I am aware, there is no coordinated thinking along these lines, no organized group with this specific directive. I think that there should be, and I hope to see it accomplished in the near future, for there is no time to waste."

I am of the same mind now as I was then. Since I spoke last December, some groups have been studying the problem. The Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, the National Planning Association, and the National Resources Planning Board have all, among others, been at work on initial discussions. But more than that must be done. I sincerely believe that if we tackle this problem of post-war demobilization of industry and manpower with an energy comparable to that which we are now devoting to the opposite process, we can build an economy and a standard of living the like of which the world has never dreamed. We can, in that process, lay the ground work for an industrial system that will have as its only limits the limits of available manpower for production. This system would be based on a price structure designed to reach a vast reservoir of potential consumers that have in the past only been able to afford the basic necessities of life.

I do not want to bore you with my own philosophy but it is because of certain beliefs that I hold that I am so strongly in favor of the sort of thing the two resolutions before you propose to do. I have a great and abiding faith in the rightness and the potential good inherent in democracy and in private enterprise. I also have a strong conviction that the dynamics of this system must be consciously planned, directed, and harnessed so that it grows, progresses, and improves. It can neither remain motionless nor be permitted to drift aimlessly. If either of these things happens our system will be supplanted by something else—something more violent, more restrictive, more suppressive than any of us would like to see.

In other words, I think we should not only be making plans for the demobilization of a wartime economy, but also planning for the mobilization of all our resources—human and material—for better living in a world at peace. If I may borrow a phrase from Henri Bergson, it is time "to think as men of action, and to act as men of thought."

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD the joint resolution I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) creating a Joint Congressional Bipartisan Committee to study postwar problems, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas because of the present world conditions the President of the United States has proclaimed a complete national emergency to exist; and

Whereas we are now engaged in a program of national defense, which is being vigorously prosecuted through emergency measures seriously affecting every phase of our national life; and

Whereas problems of great moment to the present and future of the Nation affecting our political, social, economic, and spiritual welfare will be met both now and in the post-war period; and

Whereas the existence of similar conditions arising from the first World War threw our governmental and social machinery out of balance and produced a chaos and depression of great magnitude; and

Whereas experience dictates that measures to calculate these problems and prepare for their orderly solutions should be devised in advance; and

Whereas there is a growing national consciousness of this need and a rising tide of sentiment on the part of our national leaders for the necessary protective measures: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America hereby creates a Joint Congressional Bipartisan Committee, composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives, to foster and encourage the study of data bearing upon post-war problems, both national and international, through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and that full sanction be given the organization of an auxiliary committee of leaders of labor, business, agriculture, and other significant groups in our national life to devise means of implementing and pursuing these studies, collecting all pertinent data, tabulating essential information, and making it available to governmental agencies, the Congress, and the general public.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5166. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMPENSATION ACT—BILL REPORTED

The following report of the Committee on the District of Columbia was submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON:

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 481).

CONSTRUCTION OF CRYPT FOR REMAINS OF GUTZON BORGLUM—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in the passage of House bill 3857 authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum, there was an error. I do not feel free to ask that it be corrected now. Therefore, by reason of the running of time, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed in order that it may be held up until the return of the Senator who is interested.

The SECRETARY. The motion will be entered.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in view of the rule I offer for the RECORD a notice in writing of a motion to suspend the rule and to submit an amendment in accordance with the notice which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

The SECRETARY. The notice submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma, together with the amendment intended to be proposed by him, will lie on the table.

The notice in writing is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 76, after line 12, to insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of War that portion of the Petersburg National Military Park, in the State of Virginia, lying generally to the east of the present Camp Lee Cantonment hospital area and comprising 507 acres, more or less, formerly a part of the Camp Lee Military Reservation."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4965, making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM—ALUMINUM INVESTIGATION (REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have a report to submit to the Senate from the so-called Truman committee, which is properly known as the Special Committee Investigating the National-Defense Program. Under the able leadership of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] we have conducted a number of hearings, and we have decided, rather than to wait until the hearings are over and the subject forgotten, to make to the Senate occasional reports on subjects of current interest, and then later on to submit a complete report at the termination of our efforts.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to submit from the special committee a report on the aluminum investigation, for printing in the RECORD and as a report.

The SECRETARY. The report submitted by the Senator from New York will be received, printed, and printed in the RECORD.

The report (No. 480) is as follows:

The Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program submits the following report pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 71, Seventy-seventh Congress:

Modern warfare demands enormous supplies of raw materials, production facilities, and manpower. With these essentials a nation can adequately prepare itself for defense if it has the will and determination.

The present conflict is largely an air war and requires swarms of airplanes. The important essential in the production of airplanes is an adequate and continuing supply of aluminum.

To determine the facts with respect to such supply the committee held public hearings on May 12, 14, 15, June 16 and 17.

Numerous witnesses were examined, primarily representatives of the Army, Navy, Office of Production Management, Federal Power Commission, Department of the Interrior, Aluminum Co. of America (formerly the sole producer of aluminum), Reynolds Metals Co. (a new producer coming into the field), and others.

The disclosures of the investigation brought to light that we are facing a serious shortage of aluminum and that we do not now have the capacity to overcome the deficiency.

When the committee began its investigation of the available supply of aluminum there were three schools of thought:

1. Those who recognized the facts and were calling for more aluminum production facilities.

2. Those who were being rudely awakened to the realities of the situation and thought there might be something wrong with the supply.

3. Those who were still convinced there was no shortage and that there would be none.

For months the Defense Advisory Commission and the O. P. M. had said that talk about a shortage was misleading and that it was unpatriotic to talk about the possibility of such a shortage. As recently as December 1940, news releases had been issued calling attention to the adequacy of the supply for all military and civilian needs.

In February 1941 there began to crystalize opinion to the effect that serious miscalculations had been made. The demand began to outrun the supply and in an effort to relieve the shortage O. P. M. issued priority regulations governing the distribution of aluminum to users. In the light of the serious shortage which exists, it is interesting to note that substantial amounts of aluminum are still permitted to the automobile industry for use in production of pleasure cars.

At the hearings of the committee, the O. P. M. admitted that there would be a direct military requirement of 1,200,000,000 pounds per annum which was to be provided for by a planned future capacity of 800,000,000 pounds, 300,000,000 pounds of secondary or scrap aluminum and 100,000,000 pounds to be obtained from Canada. They also recognized the need for providing for at least 200,000,000 additional pounds. Inasmuch as the above would meet direct military requirements only, with no allowance for indirect military and civilian consumption, the O. P. M. subsequently advised the committee they were proceeding to obtain 600,000,000 pounds additional capacity and were hoping to increase the imports from Canada to 200,000,000 pounds.

O. P. M.'s reasons for its prior miscalculations were stated to be:

"1. Necessity for greatly increased working inventories, particularly in the case of aircraft, which are required by companies working directly and indirectly on defense contracts.

"2. Great increase in so-called indirect military requirements which are very difficult to estimate.

"3. Large withdrawals of aluminum scrap from the secondary market which can normally be counted upon to return to the market for refabrication.

"4. Temporary reduction in imports of aluminum from Canada."

This situation existed despite the fact that Reynolds Metals Co. (hereinafter called Reynolds) had for a year insisted there was a shortage and had proceeded, without encouragement from O. P. M., with the construction of facilities for the production of 120,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually. Such facilities were built at Lister, Ala., and Longview, Wash., with funds borrowed from the R. F. C., by mortgaging the plants of Reynolds. Coupled with the plant at Lister, a rolling mill is being built by the Defense Plant Corporation (a subsidiary of R. F. C.), and leased to Reynolds, making the only complete operation in existence in this country which can take in bauxite at one end and bring out fabricated aluminum at the other end. The plant at Lister is now producing aluminum. The rolling-mill construction is being pushed and should be ready in August 1941. The aluminum plant at Longview is expected to begin producing in September 1941.

During all this time the O. P. M. had apparently completely relied on the Aluminum Co. of America (hereinafter called Alcoa), as a source of information as to the availability of aluminum, and had discouraged anyone else from going into the business of producing aluminum. Alcoa was at the time the only producer of aluminum in America. It is reasonable to conclude that Alcoa had convinced O. P. M. of the adequacy of the supply in order to avoid the possibility that anyone else would go into a field which they had for so many years successfully monopolized. How they expected to take care of the situation when the shortage would become apparent is not clear. They may have reasoned that in its desperation the Government would do almost anything to increase the supply and that Alcoa would be favorably treated by the Government in order to insure an adequate supply for defense purposes.

Alcoa had long followed a policy of maintaining high prices, and building new capacity only when certain that it could sell at its fixed prices all that would be produced.

The maximum annual output of aluminum by Alcoa was in 1939, when it produced 327,000,000 pounds. Its capacity was then not more than 350,000,000 pounds per annum. Alcoa had increased its capacity during the year and was producing at the end of the year all it had capacity for.

Germany and the territory it now controls has a present capacity of 915,000,000 pounds. It is constructing facilities to increase this output. By 1943 it will have increased this capacity by 470,000,000 pounds, making a total of 1,385,000,000 pounds, without including secondary or scrap aluminum. Russia and Japan have a present capacity of 330,000,000 pounds. Japan's capacity is being increased by 200,000,000 pounds. This will make the capacity of Russia and Japan total 530,000,000 pounds in 1943. This may again be available to Germany should she conquer Russia. If so, in 1943 Germany will have available to it 1,915,000,000 pounds, plus secondary or scrap aluminum.

At the time of the committee hearings the maximum capacity planned by the O. P. M. was 800,000,000 pounds, of which 730,000,000 was to be produced by Alcoa.

The greatest investment cost in creating facilities for the manufacturer of aluminum and the most difficult to obtain is power. One kilowatt of installed capacity is the estimated requirement for the production of 1,000 pounds of aluminum per annum.

The power facilities owned by Alcoa, or contracted from private power companies, at May 31, when they were producing at the rate of 600,000,000 pounds per annum were only 404,000 kilowatts, and the amount of power furnished to Alcoa from Government projects was 222,000 kilowatts. To provide power for the production which Alcoa plans it is installing an additional 50,000 kilowatts, and expects the Government to provide an additional 100,000 kilowatts. Some of this capacity is for smelting operations and some to replace emergency facilities now being utilized. In August 1942 Alcoa's production would be at the rate of 730,000,000 pounds per annum, and used for this and smelters would be 454,000 kilowatts from private sources, and 322,000 kilowatts from the Government.

In addition, 120,000 kilowatts of Government power are required for the Reynolds' production of 120,000,000 pounds per annum (instead of the 60,000,000 pounds estimated by O. P. M.), and 600,000 kilowatts of Government power are required to produce the needed additional 600,000,000 pounds per annum, making totals as follows:

Total production aluminum (lb.)	1,450,000,000
Private power (kw.)	454,000
Government power (kw.)	1,042,000

Therefore, private industry expects to furnish less than one-third of the power needed, and without Government power the Nation would have been wholly unable to obtain the aluminum so vitally needed for the defense program.

Alcoa owns power sites which it has not developed, to which reference will be made later. It prefers to receive cheap power from T. V. A. and Bonneville which the Government, to meet the emergency, will be forced to provide.

As previously mentioned, Reynolds was constructing facilities for the production of 120,000,000 pounds of aluminum, despite the position of the Defense Advisory Commission and O. P. M. that such facilities were unnecessary.

Reynolds' 120,000,000 pounds, plus the maximum production of 730,000,000 pounds planned by Alcoa, just about equalled requirements as estimated in the fall of 1940, although there was doubt whether the increased capacity would be ready in time to meet the date when maximum requirements would accrue.

Under the estimates as revised in May 1941 there is an admitted shortage of at least 600,000,000 pounds in capacity, assuming we obtain 200,000,000 pounds annually from the Canadian production (of which 100,000,000 pounds has been arranged for), and also obtain control of 300,000,000 pounds of scrap.

Considerable care must be exercised to avoid being misled by the intended use of scrap aluminum. Unless a high degree of care is used in sorting scrap the melted material may be of such an alloy mixture as to be unusable for ordinary purposes. Experts to date have consistently taken the position that sheets produced from such scrap are unusable for airplanes. At best, the melted metal must be heavily enriched with virgin aluminum so as to offset the impurities from the conglomeration usually found in scrap heaps. This means that some substantial part of the aluminum produced will have to be used with the scrap to produce a sheet which is usable for planes. We do not yet know whether sheets suitable for airplanes can be produced in this manner.

That portion of the total of secondary aluminum which is represented by new scrap originates from the production and is not an additional source of aluminum to be added to the primary production capacity.

No testimony has as yet been introduced with respect to the rolling-mill capacity were it possible immediately to begin fabricating aluminum at the rate of 1,600,000,000 pounds per annum (1,400,000,000 domestic production plus 200,000,000 from Canada).

It appears that under favorable circumstances, and with no delays in the delivery of machinery, plant facilities can be constructed in about 10 months to extract alumina from bauxite and reduce it to aluminum.

The Secretary of the Interior has testified that at least a part of the power necessary to produce additional aluminum is available, and that for nearly 6 weeks he has been ready to discuss its application with the O. P. M. The O. P. M. admits that it has no real plans for the production of the 600,000,000 pounds, for which it has admitted a need, and ascribes that failure to its efforts to survey the power situation.

This situation is especially serious, as we cannot have confidence in our estimates of needs for aluminum, and as we may want to increase our airplane program still further. Unless we proceed at once to create new facilities, we may be unable to get the aluminum when we need it, or we may have to ration private consumption of electricity in the home.

In the construction of hydro plants the length of time for construction is an important factor. Steam plants can, under ordinary circumstances, be built faster than hydro plants. At present, however, the unavailability of boilers, condensers, and other machinery is a draw-back to the erection of steam plants. The lesser amount of mechanical machinery required in a hydro plant would appear to make that source a more readily available one for power, provided there are in the country available undeveloped water sites. Mr. Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, testified that his Commission was now making a study of power potentialities.

The Alcoa policy, as it affected the Fontana project, capable of producing 100,000 kilowatts, is worthy of note. Alcoa officials testified the first properties involved in the Fontana project were purchased in 1913 or 1914, and that since then Alcoa has been accumulating the necessary parcels of land for the project. It is situated in the western section of North Carolina on the Little Tennessee River.

In October 1940 Alcoa filed a declaration of intention with the Federal Power Commission with respect to this development. In November 1940 the Federal Power Commission determined that a Federal license issued by it would be required. Under the terms of such license, as prescribed by the Water Power Act of 1920, the Government has the right to capture the plant at the end of 50 years upon payment to the owners of the legitimate investment in the project, less accrued depreciation to the date of capture. Alcoa then decided not to construct the project on the ground they were not warranted in making an investment of $45,000,000 or more of their stockholders' moneys because of the danger of recapture at the end of 50 years.

They then awaited the outcome of other litigation involving the Federal Power Commission which might clarify the doubts which Alcoa had as to the powers of the Federal Power Commission. The Supreme Court sustained the Federal Power Commission in a decision handed down on December 16, 1940. As testified to by its officials, Alcoa is prevented from developing the project because of inability to finance it privately. It now states that it is willing to either sell the site to the Tennessee Valley Authority or develop it if funds are advanced by the Government. The committee has requested the O. P. M. to make an immediate survey of the Fontana situation and to inform the committee of its plans.

It appears that the Fontana site, with others owned by Alcoa, are not being developed so as to avoid the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, leaving to the Federal Government the problem of making power available for essential industries.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has indicated a willingness to provide $250,000,000 for the construction of facilities to make aluminum available. The O. P. M. has made no plans for the erection of such facilities, ascribing as the reason their lack of knowledge as to the power sites to be used and the quantities of power which will be available.

The Secretary of the Interior testified that on June 3, 1941, a conference was held between representatives of the O. P. M. and officials of the Department of the Interior and Tennessee Valley Authority. Following that conference the Department of the Interior furnished the O. P. M. with a tabulation showing when and where power could be made available in the West and South.

It is estimated by the services that the peak of their aluminum requirements for aircraft and other direct military needs of 100,000,000 pounds per month will be reached in March 1942. Based upon completed plans now under way the production capacity in March 1942 will be 75,000,000 pounds per month, a shortage of 25,000,000 pounds per month. This still leaves no provision whatsoever for indirect military and civilian requirements.

The available supply of high-grade bauxite in this country is estimated by the Bureau of Mines at 5,200,000 tons. At the consumption rate necessary to provide 1,400,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum, this supply would be exhausted in less than 2 years, unless supplemented by the importation of bauxite from South America (British and Dutch Guiana). Such importation presents a serious shipping problem, because of the growing scarcity of tonnage. Alcoa promised to build up its stock pile of bauxite, but did not do so.

The O. P. M. has not only not encouraged, but actually his discouraged, research and experimentation in the use of alternative processes for the production of aluminum from low-grade bauxite or other sources, such as alunite. On the other hand, the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, has encouraged the development of processes which involve the use of basic materials other than high-grade bauxite. The Bureau of Mines is now conducting such experiments with the cooperation of the inventors of the processes. A report recommending alunite as a source from which to produce aluminum was prepared by the Bureau of Mines and sent to O. P. M. more than 6 weeks ago, but O. P. M. has not yet acted on it. Other experiments have not yet proceeded to the point where a decision can be made with respect to their feasibility, but the results to date have been encouraging.

Coupled with all the foregoing is the problem of transportation, the costs of which are included in the cost of the finished product. It appears that bauxite is transported from Arkansas and the Guianas to Mobile, Ala., and East St. Louis, Ill., at which points alumina is extracted. Alumina is then shipped to Alcoa, Tenn., Niagara Falls, N. Y., and Vancouver, Wash. At these points it is reduced to aluminum in ingot form. Then it is shipped to rolling mills in Pennsylvania, New York, and Tennessee. From the rolling mills sheets are shipped to the airplane plants. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce estimates that 40 percent of all the planes to be produced will be built on the west coast. If that is correct, then 40 percent of the aluminum sheets for airplanes will be shipped to the west coast.

So we have bauxite going from Arkansas and the Guianas to East St. Louis, then in the form of alumina to Vancouver, then in the form of ingots to the East, then in the form of sheets to California. This cross shipment adds to the cost at the rate of $0.02 per pound for freight alone, which could be saved if integrated plants were located in the far West.

The Secretary of the Interior believed that it would be undesirable to build a few aluminum plants of gigantic size. After the emergency, such plants probably would be entirely shut down and the Northwest deprived of the industry for the creation of which the power plants were constructed. In the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, it would be better to build a number of smaller plants capable of integrated operations.

These small plants, if his policy is adopted, should be so located and so constructed as to minimize the transportation of the material in its various stages back and forth across the United States.

The problem of pricing aluminum should be given careful consideration.

On the basis of presently arranged-for capacity, Alcoa will be producing at the rate of 730,000,000 pounds per annum in August 1942, and Reynolds will be producing at the rate of 120,000,000 pounds per annum in November 1941, a grand total of 850,000,000 pounds.

For the above program the Government will be furnishing more than half of the power capacity required. With the completion of the entire program bringing the aluminum-producing capacity to 1,400,000,000 pounds per annum, the Government will be furnishing 70 percent of the power capacity required. The greatest dollar investment in the facilities for the production of aluminum is represented by the power facilities, and therefore the Government will have the predominant investment in the entire facilities.

To the extent that funds invested by private capital are permitted to be amortized over 5 years against income for tax purposes, as provided by law, the Government will in the final analysis also provide the funds for the nonpower facilities.

Especially is this true by reason of the fact that for some time the Government, by reason of priorities, will directly and indirectly be practically the sole purchaser of aluminum.

Under such conditions there is no basis for large profits to private interests.

The furnishing of management skill and services is all there is left. There is a question whether, at least as to one or more plants, the Government should not hire the necessary personnel on a salaried basis.

The committee recommends that the available power be put to work as soon as possible and that the O. P. M. should proceed at once to obtain the aluminum we need on fair terms and should report to the committee any difficulties which it may experience.

The committee will continue its investigation into the aluminum situation in an effort to keep informed concerning developments therein.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, during the hearings which our committee has conducted with reference to the question of aluminum production we have heard from a number of witnesses, including William L. Batt, Deputy Director, Division of Production, Office of Production Management; Grenville R. Holden, consultant on aluminum and magnesium, Office of Production Management; Frank B. Cliffe, Priorities Division, Office of Production Management; M. B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co., formerly with the National Defense Committee; Arthur V. Davis, chairman of the board of directors, Aluminum Co. of America; I. W. Wilson, vice president, Aluminum Co. of America; E. K. Davis, president, Aluminum Co. of

America; Richard S. Reynolds, president, Reynolds Metals Co.; R. J. Gaudy, president, Standard Aluminum & Alloy Co.; Leland Olds, chairman, Federal Power Commission; Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; and J. A. Krug, power manager, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, this Nation is lost without aluminum. Without aluminum we cannot have airplanes, and, of course, without airplanes modern war cannot be waged. The production of aluminum in this country, until very recently, was monopolized by the Aluminum Co. of America. This resulted in a policy of maintaining high prices without increasing capacity to produce aluminum, until and unless metal could be sold at the prices fixed by it. The Department of Justice has charged that this monopoly was in violation of the antitrust laws. There has been an extended trial of that issue, but it has not yet been adjudicated by the courts. The Secretary of the Interior has testified that the Aluminum Co. is in fact such a monopoly, and that its actions have been wholly selfish. This, of course, has been categorically denied by the Aluminum Co.

Your committee, Mr. President, cannot attempt to determine such issues, but it is obvious to us that the Aluminum Co. of America has pursued a high price and low production policy. The fact remains, too, that the Aluminum Co., whether a legal or illegal monopoly, did permit Germany to outstrip America in the production of aluminum, and, since Germany has appropriated the aluminum facilities of occupied Europe, we are now in such a position that we cannot possibly have, under present conditions, as much aluminum as Germany and the nations controlled by her.

It is axiomatic that one should not fight unless his club is at least the same size as that of his opponent. The O. P. M. estimates that Germany and the territory she now controls have a capacity of 915,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum, which together with the Japanese production capacity, makes a grand total of over a billion pounds presently available to Hitler, without including secondary or scrap aluminum. Furthermore, that capacity is being increased in controlled territory by 470,000,000 pounds, and in Japan by 200,000,000 pounds; so we may expect that in 1943 Germany will have available to it an annual production in excess of approximately 1,750,000,000 pounds of aluminum.

Mr. President, the Aluminum Co. of America in 1939 produced, according to its senior vice president, every pound it could produce, but its total production was only 327,000,000 pounds. At the time of our committee hearings its plans for increased production in the future provided for an annual output of 725,000,000 pounds effective about June 1942. To this must be added 120,000,000 pounds annually to be produced by the Reynolds Metals Co., a newcomer in the field of aluminum production, and 100,000,000 pounds which the O. P. M. has arranged to obtain from Canada, or a total of slightly less than one-half the estimated production available to Germany.

Mr. Batt, of O. P. M., testified before our committee that we would have sufficient aluminum to meet only our direct military requirements, as they were estimated early in May, if we could add to the aluminum referred to, an additional 300,000,000 pounds of secondary or scrap aluminum. Mr. Batt said there would be nothing left for indirect military needs, and nothing left at all for civilian needs. There would also be nothing left for possible future increases in the defense program, and no allowance for mistakes in judgment, of which there have been many in the earlier estimates.

The Defense Advisory Council repeatedly took the position that there was plenty of aluminum for both military and civilian needs, and that it would not approve the plans of the Reynolds Metals Co. to enter into competition with the Aluminum Co. of America because increased production was not necessary, it held, for our defense program. As late as November 28 Mr. Stettinius announced that there was plenty of aluminum for all needs, including both civilian and military, and it was not until February of this year that priorities were instituted. Actually, Mr. President, it was not until our Senate committee asked the O. P. M. for the facts that the seriousness of the situation was finally ascertained.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator, as a member of the Temporary National Economic Committee, will recall that this subject was discussed at the opening of the public sessions of that Committee to hear recommendations for economic improvement. Our sessions, as the Senator well knows, since he was a member of the Committee, were opened in the middle of January. A few days before they were opened, the chairman referred to the very conditions of which the Senator from New York now speaks, with respect to the shortage of aluminum, and the policy of restricted supply and price maintenance which he has discussed, and called attention to the fact that it was essential to national defense that there should be an increased supply.

That announcement was immediately greeted as an attack upon the Aluminum Co. and upon the O. P. M. Of course, it was nothing of the sort; but it was perfectly obvious to the Temporary National Economic Committee that this problem would have to be met, and that the stimulation of production was one of the most necessary steps to be taken in connection with national defense. It was also pointed out that during the last session of Congress the Appropriations Committee brought to the floor of the Senate, and the Senate approved, several appropriations to increase the power capacity of T. V. A. in order to supply power for the Aluminum Co. to enable it to expand its production. If I am correctly advised, the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Appropriations Committee is now considering another appropriation for increasing T. V. A. facilities to supply new power so that there may be increased production of aluminum.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee has correctly stated the conditions revealed by his Committee. At that time he very thoroughly emphasized the need for added aluminum production; but, as he has explained, the seriousness of our defense needs was not fully realized in all cases by the officials in charge of the program, and it probably was not fully realized by the country at large. His Committee accomplished a splendid piece of work in its review of the aluminum set-up and the aluminum needs of the country.

While discussing the appropriation for additional power facilities, and noticing that I am honored by the presence of the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is considering the proposed legislation mentioned by the Senator from Wyoming, I desire to express the hope that before long the Appropriations Committee, the Senate, and the Congress will have approved the T. V. A. appropriations for the construction of the Hiwassee-Ocoee development, which is very necessary in connection with added electrical production. I hope that proposed legislation will be expedited, for it is my opinion that it is essential in the production of an added aluminum supply.

The failure to make accurate estimates of our aluminum needs can be ascribed in part to increases in our airplane program, and perhaps to increases in our lend-lease policy; but O. P. M. has also ascribed it, first, to the necessity for greatly increased working inventories; second, increases in the estimates of so-called indirect military requirements; and, third, large withdrawals of aluminum scrap from the secondary market.

The failure to make accurate estimates does not necessarily mean that a bad job of estimating was done, for many difficulties are encountered in making such forecasts. The criticism should be made, however, that it must have been evident that the estimates, by their very nature, were largely the result of guesswork, and not something on which we could properly base the false conclusion that plenty of aluminum exists for both military and civilian needs.

As Secretary Ickes said, the defense emergency is no time for smugness and self-complacency. Complete reliance ought not to have been placed on estimates which were known to have been subject to so many possibilities of error, and which were known to be far below the aluminum-producing capacity of Germany and the countries controlled by her. At this late date the O. P. M. tells us that it thinks we should have at least 600,000,000 pounds annually, in addition to our present plant production and importation of a total of 900,000,000 pounds annually. We are also told that our domestic supplies of commercial bauxite are very limited, and that we are largely dependent upon importation of bauxite from South America, with the attendant necessity of making ships

available at a time when they are needed elsewhere.

Our Committee was told also that the Aluminum Co. has made no provision for obtaining the huge quantities of power necessary for the reduction of alumina to aluminum, and that its own power resources will be sufficient to produce only about 450,000,000 pounds annually.

The Aluminum Co. of America is already dependent upon the Government for the power to produce about 322,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year, while the Reynolds Metals Co. is dependent upon the Government for the power to produce its 120,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually. The Government will have to furnish the power for the proposed increased production of 600,000,000 pounds annually. This means that without the program which the Government has carried out over a period of many years, of constructing new power plants in the Tennessee Valley, at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dam, the country would not now be able even to consider the airplane program which is needed for the Nation's defense. There can be and is no dispute about that. That is the undisputed record. But extensive as those Government projects are, they are still not sufficient to provide the huge quantities of power necessary for aluminum.

Again, according to Secretary Ickes, we are facing a very definite shortage of power for aluminum and other defense purposes, which will become more and more acute as the emergency continues, especially if the present estimate of power needs should prove to be as faulty and inaccurate as the estimates which the O. P. M. has made to date as to aluminum, steel, and other vital needs.

Secondly, Mr. President, we may soon see the day when electricity will be strictly rationed, when we shall be asked to go to bed early so as to save electric lights, and when the housewife will be asked to cut down on the use of household conveniences on which we have all come to depend so much. I am sure that the Nation is ready to make all necessary sacrifices; but I am also sure that no one wants to make sacrifices because someone has bungled the job of preparing for the emergency. It takes time to create electric facilities; and every day lost brings us that much closer to the possible failure of the defense program on the one hand and on the other hand the almost certain imposition of hardships on the Nation and its people. We should not lose a single day; and yet your committee has been told that there is power available today which is not yet being utilized.

Secretary Ickes testified that for more than 6 weeks he has been ready to discuss the allocation of power with the O. P. M. and with others; that there is power today which could be used and that more power could be made available before aluminum production facilities could be installed. We believe that available power should be put to work at once, and that the additional power needed should be obtained as soon as possible and put to work as quickly as it can be made available, because it is needed now.

The necessity for obtaining power also requires us not to disregard the fact that there is now at Niagara Falls sufficient installed power capacity to enable us almost immediately to start producing upward of 70,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually. Arrangements for the immediate use of that total power capacity should be made without delay. Additional power for aluminum is also available, we were informed, at Massena, N. Y.

Power is the bottleneck of the aluminum problem; and I am sorry to say that the Aluminum Co., for monetary or purely selfish reasons, has caused us to lose the better part of a year in obtaining a very large block of power from the Fontana power site in North Carolina. This site the Aluminum Co. has controlled and has kept from development for more than 25 years. A power project at that site would be of great strategic importance, because it would not only produce power at the dam, but by conserving water at dry periods of the year would greatly increase the power facilities of the entire Tennessee Valley system.

Last year the Aluminum Co. decided to develop the project, but later refused to do so because the Federal Power Commission would not and could not grant to the Aluminum Co. an exemption from the recapture provisions which the Congress enacted for the purpose of protecting our natural resources. Rather than submit to the provision that the United States could recapture the Fontana project at the end of a licensing period of not to exceed 50 years by paying to the Aluminum Co. its legitimate investment, less depreciation, the Aluminum Co. chose to abandon the project, and as a result of that decision we have lost many valuable months. I am glad, however, to report that the Aluminum Co. has assured the committee that it will work closely with the various governmental agencies and will proceed with the erection of the dam if the Government will provide funds on terms acceptable to the Aluminum Co. I hope that by "acceptable terms" the Aluminum Co. means just that, and that it does not expect the Government to make it any gifts or to do it any unusual or unwarranted favors.

The Aluminum Co. insists that it has done all that can be expected of it, and more; and the committee is not desirous of characterizing its actions in one way or another. They speak for themselves. They speak for themselves in our lack of a stock pile of raw materials. They speak for themselves in our lack of the power necessary to increase aluminum production, and in our inability to match European production.

The Federal Government has been most generous with the Aluminum Co. Its income over and above and after all provision for Federal income taxes in 1938 was approximately $15,000,000, and during the first 3 months of this year was at the rate of about $48,000,000, an increase of more than 300 percent. Most of the money it claims credit for spending for defense facilities will come from its profits. It has made no real sacrifices in this emergency up to date.

The Nation expects the Aluminum Co. to do its utmost, and it expects the O. P. M. and the other agencies of the Government to proceed at once to make effective plans to procure as soon as possible the needed additional 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum. The first job is to harness the power we now have, and the second is to get as much more power as quickly as we can do so, and that before the end of 1942.

Mr. President, we must have airplanes. To produce them we must have aluminum. To produce aluminum we must have electrical power. In this connection, the committee pleads for immediate action.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Is the testimony on this subject before the Senator's committee in print, so that it is available to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MEAD. It is now being corrected and printed, and will be available very shortly. We shall be glad to see that the testimony is furnished without delay to the Senator's committee.

Mr. ADAMS. My reason for asking the question is that, as stated by the Senator from Wyoming, the Appropriations Committee has the deficiency bill before it for consideration at this very time. The bill was before the committee yesterday.

Mr. MEAD. I am informed by the clerk of our committee that we can furnish the Senator with a galley proof of the testimony, so that there will be no delay.

Mr. ADAMS. We shall be glad to have it. How recent is the testimony? When was it taken?

Mr. MEAD. Within the past few weeks, and up until 10 days ago.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask the question because we find that there has been considerable instability in connection with statistics regarding aluminum production and consumption. There seems to be a different set of figures almost every day.

Mr. MEAD. The testimony to which I refer is very recent and up to the minute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he changes the subject, if he is about to do so?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator what action his committee recommends? He concluded his discussion with the expression of a fervent hope that there should be immediate action.

Mr. MEAD. In that connection, this being a special committee and without the authority vested in a regular committee I will state that we are bringing this matter to the attention of all the parties in interest, just as I am bringing it to the attention of the Senate today. On June 20 the chairman of our committee dispatched a letter to Hon. William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, setting forth the need of aluminum, and suggesting to him the expeditious determination of the T. V. A. aluminum controversy which now is in the hands of O. P. M. In like fashion our committee is also taking up the matter with the Federal Power Commission, and Mr.

Leland Olds has reported to our committee the Power Commission's very progressive program looking toward the procurement of additional power.

We have taken up the matter with Secretary Ickes. He has provided us with a great deal of comfort, and hopes to make it possible in the immediate future to secure added power for aluminum production. So we are leaving no stone unturned. We are doing everything we can do to expedite the production of aluminum, and to do so at once.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, in order that I may make one or two remarks about the general situation?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the immediate problem is to produce the largest possible amount of aluminum, which obviously is necessary in the national defense. It is utterly ridiculous that a great nation such as the United States, with the engineering and technical genius which our people have, should now be dependent, as it appears to be, upon the collection from the kitchens of the people of pots and pans with which to supply aluminum needed in the national defense.

In some way or other we will form the requisite organizations and appropriate the money necessary to increase the production of aluminum in order that we may have sufficient aluminum for the manufacture of airplanes and other essential articles; but the deeper issue here is what we shall do when this war effort is over, and what position we shall take to prevent the sort of throttling of national industry which has continued over a period of more than 50 years.

The story of aluminum illustrates almost better than anything else how organizations have gained control of our national resources, and, for the advantage of the organizations concerned, have prevented competition and thereby have prevented development.

But the story of aluminum is not the only story. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], who is interested in the particular appropriation dealing with T. V. A. expansion, is also interested in the iron and steel industry. At Pueblo, in his State, there is a very substantial iron and steel plant. It gets much of its supplies from raw materials produced in the State of Wyoming; but the history of the past 30 years has been the history of the suppression of industries of that kind in the West because the control was held in the East by concentrated economic power of exactly the same type.

The Senator from New York referred to the fact that an estimate was made by a distinguished and competent engineer associated with O. P. M. that there was no need for any expansion of steel capacity. Obviously, that was a mistaken assumption. There is a need for steel expansion; and the question will be, How shall we develop these resources for the benefit of the masses of the people who are primarily interested, and not for the specific interest of those who are directing our concentrated industries?

Because it is altogether appropriate at this point, I ask unanimous consent, without further interrupting the Senator, that there may be printed at this point an extract from the final statement made by the chairman of the T. N. E. C., and an extract from the final report, in which it is pointed out that we must devote our attention, if we believe in saving free private enterprise, to the stimulation of competition and the development of small business. We cannot permit great concentrations of this kind to continue indefinitely unless we are willing, in the last analysis, that the Government step in. We are now at the very threshold of the conflict between all-powerful government and all-powerful monopoly. Between the two we must save free, private enterprise, and we can do it only by sustaining competition. No new revolutionary theory is necessary. All we need is to return to the substantial fundamental basis of free enterprise, which means that opportunity shall be maintained for the masses of the people.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, the extracts referred to by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed in the RECORD.

The extracts are as follows:

[From the final statement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, at the closing public session to consider recommendations]

If we are agreed, and we all seem to be agreed, at least here in the United States, that we want to preserve free enterprise it becomes apparent that we had better get about the task and a good way to begin, it seems to me, would be to make up our minds exactly what we want to do about our problem instead of trying to blame one another for its existence. The representatives of business, as well as the representatives of government, those who are engaged in agriculture, those who are engaged in industry, all are vitally concerned and it must be perfectly clear that any remedy which does not stop the steady progress of concentration will be utterly futile and will end only in an all-powerful government. If we want to remedy these obvious ills, we'd better stop scolding one another and begin to cooperate.

Business leaders who object to any government action overlook the plain fact that there is no possible way of bringing about the coordination which we need except through government action. To refuse to cooperate means only to accentuate the present drift toward centralism which has produced the authoritarian government in Europe and brought the democratic nations of the Old World to the very brink of disaster. It is more important to business than to any other group to cooperate in the reestablishment of free individual, local, private enterprise and full employment if it desires to remain free from complete government control.

NATIONAL CHARTERS FOR NATIONAL BUSINESS

The first and most necessary step is to recognize that we must have a national rule for national business. We must be able to differentiate between that business which is naturally and properly national in scope and that business which is naturally and properly local in scope. If we desire to have business carried on by collective units, and it must be carried on thus in the modern world, then we must find the way to make these units thoroughly democratic. Economic freedom and political freedom go hand in hand. Neither can survive without the other, and since it must be acknowledged that in a republic the government of all the people must be able to speak for all the people then we have no recourse except to have that government define the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the organized agencies which conduct and control the commerce on which its citizens depend for employment and income.

It is idle to think that the huge collective institutions which carry on our modern business can continue to operate without more definite responsibility toward all the people of the Nation than they now have. To do this it will be necessary, in my judgment, to have a national charter system for all national corporations. Whether this system should operate through licenses or through direct charters seems to me to be of little importance. One thing is certain: We cannot hope to stop the processes of concentration if we are willing to continue to allow the States to create agencies through and by which the concentration has been brought about.

I am aware that many businessmen, fortunately not so many now as formerly, look upon this plan for Federal charters as merely another step in the growth of all-powerful government. That is an error. It is only through a charter system that the growth of government can be prevented. For 50 years Federal regulation and, in some instances, even Federal control of business has been steadily increasing. It is unnecessary to recite here the laws by which, during the past generation, new bureaus and commissions have been established in Washington. Without regard to which political party happened to be in power, one bureau after another has been created and, necessarily so, because without them the public interest would have been completely neglected. Businessmen have resisted every such law, but once a new agency has been created it has never been abandoned. From the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission down to the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission the same story has been told and although each in its turn has been roundly denounced by the organized agencies which were to be regulated, the necessity of the regulation has always been recognized by most of those affected and no political leader has ever dared to propose the abolition of such a commission after its establishment and the restoration of the conditions that existed before its creation.

But these bureaus and boards have been unable to solve the problem. Concentration has proceeded without interruption because those who wish to avoid the objectives of regulation in the public interest were always able through the corporate charter of some State to find a way around the law. The Insulls and the Hopsons, the Coster-Musicas have been able to prey upon the economic system of all the people solely because they were able to secure the separate States' charters which enabled them to engage in national commerce although their creators had neither the desire nor the governmental power to regulate the commerce in which they were engaged.

I see no other way to avoid the continued expansion of government debt and the continued expansion of government control over private business except through a national charter system. Such a system would make unnecessary the creation of new boards and commissions because it could be used to define so clearly the responsibilities and the duties of all national corporations that discretionary regulation would be unnecessary.

Over and over again it ought to be asserted that a corporate charter is a contract between individuals who want the privilege of doing business in corporate form and a government which speaks, or ought to speak, for all the people. Here in the United States the separate States do not have the constitutional power to speak in the public interest. Only the Federal Government has that power

so far as interstate and foreign commerce is concerned. If we believe that the framers of the Constitution acted wisely when they gave to the Federal Congress the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, then we cannot fail to acknowledge that the Federal Congress should exercise that power by insisting upon writing the contracts which call into existence the corporations which carry on that commerce. Until that is done there can be no effective regulation except by piecemeal through the continued multiplication of Government boards and commissions. That system will inevitably be accompanied by continued evasions, continued abuse, continued concentration, and continued expansion of government.

The maintenance of free private enterprise demands first of all that small enterprise should be effectively protected against attack by what we call monopoly. The big company which crushes its small competitor by underselling, that is to say, by selling at a loss, commits the unforgivable economic sin. That is not competition. That is economic war. The national oil company, for example, which enters a little community and builds a filling station across the street from an independent dealer and, by selling at a loss, forces him to sell out or suspend, destroys the very basis of a free economy The monopolistic practices which kill free enterprise and which are without justification are so well known that they need not be restated here, but certainly the great crisis which the world now faces in the conflict of democracy and dictatorship should be enough to convince every business executive, as well as every government spokesman, that the time has come to outlaw all such practices in a way that will be effective.

That such practices exist in the United States in violation of well known law is demonstrated by the antitrust record of the Department of Justice under the direction of one of the members of this committee. The defendants who have been charged with violations of the antitrust law in the past 3 years have, for the most part, walked into court and pleaded guilty. The cases were so clear that there was no resistance. That the practices of which they were accused should not be tolerated in any society which even pretends to believe in free private enterprise no one can possibly deny, yet it is perfectly evident that the Sherman antitrust law can be effectively enforced only so long as we have an Attorney General who is disposed to enforce it, and a Congress that is willing to make the appropriations necessary to maintain a sufficient staff. That such a staff has not been maintained during the past 50 years except under Thurman Arnold is one of the reasons why the concentration of economic power and wealth so clearly demonstrated by the hearings and publications of this committee has not been prevented.

It would not be difficult so to draft a national charter law as to reduce materially not only the possibilities of evasion of the antitrust law, but the difficulties of its enforcement. A charter law which, for example, would make corporate directors trustees in fact as well as in law, and, at the same time, make them personally liable for violations of the antitrust law which they themselves conceived and directed, a law which would clearly define the fields into which a corporation might enter through subsidiaries, and one which would standardize intercorporate financing would not only tend to prevent some of the worst infractions of both ethics and law which have contributed to the creation of our dilemma, but would also tend to open new fields for small enterprise.

[From the final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee]

The committee therefore recommends the vigorous and vigilant enforcement of the antitrust laws, confident that an awakening business conscience will realize the necessity of complete cooperation in the elimination of monopolistic practice. Enlightened self-interest upon the part of those who own and manage the commercial and industrial organizations of our time will prompt them to cooperate.

FOSTER AND ENCOURAGE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

We must, however, not only stop the processes of concentration by the action of government and business under the antitrust laws, but the Government should actively encourage the development of new private enterprise by positive programs designed to foster and protect it. We cannot continue to rely upon Government expenditures, whether by way of contribution or loan, to sustain enterprise and private employment unless we are willing to invite eventually some form of the authoritarian state. If the opportunity for the employment of idle men and idle money is to be found in a free, private enterprise system, then obviously we must find the way to stimulate that enterprise by encouraging the investment of private savings in new private enterprise.

It is only thus that business and industry can be decentralized, either socially or geographically, and the danger of final centralization in government avoided. This centralism which threatens us appeared first in business, but now it manifests itself in almost every activity. Because of the concentration of economic power in the organizations which dominate commerce and industry, we have found individuals forming new national organizations to deal with new problems. First are the national trade associations established and maintained by dealers and manufacturers in many lines. Commercial organizations have become regional and even national. Farmers have their national farm organizations to protect their interests in the field of national business. Finally, organized labor, which was first purely local and then became a national federation of local unions, produced a wholly national organization which was designed to cover the same areas covered by big business and big government. From the leaders of all of these organizations in their central offices go out to individual members all over the country the suggestions which direct their group activity. Frequently, instead of the organization being directed by the thought and will of its members, the action of members is directed by the thought and will of the leaders. This has necessarily followed because one result of the development of centralism is that individuals are no longer in contact with information which is essential to the formation of policy vital to their existence.

Curiously enough, this development has been accompanied by another, which was vigorously criticized in the hearings of this committee—namely, the rapid growth of State trade barriers and the development in many States of combinations of small business to protect themselves from the evil effects of centralism. The causes which bring trade barriers into existence and which produce centralism in every form of economic activity must be attacked if a real system of free enterprise is to be reestablished.

The work of the Temporary National Economic Committee has not culminated in a set of recommendations designed to turn the economic clock back. We are not wistfully wishing for the return of any previous period in our economic evolution. Ours is a positive affirmation. Our recommendations are intended to enable the individual to maintain himself freely, both economically and politically. They are not intended to expand the power of Government over business or over the individual. The purpose of the committee is to suggest such policies as seem calculated to restrain the continued progress of concentration which so obviously is undermining the foundations of both free enterprise and free government.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I appreciate the further contribution made to the discussion by the Senator from Wyoming, and I concur in his views. I wish to point out that the experts who advised us of the availability of adequate supplies of power, steel, and aluminum have very recently tendered their resignations. So our committee has emphasized the problem to such an extent that we believe that it is receiving the serious attention it demands by agencies of the Government which heretofore were laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. President, we located the possibilities of electrical power in many sections of the country. The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission brought to our attention the situation at Badin, N. C., where the Carolina Aluminum Co. has an installation, and where there is a fairly adequate supply of electrical energy, but, so far, the Carolina Aluminum Co. has refused to install the necessary rectifiers or conversion equipment necessary to permit the continuous operation of the aluminum reduction pots during extreme droughts which have occurred in the past and which are now occurring again. If the rectifiers were installed immediately, additional aluminum could be produced from the power which is available from the utilities in that area.

In addition to the above possibilities for producing more aluminum at the Badin plant, if certain curtailment measures now under consideration by the Power Commission because of the drought situation in the Southeast are extended to the Carolinas, it would make available for producing aluminum 60,000 kilowatts of additional continuous energy, which would enable the Badin plant to turn out 50,000,000 additional pounds of aluminum a year.

So, Mr. President, our committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], has been very diligent in the search for a solution of all these vexing problems. We have not the authority of a regular committee so far as legislation is concerned; we have never attempted to interfere in the expeditious activities of any executive agency; but we have striven always to be helpful and to secure an adequate supply of the materials of which the Government stands in need.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the report of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] on behalf of the Truman committee investigating defense production. It seems to me that the tragedy of the situation with regard to aluminum is typical of what I fear prevails in many other fields, that is, that there is no individual to blame for the lack of the coordination which is essential to the great industrial mobilization in which this country must now be engaged. There is no place other than the President's desk where the responsibility can center. It seems to me evident from our researches of the past 3 months into the defense procurement program that the

real "bottleneck" rests there upon the President's desk. He has the enormous responsibility of the conduct of our foreign policy; he has necessarily very great responsibilities in connection with the lease-lend program under which we are distributing $7,000,000,000 worth of material to the beleaguered democracies of the world. It seems to me obvious, and I believe it has been shown conclusively by the studies of the past 20 years conducted by the War Department and the Navy Department, as evidenced in the report of those Departments in 1939 on the industrial mobilization plan, that we must, without delay, adopt some integrated method of procurement if America is not to drift into industrial chaos. This situation can ultimately be resolved to our advantage only by centralizing the responsibility in accordance with the well-settled conclusions reached as a result of the studies of the past 20 years, since the last great war.

Field Marshal von Hindenburg paid high tribute to the American genius for organization when he gave it credit for American success 20 years ago. America's "brilliant if pitiless war industry had entered the service of patriotism and had not failed it," he said. "They understood war."

We have heard from the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] about aluminum, which is one of the key necessities in any adequate preparedness program. We have learned, as amateurs, that aluminum production depends first on power, second on bauxite, and third on putting these things together. We have sought to find who was responsible for America not having the 1,400,000,000 pounds of annual production of aluminum which is absolutely essential for our plane program alone. We have talked with the Army, we have talked with the Navy, we have talked with the O. P. M., we have had before us the Federal Power Commission, we have had before us the T. V. A., we have had before us the Aluminum Co. of America; and it is, I think, our sober conclusion that upon no one of these individuals or agencies can the responsibility properly be placed. That, to my mind, is the tragedy of the situation. What America needs is aluminum, and what America gets is an alibi. What America needs more than anything else today is one good "goat" that can be responsible for getting what we need.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out, in his exhaustive studies on our economic situation, the degree to which there has come to be concentrated control of industry. Government must emulate, in this period of crisis, the well-settled lessons of industry, and must centralize the responsibility if we are not to see America's gigantic effort nullified by failure to fix responsibility.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, and to read one paragraph from it, in which it is said:

> The entire defense program ought to be under the control of a single unified agency, directly responsible to the President, and clothed with authority to coordinate every element, including industrial production, the regulation of prices, and the integration of the lease-lend program with our own rearmament. It has become increasingly apparent, both from the figures of lease-lend aid and of national-defense expenditures, that we have not yet achieved an all-out effort or anything approaching it.

I ask to have the entire editorial inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

CENTRALIZING DEFENSE

The Office of Production Management has announced a plan of reorganization intended to centralize the activities of that agency and eliminate some of the overlapping that now exists. Under the new arrangement, committees will be established for about 30 industries corresponding to a like number of commodity sections in the O. P. M. Each industry will deal with a single division of O. P. M. through one of these commodity sections, instead of having to deal separately on questions of production, priorities, or purchase with the three separate branches of O. P. M. that have handled those fields.

This is clearly a good move. The marvel is that it was not done before. The question that will at once be asked is why a centralizing program of this character should be limited to O. P. M. The overlapping that has existed in that agency is paralleled on a larger scale in the overlapping that exists among the O. P. M. itself, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, and the organization of lease-lend. All three are essential elements of national defense and are compelled, of necessity, to coordinate their activities. Yet each of these operates as a separate entity.

The entire defense program ought to be under the control of a single unified agency, directly responsible to the President, and clothed with authority to coordinate every element, including industrial production, the regulation of prices, and the integration of the lease-lend program with our own rearmament. It has become increasingly apparent, both from the figures of lease-lend aid and of national-defense expenditures, that we have not yet achieved an all-out effort or anything approaching it. One of the first requisites in achieving a more efficient production of arms for Britain and ourselves is the centralizing of administration of the whole defense effort. The need has been clear from the beginning. It has been repeatedly emphasized by men of experience. No further time should be lost in bringing it about.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator stated that we should emulate the lessons of industry in the concentration of authority in order to get progress and action. He might also say that we should emulate the Government, and particularly this administration, in the way they have concentrated authority in certain things that appeal to them, such as the National Labor Relations Board, which has become a sort of czar, and along other particular lines of that kind. But here is a vast emergency which the Senator is discussing, in which the administration is going along in an aimless fashion without placing the matter under a definite head, though it has acted differently in connection with other things at other times.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is a good deal of force to the Senator's observation. There are various phases of the activities of the Government in which tremendous efficiency and concentration of control have been evident; and I believe that in this crisis it is imperative that we should coordinate our procurement and that without delay. Aluminum is only an illustration—a case history, if you please—of what is going on. We must always remember, when we read of 1,200 or 1,500 planes being produced a month—more this month, less last month—that, after all, planes and tanks and guns are only a few of the 2,000,000 items that are required in the defense of our country at the present time. When we get the total figures which were given to us by Mr. May, of the Statistical Division of the O. P. M., we find that while we started out with a very modest program of $17,000,000,000 this year, we are falling far short of that program. During the first 4 months of this year we produced at the rate of less than $1,000,000,000 a month. It may seem strange for one on this side of the Chamber to be criticizing the Government for failure to spend money; but, as a matter of fact, having embarked upon this all-out effort, having determined upon the necessity of furnishing these supplies, I think it is evident that time is of the essence, and that the failure to get this program to functioning so that all the resources of America shall be immediately mobilized is a thing that is adding very greatly to the peril of our country at this time.

We have learned from a survey by an outside agency, to the accuracy of which no Government agency was prepared to take any exception, that 50 percent of the machine-tool capacity of this country at the present time is unutilized. What an astounding commentary, after America for 12 months has been attempting to mobilize its machine resources. The governmental authorities are now engaged in an endeavor to find out, first, whether or not that report of a private agency as a result of a careful survey is correct; and, second, if it is correct, what can be done to remedy the situation, and to put machine tools to work at least 20 hours a day, instead of the 10 hours a day, for which they are now employed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The SECRETARY. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course there is an explanation of the condition to which the Senator refers.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume that the survey of which he speaks is that which was conducted by the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That association sent questionnaires to various chambers of commerce and organizations of industry throughout the country, and received responses. The report, as I understand,

is exactly as the Senator has stated it to be, but the reason why there is so much unutilized capacity in the machine-tool industry is primarily that the War Department and the Navy Department and the O. P. M. and the R. F. C. in making their contracts turned very naturally, and probably properly, to the large organizations which were controlling our entire industrial machinery, so to speak. It was the concentration of industrial control, so epitomized in the story of aluminum, that brought about the conditions which resulted in the award of most of these contracts to a comparatively few organizations. If I remember correctly, some $13,000,000,000 of contracts had been awarded down to February of this year, and more than three-fourths of those contracts had gone to about 68 companies and affiliates of large organizations.

In other words, the concentration represented by what we see in the aluminum industry and what we have seen in the steel industry has gone on all over the United States, and has prevented the utilization of the productive capacity of the people of the country.

Of course, it is true that in the emergency we must be prepared to organize all these facilities under one head, so far as possible, and we are building here in Washington an over-all control of industry. But we must look beyond that; we must look forward to the time when, after this war, we shall be able to guarantee to all the unused productive capacity of America the opportunity to produce, and we must go to the root of that problem.

If I may trespass for one more moment upon the Senator's time——

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to have the Senator's contribution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recall again the fact that in the public-land States there are resources of oil and of minerals which are almost beyond imagination—resources which are not being utilized at this moment.

In the Committee on Appropriations a few days ago I called to the attention of the Under Secretary of War—and to the attention of the various officials who were assembled there—a map prepared by the Federal Real Estate Board, which shows that in some of the public-land States—only a few of them, to be sure—more than 50 percent of the entire area within the boundaries of those States is controlled by the Federal Government. Traversing this area, through lands which are rich in mineral resources, are great railroads, which would greatly profit from the transportation of the materials if once we undertook to use them. I feel very certain that there will be no permanent solution of our problems until we make up our minds that we will prevent the sort of practice which in the past has enabled a few to gain control of the economic processes of the Nation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Wyoming in the future of our country after the war. I appreciate also the tremendously valuable contribution resulting from the exhaustive studies of our economic situation made under his direction. But I feel very strongly that our immediate problems are something different. The present must concern us now, and that means organizing the resources of America in the current crisis, which the President has found to be an emergency of the first magnitude, and yet the Government has failed to place the responsibility upon one administrator, who should be responsible for procurement, so that it will not be necessary for the Truman committee, or any other committee of the Senate, to find 6 months from today that not only aluminum, but myriad other necessities for our defense, are still in the process of consideration and planning.

What happened in the case of aluminum? In the first place, the Aluminum Co. of America says it was never informed as to what was required and that it prepared to produce more than was ever indicated would be desired. Certainly it is difficult to place responsibility upon that company if it was not told by any responsible agency of the Government what would be required.

Meanwhile, Fontana was to be developed, and a controversy developed with the Federal Power Commission and T. V. A. as to whether or not Alcoa would develop it, and as to whether Alcoa would submit to the requirements of the laws as to recapture.

Curiously enough, there was put into the record of the committee a letter from the counsel of the Aluminum Co. of America, who happens also to be vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, advising that they did not care to proceed with the development of Fontana as a private power project, because, he said in his letter, he had been assured by a representative of the Office of Production Management that the R. F. C. would finance the private development of the power project if Alcoa simply discontinued the other procedure with the Federal Power Commission.

I am not undertaking to pass upon the ethics or the propriety of that suggestion or procedure. I am merely pointing out that it resulted in nothing being done. Whether or not the O. P. M., the R. F. C., the T. V. A., or the Federal Power Commission, was responsible, I do not know. The one thing I know is that we got no aluminum.

Out in the Northwest, at Bonneville and at Grand Coulee, there are vast reserves of power. Secretary Ickes testified before our committee that, as a matter of policy, he did not believe it was wise to let that power be utilized for the production of aluminum by the Aluminum Co. of America in any such large quantities as they desired. This is a matter of policy. I am not saying now whether that was wise or unwise; I am merely pointing out that, with a vast reserve of unused power absolutely vital to the development of aluminum, one official of the Government in no way related to the defense program as are the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the O. P. M., and other administration agencies decided 6 months ago that that was not a wise way to proceed. There was nothing to indicate that the matter was discussed with any of the other agencies responsible in our Government for the preparation of our defense.

I do not seek to blame any individual or any company. I say that the tragedy of this situation is that there is no one in our Government today who is responsible—upon whom this great responsibility can rest—and I hope that following the editorial in the New York Times, and what I believe to be the increasing volume of considered opinion in this country, we shall without delay proceed to inaugurate the industrial mobilization plan the War Department has developed over the past 20 years.

It was in the old Roman Senate that one of the members rose every day and said, "Carthage must be destroyed." I have been saying for a year, in the other House and in the Senate, that we are now in a crisis, and that we should proceed without delay to inaugurate this industrial mobilization plan. We had hoped to get 20 percent of our production into our defense this year. We will be lucky if we get 15 percent. That means we are 25 percent behind our program, and the only way we can ever hope to achieve our goal is by studying the lessons of history and putting the program into effect.

When the Secretary of War appeared before us, we asked him why he did not put the program into effect—a product of his own Department. He replied that he did not consider that the crisis was yet serious enough. The next morning the President of the United States said that the country did not seem to realize how serious the crisis was. I do not wonder the country does not realize it if the Secretary of War does not realize it.

Mr. President, in the light of all these developments, it is high time that the attention of the Congress and of the country should be directed to the mobilization of our industrial resources, in order that America may speak with authority in the councils of the nations of the earth.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the distinguished Senator from Maine make available to me and to the Senate the name of the official of the Democratic National Committee, who is also an official of the Aluminum Co. of America, who has had the close cooperation of the T. V. A.?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, of a New York law firm, who is counsel for the Aluminum Co. of America appearing before the Truman committee. I suspect that if he had been a member of some other national committee, it might have been a matter of comment, but I do not want to introduce partisan elements into this discussion.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The SECRETARY. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. BYRD on May 26, 1941, was read, as follows:

Whereas the unsettled condition of the world today and the uncertainties of the

future necessitate complete cooperation between government, management, and labor; and

Whereas numerous strikes are taking place in national-defense industries throughout the United States; and

Whereas such strikes are retarding and greatly impeding our efforts to build an adequate Army and Navy and to render effective aid to other democracies: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may go over without prejudice.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPPER BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on June 23, 1941, before the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 23, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE ON EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 21, 1941, on the topic "Democracy will keep us out of war," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY BEFORE CATHOLIC HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY on June 17 before the Catholic Hospital Association at Philadelphia, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON RUSSIA AND THE FOUR FREEDOMS

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on Russia and the Four Freedoms, delivered by Senator TAFT on June 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY ON SUGAR BILL

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter defending the so-called sugar bill, addressed by Senator O'MAHONEY to the editor of the Washington Post, and published in that journal on June 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by C. B. Baldwin, Administrator, relative to the work of the Farm Security Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE SIMMONS, OF NEBRASKA

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial address delivered on May 29, 1941, by Chief Justice Robert G. Simmons, of the Nebraska Supreme Court, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR SMALL DEMOCRACIES—ADDRESS BY RAYMOND S. RICHMOND

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Food for the Small Democracies" delivered on June 21, 1941, by Raymond S. Richmond, Secretary of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR SMALL DEMOCRACIES—LETTER FROM FRED BRENCKMAN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, relative to a proposal that the United States feed starving people of Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY CHARLES MOYNIHAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered at Rifle, Colo., by Charles Moynihan, of Montrose, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY ROBERT MARCH ON THE JOB OF SENATE PAGES

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Page Job—Unique Opportunity" written by Robert March, one of the Senate pages, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM CARROLL COUNTY (N. H.) INDEPENDENT ON GASLESS SUNDAYS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gasless Sundays," published in the Carroll County Independent, of Center Ossipee, N. H., on June 13, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES ON THE GERMAN-RUSSIAN WAR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 26, 1941, entitled "America, Britain, and Russia," which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM NEIL SABIN ON EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Neil Sabin to the editor of the Nashville Tennessean, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SAMUEL E. HUDSON BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Samuel E. Hudson, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE NEEDS

The SECRETARY laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

To the Congress of the United States:

The act of October 14, 1940 (Public, No. 849, known as the Lanham Act), as amended and supplemented, has to date authorized a public housing program of $300,000,000 for defense needs. Appropriations have been made to the full extent of the authorization and practically all of the funds appropriated have been allocated to projects.

I am convinced, from information presented to me by heads of interested departments and agencies of the Government, that there remain further needs which cannot be provided for except by the enlargement of the authorization under this act. It is normally exceedingly difficult to predict housing needs, and during the present emergency accurate prediction is well-nigh impossible by reason of rapid expansion of and frequent necessary changes in the national-defense program, which defense housing must serve. Data have been presented to me which indicate the possibility that the Government should be prepared to undertake the construction of at least 125,000 additional defense homes between now and July 1, 1942. It is thought best, however, to limit the additional program to $300,000,000 at this time, which will permit the construction of approximately 75,000 houses to fill the most urgent present needs.

The effect of the national-defense program has not yet been fully registered on the housing market. Some new plants heretofore brought into the defense program have not yet reached full capacity and many new facilities yet remain to be constructed. It has been recognized that increased subcontracting and curtailment of certain kinds of production for civilian use will reduce the need for new housing to some extent. However, in many cases new plants or increases of existing plants will of necessity be located in areas not affected by these factors. In practically every case where existing plants are increased those workers who must be brought into the area will require a proportionately larger number of new houses, because those vacancies which were previously available have generally been absorbed.

The importance of adequate housing in the defense program should be self-evident. Without housing for workers, industries producing ships, planes, tanks, and other defense materials cannot function to full capacity.

I therefore suggest to the Congress the enactment of legislation providing an increase from $300,000,000 to $600,000,000 in the authorization contained in the act of October 14, 1940, as amended.

In view of the urgency of this matter, I suggest that it receive the early consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1941.*

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS AND SIGNING OF BILLS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment following today's session the committees of the Senate be authorized to file reports with the Secretary, and that the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills.

The SECRETARY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The SECRETARY. Under authority of an order heretofore entered, the Chair lays before the Senate, as in executive session, messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which will be referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26, 1941:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Clyde O. Eastus, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas. (Mr. Eastus is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires August 4, 1941.)

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR PUERTO RICO

Jose M. Gallardo, of Puerto Rico, to be commissioner of education for Puerto Rico. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Surgeon Henry A. Rasmussen to be senior surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from June 15, 1941.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Cummings, Infantry (colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Lt. Col. Willard Stewart Paul, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. George Henry Dietz, Infantry (major, Army of the United States), with rank from August 1, 1935.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Elmo Stewart Mathews, Signal Corps (major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 9, 1938.

First Lt. Daniel Light Hine, Field Artillery (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 13, 1936.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Maurice Wuchter Musgrave, Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Second Lt. William Calvin Banning, Infantry (first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1939.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 4, 1941

Maj. Geoffrey Cooke Bunting, Coast Artillery Corps (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Orion Lee Davidson, Infantry (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Thomas Francis Hickey, Field Artillery (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Leander Larson, Quartermaster Corps (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Arthur Kay Chambers, Coast Artillery Corps (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Emmett Michael Connor, Infantry (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Thomas Newton Stark, Infantry (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 6, 1941

Maj. Paul Thomas Hogge, Infantry (lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1941

(All officers listed below hold rank as temporary first lieutenants, Army of the United States.)

Second Lt. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Felix Moses Hardison, Air Corps.

Second Lt. Herman Huebner Hauck, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lt. John Vincent Roddy, Field Artillery.

×Second Lt. Perry Elmer Conant, Cavalry.

×Second Lt. Howard Monroe Means, Air Corps.

Second Lt. Melvin Charles Helfers, Infantry.

Second Lt. Edward Bruce Bissell, Infantry.

Second Lt. M. Griffith Berg, Infantry.

×Second Lt. George Ellis Deshon, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Amos George Johnson, Infantry.

Second Lt. Carolus Adams Brown, Signal Corps.

×Second Lt. John Harris Griffith, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. William Raymond Peers, Infantry.

Second Lt. John Edwin Jarmin, Infantry.

Second Lt. John Ernest Walker, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. William Morgan Summers, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Leland Wayne Cramer, Cavalry.

×Second Lt. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, Field Artillery.

×Second Lt. Laverne Arthur Parks, Chemical Warfare Service.

Second Lt. Robert Peter Hagen, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Murray Elroy Sparks, Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Charles Albert Armstrong, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Charles Peter Stone, Infantry.

Second Lt. James Robert Wergin, Field Artillery.

×Second Lt. Frank George White, Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Arthur Theodore Sauser, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Elwin Thomas Knight, Cavalry.

Second Lt. Samuel McGraw Swearingen, Infantry.

Second Lt. Wayne Gill Springer, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Leland Gordon Fiegel, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Thomas Danville Brown, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Gregory Leo Higgins, Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Robert Joseph Chandler, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. John Dudley Wood, Coast Artillery Corps.

×Second Lt. Harry Philip Leber, Jr., Air Corps.

×Second Lt. McClellan Ferguson Stunkard, Jr., Air Corps.

Second Lt. Aaron Alexander Abston, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lt. Thomas Patrick Bell, Infantry.

Second Lt. John Richardson Alison, Air Corps.

Second Lt. Michael Joseph Coffield, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Winfred Alban Ross, Signal Corps.

Second Lt. Steele Roy Patterson, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Waymond Austin Davis, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Leo Bernard Burkett, Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Thornton Kise Myers, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., Air Corps.

Second Lt. Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

×Second Lt. John Ray Kilgore, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., Air Corps.

Second Lt. Jerome Stanley Byrne, Coast Artillery Corps.

×Second Lt. Edwin Shepard Chickering, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Joseph Harold Stangle, Field Artillery.

×Second Lt. Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Meredith Ernest Allen, Field Artillery.

×Second Lt. Elton Woodrow Ringsak, Infantry.

×Second Lt. Henry Gordon Barrett, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Robert Carl Orth, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. Jack Emerson Babcock, Chemical Warfare Service.

×Second Lt. Stanley Robert Kelley, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Rollie Neel Blancett, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Horace Malcolm Witbeck, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Charles Benjamin Schweizer, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Alfred Matthew Eschbach, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Harold Kenneth Howell, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. William Brennan Stelzenmuller, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. Charles Thomas Bagley, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Harry Ellsworth Skinner, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Carroll Hilton Dunn, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Judson Woodring Wark, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. John Chris Pappas, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Gilbert Byron Hall, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Harry George Woodbury, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. William Chipman Holley, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. George Wright Bennett, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Joseph Ernest Veale, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. Robert Nendel Anderson, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lt. Herbert Evans Brown, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Andrew Olaf Lerche, Air Corps.

×Second Lt. John Claude Potter, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. William John Ellison, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Frank Milner, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. R. Ernest Leffel, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Perry Bradbury Hackett, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Frederick Zitzer, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. James Russell Rorabaugh, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. James Henderson Beddow, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Earl Carpenter Paules, Corps of Engineers.

×Second Lt. Andrew Vaiden Inge, Corps of Engineers.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 19, 1941

×Second Lt. Milton Irving Wallace, Corps of Engineers (first lieutenant, Army of the United States).

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 30, 1941

Second Lt. Roy Tinsley Dodge, Corps of Engineers (first lieutenant, Army of the United States).

×Second Lt. Donald Harry Kauffman, Air Corps (first lieutenant, Army of the United States).

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1941

×Capt. Jesse Benton Helfrich, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Thomas Albert Wildman, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Duran H. Summers, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. James Hedges Forsee, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Walter Atwater Carlson, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Robert Moore Allott, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Steven Vincent Guzak, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Edward Joseph Tracy, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Arnold Archibald Albright, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Robert Cabaniss Gaskill, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Dan Clark Ogle, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. William Spencer Stone, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Milford T. Kubin, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. John Edward Pluenneke, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. James Donley Gardner, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Emmett Bryan Litteral, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Austin Lowrey, Jr., Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Jasper Newman Knox, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Carl Willard Tempel, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Nuel Pazdral, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. George Dewey Newton, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. George Edward Leone, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Albert Henry Schwichtenberg, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Ehrling Lloyd Bergquist, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Wendell Axline Weller, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Clinton Stone Lyter, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Walter Lee Peterson, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Russell Samuel Leone, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Dwight Moody Kuhns, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Lawrence Abraham Matternes, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Arthur Lyman Streeter, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. John Alexander Isherwood, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Harold Bradley Luscombe, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Charles Lewis Baird, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Thomas Neilson Page, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Samuel Leonard Cooke, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Harold Eastman Coder, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Victor Allen Byrnes, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. William Smith George, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

×Capt. Kenneth George Gould, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

To be major with rank from July 3, 1941

×Capt. Gustave Everett Ledfors, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

To be major with rank from July 17, 1941

×Capt. Herbert Theodore Berwald, Medical Corps (major, Army of the United States).

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1941

First Lt. George Andrew Rader, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. William Enloe Strozier, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. Robert Sexton Higdon, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Fred James Fielding, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Herbert Downing Edger, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Ernest Martin Nielsen, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Robert McAllister Davis, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Edwin Wayne Hakala, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. William Clinton White, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. Homan Elfred Leech, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Philip Jack Smith, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. Frank Paul Pipia, Medical Corps (capt. Army of the United States).

×First Lt. Myles Patton Moursund, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

To be captain with rank from July 5, 1941

×First Lt. Josephus Bartow Talley, Jr., Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

To be captain with rank from July 15, 1941

×First Lt. Fred George Lahourcade, Medical Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains with rank from July 8, 1941

×First Lt. Donald Charles Hudson, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Leon Guin McConnell, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

×First Lt. Winlaw Archiebald Priebe, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Benjamin Walter Dunn, Dental Corps (captain, Army of the United States).

CHAPLAINS

To be major

Chaplain (Capt.) Christian Anthony Wachter, United States Army (major, Army of the United States), with rank from July 15, 1941.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captain

×First Lt. Paul Christian Borup, Medical Administrative Corps (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from July 21, 1941.

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Glenn Keith Smith, Medical Administrative Corps (first lieutenant, Army of the United States), with rank from July 9, 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, Thou hast surely possessed us with a land flowing with milk and honey. Our riches, our institutions are beyond compare; do Thou persuade us that these do not constitute the greatness of a people. We pray Thee to hold us to the deep-sea and the star-high truth that it is righteousness that exalteth a nation and refines the disposition of its soul. We cannot be hidden; whatsoever we are by choice will remain for time and eternity. Do Thou school our country in the blessed art of high moral purpose and in the spiritual approach that we may know life at its strongest and best. Let the teaching of our immortal Master unify all works and workers that the tide of brotherhood may enrich every faculty, sweeten all speech, and transfigure all hopes. Be pleased to give Thy wisest guidance to the Congress in all deliberations and enactments. Mercifully preserve the health and strength of our President, his Cabinet, and his immediate advisers. Dear Lord, increase our love and devotion for our country and cause us to live within those tides which make all things new. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 24, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 188. An act for the relief of Major R. Lee;

H. R. 792. An act for the relief of Rinzo Takata;

H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Vernon Atkison;

H. R. 1753. An act for the relief of Maggie Lou Morse, administratrix of the estate of Exie Morse;

H. R. 1993. An act for the relief of Bert and Marie Freeman;

H. R. 2739. An act for the relief of Jack Y. Upham;

H. R. 2861. An act for the relief of Cascade Investment Co.;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 3536. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes;

H. R. 3847. An act to adjust certain losses occurring in the redemption of adjusted-service bonds; and

H. R. 4459. An act to validate payments of retired pay made to Pay Clerk Ray Bellamy Veirs, United States Navy, retired, for the period September 21, 1939, to November 15, 1940, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the Appendix a

speech I made last Tuesday at Charlottesville, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address delivered by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], last Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from The Adjutant General of the Army in which the War Department requests cooperation and assistance in popularizing the slogan "Keep 'Em Flying."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by Emil Schram, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, before the National Retail Credit Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNES. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a speech made by Mr. Schram in New York City last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an article written by Walter Lippmann on the seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a statement made by the district attorney of the State of North Dakota on S. 674.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter, which I sent to the Committee on Ways and Means containing certain suggestions and amendments to the pending tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement from the New York State Board of Social Welfare.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio address by Mr. Fred Brenckman, the legislative representative of the National Grange, on the subject of safeguarding the sugar supply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement made by myself before the Committee for Reciprocity on Beef Production and Strategic Materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief resolution by the Louisiana State Federation of Labor opposing strikes in defense industries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Nelson, of the Office of Production Management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a short editorial appearing in one of the weekly newspapers in Louisiana on the longevity-pay bill for postal employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a letter from Hon. C. B. Baldwin, in reference to the quarterly report of the Farm Credit Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an address by Hon. William Hudlett, a member of the General Assembly of Ohio, on the subject of German-American patriotism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a contribution by Lewis A. Harding, of Indianapolis, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on convoying and an editorial from the Long Beach Independent of June 24.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement and a letter from General Rivers on the Philippine situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 292)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The act of October 14, 1940 (Public, No. 849, known as the "Lanham Act"), as amended and supplemented, has to date authorized a public-housing program of $300,000,000 for defense needs. Appropriations have been made to the full extent of the authorization, and practically all of the funds appropriated have been allocated to projects.

I am convinced, from information presented to me by heads of interested departments and agencies of the Government, that there remain further needs which cannot be provided for except by the enlargement of the authorization under this act. It is normally exceedingly difficult to predict housing needs, and during the present emergency accurate prediction is well-nigh impossible by reason of rapid expansion of, and frequent necessary changes in, the national-defense program which defense housing must serve. Data have been presented to me which indicate the possibility that the Government should be prepared to undertake the construction of at least 125,000 additional defense homes between now and July 1, 1942. It is thought best, however, to limit the additional program to $300,000,000 at this time, which will permit the construction of approximately 75,000 houses to fill the most urgent present needs.

The effect of the national-defense program has not yet been fully registered on the housing market. Some new plants heretofore brought into the defense program have not yet reached full capacity and many new facilities yet remain to be constructed. It has been recognized that increased subcontracting and curtailment of certain kinds of production for civilian use will reduce the need for new housing to some extent. However, in many cases new plants or increases of existing plants will of necessity be located in areas not affected by these factors. In practically every case where existing plants are increased, those workers who must be brought into the area will require a proportionately larger number of new houses, because those vacancies which were previously available have generally been absorbed.

The importance of adequate housing in the defense program should be self-evident. Without housing for workers, industries producing ships, planes, tanks, and other defense materials cannot function to full capacity.

I therefore, suggest to the Congress the enactment of legislation providing an increase from $300,000,000 to $600,000,000 in the authorization contained in the act of October 14, 1940, as amended.

In view of the urgency of this matter, I suggest that it receive the early consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1941.*

EXTENSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH OBLIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES MAY BE USED AS COLLATERAL FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1471) to extend

the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1941" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman wants to take up this bill now?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. FISH. If we could get a definite assurance from the gentleman in charge on the majority side and the gentleman in charge on the minority side that you could dispose of it within 10 minutes, I would not object, but sometimes we get into very long debates on these matters, and we have a program for today.

Mr. STEAGALL. We are not going to take very much time on this.

Mr. FISH. Can the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] make a statement to the House as to how long this matter will take?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The time is within the control of the Chair under reservation of objection. Any Member can demand the regular order, but I hope sufficient time will be granted to make a short statement.

The SPEAKER. On a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of a committee, the ranking minority member or any Member of the House would have the right to reserve the right to object for a reasonable time in order that the bill may be explained. The Chair was assured, however, that this would not take a great deal of time.

Mr. FISH. If we bring this bill out now, it might take 2 or 3 hours.

The SPEAKER. Well, it is not going to take 2 or 3 hours. The regular order can be demanded at any time.

Mr. FISH. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is a bill to extend the time in which direct obligations of the Federal Government may be used as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes. Under ordinary circumstances I think we should not pass the bill. As a matter of fact, I was somewhat troubled when I consented that we take it up in this manner. However, if the bill is passed at all, it must be passed before July 1.

The subject matter of the bill at the present time is purely academic. At some future time I hope that this whole question of money and currency and the relationship between currency and prices can be discussed at length on the floor. Because the question is at the present time purely academic, because perhaps there is no particular harm in passing it, because uses are not being made of it generally now, I decided I would not object to the consideration of it. However, I think we should call attention to the fact that under other circumstances, where there might not be a large amount of excess reserves, this bill might become a serious threat to inflation. I have taken the attitude that it is contrary to the recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board as contained in their annual report published last January, in which they advised against the continuance of gold devaluation, in which they advised legislation empowering them to increase the reserve requirements and rediscount rates. They advised against the issuance of silver certificates against the seignorage of silver. This House has already repudiated that report. If it were not for the billions of dollars of excess reserves in the banks today there would be some potential harm which might come from this bill. But because, as I say, of the tremendous amounts of excess reserves, the question involved in this bill becomes purely academic.

I want to see the time come—and it must be after much deliberation on the subject—when the Federal Reserve System will again accomplish its original purpose of providing machinery for the rediscounting of Government and private paper and the issuance of currency against that in accordance with the needs of the country—a flexible currency. Of course, we have maintained that to some degree, but at the present moment there are more important things that we should be thinking about and discussing on the floor of this House than this academic question of money and the relation of money to prices. Until we have had an investigation, which I foresee will come within the next few weeks, to study this whole question of the relationship between money and prices, I have agreed not to oppose the bill by objecting to its consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman satisfied with the time limit in the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. There is a time limit in the bill. I do not anticipate that much use will be made of the authority in the bill within the time limit. That is why I do not oppose the bill more vigorously at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman will remember that this measure was passed originally during the administration of President Hoover, in February 1932. At that time the Federal Reserve banks found themselves without a sufficient amount of commercial or eligible paper to maintain the proper collateral back of the issues of Federal Reserve notes, so that they were having to carry 80 percent of gold against their Federal Reserve notes for protection, instead of 40 percent, as required by law. The bill has been extended from time to time, and this bill simply extends it once more from the end of this fiscal year until June 30, 1943.

It is not contemplated there will be an immediate need for this legislation, but it is very possible that in the course of a year or two the situation may be such that we would find ourselves again in need of this type of legislation to maintain the operations of the Federal Reserve System in supplying credit to the country and its other operations. There never has, as a matter of fact, to my knowledge been any reason, any valid reason, why Government obligations should not be counted as valuable and desirable as security for a Federal Reserve note as is commercial paper gathered from the four corners of the earth, such as takes its place in the portfolios of banks in the average run of business. I do not mean to take any more time, but I felt that statement should be made for the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the request, because I realize the futility of doing so, that it will be passed eventually anyway.

My main objection to this bill is that it permits the creation of a large volume of currency. At the present time an immense amount of currency is being exported by certain people, who are expecting to use it as a means of saving their property and their interests. When this conflict is over, they expect to convert that paper currency into gold, held by the Treasury. They are using this as a means of hedging against the dangers of inflation, high taxation, or possibly confiscation of their property.

I want to point out to the House that there is a vast difference between exporting gold against paper currency and exporting gold by reversing the process which brought the gold into this country. If we export our gold by reversing the process which brought it in, we can get rid of an equal amount of fiat credit created in the banking system through the payment with fiat by the Treasury of the gold purchased by it. The amount of this fiat credit in the banking system now is about $15,000,000,000. When gold is taken out of the country by means of converting currency into gold, by the amount so converted, this fiat credit will remain permanently in our banking system, and will permanently dilute and reduce in value by the same amount the bank deposits already in the banking system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Alabama why it is the Federal Reserve having authority to make commercial loans have refused to make them? This being so, why is there need for this legislation, in view of their refusal to cooperate to aid, and to assist business?

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that the matter of policy on the part of the Federal Reserve with respect to industrial loans which they are authorized to make to a limited amount under special authorization of the Congress does not relate either directly or indirectly to this bill. The gentleman seems to entertain fears—and I am not taking issue with the gentleman—as to the policy of the Federal Reserve with respect to industrial loans.

The passage of this bill would only more adequately equip the Federal Reserve with resources sufficient to take care of domestic or any other demands that might be made on the system.

Mr. SABATH. In view of their refusal to make loans, extend credit, and help the commerce of this Nation, although they were in position to do so and were authorized to do so, I see no reason why we should now give them more power. We should not unless we have their assurance they will change their tactics. I have lost all confidence in this institution to be of any assistance to the industry or commerce of the Nation, or that they will carry out acts of Congress.

May I ask the gentleman whether this bill has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. STEAGALL. It has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the administration.

Let me remind the gentleman that, as he knows, the Federal Reserve banks are banks of rediscount that do not ordinarily under their general operations make direct loans. The authority to which the gentleman refers was a special act of Congress within a limited amount. How much they have on hand now I do not know, but it is only a few millions, it is not even a drop in the bucket so far as it relates to the general supply of bank credit in the United States. This bill, however, would not interfere with carrying out the terms of the authorization to which the gentleman refers and which he seems to desire. On the contrary, it would be an aid for that action.

Mr. SABATH. And I am fully aware of the fact that it was the understanding of Congress when we gave them that power that they would carry out the desire of Congress; but they have failed and I am afraid they will continue to ignore the instructions of Congress.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask our distinguished chairman one of two questions. Is it correct to say that the Chairman of the Board of Governors made the observation that this power had not been used since about 1938?

Mr. STEAGALL. 1938 or 1939, as I remember.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that he personally felt that in the general approach to the problem the national and international situation was such he felt this power should be extended at the present time?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And, furthermore, there is what might be called an absolute absence of commercial paper for rediscount purposes insofar as the Federal Reserve banks are concerned?

Mr. STEAGALL. Only about $2,000,000 in all at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Along with the approximately five and a quarter billion dollars of excess reserves?

Mr. STEAGALL. At the time this original act was passed there was nearly a billion of commercial paper in the Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the consideration of this bill at the present time. Personally, I regret it is necessary for action of this kind to be taken, and on a roll-call vote I personally would not support the measure under present conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if he will tell us, during this 1 minute, what became of the Vinson bill he promised would be up for consideration on the 23d of June. We were back here waiting for it and wanted the opportunity to vote on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM JULY 3 TO JULY 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts made no promise. That is the complete answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I said "probably."

I want to announce for the benefit of the House that the May bill, due to the fact that there are several appropriation bills, the conference reports on which will come up for consideration, and due to the fact that we have to keep ourselves in a position where they can be considered as it is important that they pass before the end of the fiscal year, June 30, and on account of other emergency matters that may arise, will come up for consideration on July 8.

May I also announce that it is the intention, if unanimous consent can be obtained, to adjourn from next Thursday over until Monday following, with the understanding that on Thursday there will be no important legislation called up, and there will be no important legislation called up on the following Monday, July 7. I want to make this announcement for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Everybody may rest assured that the May bill will not be called up, then, before July 8?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is right.

Mr. MAY. As I understand it, then, it is definitely understood that that bill will have precedence at that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. On July 8. That is the understanding.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I did not say that the gentleman had definitely promised that the Vinson bill would be up on June 23. However, we were led to believe that that bill would come up for consideration on June 23. We were also told about 2 or 3 weeks previously that the bill would come up for consideration. It has not come up. Who is holding it back, who is permitting these strikes to continue? We ought to do something.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a rule has been reported out of the Rules Committee. Seven legislative days have gone by. I assume the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as well acquainted with the rules of the House as is the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 244, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4972, a bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the rule by striking out "the Civil Service" in line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof "Banking and Currency."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] desire to use any time?

Mr. FISH. Half of the hour.

Mr. SABATH. As usual, after I conclude, I shall yield to the gentleman one-half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which increases its credit resources from $1,400,000,000 to $2,650,000,000. We are informed that this is necessary because of the law Congress has passed to increase the parity

prices from what was originally 57.5 percent, as increased by the House, to 75 percent, and later increased by the conferees to 85 percent, which is the amount provided in the law today. The amount provided in the bill by reason of this increase is a tremendous one, but it is claimed it is necessary. I felt, and feel now, that 85 percent is not justified, but in view of the fact that the House and the Senate have acted, I am not going to try to criticize that action.

That this will be of tremendous help to agriculture no one can deny. What I am wondering is whether the farmers will ever appreciate what is being done for them. Somehow or other, up to now, although we have gone far afield and have given them everything for which they have asked and many things for which they have not asked and never dreamed of receiving at the hands of the Congress, they still seem to be dissatisfied.

I have not been to the Western States lately, but last fall I traveled some, and I observed that whether it was in New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, or other States in this section, there was greater prosperity all throughout the rural sections of the country than ever before in our history. I was immensely pleased and gratified that Congress has aided the agriculture of this country to that extent.

I recognize that there may be some sections of the United States that may need a little help, and I am willing they should have it, but I cannot see where the States I have mentioned and many others really need the continuation of the aid and assistance Congress has been giving them and that it is being asked to grant them from time to time.

I notice this morning's papers show that wheat is $1.02¾, that corn is 73 cents, that December corn is 78 cents, and that cotton is 14⅞ cents, and I am very glad of that. The prices of all commodities have been increased tremendously, for which I am thankful. I feel that the amounts we have advanced will not be lost, due to this increase. Many gentlemen here feared that the Government would lose tremendous sums of money because of the loans that have been made on cotton. If the Government should see fit to start to dispose of its cotton today, it would not only not show a loss but there would be a tremendous profit to the Government; in fact, taking everything into consideration, I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation, on the whole, would show a profit today.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand now about $231,000,000 and, therefore, I could not see why it was necessary in the first place to increase the amount from $1,400,000,000 to $2,650,000,000. But I am satisfied that the gentlemen in charge have carefully considered the needs and want to be safe, and that is the reason it is asked that this amount be increased. They state that the increase to 85 percent in the parity prices made this absolutely necessary.

Of course, I know that this will be of great help to the farmers of my district in Chicago.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman said that rather facetiously, but I wish to assure my good friend from Chicago that his constituents are going to benefit by this, because it is of benefit to the businessman just as much as it is to the farmer.

Mr. SABATH. I fully agree with the gentleman. That was one of the several reasons why I have for all the years I have been here advocated legislation favorable to the agriculture of our country, notwithstanding the fact that my district has not a single farmer. Many of my constituents would like to be farmers if they could get some land somewhere on which they could make the splendid living that most of the farmers do in the Middle West and in many other sections of the country.

I fully appreciate that if a farmer is successful and prosperous, it enables him to buy what he needs for his farm, for his family, and for himself, which stimulates business and increases employment, and in that way is helpful and beneficial to the people in the manufacturing sections and in the cities. For that reason I have supported this legislation.

From my observation, however, I feel and I hope that it will not be necessary in the future to appropriate hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, because I really believe it will not be needed or required; but the farmers have become accustomed to Government aid and some of the Members here, wishing to be in a position to demonstrate to their people at home, have continuously pressed for still larger appropriations. As I say, I hope the argument they have heretofore employed—that it is needed—will be eliminated because of the continuously improved farming conditions and the higher prices that the American farmer is enjoying today.

Mr. Speaker, I shall join with my colleagues from the agricultural sections in voting for the bill, but cannot refrain from saying that notwithstanding my support and aid in the passage of legislation in the interest of the American farmer and that I have voted for the appropriations of all these millions of dollars, I regret that the gentlemen representing the rural sections do not reciprocate in supporting legislation that will aid those who consume the products of the farm when they have an opportunity to do so, and I can but hope that they will do so in the future. I do hope, however, that the farmers of this country will recognize and appreciate what this administration and Congress have done for them.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], to whom I later will yield 30 minutes, informs me that he will shortly report for active duty with the Army Reserve Corps and, therefore, he will not be with us for some time. I congratulate him upon his privilege to serve the country in that field, which privilege, due to my age, is denied me. I understand that he has recently taken a poll in his district and finds that a large percentage of the residents are opposed to war. There cannot be anything surprising about that poll because beyond question all of us are opposed to war.

Despite the gentleman's opposition to war, I hope he will continue to advocate all possible aid for our national defense and that he will further urge aid to Great Britain, China, and Russia. By helping those countries it will serve to help us from being forced to defend ourselves from the well-laid-out, diabolical scheme of Hitler, who is trying to carry out the old Prussian dream of world conquest. For the information of the gentleman from New York and of that of the House, the attack against Russia is for the purpose of enabling Hitler to attack the United States from the north. Therefore it is to our advantage and for our own protection to encourage and aid Great Britain, as well as Russia, to stop Hitler in his plan, as he has so many times stated, to attack us after he will have conquered Europe. Consequently, whether we like the communistic form of government or not, we cannot be blind to the fact that Russia, the same as Great Britain, is fighting against Hitlerism, whose main aim is to destroy the democracies of the world. There is no question in my mind or those of well-informed men that the defeat of Hitler by Great Britain and Russia will save us from being ultimately forced to use our armed forces to protect ourselves. I hope that very few people in the United States will be misled by the redoubled Nazi propaganda against communism. The truth is that the hue and cry against communism has been emanating from the Nazi agents in the United States, and, no doubt, will be increased by the Fascists in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order during part of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there is no serious objection to this bill, increasing the amount of money for the Commodity Credit Corporation by $1,250,000,000 and extending the time for 5 years. I hope when this matter is considered in committee there will be a thorough study of the time limit. It seems to me at first glance that this is too long and that it would be much better to have it extended 2 years or 3 years instead of 5 years. Certainly, in my humble judgment, without having listened to the arguments on the other side, it would be better to have it end June 30, 1944, if not before that.

I understand from members of the committee on this side that there is no active opposition to the bill. I would like to find out, however, from the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], whether he can give the House

any guaranties that the $1,250,000,000 we are adding in this bill will not be used for propaganda purposes in arousing the farmers and trying to break down their determination to keep out of war. The gentleman himself will recall that a few days ago in the House a letter was read by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] from the Farm Security Administration calling upon the farm agents to go around the country and by word of mouth try to arouse the farmers to a warlike spirit in order to take some drastic action to involve America in war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will answer the gentleman by saying that personally I was much surprised to hear the letter read. I did not know by whom it was written or who was behind it or why it was written, but I do know that the Commodity Credit Corporation has functioned splendidly in the interest of the Nation and at the same time in the interest of the agriculturalists of this country, and I know from the evidence before our committee and from the assurances I have had that they will continue in their efforts to be of service without playing any politics. The fact that I have stated that the farmers have not appreciated certain things should not be taken to mean that such a statement should be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is my own conviction and belief. I have always believed they should show some appreciation for an administration that has done so much for them, but that should not be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FISH. The chairman of the Rules Committee has been outspoken in his opposition to war and I want to commend him at every possible opportunity, but nevertheless the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, who will be in charge of the money provided under this bill, has repeatedly gone before the farmers and urge them to get excited, stating they must get excited immediately, that they do not know the facts and they must change their point of view entirely.

The letter sent out by the Farm Security Administration constituted a virtual conspiracy to break down the will of the American farmers to keep out of war. Mr. Wickard will be in charge of this huge appropriation. He has repeatedly made speeches to the farmers, urging them to become aroused and to get excited; just another scheme to spread fear and war hysteria among the farmers. I always suspect these members of the Cabinet and high Government officials like Mr. Wickard and Mr. Ickes who are invincible in peace and invisible in war. I do not know Mr. Wickard, but I looked up his record in the Congressional Directory and found out that he is 5 years younger than I am and, according to his biography, he did not serve a day in the World War, but now he is making war speeches all over the country. I should think those individuals in their twenties who did not serve in the last war would hesitate to urge sending American youth of this generation into European and Asiatic wars. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of the House, that things have come to a pretty pass when those who did not serve when they had a chance to defend America are now going over the country urging others to serve and shed their blood in another foreign war.

Mr. SABATH and Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. FISH. I yield first to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I regret that the gentleman from New York does not know the Secretary of Agriculture. If he knew him he would come to the conclusion that he is a highly patriotic gentleman, who loves his country and who desires that the Nation should do everything possible for national defense.

Mr. FISH. Certainly, we are all for that.

Mr. SABATH. That is his aim and his only aim, and not to involve us in war.

Mr. FISH. I am not going to read his speeches, although I have them all here, but if the gentleman will take the trouble to read his speeches he will understand precisely what he said, and that the purpose of all his speeches was to incite the American farmers to war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have been reading some of the Secretary's speeches about war likewise and I will say that if the Secretary had gone before the people in an election and made such talks before election he would still be on his farm in Indiana, and if he wants to find out what the people think of his stand, just let him run for office.

Mr. FISH. I would like to see a lot of those war makers try to run for office, and as I go along I am also going to say something about those from the Southland. I want to answer some of the statements repeatedly made in the cloakroom and even on the floor of the House by Representatives from the South. If you talked to some of these southern Representatives you would think that everybody in their districts was for war. I challenge any Member of the House, and especially any southern Representative, to poll all the voters in his district. Not a single district in the United States and not a single district in the South will show a vote of more than one-third for war, in spite of the fact that you may get many letters from distinguished, rich, and powerful Democrats in the South, and maybe officeholders under the administration, urging war; yet not one district in the South, if you include all the people, will show that more than one-third are for war, and generally not over one-fourth or one-fifth. Some young and ambitious Democrats may wake up to this situation, which is filled with political dynamite, and decide to enter the primaries on the clear-cut issue of staying out of the war except in defense of America. If they do, some of the interventionist Members from the South will be headed for trouble. Even the Gallup poll shows only 20 to 30 percent for war in the South, and I think the Gallup poll minimizes the sentiment against war. I propose to take this opportunity to present the facts regarding the poll that I took in my district, which is a typical district, half urban and half rural. Furthermore, it is a district which I would have said would have voted about 3 to 1 against war, because it is influenced by the great New York daily interventionist newspapers, the Times and the Herald Tribune, and by the eastern interventionists radio commentators and the war-making columnists. I would have said offhand that my constituents would have voted 2 or 3 to 1 against war. I sent out 106,000 post cards, and the questions were, "Shall the United States enter the war?" and "Shall the United States stay out of war?" It is a clear-cut issue, crystal clear, not involving the lend-lease bill or aid to England and not involving anything that might happen in the future 6 months from now under unpredictable conditions and circumstances. The returns are still coming in. Of the 106,000 postal cards I sent out, probably 6,000 were not delivered because of wrong addresses or because the people may have died or moved away. I assume that 100,000 were delivered to the voters. The poll today shows 20,496 for staying out of war and 2,245 for going in, or a percentage of 90.1 in my district, which amazes me. Here is what one of my largest newspapers says about the poll. It is headed "Representative FISH's Poll," and reads as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE FISH'S POLL

Representative FISH's poll on the issue of peace or war is reportedly the first of its kind yet undertaken. It is important that everyone who receives a post-card questionnaire fill it out and mail without delay.

Much interest has been aroused in the poll throughout the country. It is not doubted that citizens of the Twenty-sixth District are representative of the population of the country generally, and what they decide will be powerfully significant.

That is not the clipping that I intended to read first, but it is all right. The one I had in mind particularly at this time is as follows, from the Newburgh News of June 24, 1941:

ATTACK ON FISH'S POLL

Attack of Orange County Town Meeting on Representative HAMILTON FISH'S poll on the issue of peace or war takes the form of a charge that the ballot is "unfair." We would say instead that the attack is unfair.

Colonel FISH has made the issue simple and direct. His critics would make it complex, and bring in qualifications, with the result the poll would be of no merit at all.

That poll only goes to show this, that 90 percent of our people, even in the east, the so-called effete east, are against involvement in European and Asiatic wars. It also goes to show that 10 percent of the people, those who want to involve us in foreign wars, are vocal, vociferous, wealthy, and powerful—very powerful with the eastern press, the radio, and the columnists. This is true to such an extent that people back home are fearful that they, the 90 percent, may be in the minority and possibly they are among certain social and higher-bracket income classes in the district. These groups meet and talk war over the dinner table, and they all think that everybody is for war, because they talk to themselves. The same thing applies, I think, to some of my southern friends,

who tell me in the cloakrooms that everybody in their district is for war. I deny that, and I challenge any southerner to take a poll. If he does, I am sure that he will not find more than one-third of his district for war, and I imagine that out in the West that it will run 20 or 30 to 1 against war.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Can the gentleman tell me whether he received any answer from the No. 1 and 2 citizens of Hyde Park, N. Y., in the gentleman's district?

Mr. FISH. I do not know that, but I expect not. I am speaking on the radio at 6:45 on Monday next, eastern standard time, and I expect to give a complete break-down of this poll, and if President Roosevelt or his wife or family have answered, I shall so state. I shall also give the returns from Hyde Park, Tuxedo, Cornwall, Millbrook, Rhinebeck, and my little home district of Garrison, where the war sentiment is centered largely among the bigger taxpayers rather than among the ordinary, plain people who are 9 or 10 to 1 against war, and have a right to be heard. My reason for taking this poll is that the Congress alone must decide this war issue. Everybody knows that we are on the brink of war. We do not have to be told by the Secretary or Undersecretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy that we are on the brink of war. The people know that we are, but Congress alone must decide this issue, and, therefore, we have a right to find out how our constituents feel and what public opinion is on this greatest of all issues, affecting the destiny of America.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I say to the gentleman that I have not encountered a single man or married man who is young enough to go to war who wants this country to get into this war. The only people that I hear talking war are either women or old men who are too old to fight.

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement. Of course, the gentleman represents a little different district than mine. Many of my constituents have lived abroad, have been educated abroad, and have interests abroad. It is a little different. But I do know that one of my constituents, without mentioning any names, wrote a public letter against this poll and said, "We must not hide behind the skirts of Great Britain." He is from my own home district, and I looked up his record. I was told—and I am going to further check on this—that he had pleaded exemption from the draft because he was married—hiding behind female skirts. Talk about our being cowardly and hiding behind the skirts of Great Britain does not make sense from anyone who wants someone else to go out and fight for him.

Then, again, when I looked around to find out something about those who wanted to take us into war, I found that the leader who made a campaign and raised a lot of money against me, although he does not live in my district, was a man called Dr. Kingdon, and that he was born in London. He is still the head of the New York chapter to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. I found the same thing about a man in my own district who was head of this same organization locally, and that he was born in Canada. Bishop Manning, who is the head of the Episcopal Church in New York, to which I belong, was born in England, and he is sounding off all the time for war.

When you analyze the background of these fire-eaters and war makers who are breaking forth in print for war you find out their motives. I want the people to know the facts and not to be fooled. I was fooled myself. I thought there was a much greater desire in my district to get us into war. I would not have been surprised if the poll had shown as high as one-third of my district for war, yet when the votes are counted it discloses 9 to 1 among the plain people. After all, we in Congress have the responsibility, and no one else. We in America do not know what an undeclared war is.

If war is to be declared the President must, in an honest, honorable, and American-like way, submit a war resolution to the Congress, where we must have a great national debate and then vote it up or vote it down. If the President would repeat the assurances that he gave before election that he would keep this country out of war unless attacked and that in case of any cause for war—causus belli—he will submit a war resolution to Congress for its determination, I would stop talking immediately about keeping out of war. I would not make any speeches for the America First Committee or any other organization. If the President accepts that challenge and reiterates his assurances and promises to keep us out of war, and will submit a war resolution in case of a cause for war to the Congress, I am sure all of us would stop taking this issue to the public, in order to have the public know the facts. The people who are trying to get us into war are not so much the President, but this comparatively small group of 10 percent, well represented in the Cabinet, and the worst offenders and fire-eaters are former Republicans, Messrs. Knox, Stimson, and Ickes. Every speech they make is not only warlike, but that we must get into war now.

When this poll began, the first day's poll was 6 to 1 in my district for keeping out of war, but when the polls of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday came in, after Germany had gone to war with the Communists, and when the Communists lined up leading the fight for democracy and religion, the vote jumped to 9 to 1, and it has been 9 to 1 every day since.

I want to take this occasion to read a letter. I really do not know much about the gentleman. Being one of my constituents, I suppose he is a 100-percent American, but here is a letter that arrived today. I will read part of it. It is from Goshen, N. Y., dated June 25, 1941:

DEAR SIR: It is my desire to retract what I said in my recent open letter to you, and I hereby apologize for same. That was written and mailed before I knew about the German action against Russia. This latest development of the war has convinced me that the United States and Britain should mark time in the war effort, strengthening themselves to all possible limits in the interim during which the Nazis and Reds are fighting it out.

Having often said that I would prefer to live in a democracy headed by the vilest specimen of a man than to be the subject of the most virtuous dictator, I do not hesitate now to add that, as between Hitler and Stalin, I should rather a hundredfold be enslaved by Nazi Hitler than by Red Stalin; that our leader should want to give aid to Russia is utterly repugnant and reprehensible and merely indicates their insincerity of purpose in this entire mess.

Earnestly seeking some degree of sincerity in the utterances of the great democratic leaders assuring us that their fight was to save the democratic way of life, this became my hope and belief; being eager for an ultimate settlement, based an equality of opportunity and justice so as to insure a more permanent peace, I ardently espoused this great principle. But sincerity seems to have been transitory and a travesty; I see ardent British supporters patronizing freely those who refuse to help Britain; I see this revolting spectacle of Churchill embracing Stalin, the arch enemy of all democratic tenets; I see our own President enthusiastically going "all out" to aid Russia. It confounds me, and I can only wonder if, after all, England merely wants her control of Empire and her mastery of the seas sustained, which were threatened by the growing strength of Germany, and which Hitler apparently feels he cannot destroy without destroying England herself.

It was signed by Louis Faver.

That is a typical letter that reached me today. If I had my way, I would urge the Congress of the United States to provide free transportation and turn over the steamship *America*, now called the steamship *West Point*, to all American Communists who want to fight for Soviet Russia—who want to fight for the "red" flag, communism, and world revolution. They have been talking that way for 20 years. Now is their opportunity. Let the Congress provide a one-way free transportation and let all the Communists—alien and native-born American Communists who believe in the "red" flag—go over to Soviet Russia and fight there for world revolution. I would do the same for the Nazis, Fascists, and all others who would undermine and destroy our free institutions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We should not only furnish transportation but we should corral them all and send them over there.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania always goes one step further than I. I believe the gentleman is right.

Now we propose, without action of Congress, to turn the lend-lease bill into a Lenin-lease bill and send our articles of defense to Soviet Russia in defense of democracy and religion. What a travesty. O Democracy, what crimes are committed in thy name. I wonder where the great Catholic Church will stand when this issue is clear? I wonder whether it will want to help build up

communism, world revolution, and atheism not only in Russia but throughout the world with American money and maybe with American blood.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. In just 1 minute.

I think Dictator Joseph Stalin has played a dirty trick on Comrades Stimson, Knox, Wickard, and Ickes. Pal Joey, by taking the lead away from these gentlemen and fighting for democracy, has stolen their clothes and thunder. They claim to have been leading the fight for world democracy, but now we have Comrade Stalin as their partner and ally, taking the whole play away from them. I look forward with anticipation to listening to their next speeches and hearing their alibis. I believe the war between the Nazis and the Communists is the greatest event that has happened recently for the benefit of America, because I think the American people will be united and instead of being 6 to 1 for keeping out of the war they will be 10 to 1 and more for keeping out of war.

What American mother, no matter from what district she may come, will want her sons to fight and die in Soviet Russia or anywhere else in the world for the red flag for communism and world revolution? I believe this new war has definitely decided the issue for us, because the American people now will take a stronger stand to keep out of all foreign wars and will see to it that we do not go into this war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Those people who want us to get into this war on the side of Russia want us to get in bed with a rattlesnake and a skunk.

Mr. FISH. I said the gentleman always went me one better. He has gone me two better this time.

I now yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Do I understand the gentleman to feel that we should cease all aid to Great Britain?

Mr. FISH. Certainly not. I am for aid to Great Britain short of war and consistent with our own national defense.

Mr. SABATH. Is the gentleman still in favor of our doing everything possible to aid Great Britain?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I am for carrying out the laws passed by the Congress, and that is the policy of the Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman feel that what has transpired, what Hitler did in the last few days, has been helpful to Great Britain? The gentleman is a soldier.

Mr. FISH. That is a row between two dictators, as the gentleman from Illinois well knows, between two aggressor nations; and I say a plague on both their houses.

Mr. SABATH. Is the gentleman in favor of helping Hitler, then?

Mr. FISH. I am opposed to helping Hitler at all times, and I am likewise opposed to helping the Communists. Nothing I can think of would be too bad to say against Hitler and nazi-ism, but there is one thing worse than nazi-ism and that is communism. I am against both.

The idea of talking about bringing the four freedoms to Soviet Russia—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—with American blood and American treasure only goes to show we should keep out of this rotten European and Asiatic mess. We may be able to save America. Let me state the issue utterly regardless of partisanship, because this may be my last speech here for a long, long time, for I am going to camp on the 1st of July for 4 weeks' military training. This great issue has nothing whatever to do with partisanship. This issue is far greater than the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, or both parties combined; it transcends all party lines, all social affiliations, all family relationship, and even church connections. It must be decided by one yardstick and one yardstick alone: What is best for America? That is all. This is the greatest single issue with which the country has been confronted since the birth of the Republic affecting the safety, the security, and the destiny of America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has consumed 30 minutes.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a conferee on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 2097), to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k), and that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] may be substituted in my place.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he be excused from further service as a conferee on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k).

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] as a conferee on the part of the House on the bill H. R. 2097. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

EXTENDING LIFE AND INCREASING CREDIT RESOURCES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, with Mr. LEAVY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a bill to implement and carry out the mandate of the Congress in legislation already enacted. The Congress has declared by act that loans shall be made on a basis of 85 percent of the parity price of the five basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice. We have provided in this bill for an additional borrowing power on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation to an amount of $1,250,000,000. That is the amount the officials of the corporation estimate that may be required to carry out the law and the responsibilities imposed upon it by the recent act of Congress.

The measure does not provide for any appropriation but simply is an extension of the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation in order that it may, as need requires, have sufficient funds to meet all anticipated requirements in the fulfillment of the orders of the Congress.

The second section of the bill amends the act providing for an annual appraisal of the assets of the Corporation by providing that the value of the assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market price of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less. Under existing law such value is determined on the basis of market price at the time of appraisal.

We have a provision in the bill to the effect that when the Secretary of Agriculture encourages the production of nonbasic commodities, loans or purchases or other operations on such commodities shall be made so as to insure not less than 85 percent of the parity price for such commodities. Where no proper basis for parity-price calculation exists the Secretary shall undertake to make such loans on a basis of what he finds to be the parity comparable with the five basic commodities.

There is further provision that in such cases the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture shall give notice to the producers of commodities that have been encouraged to expand production before withdrawing the benefits of loans upon the basis of 85 percent.

In addition, there is a declaration of policy that the Commodity Credit Corporation in its operations shall undertake to base its action upon all other commodities in accordance with the concept of the 85-percent parity loans. This does not mean that on farm nonbasic commodities there will be a full parity price realized by producers, but insofar as the funds authorized by this bill are concerned, and insofar as such funds are

available, the loans would be made up to 85 percent. There are no benefits and other payments, such as is the case with respect to the five basic commodities.

Commodity loans have been one of the most successful features of the national farm program and commodity loans are the literal foundation stones upon which our present farm program is built.

In order to make clear the importance of just what is undertaken in this bill it is necessary to review very briefly the general farm program which has been enacted by the Congress under the broad provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and see how the Commodity Credit Corporation and its operations function as a basic support of the national farm program.

As the Congress well understands, we have enacted laws which enable producers of farm crops, such as cotton, wheat, tobacco, corn, rice, and the several minor crops, to cooperate in the adjustment of their production to demands and to improve their soil resources and balance their farming operations generally. We are appropriating some $500,000,000 each year for soil benefit and conservation payments to supplement the income of farmers and to encourage them in the carrying out of these programs. In addition, parity payments amounting to some two hundred and twelve million are being paid to cooperating farmers.

But it is not enough aid for farmers and the total income of agriculture is still below its normal portion of the national income, and there are times during the harvest season and in period of large crops, due to weather conditions or to the dislocation of markets by war conditions, when farmers are faced with ruinous losses and disastrously low prices. So as a part of the program to increase and maintain the income of the farmer, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up by Executive order of the President in 1933 to make loans on agricultural products. Subsequent laws have been enacted which make such loans mandatory under certain conditions. These loans have had the effect of placing a bottom under the market during the harvest season and emergency periods. They have protected the farmer against drastic price declines, and in many instances permitted him to carry over his crops into better prices later in the season.

Congress has enacted labor laws which fix minimum wages for most employees of the Nation. We just recently passed laws which will permit industrial plants handling defense contracts to amortize their investments for new construction over a shorter period and in that way we have almost guaranteed them a profit on defense contracts. We have given industry the tariff, we fix minimum freight rates, and so forth, so that the income of practically every segment of our population is governmentally protected in one way or the other by law. But we are just now getting around to assuring something nearer reasonable minimum prices and minimum income for farmers.

The indexes of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on April 30 showed that general farm prices stood at 110 in relation to the so-called base period of 1909–14, but the price of things the farmer buys has increased to a ratio of 129. Thus, even with the increase in farm prices and income, farm prices are still 15 percent below a parity with the prices of things the farmer must buy to carry on his business.

The loan provisions which the Congress has included in the agricultural legislation represent an attempt and promise to give the farmer a guarantee of at least a reasonable minimum return for his crop. Even with loans at 85 percent of parity for the major crops, the farmer is still far behind the parade when it comes to equality of income.

Last year the Congress increased the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation by $500,000,000, and I think those who have studied the matter will agree that this power to lend funds on the 1940 crops literally saved cotton, tobacco, and wheat farmers from disaster in the past year. Last summer crops were going to harvest and the world markets, which normally absorb 40 percent or more of our cotton, 50 percent of our flue-cured and dark-fired tobacco, and from 15 to 20 percent of our wheat crop, were almost completely closed. Farmers could not have sold their crops last fall at any reasonable price save for the fact that the Department of Agriculture, through Commodity Credit Corporation, placed a bottom under the markets by making nonrecourse loans available. The wheat and corn and cotton dammed back by lack of exports flowed into the loan and the income of farmers was maintained. Due to the large accumulation of these products in the loan, however, it took nearly all of the borrowing power to meet the needs of the current year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will simply enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue its functions of stabilizing prices on basic crops and will provide the necessary funds to do the job.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if he would object to changing the word "encourage" to "whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall proclaim that the expansion of"? Let me say why I think that ought to be done. With the word "encourage" in there literally thousands of people may assume that the Agricultural Department is encouraging the expansion of crops of a nonbasic character and, as a result, we will have a tremendous overproduction all over the country. If it is limited to a proclamation by the Secretary of Agriculture, it would improve the bill, in my opinion, and it would make a better and safer proposition.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I say to the gentleman in the first place, this bill is the result of frequent conferences and discussions, and in those discussions the officials of the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the American Farm Bureau Federation agreed to the language written in the bill to which the gentleman addressed his remarks.

It cannot be successfully contended that the suggestion made by my distinguished and able friend from California would bring about any substantial change in the provisions of the bill, and I do not understand the gentleman from California has such purpose. I submit that it would be a very different thing between making these loans upon the encouragement of an expanded production on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and basing it upon a proclamation of such policy by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not say that the Secretary of Agriculture would disobey or attempt to thwart or refuse to follow the expressed intention of the Congress, but legislation, as far as it can, should always be clear to make sure what the result will be when it has gone the rounds of administration. If a Secretary desired—and I do not for a moment charge that would be the case—he might write a personal letter to every farmer in the United States urging an expansion of production of any particular commodity, yet this law would not apply, and the provisions of this bill would not apply, unless the Secretary issued a public proclamation in that regard. The whole provision could be avoided by inserting the language requiring a proclamation. It is not difficult to tell what Congress means when we speak of encouraging production. We had an experience of that kind during the other war, and following that war adjustments were made with farmers in connection with certain commodities where expansion of production had been brought about at the instance of the Government. That principle was applied to industrialists, manufacturers, and others. There is no reason why farmers should be called upon to make a sacrifice different from anybody else.

I assume, however, that as to the merits of the provision there is no dispute. May I say further the Commodity Credit Corporation already is undertaking to encourage the production of dairy products, including cheese, dried milk, butter, casein, condensed milk, pork and pork products, poultry products, tomatoes for canning, and different varieties of beans. They understand what is meant by encouraging production, and there is no difficulty whatever in carrying out the will of the Congress as expressed in the language contained in the pending bill. But if we were to change it and predicate the whole procedure upon a condition such as is suggested—that is, the Secretary first issue a formal proclamation—we would create the possibility of defeating the very purpose of that provision of this bill. I do not say that would happen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The language is "whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture encourages the expansion of production of any commodity." What commodities has the gentleman in mind that would be included in this bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have just read a list.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman have the list?

Mr. STEAGALL. They have already encouraged the production of these products.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to know what they are.

Mr. STEAGALL. It also applies to others. I cannot anticipate. They may want to increase the production of soy beans and tung oil, for instance.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What about beef, mutton, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, they would be included.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And pork and pork products?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; that is included. We have already covered that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In fact, any food commodity may be included in this bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

This is not going to give the farmer a full parity price on nonbasic commodities. It directs the use of funds provided in this bill to the effect that loans made out of such funds shall be on the basis of 85 percent of parity.

May I say in passing that when we restore parity prices to the farmers of this country we still will have a long way to go before we accomplish what would in my judgment be an adequate and fair readjustment of the economic hardships and injustices the farmers of this country underwent during the period of upheaval and disturbance that followed the last war. Many of them increased their production and were unable to obtain prices such as they had been led to expect they would receive.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman understands I am not making these remarks for the purpose of opposing the measure in its entirety, but the gentleman will recall, as other members of the committee will also, that we agreed the night before we voted this bill out that "proclamation" was to be used instead of the word "encourages," but somehow or other the word "proclamation" got lost in the shuffle.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman that I have no such understanding as that of the matter. The matter should have been called to our attention.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I distinctly called attention to it that morning, and my recollection is that other Members were in full agreement with me.

Mr. STEAGALL. It is a matter of record, if it is true, but that is not my understanding, because the whole matter was thrashed out and discussed just as it has been here.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It was thrashed out in executive session.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am sure that nothing like that happened.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It is my definite recollection that the word "encourages" was to be left out and we were to put in "proclamation."

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not believe any member of the committee would remember that, if the gentleman does.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. They have talked to me about it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In section 4 you provide that the Secretary shall so use the funds made available under this act or otherwise made available to him, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, and so forth; and the section goes on to provide for 85 percent of the parity price on purchases. Do they purchase from the producers?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes, they do; not the Commodity Credit Corporation, but they do supply funds to the Surplus Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, and those operations represent a simplification of methods by which supplies may be maintained with the least expense to the Government from the point of view of personnel and other incidentals for the supply of products to Britain.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman does not want to try to make us believe that under these operations they actually go out to the individual farmer and buy from him?

Mr. STEAGALL. I would not attempt to say that in these purchases they would run down to the individual farmer in many instances. They buy on the open market.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the point I am making, that if they pay 85 percent of parity on purchases, it is not the producer who is getting the 85 percent, it is the man who got the commodity after it left the hands of the producer.

Mr. STEAGALL. That would perhaps happen in some cases.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what happens and is the whole trouble with the farmer today.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know any way to avoid it.

Mr. COCHRAN. The farmer, I insist, does not get the 85 percent of the parity price. Somebody between the farmer and the consumer does get it.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman will understand that in handling nonbasic commodities some of them that are perishable cannot be handled and stored like cotton and wheat. Such transactions have to be handled with a greater degree of risk, they have to be handled more expeditiously, and they are handled under disadvantages as compared to the basic crops.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is exactly what I do know, and that is the reason I say that when you use the word "purchase" in this bill and say that it is going to be beneficial to the producer, that language is misleading.

Mr. STEAGALL. There is no way to avoid the natural laws of trade and commerce. The final price for any product will, of course, be reflected all down the line to some extent. Whether it goes as far as it should is another matter; I cannot say. We have this question of the middleman everywhere.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when we considered the conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, he will find that the gentleman from Missouri certainly did not agree with the language just expressed by the gentleman from Alabama, that the producer benefited.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman from Missouri will read down a little further, he will find that the Secretary is directed to use the funds in such a way as to "support the price for the producers."

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not see how he is going to do it.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman was complaining about the act in the beginning, and now he is complaining about whether or not the Secretary is going to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was referring to one paragraph of the act. I do not see how he is going to do it. I believe the whole thing is misleading in that it implies that the producer eventually will get 85 percent of parity of what the Commodity Credit Corporation will purchase. Of course, he will get 85 percent on loans, but not on purchases. That, at least, is my view.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I take this time at the opening of the discussion on this bill, which is ostensibly for the aid of agriculture, to express my regret at the decision announced by the majority leader earlier today for the postponement of the consideration of the so-called May bill. At this peak of the farm-labor season it seems to me highly unfortunate that we should continue the uncertainty that exists for every boy beyond 28, who wonders whether or not he is going to be called into service under the Selective Service Act on the 1st of July, and for those under that age, who wonder whether or not the number may be shoved down to them. Not only farm jobs but all jobs are affected.

I am also disappointed in the decision to postpone the consideration of the May bill because of the parliamentary situation in which the conferees on the War Department appropriations bill will find themselves. We are told that the other body has stricken from that bill two amendments that were adopted by the House, the so-called Case and Pace amendments, that seek to give some power to the National Defense Mediation Board to deal with strikes in defense plants. If we recede and concur and then the May bill fails to carry any provisions dealing with the stoppage of work, we are back where we started.

Those same amendments are on the deficiency bill that was passed by the House yesterday. Almost everyone realizes that those two amendments were the first positive action taken by the

House with respect to stoppages of work affecting the national-defense program. Now the conferees may find themselves euchered out of position, for nobody can tell what is going to happen when the May bill does come up for consideration. It may pass and it may not.

I protest the program as announced because I believe the House should complete action on the 28-year section of the May bill before July 1, when many boys are due to go, and we should act on the stoppage-of-work provisions before the appropriation bills are completed for the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are now about to prove to the world that "government can be superior to economic forces." It is a marvelous thing that we have performed if, in the end, it succeeds. But we are traveling on this road at so fast a pace that we cannot turn back. We cannot stop the program; and I would call this bill, if I might emphasize or stigmatize it, a subsidy for all farmers, not only for wheat, cotton, and tobacco, but so that everybody interested in the farmer can now get his finger in the pie. Here is the chance. Here is a bill where every prospect pleases and only the ink is red. We have continued on these subsidizing joy rides for some time and, hence, of course, cannot stop this particular legislation.

I shall enjoy myself for a few minutes in generalizations on the roads which we have traveled. We have been swindling posterity for a long time, but, to quote a good old Democrat, speaking on the floor of this House sometime ago, "What of it? What has posterity ever done for us?"

Little by little, starting in with $3,000,000 capitalization, see how the Commodity Credit Corporation baby has grown. Last year it received an extra $500,000,000. This year an additional $1,000,000,000, and, if you will pardon the expression, like all nondefense appropriations it has been made to smell very strongly of gunpowder.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; that is what I am here for.

Mr. MURRAY. I hesitate to question such a distinguished colleague, but, as I remember it, the gentleman voted for the $7,000,000,000 lend-lease bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; all defense measures.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the gentleman realize that this increase he just speaks of is nothing more than a guaranty to the farmers of this country whom the Government has asked to increase their production?

Mr. GIFFORD. I know what this bill is.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman would not want to be in the position of saying to the farmers of this country they should not have 85 percent of parity on what they produce to feed the world and then appropriate $7,000,000,000 to send across the water.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will answer the question. Everybody votes for defense measures. I am talking about swindling posterity in the $59,000,000,000 spent during the last 7 years before defense came before us, of which one-half was called recovery and relief. However, I have spoken about this so many times that there is little use of going over it again. But I repeat, it was swindling posterity.

Now, as to the farmer. I have been a farmer and I have, in all probability, milked as many cows as the gentleman from Wisconsin has. I am most sympathetic toward farmers. I am also sympathetic toward my fishermen. I wish to be sympathetic with all classes of citizens in addition to the farmers—the citizens who pay the bills and who are watching this proceeding.

You rise here and say that you have done much for labor. You see to it that labor gets its price per hour and you set up all kinds of boards for it, but you have done nothing to guarantee the individual laborer work or to keep him producing. You have no "ever-normal granary" for manufactured goods. You have never thought of a scheme by which you could allocate money to keep an ever-normal granary of manufactured goods.

You have set up boards whereby you can make the employer pay a higher rate for the few hours one does work and you may claim that you have done a lot of things for other classes of citizens, but it is nothing in comparison with what you have done for the farmer.

I have been here nearly 20 years and I had my baptism in tears for the farmer when first I came. I voted for many measures to help him, and I am not sorry that I did it. I am very glad to grant him help, of course, but not for the experiment presented today. You have formerly taken in cotton, corn, tobacco, and wheat, but you are taking in all products of agriculture today. It was testified in committee that even the dairy farmer has really been well treated, and perhaps more so than others, on the whole. Many of you deny that.

We are now watching the business index go way up beyond that of 1929. But we must not reduce any relief expenditures. I read the W. P. A. debate most carefully. You now have crops in the West such as you have not had for 7 years. You have people being called for defense work, but you objected to the reduction of a dollar in the W. P. A. appropriation. I suppose I should not blame you—get it if you can. My own State ought now to be able to take care of its needy. It is a wealthy State and it could take care of its own. But, of course, it will not, and our wealthy towns will not as long as the W. P. A. will give it to them. This administration wants to garner these votes. There is little sense in giving wealthy communities W. P. A. money. We know it. Everybody knows it. If in Wisconsin and other places, where they may show that their State is unable to care for their needy because they are allowed only their percentage of the W. P. A. fund, it proves itself to be an unjust distribution. What an indictment. The needy should be taken care of, and States unable to do so should properly receive assistance from the Federal Government; but for the sake of a few votes, why give to wealthy communities, which could well take care of their own? This method merits severe condemnation. My voice has been raised persistently on the floor against this. I have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations against it. But these votes are seemingly important. Today statistics will be tortured in order to bring about a preconceived and a predesired result. I warn you to pay careful attention. Today we will be told that the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost only $67,000,000. Beware of that statement. That is in reference only to the goods that they have taken and sold, fully wiping out the transaction. They will tell you little about the nine to twelve million bales of cotton that have been stored, much of it since 1934, which is still owned by the Government. Of course, there will be a tremendous loss, because every year the storage and other costs are added. In 1939 it is reported that only 25,000 bales were taken over. That is statistics for you. What happened to all that cotton? They could not sell it. It was stored, and the market price was held up by loans guaranteed by the Government. Money was loaned on this cotton by private banks, and the loans guaranteed by the Corporation. In March of each year the Treasury has to find out the true condition of assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The market value of cotton is about 12½ cents, although it is stored and cannot be sold at a price perhaps not more than 5 cents.

The Government fixes the market price by the loan it will make upon it. It has worked very well with corn and many other products which could perhaps be sold a little later. The Government is coming to the rescue and putting a price ceiling on it by the way of a loan, and that is the so-called market value. It is indeed a fictitious market price when for years held in storage and impossible to sell at almost any price. This cotton proposition, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] brought out in the hearings, has brought about a condition such that we buy much foreign cotton for use in our own country. It is because we can buy the foreign cotton cheaper than the domestic cotton at its fictitious price caused by Government loans. What a happy thing that is for Brazil and Bolivia and other places where they can now raise cotton and sell it cheaper to us while we keep our own cotton in storage. There is only a loss of $67,000,000, it is declared. Will you believe it? How convenient statistics are. The truth hurts. So would you if you were stretched so much. Now, these statements are largely generalities, but they remind us of the road we are traveling. We have put the Government back of everything. I have been here for many years. Twenty years ago one would not have thought of doing any of these things. The Democratic Party stood squarely for the policy of "no subsidy." I repeat that now that party believes in nothing but subsidy. The Government guarantees about every-

thing, and some of us are truly frightened. I was really frightened at the expenditure of the $59,000,000,000, one-half for relief experiments for recovery and relief.

Mr. PIERCE rose.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I see the gentleman from Oregon rises. Please do not ask me whether I am in sympathy with the poor farmer. I am in sympathy with him, of course.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman turn back to 1932?

Mr. GIFFORD. I will turn back to 1932 surely, but I want 20 minutes to portray that picture, and the gentleman would not like the portrait.

Mr. PIERCE. Has not what we have done for the farmer been the basis of the prosperity for all today that we enjoy?

Mr. GIFFORD. Talk about 1932 and what Hoover did for the farmers when he lost some $300,000,000. It is a $500,000,000 gift for soil conservation every year now; parity, $212,000,000. You take away the money that we get from the tariff and subsidize agricultural exports. That is cold cash that is handed out. It is not a pretty picture.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will my genial friend yield to me?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. When we give a contract for a number of ships or a number of airplanes or a number of other products that are essential to national defense, do we not say to the man who takes the order, "We will guarantee you a fixed fee for that operation"? And is he not guaranteed his profit over the cost of production?

Mr. GIFFORD. In some cases. We tried to grant a subsidy 20 years ago for shipping. Your side would have none of it. Read those speeches of 20 years ago and learn from your former Democratic leaders. But you have adopted that theory of the old Democrat who said, "What has posterity done for us?"

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. But my friend will admit that as a fair basis of argument, if you will do that for one class of people, there is no reason why you should not do it for another.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is what I am talking about today. Everybody who works—all classes of people should have parity and will probably demand it. It is a magic word. If we give it to the farmer, why not all other classes?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will my genial teacher and friend answer as to whether he knows what the price of cotton is today and whether it has reached parity?

Mr. GIFFORD. They claim that 12½ cents reaches parity, but that which has been stored for 6 years I do not think they can get parity or more than 5 cents a pound.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If my good friend would read the papers, as I did last night, he would discover that cotton now is above parity.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. I know that. I just explained it. It is because the Government fixes the loan price, and it is kept in storage and not allowed to be placed on the market. Release a little of it and watch the toboggan.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Now, is it not true that cotton is above the storage price this afternoon at 2 o'clock?

Mr. GIFFORD. Absolutely, because the Government will not allow vast quantities to be sold at all until this price will be paid.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And is it not also true that if the Government had not done that, then the speculator would have made the difference between what the poor devil of a farmer would have had to take for it and what it would be today?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am very sympathetic with the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: Alexander Hamilton said at the time that the first tariff bill was introduced, that if we were going to protect the manufacturers we had to pay a bounty to the American farmer as restitution, to make him on an even basis with the manufacturer. What we are doing today when we vote these parity payments is to try to put the American farmer on a basis of equality with your manufacturers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but half of my manufacturers have gone out of business entirely. The Government did not pay cash bounties to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We remember what good service you rendered your district up there in the northeast when you got us to buy all those elm trees.

Mr. GIFFORD. That was not in my district.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And all those fish. They were in your district.

Mr. GIFFORD. Just think of it! Once during all these years have I stooped to ask for a few thousand dollars. I plead guilty and perhaps I ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. You should be proud that you did.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do hope my fishermen were helped even although so little.

I want to put in the RECORD a sentence that little Tommy gave when he was asked by his teacher to make a sentence using all the letters in the alphabet:

> New Deal quackery and extravagance have piled a fearful debt upon junior citizens, including myself.

We should plead for the young people. Seemingly they are beginning to realize what we are doing to them. We are trying so hard in the Congress to give equal distribution of unequal earnings, and our job seems to be to find somebody who is earning something and producing, and take it away from him and give it to somebody who is not. It is not an entirely happy assignment. I had hoped to stir your interest to debate this present bill with some real interest in the general subject of Government subsidies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 4972, the bill now under consideration, is to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as a lending agency on agricultural products, to maintain its capital unimpaired, and to increase its borrowing power so that it may continue to be an effective agency of the Government. If the operations of Commodity Credit Corporation are extended for a reasonable period, the farmers will have a measure of continued protection now afforded industry and labor in existing legislation such as tariffs, franchises, freight rates, collective bargaining power, maximum wages, and minimum hours and the like. Farmers need and must have similar assistance. This can only be achieved by extending the life and increasing the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

The effect of the naval blockades as a result of the wars abroad have virtually closed most world markets to American farm products. This has not been true for industrial products of this Nation chiefly because of preferences given in both purchasing and shipping. Factories are running at top speed and employment is on the increase and at somewhat higher wages. Exports of nonagricultural products during the period from September to February 1941 were 63 percent larger than during the same period in 1938 and 1939. On the other hand, notwithstanding the fact that large acreage reductions have been made in such major crops as cotton, tobacco, wheat, and corn, surpluses continue to accumulate with the result that prices of these products remain depressed. The loss of the export markets has this effect. Exports of agricultural products during the period from September to February 1941 were 62 percent smaller than during the same period in 1938–39.

These huge economic losses are first imposed upon the 23 percent of the population of this Nation that live on farms. These same families have 31 percent of the children of the Nation, yet they are receiving only 11 percent of the national income. Obviously, if farm children are to have the same opportunities in this country as children living in small towns and cities, farm income must be protected and must be increased.

During the last session of Congress, the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation was increased from $900,000,000 to $1,400,000,000 or $500,000,000. This bill seeks to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation to $2,650,000,000, an increase of $1,250,000,000.

Parity is the price farm commodities must bring if the farmers' buying power is to be equal of that prevailing from 1909 to 1914. If the farmer can borrow 85 percent on the basic commodities, this will give a loan rate of a little over 13½ cents per pound for cotton, 71 cents a bushel for corn, 97 cents a bushel for wheat, 89 cents a bushel for rice, and 20 cents a pound for tobacco. The price

of the products of the farmer, while fluctuating, has tended down in the last few years, and there has been a great relative increase in the cost of things he buys. We all realize, or should realize, that parity must be the goal of the farmer. Of course, we may differ in the exact method of achieving parity. The loan amount from the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton has been increased from 56 percent to 85 percent of parity, and the benefit from soil conservation and the regular parity payment added to the 85 percent will give the farmer practically 16 cents a pound for his cotton.

Financial panic rarely comes when agricultural interests are prosperous.

COTTON LOANS

I desire to call attention to Commodity Credit Corporation's operations in respect to cotton since 1933. Loans to farmers have been made on 19,944,000 bales of cotton against which $1,042,000,000 has been advanced, while of this amount $100,000,000 was loaned farmers on nearly 2,000,000 bales of 1933 crop cotton at 10 cents per pound. This cotton has been repossessed by farmers without cost to the Government and has been sold at a profit.

Loans were made on 4,632,000 bales of 1934 crop cotton, of which there still remains a million three hundred and forty-eight thousand bales, the remainder having been repossessed by producers. Title to the remaining 1934 crop cotton remaining under loan was taken by the Government in 1939 in order to have stocks to meet the treaty with the British Government requiring the exchange of cotton for rubber.

The Government also owns 4,778,000 bales of 1937 crop cotton that was required at approximately the same time and for approximately the same purpose. The amount of the original advance plus all accumulated carrying charges against this cotton amounts to 15.35 cents per pound in the case of 1934 crop cotton and 10.75 cents per pound for 1937 crop cotton. This compares with the average price of 14.2 cents per pound prevailing throughout the Cotton Belt.

Loans were made on 4,482,000 bales of 1938 crop cotton at 8.4 cents per pound. All of this cotton, with the exception of 1,336,000 bales, has been repossessed by the farmers and sold at a profit without cost to the Government and at present this reserve stock is being reduced by more than 100,000 bales per week.

For the years 1935, 1936, and 1939 few, if any, loans were made and only 13,500 bales of cotton remains under loan for these 3 years and this amount is being reduced rapidly by farmer withdrawals.

During the current season loans were made on 3,200,000 bales of cotton at the rate of 9.3 cents per pound against which $153,000,000 were advanced. Of this amount less than 600,000 bales remains under loan, the remainder having been repossessed by farmers without cost to the Government. This stock is also being reduced by approximately 100,000 bales per week.

In summary, I wish to emphasize that while Commodity Credit Corporation's operations with respect to cotton have been large, involving advances of more than $1,000,000,000, which is equal to approximately 50 percent of all advances made by Commodity Credit Corporation, the loan record on cotton, considering the unfavorable circumstances existing on cotton exports during the past 7 years, is a record of which we all feel justly proud.

If the Government-owned and Government-loan cotton could be sold today at present prices the Government would not only not lose but the transaction would show a profit.

I think this agency has done more to stabilize prices and assist the farmer than all other agencies combined.

The amount of loans now outstanding on cotton is approximately $145,000,000.

The book value of the Government-owned cotton amounts to approximately $360,000,000.

The total amount of loans on other basic and a few nonbasic commodities is approximately $330,000,000.

The book value of other Government-owned basic commodities is approximately $300,000,000.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently found it necessary to encourage farmers to increase the production of certain food crops in order to obtain additional supplies for Great Britain during this present emergency. In order to meet this need section 4 is included in the bill for the purpose and intent of assuring such farmers that the Department of Agriculture will undertake to provide, through loan and purchase programs, a fair price for such commodities.

The Corporation's general commodities purchase program commits $90,000,000 for the purchase and resale of evaporated milk, dry skim milk, cheese, butter, eggs, pork and pork products, lard, dried fruits, dry edible beans, corn and wheat products, and other agricultural and food products and concentrates. Products handled under the program are urgently needed to meet export requirements of the Red Cross and of certain foreign countries. The program is designed to stabilize prices for the commodities involved and to mitigate the impact on American agricultural economy of emergency purchases in quantity which are necessarily made without regard to the period of processing, the location of surplus stocks, or the seasonal period of production and marketing; while at the same time utilizing these prospective outlets for agricultural and food products and concentrates, and thereby giving relief from agricultural surpluses and maximum benefit to American farmers.

LOANS ON VARIOUS OTHER COMMODITIES

Corn

Loans have been made to farmers on corn stored on farms each year beginning with the 1933 crop. Approximately 270,000,000 bushels of the 1933 crop were placed under loan at 45 cents per bushel, aggregating slightly in excess of $121,000,000; 20,075,000 bushels of the 1934 crop were placed under loan at 55 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $11,000,000; 30,966,000 bushels of the 1935 crop were placed under loan at 45 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $14,000,000; only a small number of bushels of the 1936 crop were placed under loan at 55 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $46,000; approximately 48,000,000 bushels of 1937 corn were placed under loan at 50 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $23,000,000; 229,839,000 bushels of 1938 corn were placed under loan at 57 cents, aggregating approximately $131,000,000; approximately 302,000,000 bushels of 1939 corn were placed under loan at 57 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $172,000,000; approximately 100,000,000 bushels of 1940 corn have been placed under loan at 61 cents per bushel, aggregating approximately $61,000,000. Accordingly, a total of approximately 905,000,000 bushels of corn have been placed under loan at an aggregate value of approximately $475,000,000. Of the total bushels placed under loan approximately 250,000,000 bushels have been delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation in satisfaction of loans, the balance having been redeemed by producers. The Corporation owns at the present time approximately 200,000,000 bushels of corn which is available for increased productions of livestock and poultry products in connection with national defense.

Wheat

Approximately 86,000,000 bushels of the 1938 crop of wheat were placed under loan, aggregating approximately $50,000,000; of the 1939 crop, approximately 168,000,000 bushels were placed under loan aggregating approximately $118,000,000; 272,192,000 bushels of 1940 wheat were placed under loan aggregating approximately $197,000,000. Practically all of the wheat of the 1938 and 1939 crops was redeemed by producers and approximately 175,000,000 bushels of the 1940 crop have been turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation in satisfaction of loans and placed in a producers' pool. Any proceeds from the sale of this wheat in excess of the amount loaned plus charges will be prorated to the producers. The loan program for 1941 has just been placed in operation. It is estimated that 300,000,000 bushels will be placed under loan at an average loan value of 98 cents per bushel with an aggregate loan value of approximately $295,000,000.

Naval stores

Loans have been made to farmers on rosin and turpentine through the American Turpentine Farmers Association Cooperative for several years. Normally between 50 and 60 percent of the United States production of rosin and a considerable part of the production of turpentine is exported. For several years the export demand has been poor and since the outbreak of war exports have been sharply curtailed. The situation has been met by conservation and loan programs. Under the former, wasteful exploitive methods such as the working of immature trees have been discouraged. In 1939 loans of approximately $9,000,000 were made on over 6,000,000 gallons of turpentine and 670,000 barrels of rosin. In 1940 loans totaling nearly $7,000,000 were made on approximately 3,000,000 gallons of turpentine and 527,000 barrels

of rosin. Due to improved demand for turpentine, releases of loan stocks have been large and prices have been strong. Some recent improvement has been shown in the rosin situation but stocks are still burdensome and prices are weak.

Tobacco

Unrestricted production and marketing led to the record crop of flue-cured tobacco in the fall of 1939 when export sales practically stopped because of the outbreak of war. The situation was met by the adoption by growers of marketing quota programs and the making of loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Similar but less acute situations have led to the adoption of marketing quota and loan programs for dark tobaccos and burley tobacco. Under the 1939 flue-cured program nearly $37,000,000 were advanced on 174,000,000 pounds of tobacco. This tobacco is now being shipped to Great Britain. Under the 1940 program over $42,000,000 were advanced on approximately 200,000,000 pounds of flue-cured tobacco. Advances of approximately $4,750,000 were made with respect to 43,500,000 pounds of dark tobacco and advances of $4,250,000 were made with respect to 23,400,000 pounds of burley tobacco. The 3-year marketing quota programs now in effect on these tobaccos are expected to improve the situation fundamentally.

Until the war is over, however, exports will be small and uncertain and growers will need the protection of loan programs. The accumulation of stocks under loan programs should go far toward meeting the large export demand that is anticipated as soon as the war is over. Stocks in foreign consuming countries are being depleted and unless reserve supplies are available in the United States at the conclusion of the war, shortages and inordinately high prices will occur with the result that production will be stimulated in foreign countries.

Prunes and raisins

Unusually bountiful crops of these commodities in the face of large carryovers made necessary loans of approximately $15,000,000 on approximately 304,000 tons of prunes and raisins during the last 3 years. With normal exports sharply curtailed, loans on the current crop of both products will be necessary to the extent of approximately $10,000,000 on a proportionate share of the production. These loans for 1940 were made through the Prune and Raisin Prorate Associations, respectively, which operate directly under the State department of agriculture under the California prorate act; and provide some measure of curtailment in production and improvement in grading standards.

Peanuts

During the past 4 years loans aggregating $15,000,000 on approximately 250,000 tons of peanuts have been made under the peanut surplus removal programs of the Department. The production during 1940 reached an all time high but under a recent act, providing for production quotas, the crop available for the so-called edible trade for the current year may be somewhat smaller. In view of this, and certain arrangements existing between the several peanut associations and commercial banks, it is not unlikely that approximately 3 to 5 million dollars will provide sufficient funds during the current year for loans on peanuts.

I should be glad to see every Member of the House vote for this bill because it is fair, just, and right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 29 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan has 41.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be relatively little opposition to this bill, but there is apparently vociferous opposition, as usual, to the idea of giving Government subsidies to farmers. They charge that Government subsidies are unjust to taxpayers.

To a certain extent this may be true, since a taxpayer, particularly a high taxpayer, consumes little if any more food than a person who pays no taxes. It may also be true that many farmers, when they receive these payments, imagine that they are sharing in political graft.

As I see the farm parity checks, however, they are a form of economic appeasement. There are today laws upon our statute books, affecting other forms of industry, which thwart the natural working of economic principles. The farm subsidies we pay farmers are only a part of the income which would come to them under the eternal principles of supply and demand had we not through legislation enabled other persons to take the money that would otherwise go to the producers of the materials which we eat and wear.

I believe, moreover, that all of us who represent the multitude of small towns that dot this Nation like raisins in a fruit cake should want farmers to receive a fair income. We know how a little outside money coming into a small town annually from a factory or industry there will cause that little town to flourish. Farm income is the chief source from which most of our little towns in the South, West, and Midwest obtain outside money.

It has always seemed a pity to me that no statesman has risen to leadership who could see the wonderful future for this country if by encouraging the prosperity of small towns we were to encourage people to leave the slum-filled cities and live in pleasant little towns in rural areas.

Today, however, with cost of production on the farm eating increasing amounts of gross income, the farm income is slipping, our little towns are slipping. Again as in 1928 the hope is held out that we can build an enduring prosperity with the cities hitched to an increasingly higher standard of income and the rural populations hitched to an increasingly lower one. It is regrettable that leaders from the eastern cities are internationalists on foreign policies and economic isolationsists against the hinterlands of their own country.

This time we cannot say, as was said in 1929 that we did not know what the tragic result would be. Some of the statements and opinions given by the Government experts before our committee sound a significant warning.

Says Dr. Robbins, head of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

> While agriculture has 23 percent of the Nation's total population and is rearing approximately 31 percent of the Nation's children, yet it receives only 11 percent of the total national income.

The Government experts submitted a table which every citizen would do well to study. It shows that, while nonagricultural income has risen steadily from $23,562,000,000 in the 1910–14 period to $67,559,000,000 in 1940, agricultural income has remained almost constant, rising in that period only from $5,210,000,000 to $6,738,000 000 in 1940—and that last figure includes Government payments to farmers. In other words, agriculture's share of the total national income has gradually fallen in 30 years from 18.1 percent to 9.1 percent.

Another table, submitted by the experts, shows national income from 1929 to 1939 so as to indicate the amount of income received by various types of business. And what type of business do you think has prospered best in that period? Government. Government income, exclusive of relief, has risen from $6,330,000,000 in 1929 to $8,042,000,000 in 1939—which, of course, was before the politician's paradise which began with the defense spending. It is a strange and dangerous experiment your country is attempting, without precedent for success. For what nation ever hoped to endure with a failing agriculture and the business of politicians thriving with a rise in 10 years of from 7.6 percent to 11.6 percent as its share of the national income?

It was testified by the experts that while the average wage of the industrial worker is $688 per year, the average income of the agricultural worker, including Government payments, is $288.

One reason for this inequality at present is, of course, the war situation. American agriculture, according to Dr. Robbins, is geared to supply the American market and part of the foreign market, lost at present.

The inequality, however, exists in peacetimes. The president of the farm bureau submitted a table showing wages for carpenters, masons, and other workers. If they were reduced to parity with agricultural labor the worker who averages $58 per week would be making $38 per week. Even in peacetimes, according to Dr. Robbins, plenty of agricultural workers in America subsist on 18 cents per day.

You often hear it said that increased industrial activity will raise the farm income. The head of the farm bureau denies this. He quoted a United States Department of Agriculture study to show that the total per capita food consumption has not varied 10 percent, good times and bad, in the past 30 years. He also submitted a table showing the way prices of things the farmer has to buy have skyrocketed. A glance at those

figures will show you one reason why the farmer is not making cost of production.

Articles in the Washington newspapers day after day vociferously insist that rise in farm prices of 10 percent will cause increase of 10 percent in cost of food to the consumer. But, according to the Government experts who testified before the committee of which I am a member, this is not necessarily so. Says Dr. Robbins:

> The farm gets only 1¾ cents out of the price you pay for a large loaf of bread. The man who wraps it up and makes the change probably gets more out of it.

Why, then, is the sweat of the farmer plowing wheat in the sun less valuable than that of the man who ties string around a package of bread?

The head of the Commodity Credit Corporation answers that by saying:

> In order to reduce industrial prices and wages to parity with agriculture it would be necessary to revise the legislation which has enabled other commodities to rise to artificial heights—quotas, tariffs, franchises, patents, collective-bargaining laws and minimum-wage laws. Attempts to lower industrial prices in that manner would upset contractual relationships and start a downward price spiral which we call depression. The next best thing to do is to make an attempt to raise agricultural prices.

Government subsidies, then, are the method the Government has adopted to appease the farmer for not getting income which Government legislation has diverted to other citizens.

We could, of course, say to the farmer:

> You will never again acquire a net income comparable with other businesses unless, like them, you organize, threaten strikes and lock-outs, threaten not to produce any food or material for clothing, acquire political influence, make contributions to political campaigns, and vote for the political candidates who promise you whatever legislation you want.

Who questions that, if farmers were to organize for collective bargaining and threaten a general strike in food and commodity production, the public would accede to their demand for parity income?

I asked a farmer in my district who, 2 or 3 years ago, shut down his dairy because milk checks did not pay cost of upkeep, why, now that there is to be a milk shortage, he does not open his barn again and drive his own milk to the city consumer. "They would shoot my truck drivers on the highway," he answered.

The farmers have not objected much that we appropriated money to fight Hitlerism abroad. We must not force them to become economic slaves to Hitlerism in America.

The farmers and the little businesses in small towns which are so directly dependent upon farm income have, so far, shown an almost bovine patience. They have hoped that eventually we should remember that the fundamental purpose of the Federal Constitution is to guarantee justice to every person and every group of persons, rich or poor, whether or not they mix in politics.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS].

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, regardless of political considerations and party affiliations, the House of Representatives is a body composed of men and women who, above all, are Americans.

And that description carries with it the assumption that, as Americans, we all believe in truth, freedom of conscience, and equal justice—principles upon which this Nation was founded.

I was, therefore, shocked beyond words when not so long ago assertions were made affecting individuals in my district and in my city of Philadelphia. Within the confines of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks were made, the nature of which, in effect, strike at the very fundamentals of our Government. I may say that this is not the first time that the ugly issue of racial and religious bigotry has been injected in recent months into the proceedings of this body.

I feel that the time is past when vague, unsupported charges and misleading innuendo can be permitted to emanate from this floor unchallenged.

After all, this is the Congress of the United States, the Hall of a deliberative and legislative body representative of the people of this Republic—one of the few remaining free parliaments in the world, whose Members can, without duress carry out the purposes, duties, and functions which they were created under our Constitution to perform.

If we are to permit on this floor remarks unbecoming the dignity of our position in the councils of nations—if we are to permit the RECORD of our proceedings to degenerate into an organ for the dissemination of scurrility and defamation—then I say—even apart from more serious implications of the specific incidents which I call to your attention today—I say out standard of conduct reflects poorly upon the intelligence and character of the self-governing people who have honored us by election to this Congress.

Furthermore, the practice raises the question of abuse of the long-standing privilege of extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which we now mutually enjoy by reason of unanimous consent. At a critical hour in history, under the pressure of soul-stirring events from which statesmen are struggling to rescue the remnants of our civilization, it is hardly a contribution to the welfare of the United States to adopt the methods which have caused the downfall of other nations.

In the heat of debate, with grave issues involved, it is conceivable that men, under stress of emotion, may say things which they later regret. But in extended remarks, prepared and written in advance for printing in the RECORD with full deliberation, knowledge, and responsibility for his acts there is no excuse for any Member of Congress to sponsor material of un-American nature.

In allowing such a practice, the membership of this House not only stultifies itself but, what is even worse and more important, we make ourselves the pawns and dupes of an alien-fostered plot to create disunity, distrust, and division in our own ranks.

It has been conclusively demonstrated in nearly a dozen instances and needs no elaboration here that physical invasion of each country so far conquered by the despoiling hordes of Hitlerism was preceded by a propaganda attack—an attack, mind you, of an exact pattern of that being followed by certain people in America today.

Divide and rule has ever been the motto of conquerors, and today's tyrant has adapted it to his own foreign purpose.

The diversity of its people is a source of America's strength. We must guard against its misuse by others as a weapon to be turned against us. We are the product of many races and many creeds sprung from forebears who came from distant lands to this haven of liberty to establish a community whose essential keynote is brotherhood. Under democracy and civil liberties, men and women of every religion, race, and nationality in the United States have learned to live together in peace, order, and mutual respect.

If this internal harmony is shattered, if this public order is upset—if group is set against group—then America also would be headed for destruction.

Certain stock canards are being revived and circulated against Americans of Jewish faith. The falsity of these various accusations has been completely established and repeatedly exposed by impartial non-Jewish authority as they have cropped up from time to time in recent years. The fact that their charges have proven untrue has not, however, deterred the purveyors of such propaganda from continuing assiduously to spread it. Facts never do deter them.

Constant repetition, not authenticity, is the means by which the charges gain credence. Now Communist-Nazi propagandists and their coworkers, seeing this poison work in Europe, are spreading it in America.

But should the Congress of the United States give sanction to this vicious campaign? Should the Congress of the United States allow the pages of its official RECORD to be thus sullied? Should this Congress permit its floor to be used as a sounding board for such utterances? Should any individual Congressman under the cloak of immunity from civil action enjoyed by reason of membership in this body further this Commu-Nazi scheme of division by himself joining in attack upon a minority people? Should he use his public office and the prestige of his official position in the cause of subversion?

Assertions have been made concerning some American citizens living in my city. An attack was made upon Leon Levy, president of Radio Station WCAU, in which it was stated that WCAU had

denied time on the radio to Charles A. Lindbergh.

Let us look at the facts. On May 23, Leon Levy, president of WCAU, sent a telegram to the one who made such assertion, in which he stated that WCAU had not received a request either from the America First Committee, a representative of Lindbergh, or from anyone else officially connected with the organization, to broadcast Charles A. Lindbergh's speech of May 29, delivered in Philadelphia, and further added that "if and when such a request is made, it will be given proper consideration." In the same telegram it was also pointed out that WCAU had broadcast Lindbergh's speech from Minneapolis on Saturday, May 10, and was also to broadcast Senator WHEELER's speech of that very day, May 23.

This telegram was received and acknowledged by letter to Mr. Levy on May 24 by the one who made the assertions. Yet, in spite of that fact, on May 27, 4 days later, he said—and I refer to the RECORD of that date:

> Dr. Leon Levy, president of WCAU, Philadelphia, denied time on the radio to Lindbergh.

Can there be any excuse on the side of error in such a misstatement made with complete foreknowledge and acknowledgement of the true facts? Can there be any justification for his deliberate misstatement? Can there be any other motive attributable to such individuals than a desire to give circulation to malicious propaganda?

Once a misstatement is put into circulation it can never be overtaken and entirely refuted with all who heard or read of it. See how this particular misstatement about WCAU has spread; on June 8, more than 10 days later, it reappeared elsewhere.

In the same assertions made on May 27 it is alleged that Samuel R. Rosenbaum, head of WFIL, also denied Lindbergh time. I have a copy of a telegram sent by Mr. Rosenbaum on May 31 to the one who made this assertion, which states as follows:

> This is not true. The fact is that instead of selling Lindbergh time I offered him time free, and he accepted it and used it, and WFIL broadcast his speech on equal terms in every respect with facilities offered the other side. No doubt you will rectify the incorrect statement you made.

Privately, the one who made these assertions admitted he was mistaken, for WFIL not only granted free time to Lindbergh's broadcast of his speech but waived the cost of wire lines for the pick-up and gave free preliminary announcements in advance of the meeting calling attention to it.

With the inaccuracy typical of this statement, it was attempted to link the war crowd to the refusal of owners of the Academy of Music to rent their hall for the Lindbergh meeting. However, it was not stated that the owners of the academy were not Americans of Jewish faith. It was not stated at the time the assertion was made declaiming the alleged attempt to deprive the so-called America First Committee of a suitable meeting hall that the sponsors of the meeting had already made commitment to rent the arena, another hall in Philadelphia. It was further not stated that this hall, in which the Lindbergh meeting was held, was rented with the consent of the six owners, three of whom are Americans of Jewish faith.

This information was easily obtainable upon the slightest effort to investigate the truth of the situation. Obviously, no such effort and no investigation was made as to the true facts.

All of this, however, merely points to the larger conclusion that the maker of these assertions is guilty of loose talk, a complete lack of the sense of responsibility which devolves upon Members of this House to consider any utterance they deliver in this time of national stress.

As a matter of fact, up until this day there has not been a correction before the House of the mistakes of fact which were admitted privately as mistakes, and which still stand on the official RECORD of proceedings, and, above all, the impression has not been corrected that the "war crowd" in Philadelphia is composed of Americans of Jewish faith and that they were a party to a conspiracy to deny free speech to Lindbergh.

From the facts deduced from this statement today it is clearly established that their falsity is beyond answer.

I question the responsibility of any Member of this House who will not publicly acknowledge the untruth of a libel which he sponsors here. Such Member is under deep obligation, not only to the individuals I have mentioned but to the country as a whole and to this House, which gives him the privileges under which these statements were made, to acknowledge the false accusations made in his statement of May 27.

Mr. Chairman, I am calling this to the attention of the Congress so that the House may determine whether or not in the future a halt should be called to this perfidious practice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit—so-called—Corporation has now been in operation for 8 years. It has made loans and purchases in all in the amount of more than $2,000,000,000, involving approximately 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn, half a billion bushels of wheat, half a billion pounds of tobacco, 20,000,000 bales of cotton, varying smaller quantities of barley, butter, figs, hops, peanuts, pecans, prunes, raisins, rye, wool and mohair, turpentine, rosin, and other products not classified.

Certainly the amount of business transacted and the time which this agency has been in operation should be sufficient to give us some idea of its worth, if it has any worth. Its record should be sufficient to supply us with enough data to determine fairly well how far the promises made to the farmers to raise their prices by this scheme are actually borne out by facts.

What does the record show? Does it show that the farmers have been helped? It does not. There is not even the smallest bit of evidence that the farmers have received a single dime more than they would have received if they had never heard of the Commodity Credit—so-called—Corporation.

Indeed, I venture to assert that to any average, honest, common-sense mind, unbiased and uninfluenced by political expediency, the record to date of the Commodity Credit Corporation presents a picture of complete failure, without a single redeeming feature in it.

The truth is a close study of the facts and figures appears to indicate that there may be a close relation between the larger amounts used for loans and the lower prices received by farmers, and, vice versa, between the smaller amounts used for loans and the higher prices received by farmers.

The figures clearly show that farmers received a much higher price for wheat and tobacco when no loans were made than when loans were made.

In the case of wheat, as shown below, the figures indicate that the farmers received for this crop a preponderously higher price in the years before the operation of this agency, when no loans or purchases whatever of wheat were made, than they did in those years when it was operating and large sums were used for those purposes.

Wheat loan or purchase program, arranged in the order of the amounts used for loans or purchases each year from the lowest to the highest amount

Year loan or purchase was made	Face amount of loan or purchase	Seasonal average price received by farmers
		Cents per bushel
1933	None	74.4
1934	None	84.8
1935	None	83.2
1936	None	102.6
1937	None	96.3
1938	$49,215,000	56.1
1939	117,358,000	67.6
1940	200,849,000	66.0

Thus it will be seen from the wheat figures above that the average annual price received by farmers in the 5 years when no wheat loans or purchases were made was 88.2 cents per bushel, while the average annual price received by them in the 3 years when wheat loans and purchases were made in enormous amounts was only 63.2 a bushel.

During the 5-year period when there was no interference by this political agency with the price of wheat the farmers received approximately 40 (39.5) percent more for their wheat than they did in the 3 years when the bureaucrats gambled with hundreds of millions of dollars in a promise to raise wheat prices for the farmer.

Although 71 percent more funds was used in 1940 for wheat loans and purchases than were used in 1939, the season average price of wheat received by farmers was less by 1.6 cents per bushel in 1940 than it was in 1939.

With respect to corn, as shown below, the figures present in bold relief the fact

that in general the lower the amount was for loans and purchases, the higher was the price received by the farmers for this crop.

Corn loan or purchase program, arranged in the order of the amounts used for loans or purchases each year from the lowest to the highest amount

Year when purchase was made	Face amount of loan or purchase	Seasonal average price received by farmers
		Cents per bushel
1936	$87,000	104.5
1934	11,042,000	81.5
1935	13,934,000	65.5
1937	22,871,000	52.0
1940	59,908,000	56.3
1933	120,207,000	52.2
1938	130,877,000	50.3
1939	171,821,000	55.9

In the 8 years that this political bureau has been in operation, from 1933 to 1940, inclusive, the least amount of loans made by it to farmers on and purchases of corn, was in 1936. The amount used for this purpose that year was almost nothing—$87,000, involving 158,000 bushels.

Yet in that very year, when there was the least amount of interference in agriculture by this political bureau, the season average price the farmers received for their corn was 104.5 cents per bushel. This was the highest price received by them for corn in any of the 8 years.

In 1939 more money was used for loans on and purchases of corn than in any of the other 8 years. One hundred and seventy-one million eight hundred and twenty-one thousand dollars was so used, and involved 301,842,000 bushels. Yet the season average price received by farmers for their corn that year was only 55.9 cents per bushel.

Though nearly 2,000 times as much money was used for corn loans and purchases in 1939 than in 1936, yet the price of corn in 1936 was 86 percent higher than it was in 1939.

In the 4 years, 1933 to 1936, inclusive, the Commodity Credit used $145,270,000 for corn loans and purchases involving 318,957,000 bushels of corn. The average annual price received by farmers for corn during those 4 years was 75.9 cents per bushel.

During the next 4 years, 1937 to 1940, inclusive, this political agency interfered about twice as much with agriculture as it had in the preceding 4 years. It used $385,477,000 for loans on and purchases of corn, involving 677,120,000 bushels. The average annual price received by the farmers for their corn during these 4 years was 53.5 cents per bushel.

While the amount used for loans on and purchases of corn was only half as much in the first 4 years as it was in the last 4 years, yet the price which the farmers received for their corn was approximately 41 percent higher in the former period than in the latter.

With respect to cotton it will be seen in the figures below that the price farmers received for this crop in the first 4 years averaged 10 percent higher annually, when in the 1 year 1936 no loans or purchases were made, and when in the other 3 years loans or purchases in the amount of $106,599,000 were made, than they averaged during the 4 last years when more than eight times that amount, or $883,329,000 was used for loans or purchases of cotton.

Cotton loan or purchase program, arranged in the order of the amounts used for loans or purchases each year from the lowest to the highest amount [1]

Year loan or purchase was made	Face amount of loan or purchase	Crop year average price received by farmers
		Cents per pound
1936	None	12.33
1939	$1,324,000	9.09
1935	5,777,000	11.09
1933	99,498,000	10.17
1940	152,081,000	9.41
1938	205,329,000	8.60
1937	243,275,000	8.41
1934	282,644,000	12.36

[1] 1933-34 cotton pool loans not included. If these figures were included the picture would be still worse for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In 1934, $282,644,000 was used to make loans on and purchases of cotton. That year the average price of cotton was 12.36 cents per pound.

In 1936, no loans on or purchases of cotton were made by the Commodity Credit Bureau. That year the average price of cotton was 12.33 cents a pound, or within three-hundredths of 1 cent of what it was in 1934, when about $283,000,000 was used by this political agency to promise to the cotton farmers more money for their crops.

In 1937 and 1938, $243,275,000 and $205,329,000, respectively, was used for loans on and purchases of cotton. The average price per year for those 2 years the farmers received for their cotton was 8.5 cents per pound. So that in 1936, when no taxpayers' money was used by this political agency to promise better prices to the cotton farmers, they received for their crop 45 percent more than they received in 1937 and 1938, when a quarter of a billion dollars was used annually for this purpose.

In 1937, $243,275,000 was used for cotton loans and purchase. In that crop year the average price the farmer received for his cotton was 8.41 cents a pound.

In 1939, only $1,324,000 was used for cotton loans and purchase. In that crop year the average price received by farmers for their cotton was 9.09 cents a pound.

Though the amount of money used for cotton crop loans and purchases in 1937 was 180 times more than that used for the same purpose in 1939, yet the crop year average price the farmers received in 1939 was 6 percent higher than it was in 1937.

In 1936, no loans on or purchases of tobacco were made by the Commodity Credit agency. The season average price per pound of tobacco received by the farmers for that year was 23.6 cents. That was the highest-price tobacco farmers received for their product since 1919. In only 3 other years, 1917, 1918, and 1919, had they received a higher price than this since 1887. Incidentally, net exports of tobacco in 1936 were, with the exception of two other years, 1932 and 1934, the lowest since 1918.

In 1938, no loans on or purchases of tobacco were made. The season average price per pound of tobacco received by farmers for that year was 19.7 cents.

In 1939 and 1940, $79,186,000 was used as loans on and purchases of tobacco. The season average price per pound of tobacco received by the farmers for those 2 years averaged per year 15.6 cents.

Tobacco farmers, therefore, received in 1936, when no loans on or purchases of tobacco were made, 51 percent more for their product than they received in 1939 and 1940, when more than $79,000,000 was gambled with by the bureaucrats in their promise to help the farmers.

Tobacco farmers received in 1938, when no loans on or purchases of tobacco were made, 27 percent more for their crops than they did in the years 1939 and 1940, when more than $79,000,000 was used in a promise to help the farmers.

These figures wholly disprove every claim made by the proponents of this political scheme that it is helping the farmers to receive higher prices for their crops.

It is almost childish to suppose it could possibly do anything of the sort.

Indeed, the idea of farm parity, and that it can be achieved by political machinery is not an economic concept, and much less a scientific one. It is a purely political concept.

Agriculture is but a segment, one of the parts, of our economy. It could not survive independently of the other parts. Though its processes govern and control in innumerable ways the processes of the other parts of the economy, its own processes are in turn likewise also under the control and government of all the other processes of the other parts of the economy.

The intricacy and complexity of the reciprocal influences of these processes upon each other, and the quality and quantity of materials and services they reciprocally supply and render to each other, are so greatly involved that they are little if at all understood.

The above principles hold especially in respect to the part played by the various segments of the economy in the production of prices. There is absolutely no such thing as a science of price production in any sense of supplying society with a better formula for regulating and controlling prices than is supplied by the free-trade and contract process.

Especially is it a fallacious assumption that agricultural prices can be controlled by political machinery that deals only with agricultural prices, such as is involved in the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Whatever effect any loans or purchases of farm products by this agency might have in raising farm prices, that effect would immediately be reacted upon by innumerable forces from the other economic segments. Surely this must be recognized by all.

Only by setting up a completely totalitarian regime which would put all prices

under political control, such only as exists under Hitler and Stalin, would it be possible to control farm or any other prices. The bureaucrats who operate the several agencies ostensibly to control farm prices themselves, as good as admit this principle in the policy they have adopted of restricting farm production.

Of course, the political planning of agriculture is proceeding rapidly toward complete regimentation and totalitarian control of the farmers.

The real reason for the existence of this political agency is not difficult to see. It will be found wholly within the political field, nowhere in the economic. The following should leave no doubt of this:

Administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit so-called Corporation, as shown in the hearings on the bill

1934	$115,645
1935	340,088
1936	560,718
1937	491,192
1938	521,097
1939	694,383
1940	1,296,000
1941 (estimated)	2,250,000

The hearings on H. R. 4972 also show the following:

The Commodity Credit so-called Corporation was set up in 1933 with a capital of $3,000,000.

Originally, the loan programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation were financed from its own capital funds and from advances made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The maximum amount of such advances outstanding at any one time was approximately $298,000,000.

April 10, 1936, the act was altered so as to permit this political agency to issue Government obligations in its own name. July 1, 1936, it increased its capitalization to $100,000,000.

March 8, 1938, the act was amended and this agency was authorized to issue or have outstanding in loans an amount not exceeding $600,000,000.

Six hundred million dollars was raised to $1,000,000,000 March 4, 1939. One billion dollars was raised to $1,500,000,000 August 9, 1940. Now we have this measure before us to raise the borrowing and lending authority of this political agency to $2,750,000,000. Next year and the next, and so on, until possibly financial ruin overtakes us completely, we should expect bureaucratic and political pressure to be brought for bigger appropriations for administration expenses and further increases in the borrowing and lending powers of this political agency.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill and will vote for it.

In view of the fact that there are going to be pressed for passage in the House bills that have for their purpose the curtailment of the rights of labor, and the further fact that I may have to go to Montana shortly and might not be here when they come up for consideration, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order so as to state my position as to any further legislation along that line.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I deplore any happening that results in stoppage of work or which in any wise hinders our carrying on our defense program. I want to see such interference with the program disposed of as quickly as possible. I deplore strikes as much as any Member of this House. I cannot say too often that in my opinion the heart of labor is as sound and patriotic as any group that goes to make up America. No greater American ever lived than Sam Gompers. It may be said of him that he is the founder of stable and permanent unionism. The improving of the conditions of his fellow workers became the crusade to which he pledged his life and labor. Carrying on down from him, the great leaders of labor are likewise good Americans, such as William Green, John L. Lewis, and Philip Murray, who are fine thinkers and great fighters for what they think is right. There is no denying the fact that there are in labor organizations, the same as in other groups, Communists and pro-Nazis. What a mistake the laboring man makes when he takes up such philosophies. He should remember that he who strikes in Russia or Germany is shot. The laboring man should also remember that the man on relief in this country is higher paid than the paid laborer in Russia and Germany.

I have felt, and do now feel, that the great labor leaders of these unions ought to and will clean out of their organizations those persons who have ulterior motives in generating and carrying on strikes that have for their purpose interference with the production of materials necessary for our defense. I am not ready, however, to condemn all strikes without a hearing. I do not believe that any presumption should be indulged either way, for or against the merits of a strike when one occurs. In my experience in reading the history of strikes and looking into them somewhat, I have concluded that workers strike only as a last resort to either secure a better and more deserving wage or safer and better working conditions. In the last analysis, strike is their only effective weapon. The Government has very wisely set up agencies through which a just determination may be made as to the matters at issue. I have said, and now repeat, that as a rule there are three sides to a strike, namely, the strikers' side, the employer's side, and what may be termed the middle side or the right side. It is the purpose of these governmental agencies to find the right side.

I feel confident if the labor organizations are not baited to the point of resentment and not smeared with communism and nazi-ism to the point where they become callous, they will see to it that the findings made by the Mediation Board or Conciliation Service will be recognized and carried out. I want, before we go too far in passing legislation, to give our labor leaders a chance to work these matters out themselves. I want to see all controversies such as strikes disposed of at a peace table by giving both the employer, employees, and the country a square deal. I do not believe in settling any matter by force unless it is proven beyond all doubt that there is no other course. Bills will be pressed for passage in the Congress to control outbreaks of labor against what labor considers is its right. My own opinion is that additional laws will not help the state of confusion which already exists. It remained for a former distinguished Member of this House, and now a Member of the Senate, Senator MURDOCK, of Utah, to point out the extent of confusion that exists today owing to the various and numerous agencies which have been created to deal with this subject. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 10, at page 5061:

> We have the National Mediation Board, established by the President; then we have the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor; then we have the Labor Service of O. P. M., under Sidney Hillman; then we have the National Labor Relations Board. Does any group of labor today know where to go to present grievances and ask for justice? It was recently reported that in a strike on the Pacific coast in the shipbuilding industry there was one mediator from the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, another from the National Mediation Board, and there was one group there grabbing onto this mediator and another group grabbing onto another mediator; so that, instead of mediation, instead of conciliation, there was nothing but confusion.

You will see, my colleagues, we already have an aggravated, cluttered condition brought about by too many agencies trying to control or trying to deal with the same condition. I do not think we should add to this already cluttered condition by passing more laws, which will only further confuse a bad situation.

The President of the United States already has ample authority to deal with all such conditions. He has it as the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and also special powers which have been given to him by legislative acts, the draft act, the lease-lend bill, and so forth. As has been seen recently in the strike in California, he has the power to use the soldiers, who may stick bayonets into the bellies and legs of the laborer who goes on a strike and who pickets. He further has the power to issue regulations providing for orders to be issued which mean work or fight under the draft act. He likewise has the power to take away the plants from owners. I supported and argued on the floor for an amendment in the lease-lend bill to give him the latter power. Now, the only additional power I can think of would be to give him the right to cause the soldiers to stick the bayonets into the legs and bellies of the recalcitrant employers and industrialists, such as the Aluminum Trust.

Further legislation along this line would only tend to make labor feel that it was being made the scapegoat for the vengeance of the many persons who are not in harmony with the progress made

by labor organizations and by our Government in advancing the position of the laboring men. Let us take it easy and do not make attacking labor our daily indoor sport. Suppose labor eventually became resentful and just stopped and went fishing. You know you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. Let us try and keep our shirts on and treat employee and employer alike.

During the last half century the people of the United States, through their various State legislators and the Federal Government, have given to labor rights, not only through legislative enactment but also through court decisions:

(1) The right to strike.
(2) The right of self-organization.
(3) The right of collective bargaining.
(4) The right to choose representatives freely.
(5) The right to be free from forced labor.
(6) The right to have labor recognized as not a commodity.
(7) The right to induce others to strike.
(8) The right to picket.
(9) The right to boycott.
(10) The right of labor organizations and their members to protection.
(11) The right of protection against "yellow dog" contracts.
(12) The right to be free from strike-breakers.
(13) The right to remain an employee, though on strike.
(14) The right to be free from discrimination, including blacklisting.

The right of labor to organize and to strike is not unlimited. Federal employees may not strike. That is the exception.

Great impetus and progress has been given to this program of bettering the condition of the laboring man by this administration.

Upon the question of strikes the principal contention in defense strikes has been wages. My information is that 59 percent were over wages. I am informed that the Allis-Chalmers strike, which was supposed to have arisen out of union relationship or a jurisdictional strike, was ended in a wage-increase agreement. Strikes occurring because of union relationships amounted to approximately 22 percent of the strikes that occurred. I have always contended that progress in our defense program has not been deterred entirely because of strikes. My contention in that regard has recently been reinforced by Secretary Ickes' criticism of the Aluminum Trust, according to press reports not denied:

Interior Secretary Ickes told a Senate committee Monday if history records the present war as lost it may be because of the recalcitrance of the Aluminum Co. of America.

Testifying before the special committee investigating the defense program, Ickes said the company had worked to prevent aluminum production by other companies.

"It is as perfect a monopoly as ever devised by man," he declared during the questioning by Chairman TRUMAN, Democrat, Missouri.

"We could get more aluminum if we weren't too polite," Ickes added. Ickes said the Aluminum Co. "would prevent the dissemination of the facilities of aluminum, regardless of the consequences to the United States, in order to get all the aluminum sources under its control."

Asked by Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, if the Government had contemplated taking over the Aluminum Co., Ickes said he "didn't know."

"The company uses many cunning methods," Secretary Ickes added. "It all adds up to obstruction."

Secretary Ickes said the Office of Production Management had "underestimated" the aluminum shortage, and commented that "underestimating seems to be a habit with them."

No doubt democracy is the only hope of the civilized world. Should the world go communistic or Fascist or Nazi, the clock of advancement of social order would be turned back at least a century. Consequently it is imperative that every one of us put forth our utmost effort in holding true to democratic principles. In order to do this we must get up on our toes and show the world that democracy works at home. Dealing in and using platitudes is not sufficient. We, in this country, have contentions and disunion in our religious groups. People are discriminated against in various ways because of religious affiliations. We have the same situation in our racial groups, and, last but a long way from being the least, are contentions between labor and capital, which perhaps is the most serious of all. In regard to our religious groups it goes without saying we all have the same objective, namely, the salvation of our soul and the betterment of human kind. In our relations among our racial groups there should be equality, and the finger of suspicion as to his Americanism should never be pointed at anyone because of a name showing foreign descent. Democracy in these two important matters should be more treasured and made a more acting force.

The most that can be said as between these isms is that there is a distinction without a difference. Hitler and Stalin, each the leader of a pack, are now at grips. So far as affecting the morals and welfare of the world, victory either way would make little if any difference. However, they have been hunting for victims in two packs in the past. Should either win now all would hunt in one pack. In the past each, fearful of the other, spent time on the watch. Should a winner emerge, the pack would give its entire time conquering free peoples. It would be better for the world, however, for Hitler not to win, as he is the shrewder and more efficient in his work; consequently more dangerous. The history of both show that they have been trying to outdo each other in brutality, human massacre, wickedness, and human slavery. Each hand is equally bloody. It is obvious that we must arm to the teeth as quickly as possible.

I am unalterably opposed to any form of ism that has for its purpose a state or socialized ownership and control of the resources and property of the country as well as the personal rights of the people for the following reasons, among others.

First. Private ownership of property is done away with. Remove from the individual the right to own his home and to have an interest in the thing on which he works is to take from him responsibility and deny him that indefinable pride and enjoyment in being able to put his feet on his own ground and in his own home and call it his. When you deny man this he loses something. Homes are the foundation of countries, social progress, and governments. Eliminate this, you have nothing but a shell. Again, when we do away with the right to own property, we fall into a common or scrambled ownership of property and a dictator will tell you how much you can have or in other words what is yours, if anything. Man was not brought into this world to be dictated to by man. It has been well said that communism means "this is ours for us, but the dictator says how much is mine and yours." Stating it in another way, as has been said: "Social purpose swallows private persons." Now the very moment we step into the realm of socialized property we necessarily lose our individualism and our liberty. At most a man becomes a cog in a big wheel, the actions of which are directed by the dictator. There can be no such thing as liberty in communism, nazi-ism, or fascism. These isms are the antithesis of free, independent thinking and action on the part of people. Any person who subscribes to the theory of democratic government if he will think through, can have no place in his make-up for any of these "isms."

As to capital and labor, labor up to the moment has, without a doubt during the past several years, been the favored and capital, it may be said, has been in a way defending itself. Now apparently in the minds of the people a recasting of the situation is going on. In my opinion both labor and capital are at fault. In the past, and I think at the present time, though it has been declared by law otherwise, labor has been looked upon as commodity, the value of which depends upon supply and demand. On the other hand, capital has been viewed as a sort of a static or inanimate thing. This view of both is wrong. Labor today is looking at itself as a commodity and therefore it wants its value determined by demand. Labor is not a commodity. It is personal effort. When we look on labor as a commodity we lose sight of the man. As has been said: "When treated as a commodity he is lost sight of in our economy. He has been used for profits and production." It has also been said that "this has been proven because when man produced more than was necessary he was put on the streets." Now the reverse should be true; that production exists for man. If this latter statement is true we would not have breadlines when we have an abundance of everything. You will recall the fact that we destroyed foodstuffs when they were needed by man, to raise the price of products. Labor itself is today falling into this very error.

As to capitalism, it has been said that "capitalism is private persons swallowing social purpose." This statement is going too far, though I do not want it understood that I claim capitalism as we

know it is perfect. It is a long way from it. It is because of the greed and selfishness of our monopolistic capitalists in promulgating and carrying out policies that brought about concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a very few people.

Now the question is what can be done which will lead toward bettering this capital-labor condition? In regard to capital, it has been said that rather than capitalism being private persons swallowing social purpose that "capitalism should be private persons living for not only their gain but for social purpose and for the betterment of mankind." That, I think is a middle ground which leads me to say that the relationship of capital and labor should be analogous to the relationship of a family unit, each helping the other. Now how can this be brought about? I think by some sort of a share-the-profits plan. For instance the employees should be paid a decent and livable wage by the employers, the employers to receive a reasonable rate of interest upon their capital structure and sufficient additional sums to maintain the plant and for replacement purposes; also such sums as are necessary for general expenses, taxes, and so forth—then a reasonable division of the profits over and above these various sums. Where industries have adopted this plan, strikes are unknown. In the first place it would make the employee feel that he has an interest in the work that he is doing. It would give him responsibility and it would give him a better chance to own his home and to create something for the future which makes for a better American citizen. It is seldom if ever we see a home owner or the owner of private property advocating any isms which would take away from him the very thing in which he takes pride.

It would also induce the worker to help make the venture more profitable, for if there were no profits he would share none. In this connection I think it is the right thing to do, as a man not only works for his wages but in addition he is contributing to increase of wealth in the country in which he should share. That may be termed the social aspect of his labor. On the other hand, the employer may say that he owns his plant and that no one has any right to have any interest in its profits. Technically this may be true, but that is just the rock upon which we in this country may flounder unless it is modified. Let us analyze this contention for a moment. It is true that there is such a thing as absolute ownership of property, but it is not true that there is an unlimited use of that property. Property may not be used to the detriment of the common good. Industries putting out essentials for the people may not arbitrarily refuse to cooperate to continue production to the detriment of the common good. There is an interest, though today it is very vague, of the working man in the thing on which he works which is the social aspect of the relation of man's labor. In labor we have as good brains and as fair men as you will find in industry. They could sit at a table together and work out a plan of profit sharing that would not only effectuate a remedy for the troubles between capital and labor but likewise would be an answer for many of our economic ills, many of which are caused by the fact that a few people own too much and the great masses too little. My opinion is that in order to save the laboring men and capitalism as we know it and our present form of Government that some such profit sharing plan must be brought about between labor and capital. This may be done without any additional laws. In fact it is being done by some employers of labor at this time.

Leo XIII had the following to say upon the question of profits:

> Capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital. It is therefore entirely false to ascribe the results of their combined efforts to either party alone; and it is flagrantly unjust that either should deny the efficacy of the other and seize all the profits.

Let us not by legislation undo or nullify what we have done for labor in the past. Let us appeal for a solution of the problems of labor and capital to the patriotism of their great leaders and save America for Americans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, when he discussed the rule on this measure, made the statement that he did not know why the farmers were dissatisfied. I take it that those well-known agriculturists from his district, Ed Kelley and Pat Nash, are doing right well with their crops down on Michigan Boulevard and in the Loop, but our farmers back in Wisconsin are not quite as well fixed nor do they stand as close to the powers that be as do Brothers Kelley and Nash. Let me give you a few reasons why our farmers are not satisfied and why Wisconsin upset a 400,000 majority for Roosevelt in 1936.

Our troubles in the dairy field started back at the time of the first reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, when the reduction of 2 cents a pound on cheese broke our price and cost us millions of dollars. Since that time, on two other occasions, tariff reductions have again lowered the price of dairy products in our State.

As to benefit payments, we have had none, or so little that the amount is negligible. You must remember that in the dairy business soil conservation is practiced by the farmer as a matter of course. He grows grasses, and has been practicing soil conservation for over 50 years in our State. The soil-conservation program did not mean much of anything to us because we knew more about it than the people who were trying to tell us about it.

To whom do the benefit payments go? To corn, to cotton, to wheat, to tobacco, and to rice. We do not have much of any of those in Wisconsin. There was nothing for dairying, therefore, in the benefit payments and we did not derive much advantage from them. Our benefit payments amount to 5.3 percent since they were inaugurated of the assessed valuation of our farms, while the average for the United States is 10.6 percent, twice as much as my State received, and may I remind you that some States in the South have received as high as 40 percent of the assessed value of their farms.

As to parity payments, there has been a lot of talk about them, but we have not had any parity payments in over a generation, so there is no reason why our people should feel they are being benefited by the parity payments, because there is no such thing.

We saw a ray of hope recently when prices started to go up; when we started shoveling out money here, there, and everywhere, with business increasing in the cities, factories putting on additional employees, wages increasing, and our market improving. But what happened as soon as our prices started to go up? The price-fixing department promptly decreed that 31 cents was a parity price on butter. It was not even close. The Department of Agriculture of Wisconsin disagreed by 5 cents a pound with that figure.

But that is not all. We were told that people in Europe needed food. Then Secretary Wickard came out with the amazing statement that the people of the United States should eat less cheese because we wanted to send it over to Britain. We reminded the Secretary that there are 29,000,000 pounds more of cheese in storage this year than there were last year; furthermore, that a great deal of the cheese that Britain demands is Cheddar cheese, while they could easily take Swiss cheese, brick cheese, and a host of other cheeses fully as nutritive and as valuable to their diet. However, no effort was made by the Agricultural Department to do anything in that regard.

We informed the Secretary that we could produce one-third more cheese than we are producing now, and we are producing 50 percent of the cheese produced in the United States. We can meet the demands of Britain and the United States with a little cooperation from the Department of Agriculture, which we have not had.

Our State has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars advertising cheese. We have raised the per capita consumption of cheese in the United States from 3.5 pounds to 5 pounds per capita. Now we are to lose this business and ruin our industry so that Britain can have more cheese.

Of course, cheese is a valuable part of the diet. The dietitians who met here recently told us that 40 percent of the people of the United States were undernourished. Why not give cheese to our people? Oh, no; our people, instead of being given butter and cheese, are to be given oleo—ersatz. We are going to transfer the United States into a country that produces food and sends it away while it eats the substitutes.

They are now making oleo with some diacetyl to give it the color of butter, they are giving it a sun bath so it gets the right amount of vitamins, and they are permitted to needle it with sodium benzoate to preserve it, so that you have a presentable spread which is good enough

for the United States, while we send our butter to Britain.

Why not use axle grease? That is cheaper, and you could needle it with the same ingredients and it would cost a lot less. As long as you are using substitutes, use the cheapest.

One of the afflictions of the dairy business in our State has been for years the fact that it is controlled by monopolies. National Dairies controls 40 percent of all the cheese we produce, Armour 15 percent, Swift 14 percent, and Borden 9 percent. Seven companies in the United States handle and control 90 percent of the cheese we produce. Why? Because these small factories do not have storage and financial facilities to take care of it after they produce it. We have some 2,100 cheese factories in my State, and 1,880 of the 2,100 do not have sufficient storage and financial facilities and are therefore at the mercy of the larger organizations.

Why, in heaven's name, does not the "trust buster" down here, who has been allocated millions of dollars to take care of the trusts, start an action and "bust" this trust and give the dairy farmer of Wisconsin some protection? Oh, yes; I know they are bringing indictments against some of the smallest dealers we have, sure. These little dealers cannot protect themselves, they do not have the money. But they do not tackle National Dairies. Why? Because they are too tough.

We offer a program to take care of our people in the dairy industry. The first point is to have a real conference with the department of agriculture of Wisconsin, together with representatives of the university, Dean Christiansen, Prof. W. W. Clark, and others who know this problem.

The second point is to finance our dairy farmers the same as you finance the Du Ponts and the other "big shots" in industry.

The third point is to protect them from outside competition, cheap substitutes, and monopolistic practices.

Our dairy farmer is intelligent, patriotic, and willing to work. Give him an even break and he will get along.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, contrary to the general impression, the duties of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not confined solely to extending direct relief to the producers of agricultural products through loans and purchases of surplus commodities. It also has the very important duty of being prepared to give assistance in the stabilization of prices when unusual crops and market conditions occur. It is to this stabilization-of-prices function that I wish to direct your special attention in connection with our consideration today of the pending bill for increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The former Corporation president, Dr. Carl B. Robbins, referred to this function in his 1940 report, emphasizing its importance under emergency conditions. On page 4 of that report, under the heading "Functions of Commodity Credit Corporation Loan Programs," he makes this statement:

> The function of the Corporation's loan programs in protecting farm prices becomes greatest, of course, under emergency conditions. For instance, the abnormal 1937 cotton crop of approximately 19,000,000 bales, which came about in part as an aftermath of the invalidation of the former Agricultural Adjustment Administration processing-tax program, would have meant untold suffering, not only to the South but also to the entire Nation, if it had not been possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to place a floor under what otherwise would have been a most drastic decline in cotton prices.

This particular function, it seems to me, takes on an even greater importance today and more so in the days to come. It is my belief that agriculture as a whole is about to enter into a period of extraordinary emergency due to great price fluctuations caused by the national-defense program and the program under the Lease Lend Act. Some thought should be given to the effect of the present-day emergency situation on agricultural prices and we should begin now to make preparations for the trying period after the emergency has passed.

Let me recall the agricultural price movements during the first World War. The average price per bushel received by the producers of wheat in the month of June 1916 was 96 cents. By June 1920 the price was $2.56. By June 1921 the price had fallen back to $1.19.

Take corn as another example. In June 1916 the producers of corn received 74 cents per bushel. In June 1920 it rose in price to $1.85. One year later, in June of 1921, the price had fallen to 62 cents.

The same general price fluctuations will be found in the instance of cotton, another basic commodity. The price per pound for cotton in June 1916 was 12 cents. In June 1920 it had risen to 37 cents. But in June 1921 the price of cotton per pound had fallen as low as 9.7 cents.

Some may contend that during the period of the first World War there were no excessive stocks of agricultural commodities as compared to today, particularly with respect to cotton. However, the 1914 cotton crop of 16,000,000 bales, the largest in history to that date, certainly proves there was no shortage. The outbreak of the war and the stoppage of exports caused a fall in price to 5½ cents. Along toward 1917, due to industrial activity at home and a general rise in commodity prices, the price of cotton averaged over 25 cents per pound and went to 37 cents by June of 1920.

It is generally true—hardly open to dispute—that when an upward price spiral gets under way all prices are affected. This is shown very clearly by the indexes of all farm products for the period of the first World War and following. The indexes of all farm products rose from an index of about 75 in the middle of 1916 to 170 by the middle of 1920. From that point the indexes fell to 80 by the middle of 1921. It must be kept in mind that while there may have been no excessive stocks of farm commodities neither was there any particular shortage except in wheat at the commencement of this period. The situation which confronted us at the commencement of the first World War is comparable to a great extent to the situation confronting us today.

It is my opinion, which is shared by many students of our economic situation, that due to the tremendous expenditures of the Government in connection with the defense program and the Lease Lend Act, in spite of all that may be done by Price Administrator Leon Henderson, there will be an advance in the prices of all commodities. There may be exceptions among certain agricultural products necessitating some artificial support to keep their prices in proper relation to the five basic agricultural products—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco—upon which parity price is based. It may also be necessary to keep on hand certain quantities of food and feed grains as a reserve in case of a crop shortage. By virtue of this legislation and legislation previously enacted the Commodity Credit Corporation has, I think, ample power to deal with these price fluctuations.

During the hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee on this bill practically all the discussion centered on the raising of the price of agricultural products to parity. That is, of course, the immediate objective. While support for agricultural prices may be momentarily necessary, it is my belief that agricultural prices will reach parity by themselves. The tremendous expenditures of the Government are certain to have a stimulating effect on commodity prices. I have already pointed out what took place during the period of the first World War.

That which concerns me is the period which will follow this emergency, when all this defense activity has ended. We should profit from our previous experience. After the first World War the real emergency in agricultural prices actually arose. It will be after this war that the real emergency in agricultural prices will arise. You will recall that in the fall of 1920 agricultural products lost more than 50 percent of their value in the brief period of 4 or 5 months. When this same situation arises after this emergency the Commodity Credit Corporation should be in a position to step in and support the market to curb any such demoralization of agricultural prices.

The pending legislation gives the Commodity Credit Corporation adequate authority and adequate credit to stabilize and increase the prices of certain commodities. It therefore behooves the Corporation to conduct its operations in such a manner that it will be in a position to give the agricultural price market the support it will need at the end of this emergency. The Congress should place on the statute books some statement of policy to the effect that it expects the Commodity Credit Corporation to liquidate in an orderly manner the commodities it owns, and we should remove whatever limitations there are

on the Corporation from following such a policy.

Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in part provides that on and after July 31, 1939, not more than 1,500,000 bales of Government-owned 1937 cotton crop may be sold in any calendar year, and then only when all the cost to the Government will be reimbursed. These costs today are around 10½ cents per pound. The Commodity Credit Corporation now owns 4,795,000 bales of 1937 cotton. At the rate of sale allowed by existing law, it would take 3 years to liquidate this stock. It is true that the Corporation may exchange this cotton for strategic materials. One such barter arrangement has been completed, but it has only relieved the Commodity Credit Corporation of 600,000 bales of cotton.

It is my firm belief that most of the farmers of the United States will in due course need the assistance of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support and stabilize falling agricultural prices far more than they need it at the present time to bring prices to parity. If at that time the Commodity Credit Corporation is already heavily stocked with surplus commodities, it will not be able to give the farm market support at the very time it will need it most, unless, of course, additional capital is made available to the Corporation. But insofar as additional capital is concerned, it must be emphasized that at that time we will probably have reached the limit of borrowing power.

With this thought in mind, at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to the pending bill that will express the policy of Congress in connection with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not have in mind that the Corporation should immediately liquidate its Government-owned agricultural products. Rather I think Congress should express in words that it expects the Corporation to liquidate in an orderly manner the stocks of Government-owned commodities held by it, insofar as such liquidation is consistent with our agricultural program. Moreover, I believe that such statutory provisions or Executive orders as now or might in the future serve to prevent an orderly liquidation should be removed in order that the Corporation may be free to carry out the policy.

I repeat that we must not forget that when the present emergency terminates, men are released from our armed forces and from extra hours of employment in industry, when our defense efforts end and there are general liquidations and readjustments, the demands upon the Government for the support of our economy will be terrific. Today we should begin to prepare wherever possible for a future deflation period.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, when the bill H. R. 4972 was before the Banking and Currency Committee, and while the hearings were being conducted, Mr. Edward O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation, presented to the committee a statement which appears on pages 165 and 166 of the hearings. This statement was very enlightening to me, in that it gives the current position of the bureau with reference to its general program.

I interrogated Mr. Edward O'Neal, and as a result of my questioning Mr. O'Neal made this statement:

The farmers have always felt that the Commodity Credit Corporation was the foundation of the whole program.

Later on I interrogated Mr. O'Neal further, when I said:

According to your conception, the farmers of the United States do look upon the Commodity Credit Corporation as a permanent institution, acting as the very basis of the whole farm program?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes, sir.

Then I further observed:

That is one of the most significant observations that has been made in connection with all of this discussion.

Mr. O'Neal replied, "Yes, sir."

Then I observed:

Because we go along from time to time and deal with the Commodity Credit Corporation as if it were a temporary entity.

Later I made this statement in the hearing:

Dealing with this Commodity Credit Corporation as a permanent operation—and if that is to be the program, let us begin to get the philosophy before the Congress that it is a permanent proposition and that we must shape it and deal with it and implement it as a permanent proposition.

Mr. Chairman, going directly to the bill, section 4, page 3, in my opinion, is one of the most far-reaching amendments ever made to the Commodity Credit Corporation Act in that the intent of that section 4 is to embrace all nonbasic agricultural products. It is my understanding the substance of this amendment was arrived at by an agreement between the directors of the Farm Bureau Federation and representatives of the Department of Agriculture in a meeting held in Chicago, Ill., while this bill was under consideration.

In view of the far-reaching influences of section 4 on the general approach and the intent involved therein to the effect that all of these legislative benefits, whatever they may be, may be extended to all agriculturalists, I think the House should approve the bill which embraces section 4 in the hope that these benefits will go as Congress intends, but I also hope, Mr. Chairman, that Members of this legislative body and the farmers of this country will never come to the point where we sincerely believe that markets can be legislated. Personally, I have always felt that it would be much better for the farmers generally if they had a market where they could sell their goods to the ultimate consumer or in the channels of trade on a fair, square parity of price basis as related to the things the farmer has to buy, instead of selling the goods to a Government agency, for instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I do not believe we will ever attain our goal until the situation develops to the point where the farmer can place his products in a free, open market at a fair price without having to clear through Government channels.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULMER. I just want to congratulate the gentleman on that statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact the gentleman's time gave out and I could not ask the question I had in mind, I take this time to state I want to congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has just made in reference to the marketing of farm products. I do not believe we will ever be able to see to it that the farmers actually get 100-percent parity prices unless we do it by legislation or unless the farmers are put in a position where they will be able to market and distribute their products. Today practically every other group controls its production in line with purchasing power. These groups absolutely control the distribution of their products and they fix their prices, but the farmers in every instance must ask, "What will you give me for what I have to sell?" In some instances there are many people or agencies operating between the farmers and the actual consumers, many of them making more out of it than the farmer who perhaps has labored long and hard to produce same.

Then we hear much talk about the price to the consumer with the statement being made that the farmer is getting too much for his product, when, as a matter of fact, the parasites operating between the farmer and the consumer are the ones who are adding to the small price received by the farmer that the consumer has to pay. I hope some day we will have a real up-to-date marketing and distributing system that will eliminate many of these parasites.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, when parity bills have been before the House in previous sessions, those of us from the Northern States, particularly the dairy sections, felt that we were so entirely left out of the program that we could support those measures only because we believed in the general principle that no farmer anywhere in this country should be asked or expected to sell his products below the cost of production or below the parity price. However, this measure, in section 4, broadens the base as to nonbasic agricultural products, and enables us to have a little share in this endeavor of the Government to guarantee at least 85 percent parity prices for farm commodities by bringing into the program dairy, pork, and poultry products.

I know there are many people who believe and who are under the impression that while we have had no loan program for dairy products, no corn program for our section of Wisconsin, that we have received benefits equal to those to other sections through the purchases of the Surplus Commodity Corporation.

That has not been the case, however. There have been some instances in which the Surplus Commodity Corporation has benefited the dairy sections. That was particularly true in 1938 when there was a great slump in the price of butterfat, and the Corporation purchased about 114,000,000 pounds of butter. That is the only year, however, in which that particular section had any principal part in even the activities of the Surplus Commodity Corporation in sustaining the price of our products. Last year the butter purchases by the Corporation amounted to less than 67,000 pounds. I think the approximate amount invested was about $19,000. In addition to that they made some small purchases of cheese for relief purposes. The Corporation also expended considerable sums for whole milk in its program for school children.

In 1938, by purchasing about 114,000,000 pounds, the price of butter was raised to about 66 percent of parity. Later a portion of that large amount of butter was released as the Corporation sought to stabilize the market for the benefit of the consumers. Appreciating such benefits as were received, we felt that we had just reason for complaint of the manner in which our dairy products had been left out of these purchases of farm products. The recent action of the Corporation in removing butter from the stamp program lessened butter consumption by 50,000,000 pounds or more.

There are those who believe that the Government should not subsidize anybody—the farmer or anyone else. However, the Government has had an extensive policy of subsidies for many years in which the farmer has not shared, and so far as the so-called farm subsidies are concerned at the present time they are very small, compared with the huge grants constantly being made to industry and commerce.

Were an attempt to be made to tax the farmers in the new tax bill in the same way that they have been taxed on their production by a lack of policy on the part of the Government, it would be a revolutionary procedure. For instance, in the last year or the last 2 years, the total value of the dairy products in this country has been approximately $3,000,000,000. At the same time, had the dairy farmers received parity prices, they would have received four and a half billion dollars. In other words, because there was broad policy for the dairy people and the dairy farmers, they were assessed a loss of one and a half billion dollars in the 2-year period by being required to sell their products at less than parity. It was not, strictly speaking, a tax, but the general effect was the same as a tax would have been. This measure as amended will extend benefits to farmers who produce butter, cheese, pork, poultry products, and so forth, in insuring that the S. M. C. will buy at 85 percent or more, instead of buying by competitive bids below parity levels. The S. M. C. is purchasing extensively for Britain under the Lend Lease Act, and it will have to protect the prices on nonbasic products in the same way as upon its purchases of basic products. Furthermore, it will have to continue to maintain prices for 5 full years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of this committee and also its members and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT; also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for having the vision to broaden out the base of this suggested legislation. For 10 years we have had low agricultural prices. After listening to the campaign of 1932 I used to think that possibly it was on account of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, but since I have been down here and found that my southern friends like to increase tariffs, I have come to the conclusion that low farm prices must have been due to the fact that the present administration assumed control of the House of Representatives in 1930. Farm prices started going down as soon as the present administration assumed control of the House. In any event, we have had 12.9-cent cheese for the last 10 years, while we had 20.2-cent-per-pound cheese for 10 years before; we have had 26.7-cent butter for 10 years, and in the previous 10 years the price was 39.1 cents per pound. I have always tried to be in sympathy with the present agricultural program, and I have been accused of being a disciple of Mr. WALLACE by my Republican opponent when I was a candidate for this great office. However, following a program of constructive criticism, I have called attention many times to the fact that we are legislating for the few at the expense of the many.

On page 5488 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, June 24, you will find a table that gives the exact importance and the percentage of the farm value of every crop produced in the United States of any importance. This table will show that the basic commodities, instead of being one-third, represented in the year of 1939, only 26.85 percent of the total value of agricultural products. Today, by adopting the amendment you have adopted, you have added another 38.15 percent of the farm products produced, making a total now, which is probably not the goal, but it will at least take care of 65 percent of the farmers of this country.

Now, there is one most important question involved here today. The Secretary of Agriculture has gone out and asked the farmers of this country to increase their production. He asked the canned-tomato people to increase production by 50 percent. He asked the cheese producers to increase their production by 30 percent. He asked other groups to increase the production of pork and other products by 8 to 10 percent. Remember, the administration today, probably the first time in the history of this country, has direct control over all the farm markets in the United States. If the administration is going to assume control of the marketing of farm crops, it must assume the responsibility that goes along with it. If they are going to ask the people of this country to furnish three or four or five hundred million dollars' worth of food to be sent to some other country, they should be willing to guarantee the man who produces it at least 85 percent of what it cost to produce it. I doubt if there is any economic group of our society that is being called upon at this time to furnish any ships or planes or anything else at 85 percent of what it cost to produce them. I doubt if any cantonments will be constructed or any other group will be asked by our Government to produce at 85 percent of what it cost them to furnish their wares. As to farm products, it is not 85 percent of what is costs to produce them. It is only 85 percent of parity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD, at this point, a list of 23 price-fixing measures that have been passed by the Congress in regard to price-control regulation during the past 65 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that privilege without asking unanimous consent later.

Mr. MURRAY. The following is the list. It shows the acts that have been price-fixing in character, so this present act we now have under consideration is not any new step in price support or of regulation.

MEMORANDUM OBTAINED FROM THE NATIONAL FARMERS GUILD RELATING TO ACTS OF CONGRESS PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF PRICES, RATES, WAGES, ETC., BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

There are 23 valid acts of Congress, dating from August 1876 to June 1938, which authorize and direct Federal agencies to regulate prices, rates, charges, wages, and services, directly protecting practically every economic group except agriculture. Agriculture remains the unprotected base of this economic pyramid.

H. R. 2371 and S. 570 applies the identical principle of Federal law to aid agriculture in maintaining a minimum price standard of equality in the marketing of their major products in interstate and foreign commerce. The existing acts of Congress as referred to are as follows:

Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, p. 5; U. S. C. 25: 261): Commissioner of Indian Affairs authorized to prescribe prices at which goods are to be sold to Indians.

Act of October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, ch. 323, p. 2): Supplemented Antitrust Act of 1914, prohibiting difference in prices to purchasers to lessen competition, etc.

Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 213, p. 120; U. S. C. 50: 80): Secretary of War authorized to determine prices to be paid for military supplies in time of war.

Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 735, p. 18; U. S. C. 46: 817): Shipping Board (i. e., Maritime Commission at present) authorized to prescribe just and reasonable rates, fares, and charges of common carriers by water in interstate commerce.

Act of August 10, 1917 (40 Stat. 281, 284–286): Fixed guaranteed prices of wheat; authorized President to fix price of coal and coke during period of war.

Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 421 (c)): President authorized to fix prices of articles necessary for conduct of war produced under license to use processes, etc., owned or controlled by an enemy or ally of an enemy.

Act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 483–487; U. S. C. 49: 6, 15): Interstate Commerce Commission authorized to fix charges, etc., of common carriers in interstate commerce, etc. (Amended by act of March 4, 1927, 44 Stat. 1447, p. 2.)

Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1073, p. 19, 20; U. S. C. 16: 812, 813): Federal Power Commission authorized to regulate charges of licensees under Federal Power Act if no State commission has such regulatory power.

Act of August 15, 1921 (42 Stat. 166–167; U. S. C. 7: 211, 212): Secretary of Agriculture authorized to prescribe charges, etc., of stockyard owners or market agencies in certain cases.

Act of September 21, 1922 (42 Stat. 1000, p. 5 (c, d): Authorized Secretary of Agriculture to designate as "contract markets" governing boards which prevent misleading reports or manipulation of prices of grain in interstate commerce.

Act of June 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 769, ch. 674): Provided that owners of potash rights agree to market the potash products at a reasonable price.

Act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 65, p. 12; U. S. Code 16:831k;: Tennessee Valley Authority to fix schedule of resale prices in contracts for sale of surplus electric power.

Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1072, p. 205; U. S. Code 47:205): Federal Communications Commission authorized to prescribe charges for communication by wire or radio or transmission of energy.

Act of June 6, 1934 (48 Stat. 889, p 9) (Securities Exchange Act of 1934): Prohibited manipulation of security prices.

Act of August 14 1935 (49 Stat. 649, ch. 532; U. S. Code, Supp. 7:218c): Act of August 15, 1921, above made applicable to live-poultry dealers and handlers.

Act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036, ch. 881, 2039, p. 6; U. S Code Supp. 41:35, 40): Secretary of Labor to determine minimum wages to be paid by Government contractors.

Act of April 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 77–81; U. S. Code Supp. 15:833): National Bituminous Coal Commission authorized to prescribe maximum and minimum coal prices for code members.

Act of June 3, 1937 (50 Stat. 247 (f); U. S. Code Supp. 7:608c): Secretary of Agriculture authorized to fix prices for milk.

Act of August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 693, VIII): Amended antitrust laws relating to contracts in restraint of trade by providing that contracts prescribing minimum prices which are lawful in intrastate transactions are not to be rendered illegal in the resale of such commodity at the minimum price elsewhere.

Act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 904, p. 201) (Sugar Act of 1937): Provided for regulation of sugar prices to consumers.

Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 822–824; U. S. Code Supp. 15:717c 717d): Federal Power Commission authorized to fix charges of natural-gas companies.

Act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 955, p. 5; U. S. Code Supp. 4¢:1131): Maritime Commission authorized to prescribe minimum wage scales in contracts under Merchant Marine Act. Same (p 964, p. 43; U. S. Code Supp. 46:845a): Maritime Commission authorized to prescribe rates, etc., of carriers subject to Intercoastal Shipping Act.

Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1064, p. 8; U. S. Code Supp. 29:208): Administrator of Wage and Hour Division authorized to fix minimum wages.

Authority: Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reported after we have had exhaustive hearings and long consideration.

Section I extends the life of the Corporation to June 30, 1946.

Section II merely provides for the method by which the inventory and appraisement shall be made each year.

Section III provides for an increase in the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $1,400,000,000 to $2,650,000,000. The bill as originally drawn increased the borrowing capacity $1,000,000,000, but because of the provision increasing loans from 75 percent to 85 percent of parity, it was increased an additional $250,000,000. This 85 percent of parity, together with the Soil Conservation payments, theoretically at least, should bring the prices of agricultural products to approximate parity.

The five basic commodities are wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and rice. The base period for them is fixed by law and cannot be changed by administrative order. The base period for all nonbasic commodities is 1909 to 1914. The Corporation has a right to lend on and purchase nonbasic commodities as well as basic commodities. The Corporation has the authority under this bill to take such action as will do justice to the producers of nonbasic commodities, notwithstanding the base period.

The purpose of section IV is to establish an equilibrium, a uniform comparative price level between the prices of agricultural commodities, basic and nonbasic, in such manner that parity, if attained for basic commodities will be attained for all agricultural commodities, basic and nonbasic. Because of the emergency, the Secretary of Agriculture has found it necessary to encourage farmers to increase the production of certain crops. The farmers should be assured this increase will not work to their disadvantage.

Of course, parity is a difficult thing to establish and maintain by legislation. There is a constant fluctuation of the prices of agricultural commodities, there is a constant fluctuation of the prices of industrial commodities, and to maintain an equilibrium between them would be difficult indeed. To assist the farmer to obtain the prices for the things he sells comparable to the prices he has to pay for the things he buys, whether we can attain that object or not will have a beneficial effect. The more nearly we come to accomplishing it, the better off the farmer will be. The purpose of this section is to endeavor to attain that object. Everything we accomplish along that line will be of benefit to the farmer and of benefit to the country at large, even though we never can establish or maintain actual parity.

Industry can regulate its production to the demand. The farmer cannot regulate his production. He is dependent upon the seasons, droughts, pests, and livestock diseases, and many other things. He has his fat years and his lean years. Smaller acreage some years produces more than greater acreage in other years. It has been stated that if we had not given agriculture the character of assistance provided in this bill, there would have been an utter collapse of prices of agricultural commodities.

We cannot consider this as a matter of first impression. The policy has been adopted and maintained over a period of years. The loans of 85 percent of parity have been made mandatory by legislation. Unless we abandon a policy we have adopted and maintained for several years, there is nothing the Congress can do other than to pass this bill. To abandon this policy now would be disastrous to the interest of agriculture and to the interests of all those dependent directly and indirectly upon agriculture.

The Corporation and the country are to be congratulated that the Corporation is now presided over by Hon. J. B. Hutson, a man of wide agricultural experience and of splendid ability and of great knowledge of agricultural needs.

[United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, Washington, D. C.]

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE CORPORATION AND ITS FUNCTIONS

THE CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation was formed pursuant to the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act under the President's Executive Order No. 6340, dated October 16, 1933. It was incorporated as an agency of the United States Government under the laws of the State of Delaware on October 17, 1933. All of the Corporation's capital stock is owned by the United States Government. Under the President's reorganization order effective July 1, 1939, the Corporation became part of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the exclusive voting rights of the Corporation's stock were vested in the Secretary of Agriculture under an Executive order of the President dated August 7, 1939. Prior to that time the Commodity Credit Corporation was an independent agency of the Federal Government. It was managed and operated in close affiliation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. All its loans, however, were made upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture and with the approval of the President.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has an authorized and paid-in capital of $100,000,000. Under the act of August 9, 1940, the Congress increased the borrowing power of the Corporation on the credit of the United States Government to $1,400,000,000.

The Congress has also provided for readjusting the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the amount of its $100,000,000 capital once each year. This was done under the provisions of the act of March 8, 1938, by requiring that the Secretary of the Treasury appraise the assets and liabilities of the Corporation as of each March 31, and providing (1) that any deficiency of the Corporation's net worth under its capital of $100,000,000 be restored through an appropriation, and (2) that any excess of the Corporation's net worth over its $100,000,000 capital be paid into the general fund of the United States Treasury. For the purpose of determining its net worth this law requires that the commodities owned and held as security for loans be appraised at the market prices prevailing on March 31 each year. Pursuant to the provisions of this act, the Congress appropriated $94,000,000 to cover a "deficit" in 1938, and an additional $120,000,000 was appropriated to cover a "deficit" determined under the provisions of the act for 1939. In 1940, however, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid a "surplus" of $44,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States to readjust its net worth, as determined under the provisions of the act, down to the amount of its $100,000,000 capital.

It may be noted that, since these appropriations to cover "deficits" and the payment of "surplus" were based on the market prices of the commodities owned and held as security for loans on each March 31, they were primarily so-called paper losses and gains rather than realized losses and gains. The actual losses incurred by the Corporation—that is, the losses realized upon the disposal of commodities—have amounted to only

about $58,000,000 during the period beginning in 1933 and ending May 31, 1941. During this period the Corporation disbursed $1,855,414,047.97 on loans, of which $1,551,470,415.97 were collected either through the redemption of loans or the liquidation of collateral. The amount of capital funds which may be used for administrative costs is limited by the Congress in an annual appropriation bill.

NATURE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOAN PROGRAMS

The Commodity Credit Corporation has made loans on butter, corn, cotton, dates, figs, hops, mohair, peanuts, pecans, prunes, raisins, rye, tobacco, turpentine and rosin, wheat, and wool. All loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been secured by commodities pledged as collateral under either warehouse receipts or chattel mortgages, and in all instances the rate of interest charged the borrowing producer is now 3 percent per annum, which represents a reduction from the 4-percent rate which was in effect until November 1, 1939. Some purchases and several types of loans have been made. Some of the Corporation's loans were mandatory, and some were not. Some loans were made without recourse to the borrower, and some were not. Some loans were made to individual producers, and some were made to associations of producers. Some loans were made directly by the Corporation, and some were made indirectly through local private banks under a contract to purchase on the demand of the private lending agency.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 loans are mandatory, under certain conditions, on three commodities—namely, cotton, corn, and wheat. On cotton and wheat the minimum rate of the loan is 52 percent of parity price and the maximum rate of loan is 75 percent of parity, but within these limits the rate of loan is discretionary. In the case of corn, the rate of loan is fixed by a statutory formula with a maximum of 75 percent of parity price. Loans are also prohibited, under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, on any of these three commodities with respect to which a vote has been taken on marketing quotas and has failed to be approved by a required two-thirds majority. Public, No. 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 26, 1941, provides for mandatory loans in 1941 upon cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. Such loans are to be made to cooperators at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price of the commodities as of the beginning of the marketing year. Loans are to be made to noncooperators at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified above. A further exception is made for cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing areas.

The law requires that all loans made to producers, pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, on cotton, corn, and wheat be made without recourse to the borrower, except in the event of fraud. Loans made to individual producers on all commodities have been of the nonrecourse type. But some loans made to associations of producers, in which it was important to assure the services and facilities of the borrowing association in the liquidation of the loans, have been of the full-recourse type.

It is believed the Corporation's loan programs have three fundamental functions—namely, to protect and increase farm prices, to stabilize farm prices, and to assure adequate supplies of farm products. The loan programs have been closely integrated with other parts of the farm program in an effort to produce the maximum benefits for American agriculture and the Nation. Attached are copies of the President's Executive Order No. 6340 authorizing the formation of Commodity Credit Corporation; certificate of incorporation as amended; bylaws as amended; reorganization plan transferring Commodity Credit Corporation to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I believe the Commodity Credit Corporation has done more than any other governmental agency to secure a better price and to stabilize the price for the farmers of this country than any other operation that the Government has engaged in.

Mr. Chairman, this bill expands the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This agency was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware in 1933, pursuant to the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and operated as an independent agency in close cooperation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until 1939, when it was transferred by Executive order to the Agriculture Department and is now operated as a bureau of that Department. It has a capital stock of $100,000,000, owned by the United States, and under present law may issue bonds to the extent of fourteen hundred million dollars. This amendment expands its note issue capacity to $2,650,000,000, or an increase of one billion two hundred and fifty million. It does not in any way enlarge its powers or impose any new duties, except to place certain restrictions on its purchasing operations.

The primary work of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to make loans to producers of agricultural products such as cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, prunes, wool, mohair, and takes either a warehouse receipt or chattel mortgage against these commodities as security. The farmer pays 3 percent interest on these loans. The loan may be made direct by the Corporation to the farmer or the loan may be made by a local bank to the farmer under an agreement between the bank and the Corporation that the latter will take up the loan upon request by the bank at any time. This last method is the way most of the loans are made and is in effect a guaranty of the loan by the Corporation to the bank. The Corporation enters into an agreement with the bank that if the bank will make the loan to a farmer in accordance with the plans and upon certain conditions and limitations prescribed, the Corporation will redeem the loan if the farmer does not pay. In case of default by the farmer, the bank calls upon the Corporation to redeem the loan. The bank is then paid its money by the Corporation, and all the rights and interest of the bank under the loan are assigned to the Corporation. The loan may then be renewed. If not, the commodity given as security for the loan passes into the hands of the Corporation. Many of these loans are paid off to the bank, and the Corporation is not affected in any way. The bank advances the money to the farmer and takes a chattel mortgage on the commodity, corn or whatever it is, as security. If the commodity is corn, it is normally stored and sealed in an approved crib on the farm. If, when or before the obligation is due to the bank, the farmer pays the bank in full, of course the mortgage is released and the possession of the commodity restored to the farmer. For that loan the farmer has paid 3 percent interest. Who gets the interest? On grain loans the bank gets 1½ percent and the Corporation gets 1½ percent. In this instance the bank puts up the money and gets 1½ percent interest. The Corporation puts up nothing and gets 1½ percent on the loan, but that may be considered the premium on the insurance which is given the bank by the Corporation. Now, take the case where the loan is made by the bank, the same as above, but at maturity of the note the farmer does not pay or in the event the bank for any reason needs the money, it calls upon the Corporation which must pay the bank the amount due on the loan and take over the security. As long as the bank carries the loan, it receives the 1½ percent interest and the Corporation receives 1½ percent, but when the Corporation takes over the loan, of course the interest to the bank stops and from then on the Corporation receives the full 3 percent.

So far in its operations the Corporation has made loans of over $2,150,000,000, and to date, based upon the present market value of the commodities owned by the Corporation, there has been little, if any, loss. Of the entire amount of loans made, $925,000,000 have been liquidated, either by payment or foreclosure and sale, while the Corporation has on hand at the present time commodities of the approximate value of $645,000,000 and the Corporation has loans outstanding to the amount of $580,000,000.

It is estimated that the Corporation will have available on June 30, 1941, $231,000,000 and it is estimated that the loan requirements for 1941 will be $1,481,000,000, which leaves $1,250,000,000 called for in this bill.

The loan demands for this year cannot be forecast with entire certainty or absolute accuracy. But based upon experience and present conditions estimates have been made as to the amount of loans which will have to be made on the 1941 crop. These estimates show aggregate loans of almost one and a half billion dollars will be required to meet the needs. At the present time practically all the lending capacity of the Corporation has been utilized. What the Corporation now has available will not go far toward meeting the estimated demand of one and a half billion dollars in loans. It must be remembered that these loans are mandatory. Made so by law. Now the question is, if the Corporation is to make loans on 1941 crops in accordance with law, it simply must have the authority to raise the money.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Corporation is directed to make available to cooperators, those who subscribe and adhere to the agriculture program, loans on wheat, corn and cotton, rice and tobacco, all the basic agricultural commodities. These are called

mandatory loans and must be made at 85 percent of the parity price of these commodities. The Corporation is in the anomalous position of being commanded by law to make loans and at the same time has no money with which to make them. It cannot do the impossible. If additional lending capacity is not to be given then the loan provisions must be repealed and the work of the Corporation curtailed if not stopped.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created primarily to assist in stabilizing commodity prices. One of the most difficult and disturbing things the farmer has to contend with is the insecurity and rapidly changing commodity price level. It is hard to operate and to plan for the future with the price of cotton fluctuating from 16 to 5 cents a pound, with the price of wheat changing from $2 to 30 cents a bushel, and the price of corn dropping from $1.50 a bushel to 10 cents. There can be no certainty or security under such conditions. The Commodity Credit Corporation has done much to level these peaks and valleys, to smooth out these extremes. Of course, it is much better, if possible, to have a fair price year after year than to have boom prices one year and depression prices the next.

By making loans on commodity securities, large surpluses can be removed from the market and ruinous price drops be avoided. Then, in time of scarcity, the products can be fed to the market in an orderly way and an excessive price be prevented and the consumers saved from a rapid rise in the cost of living. No one will contend that the Commodity Credit Corporation is a complete regulator of prices on the commodities market but I think it must be admitted that it has a helpful and a stabilizing influence and that its operations should not only be continued but should be increased and broadened in these difficult times when trade relations and policies are uncertain and changing. The only way that can be done is to extend the lending capacity of the Corporation as provided for in this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "June 30, 1941" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "June 30, 1946".

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 1, line 6, after the word "term", strike out "June 30, 1946" and insert "June 30, 1943."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss this amendment very much. It speaks for itself.

I am one of those who still believes that it is possible to eventually liquidate these political agencies. I listened intently during the hearings to the various witnesses who appeared before our committee, and I did not hear a single expression from any of the witnesses indicating there was any reason for extending this time to 1946. Therefore, I believe to extend it for a period of 2 more years will be adequate, and I am asking the Members to support my amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I felt it was the intent of Congress to make the Commodity Credit Corporation operations a temporary matter to deal with the so-called short-term emergency situation, I certainly would be willing to go along with the gentleman's amendment. But I get the definite idea fixed in my mind that no longer does the Congress, or the farmers, or the trade, the merchants, the processors, the millmen, the brokers, and the warehousemen, consider this a temporary operation, but I think they consider it a permanent program of agriculture in the United States, and that that idea is fixed permanently in what we have done heretofore, and the fact that we are making no other plans whatsoever in behalf of agriculture of consequence. Now, if the idea I get is to be the program, it seems to me it would be dangerous for us to use 1943 instead of 1946.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course, vested interests have established themselves. There is not any question that we are on the road to totalitarianism. That is really what the gentleman from Michigan said in substance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think it would be very disastrous to adopt that amendment at this time under conditions that exist in this country. This bill came to us in the first place without any limitation at all on the time. The matter of time was thoroughly considered before the committee with representatives of the Department of Agriculture and also the Farm Bureau.

The very minimum time anyone would agree to was the 5-year limitation; and there was a reason for that, of course, in order to give those interested in the program, especially the farmers of the country—and they are the ones primarily interested—an opportunity to make their plans in accordance with the provisions of the bill. To cut the time short, especially under existing conditions, would be simply disastrous to the program.

I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any time on this bill. Much as I should like to go along with the gentleman from Ohio—and I usually agree with him—in this case I absolutely cannot, because without protection the farmer, when this war ends, will have the same experience he had at the close of the last war. The Government is asking the farmers to increase production in order that we may provide needed food to other democracies in the world. When the end comes this increased-production program will be stopped, and when the crash comes there will be no protection, not even that gained under this bill. I do not care so much about the 85 percent of parity, for I imagine that during the war we shall not need to make use of it, for the demand for goods will certainly keep the price up to 85 percent of parity.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And for the very reason the gentleman has so well stated I question the advisability of putting in even the 1946 limitation.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I agree we should remove the limitation altogether, because of the language contained in the bill on page 2, line 24. It reads as follows:

Any such commodity loan or purchase operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient notice to the producers of such commodity to permit them to make a readjustment in the production of such commodity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman not believe that in this period of economic shifting and unrest the Commodity Credit Corporation is an instrumentality of Government which may well become a permanent agency of Government?

Mr. GEHRMANN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I should like to see this limitation to 1946 removed, but certainly we do not want to go beyond that and cut it down to 1943, for then we would not have any protection at all. For these reasons, I am sorry, but I have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill as one of the least things we can do for the farmer. I am very much in favor of expanding this Corporation and having it remain an adjunct of the Government until such time as we repeal another arm of the Government created by the Congress many years ago that in my opinion is responsible for the present plight of the farmer. That did not come about in 1932, or 1931, or 1930. I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], also those made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], who asked him to discuss the agricultural situation in 1932.

The distress of the middle western farmer did not come about because of anything that happened in 1932, or the 4 years preceding, nor was it because of anything that happened during the Coolidge or the Harding administrations. It came about because of the creation of an arm of the United States Government during the Wilson administration, and I refer to the creation of the Federal Reserve System. In 1920, on the 31st day of March, I was lunching with a banker in my State. We were talking about conditions in agriculture, and he told me: "We got terrible news today." I asked, "What is that?" He said, "We just received notice that the Federal Reserve Board has raised the rediscount rate from 6 to 7 percent." I asked, "Is that bad news?" He said, "That will break every farmer in Iowa." That is when the back of the American farmer commenced to

break, because conditions began to change adversely to him immediately thereafter and it was only a short time until the price of corn had dropped from over $1 per bushel to 33 cents per bushel. During the period prior to that time the Federal Reserve Board adopted the policy of having the bankers of the Middle West encourage the farmers to borrow money and they would rediscount the paper through the Central Federal Reserve Bank. When a farmer wanted to borrow $100 he was encouraged to borrow $200. When he wanted to borrow $500 he was encouraged to borrow $1,000, and was told there was plenty of money and they could always rediscount the paper. The average farmer planned an expansion program. In the midst of his program he was suddenly advised he could get no more money and must pay back what he had already borrowed. Following that, the Federal Reserve, in the early twenties ruled that first-mortgage farm paper was not good collateral.

I say to you that an arm of the Government, created by this Congress, which gives to a body of a few men the right to control the value of money by raising and lowering the purchasing price of the American dollar, is what started the farmer on the downward road, coupled with the further ruling that mortgages on farm land were not good security. Since this body is responsible for doing that, until it is ready to recall to itself the power to control and to regulate the value of money, as was given it by the Constitution of the United States, then we should continue this Corporation to help the farmer because it was the act of this body that put the farmer in distress.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman admit that there was nothing done during the administrations of Coolidge and Hoover to correct that wrong?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right, but the wrong was started during the administration of Woodrow Wilson by the creation of the Federal Reserve Banking System.

Mr. PIERCE. Nothing was done until the present administration came into power?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Nothing has been done by the present administration to correct the wrong that was created by Woodrow Wilson. Correcting one wrong by adding another wrong does not solve the problem.

Mr. PIERCE. It is a farfetched song to go away back to 1920 and the economic disaster of that time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. A little further back than the gentleman did when he referred to 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the second sentence thereof the term "on the basis of market prices at the time of appraisal" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 2, line 1, after the word "including", strike out the words "not more than 1 year of" and insert the word "all", so that the sentence will read "on the basis of the cost, including all carrying charges."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Alabama will accept this amendment, because that is the way he explained to the committee that the section would be interpreted.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot take the authority to accept the amendment. I am not sure that I can tell just what the effect of the change will be. I did say I thought the language requiring ascertainment of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation was all that was necessary, and I still think that. At my suggestion, the original bill was cut down considerably in point of space. Certain it is there can be no objection to taking the carrying charges for a year. I do not know just what the various bookkeeping transactions are that might enter into a calculation with respect to the carrying charges. There has been so much done and said about it, and over a number of years, that I do not know what the effect of that will be.

Mr. KEAN. I have a letter from the Commodity Credit Corporation in which it states it would only charge the expenses for 1 year. For instance, if they had cotton which they have held for 5, 6, or 7 years, only the first year's carrying charges would be charged; therefore, it would be on the books at a lower price, which would be phoney bookkeeping, as I look at it.

Mr. STEAGALL. This bill does not relate to cotton loans.

Mr. KEAN. Not only to cotton, but to any commodity that they happen to have on hand and that stayed there for a long time. This provision would make an entirely false picture of the situation. All my amendment would do would be to continue the system which is now being carried on as far as the appraisals are concerned.

Mr. STEAGALL. If it is to continue the system that is carried on now, the amendment is not necessary, because it cannot be more than 1 year after the passage of the act. I do not know what the situation is with respect to wheat, corn, and the other commodities. I could not accept the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that under existing law they take the market price at the time of appraisal? This is really a great addition by saying "1 year's carrying charges, including storage."

Mr. KEAN. No. They take the market price or they take the cost price. The proposed bill says "on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges."

Mr. PATMAN. That is the proposal.

Mr. KEAN. That is the proposal. All I want to do is to say "on the basis of the cost, including all carrying charges, of such assets" or the average market price.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will admit he does not know what the effect of the amendment will be.

Mr. KEAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The committee did not consider it. The gentleman did not bring it up in the committee.

Mr. KEAN. I did bring it up in the committee and the chairman of the committee insisted that what I am trying to bring about was the meaning of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Did the gentleman interrogate witnesses from the Agricultural Department as to the effect of it?

Mr. KEAN. I did not.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman probably does not know what the effect will be, neither does any member of the committee; therefore, I hope he will not insist on the amendment. It will possibly have far-reaching effects that we are not acquainted with.

Mr. KEAN. It does not have far-reaching effects, because it continues exactly the way they figure it now. It is phony bookkeeping if you are not going to charge to each commodity the cost for storage, insurance, and all those other items.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is very, very important, because the basic act in the first instance undertook to approve a survey of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the impairment of capital. When it is impaired they come to Congress, they make a report, then by necessary legislation and appropriation we repair their capital structure. We have done it several times.

The amendment proposes nothing more than to ascertain the exact outlay of the Commodity Credit Corporation, whether it be on prunes, peanuts, resin, turpentine, wheat, cotton, or what it is, but I cannot see for the world how you can ascertain the exact cost of this thing to the Federal Treasury unless you add all carrying charges. They are carrying some corn from 1938. I think they are carrying some of the 1938 peanut crop. They are probably carrying cotton back to 1937. All that can be ascertained from the records. But why should we fool ourselves and fool the American public by putting a provision in here which allows only 1 year of carrying charges and which, in the language of the gentleman from New Jersey, is "phony" bookkeeping. You are not going to fool anybody. We might just as well find out what the cost of the

freight is going to be in the first instance. If there are 4 years of carrying charges, put it in. We are going to repair the loss anyway, but I should like at least to see how much the loss actually is. It may be pretty painful to repair, but let us gather up all of the cost and put it in and swallow our medicine as we should, because we have authorized it under basic law.

I think the amendment is very important, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say to the gentleman that we are not dealing with losses. The Corporation is operating at a profit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know that.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is not in dispute. Let me say to the gentleman that as far as the matter of cost is concerned, if the Corporation were to dispose of all the holdings it now has on the basis of present farm prices, they estimate $100,000,000 of profit would accrue to the Corporation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not kick about that. I just want to see what the balance sheet shows, and I want it to reflect an accurate picture of this governmental transaction. That is all that is involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman says that we have made up losses heretofore. Assuming that we have, then we would have included those charges up to that time, and they are wiped off the books, that is true. Now we start the new year, and we say we will include 1 year's carrying charges, and each year we will do the same thing; so the charges of the previous years are covered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By the gentleman's own admission, what can be the objection to this amendment if it is going to get a good statistical picture for the Congress? Any other approach to this thing is faulty, it is fallacious, and it is not fair to the Congress or to the American people.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman is asking for a faulty situation, because this thing has been computed before. Now you are going to recompute it and add to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Despite the fact that my friend has listened to the hearings on this bill, he does not realize that some of those losses were not reflected when we last repaired the capital structure, because the cotton, for instance, had not been liquidated or the losses ascertained.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will notice that this is an amendment to section 1 of the act of March 8, 1938. I am in accord with the gentleman's views. We should know at all times what has been expended on these different commodities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then the gentleman ought to vote for this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. We have that information available. This is for a different purpose. This is for the purpose of determining whether or not the capital stock is impaired below $100,000,000. If it is, of course we shall have to put up more capital stock. This is for a different purpose. It is entirely for a different purpose from what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose I would make a poor bookkeeper to hear all this talk over here, but I do not see how Congress is going to get this picture unless every element of cost, whether it is 5 years ago or 1 year ago, has been reflected in the estimate in order to get this thing before the people and the Federal Treasury.

I believe this is an important amendment, and it ought to be adopted.

The question involved is not whether losses to the Treasury in other years will be larger or smaller. The real question is that every commodity should be charged with whatever carrying charges and costs have accrued so that when it is finally liquidated it will be possible to determine the net loss on such commodity, if there be any. It might prove to be a very distasteful picture, but it will be some stimulus in finding the kind of a farm program which can be made to work without too great a dependence on the Federal Treasury.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the past there has been an annual casting-up of the accounts of the Corporation on the 31st day of March each year, under the law which requires the Corporation to report to the Treasury the amount of any impairment of its capital stock or, on the other hand, to turn into the Treasury the amount of any profit. Those accounts were closed for the past years. They are finished transactions. The books are closed. There is no way by which we can proceed intelligently now in keeping the books except on an annual basis as provided by this bill. That is what is undertaken. This is surplus language.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very interesting to me. If you read the bill, you will see that there is a provision here that states that they will add only 1 year of carrying charges instead of charges in some cases for 6 years. If this is done, it might be lower or higher than the average market price for the period and prove more favorable to the financial report of the Corporation.

The very language convicts it of its purpose. I am surprised that the chairman should tell you that these books are closed on the 9,000,000 bales of stored cotton. I tried to tell you earlier in the day that the books had been closed on only a small amount that had been actually disposed of. They boast that they have lost only $67,000,000.

I talked about those millions of bales of cotton that they have held there for many years and that are to be held for many years more. They must not hide the cost of that cotton under only 1 year's added cost of storage. The very language convicts it of its purpose.

They have closed the books only to cotton which is sold and out of their hands. They have not reckoned the tremendous loss we are going to meet on what we still hold. I say to the House it is too painfully evident that 1 year's storage is not the true cost of this cotton and this language conveys doubt in our minds as to its real effect. Let us not mislead the public in this apparent resort to a fictitious value being placed on the commodity.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members will refer to page 2 of the report on this bill it will be noticed that this amendment is to section 1 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended, and is for one purpose only and that is to advise the President whether or not the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation is less than $100,000,000. If it is, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall restore the amount of such capital impairment by a contribution to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of such impairment.

As I understand it, these charges are paid every year and are charged up against the Commodity Credit Corporation. So, in determining whether or not the capital stock is impaired, I am at a loss to understand how it would be material to carry charges against that capital stock that have already been paid and have already been charged as a loss against the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment.

I am in accord with the view expressed that we should at all times know the charges that have been paid on each commodity, but that information is available now. You can get it over the telephone or you can get it by correspondence and you can get it as to each item. No one is hiding anything and no one is concealing anything. This is for the sole and only purpose of determining whether or not the capital stock is impaired. If so, and the capital stock is worth less than $100,000,000, efforts then shall be made to restore the capital stock to $100,000,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. At the end of the year suppose a bale of cotton costs $50 and the charge is $2, it would then be entered at $52, and the carrying charges of that year would be counted in the cost.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; so why add up these charges for several years and charge them against the capital stock when the charges have already been paid and the loss has been accounted for? I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is done to make the figure favorable and that is the

reason you take the average market prices. That may be valuable to them some year.

Mr. PATMAN. I think we are talking about different things.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am talking about the objects of this.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was talking about getting information as to these charges and there is no trouble about that.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is simply talking about the results.

Mr. PATMAN. We are talking about whether or not the capital stock is impaired and whether or not it should be restored.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am talking about the object in doing it this way to bring about more favorable results sometimes.

Mr. PATMAN. So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that since this is for the purpose of determining whether or not the capital stock is impaired, it is not necessary to have this amendment, and it is possible that it might have disastrous consequences. I do not know what the effect of it might be. It might be we would have to restore capital stock that should not be restored. If we had $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 in charges that had already been paid and charged that as a loss against the capital stock it would just require us to be out that much more money to restore the capital stock. Therefore the amendment, it occurs to me, is clearly out of order, and is not reaching the point that is desired, and I suggest that the amendment be defeated.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me that there is a difference when it is a matter between the Treasury and this Corporation. The law will require us to refund to the Treasury, and I am wondering if this amendment will not cost the Treasury more money.

Mr. PATMAN. It may cost the Treasury $15,000,000 or $18,000,000 a year, because we may not only carry it as a loss against the Commodity Credit Corporation, but we would also restore that amount to the capital stock and that is unnecessary.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And as it is now, we will come in here and appropriate more money.

Mr. PATMAN. For these carrying charges, yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. While under the amendment they could go before the Appropriations Committee and get more money out of the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, this would require us to restore capital stock that is not impaired. We are carrying storage charges and this would mean impairing our capital stock when there has been no impairment of our capital stock at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not believe the gentleman meant to say that this would cost the Treasury $50,000,000 or $60,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not say that, or if I did, I was mistaken. Of course, I do not know how much it would cost, but we do know it would cost something. It would cost the amount of the storage charges that are already carried as a loss each year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. KEAN, there were, ayes 33, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 2, line 14, after the words "available to him", insert "for the disposal of agricultural commodities."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEWEY: Page 3, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 5. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, insofar as consistent with a program of increase and stabilization of farm prices and the assurance of an adequate supply of farm products, and subject to such other limitations as are imposed by law upon the sale by the Corporation of commodities held by it, liquidate in an orderly manner the stocks of Government-owned commodities held by it whenever market prices for such commodities attain a level sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts expended by it with respect to such commodities. Any limitation on the number of bales of cotton which may be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation in any month or in any calendar year is hereby abolished."

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have the Commodity Credit Corporation take advantage of such market conditions that may occur during the period for which this bill is enacted. There is at the present time in the Agricultural Adjustment Act under section 381 (c) the following item:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on behalf of the United States to sell any cotton of the 1937 crop so acquired by it, but no such cotton or any other cotton held on behalf of the United States shall be sold unless the proceeds of such sale are at least sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts (including any price adjustment payments) paid out by any of its agents with respect to the cotton so sold. After July 31, 1939, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell more than 300,000 bales of cotton in any calendar month or more than 1,500,000 bales in any calendar year. The proceeds derived from the sale of any such cotton shall be used for the purpose of discharging the obligations assumed by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such cotton, and any amounts not expended for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has the responsibility of stabilizing prices, as well as the bringing of prices to parity.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman agree to an amendment that would provide that no sale shall be made below the parity price?

Mr. DEWEY. I would agree to that, but I want to take out the restriction on the amount that may be sold at a given time. You have a restriction here to the extent of 1,500,000 bales. There are 4,500,000 bales of 1937 cotton owned by the Government and under this restriction it would take 3 years to dispose of them, no matter whether the cotton went to $1 a pound or not. I merely want to take out the restriction and leave an orderly procedure in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation to handle the whole matter.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is willing to protect the price by providing it shall not be sold below parity?

Mr. DEWEY. I still want to know what is the gentleman's position with regard to the amount.

Mr. PATMAN. The amount would still be unlimited, the restriction would be removed, but no sale would be made below parity.

Mr. DEWEY. I am perfectly in agreement that the farmer should receive parity price. The purpose of my amendment is to remove the amount restriction on cotton.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I notice your amendment applies to any commodity.

Mr. DEWEY. It does, but there is only a restriction on cotton, as to the amount.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. But under your amendment the Commodity Credit Corporation would be told to liquidate wheat on which it has loaned 56 percent of parity and on which now, under recent legislation, they are making 85 percent of parity loans. This amendment of yours, in my opinion, would force the Commodity Credit Corporation to liquidate that wheat which it now holds at a price under the loan level that has been recently provided.

Mr. DEWEY. I have no intention of having this amendment—and I do not think it does—force the Commodity Credit Corporation to do anything but follow the procedure laid out in the entire bill as to bringing prices to parity and maintaining them there. But I would like to see, when opportunity arises, the Commodity Credit Corporation distribute the large stocks over and above requirements.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Let me point out to the gentleman this wording of your amendment:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall * * * liquidate in an

orderly manner the stocks of Government-owned commodities held by it whenever market prices for such commodities attain a level sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts expended by it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] means well, but if this amendment is agreed to, then you put the Commodity Credit Corporation in this position: Recently we passed a bill giving wheat farmers and cotton farmers an 85-percent parity program, by way of a loan. This year's crop of wheat is going on the market now and this year's cotton will be on the market by the first of August. If you force the Commodity Credit Corporation, or pass this amendment, thereby encouraging them to sell cotton and wheat that they have in storage, in competition with this year's wheat and cotton, what do you do? You force the market down to the loan figure or below the loan figure, and you simply force the wheat farmers and the cotton farmers to put their 1941 cotton and wheat in storage. In other words, it would be a merry-go-round. Selling out of the warehouses, holding prices down, and forcing the present crop into storage. If they will hold their cotton and wheat off and stay out of competition with this year's crop of wheat and cotton, no doubt the farmers will get the loan figures, 13.60 for cotton, and 97 cents for wheat and perhaps a higher price. But if you put the cotton belonging to the Government now in storage on the market, you are going to force the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer to load the wheat and cotton produced this year into storage and it will operate just as a merry-go-round.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I entertain the same view as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] entertains other views. We have not had any hearings at all. The gentleman from Illinois is a member of this committee. This is the first time this question has been propounded to the committee. Therefore it is certainly very dangerous at this particular time to adopt such an amendment.

Mr. FULMER. I would like to state to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree with him and I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, that when the proper time comes to liquidate the wheat and cotton belonging to the Government in the proper manner and at the proper time, it should be done. But it would be foolish on the part of the Corporation to put into competition with this year's production that which they have in storage, which would force the price down below the loan figure, or, in other words, force the wheat and cotton produced this year into storage.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that it would cause the Commodity Credit Corporation itself great losses by forcing this very wheat on which they loaned 56 percent of parity last year, on the market at a price that would undermine the loan structure this year, on which they are loaning 85 percent of parity, and in turn would create a loss for the Commodity Credit Corporation; whereas otherwise the price of wheat could be maintained at 85 percent of parity?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct. Eighty-five percent of parity or perhaps a little profit in addition to that, depending on the size of the crop this year and how the farmers feed it into the market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the cotton which is in storage, where storage charges for the years subsequent to the first year are lower per month than during the first year, this amendment would also, by throwing out the old crop and bringing in the new crop to the turnover, as the gentleman has described, create an additional storage charge.

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely. In the next place, there would be a certain amount of expense on the part of the farmer in putting wheat and cotton into storage in the first instance. When you put this wheat and cotton out in competition with this year's crop you force them into storing this year's crop, and at an additional expense, and, as stated by the gentleman, there will be an additional expense on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the ability and the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois who has proposed this amendment; however, it is hard to believe that he is familiar with all the possible results that might follow. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a total now of about 6,100,000 bales of cotton. On the 1st of April the Corporation carried loans on something like 3,000,000 bales of cotton. The last amount has been reduced considerably, but there is still something like 1,400,000 bales of cotton remaining in the loan and over 6,000,000 bales of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The only thing that protects the market today is the pledge of loans by the Government on the new crop on the basis of 85 percent of parity, the decrease in the amount of cotton produced under the control program, and the assurance that the cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot be dumped on the market. This is true of the entire farm program. If we pull down the bars and adopt the policy that is involved in this amendment, it means to tear down the safeguards that have been built up around the five basic farm commodities in the United States. It is not merely the loan that protects the cotton market, and it is not the actual savings or the actual policy determined on any day that might come about as the result of this amendment that affects the cotton market.

The cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, if this amendment were adopted, would be just like that same amount of cotton held by the farmers of the United States. It frees that cotton so it could be dumped on the market any day in the year, and the buying world, the consuming public, could not know one day what would happen the next. The result would be, immediately following the adoption of this provision, to throw into the situation the same thing that would result if you had a vast increase in the amount of free cotton in the hands of the farmers of this country. If this happened there would inevitably be a big break in the cotton market and it would defeat the cotton program that has been so successfully, so industriously, and so intelligently worked out during these years. Also, it would involve the Treasury of the United States in a loss, because the only way the Treasury can escape losses on its investments in cotton is to work out this problem, as is being done. The Government is now in partnership with the farmers in the ownership of the cotton. This amendment would establish a policy that would operate against the value of the cotton in the farmers' hands and that would operate against the value of the cotton in the Government's hands. The Commodity Credit Corporation is working out this problem. If we stand by our guns and adhere to the policy on cotton which we now have and maintain the laws on the statute books, it will be only a little while until the Government will be out of this transaction without any loss and farmers at the same time will be protected in their markets and the prices of our basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice will be protected against dumping on the market.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The very purpose of the Government in taking over the storage of cotton to protect the market would be thwarted if this amendment were adopted. It may be, with the rising prices in cotton, that parity will be soon reached, or even a level above parity temporarily, but with 6,000,000 bales ready to be thrown on the market by the Government at any one moment, the price would stay at parity only momentarily, followed by a drop instantly, and thus the market would be ruined as the chairman of the committee has indicated. This is a destructive proposal.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to call my friend's attention to an article appearing in this morning's Post. I believe the figures in this article are correct. This article states, as far as loan cotton is concerned, that is cotton on which the farmers retain an interest, that on June 14 there were only 1,900,000 bales still

under loan, that the farmers had withdrawn 1,000,000 bales in a fortnight, paying off the loans and putting this cotton on the market. The withdrawal, the article states, is continuing at the rate of 150,000 to 200,000 bales a week. So this cotton is being brought out of the Commodity Credit Corporation and placed on the market in competition with other cotton.

Mr. MURDOCK. And in an orderly, normal, and logical way at that, and it can be done with the present provision of law.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that under recent legislation loans will be provided at 85 percent of parity on wheat and cotton?

Mr. MURDOCK. Exactly.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In the event this wheat and cotton which the Government took over in previous years is thrown on the market at a price lower than 85 percent of parity, it would be the Commodity Credit Corporation which would suffer a loss, because they would have to lend at 85 percent of parity on this year's crop, and if the market did not reach that point the Government would lose by virtue of the loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Is not the backlog of cotton held by the Government very much like a dam? If you dynamite a dam, the water held in storage sweeps over everything before it, and if this stored cotton were thrown on the market all at once, it would break the whole cotton-price structure.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's analogy is a good one. The very purpose back of this legislation is to protect the markets, prevent them from being destroyed, or, to use the gentleman's illustration, to prevent the dam's being broken, which would wreck the price that cotton may have attained temporarily.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment let me say my only purpose is to do what I think is for the best interest of agriculture. Whether this amendment is agreed to or not, sometime you must clear the bins of the Government-owned cotton or Government-owned agricultural crops of all kinds, and be prepared to support agriculture when the recession in price actually comes, which it surely will when this emergency is over. That is my only purpose in offering this amendment. If it is not accepted now, I hope that very shortly some plan will be considered in order that we may be prepared to help agriculture when it will need help most.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest to the gentleman that since we have not considered this question in the committee it will be well to not insist upon it now and insist on it later? I see some merit in the gentleman's contention. But if this amendment is passed, as written, it will immediately cause a drop in the market. Take cotton, for instance; it will mean at least $10 a bale, which means $60,000,000 to the Government. It will mean the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and we would have to immediately restore that.

Mr. DEWEY. I do not agree with the gentleman, but would the gentleman be willing to have an amendment of such a type considered in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I speak on this amendment because as a farmer coming from a rural district I very greatly wish to express my appreciation of the friendly attitude to farmers shown by the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Chicago, Ill. [Mr. DEWEY]. The amendment, as I see it, will repeal existing law which prevents the sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of cotton held by the Government except at prices which would include not only the market price but also the accumulated carrying charges.

On that point Dr. Robbins, head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said in the committee, page 64 of the committee hearings:

> There is no real economic necessity for such a provision of law even in the case of cotton.
>
> Incidentally it only applies to cotton.
>
> But it has not operated to any substantial disadvantage yet, because we have not had any situation in which the demand for cotton, both domestic and foreign, could not be met by the current production plus the amounts under loan.

I think this restriction should be removed eventually, perhaps not today, perhaps not in the form suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]. It seems to me very obvious that it would be advisable to release some cotton as we go along at somewhat less than the price they may get plus carrying charges, which would be above the market price, selling it to Britain or some place so as not to affect market prices, rather than to take the whole loss at some future time. I believe these reasons will commend themselves to the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. You would dump the Government cotton on the market. You would dump it all on the market, together with the producers' cotton, and ultimately you would run cotton from 14 cents to 8 cents in less than 2 months. The same situation would be true with wheat and corn.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I will agree that there ought to be a different form of amendment, from the one the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] has offered. However, there is 1934 cotton that is carrying a great amount of carrying charges, and I do not believe the existing law provides for release of that cotton with real benefit to the farmer.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say this, and it has not been stated, and probably is not understood fully: The Commodity Credit Corporation can, tomorrow, release 300,000 bales of cotton. It can do that every month, so long as the price stays where it is, not above the amount of a million and a half a year under existing law. Certainly that is as much free cotton added to what is now in the hands of the farmers, and in which they have an equity, that it would be sensible to release under existing conditions if we are to protect the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest, and many of us are sympathetic with the objective which the gentleman from Illinois evidently has in offering his amendment. Those of us who have studied this agricultural situation appreciate the fact that this cotton, wheat, and other commodities that are being held off the market are taxing the capacity of our reservoir, for such withholding and the quicker we can get it out of that reservoir at a price which will not disturb the current market the better it will be. We will need that space for withholding future surpluses, just as we need the space in flood-control reservoirs to take care of future floods.

I would like to make a suggestion to the distinguished gentleman who has offered the amendment, however. Those of us who come from the cities and those who come from the smaller places appreciate the necessity of preserving the economic strength of agriculture if we are to have economic strength in the general organization of the country of which agriculture is a part. There is a definite apprehension on this side as to what might be the effect of this amendment. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that my colleagues on this side from their statements indicate a sympathy with the objective of the gentleman, but the thing being dealt with is too important to be undertaken by an amendment offered from the floor of the House. I am going to assume the responsibility therefore of asking the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] if under all these circumstances, in order to avoid any vote or any division that might appear as a result of that vote, if he will not withdraw the amendment. Let us think it over and see if we cannot work out something

that will reach the objective that everybody seems to want to reach.

Mr. DEWEY. Responding to the gentleman, and knowing what my objective is, which the gentleman has so graciously expressed, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I express the appreciation of all of us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Looking forward to a future consideration of this principle here enunciated, may I ask the gentleman if he believes that the Commodity Credit structure approach can be maintained if it is ever made known by Congress to be its desire that the Government shall not in the final analysis absorb the excess of production over domestic- and foreign-consumption demands?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me not to answer that question but to make this statement. I look on the withholding from the market of this cotton just as I look upon a dam in a river above my town that is supposed to keep the flood waters out. There is a limit to the amount of water that can be impounded, so as rapidly as the water can be got out of that reservoir without the released water plus the current flow exceeding the capacity of the channel to carry and thereby increase the holding capacity for the next flood, the better it would be all around.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That does not answer my question at all.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will say to my friend I did not mean to answer it.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment would make it mandatory?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. He has done a fine thing by withdrawing it. Let us pat him on the back.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It would be mandatory on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of a commodity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEAVY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 244, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETAIL OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, OR INVESTIGATORS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1246) to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HARNESS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee to explain the bill to the House.

Mr. MAY. I do not have a copy of the bill before me, but it is simply what it says in the title there. The situation is this. It is rather embarrassing to state the situation just as it is, but it is that, nevertheless.

The Senate passed a bill and the House passed an identical bill. I am asking unanimous consent to take up the Senate bill so as to expedite the situation and get it over with. What the bill does is to provide that the Army may detail personnel of the Army of the United States as students at technical, professional, or other educational institutions, or as observers or investigators in industrial plants and other places best suited to enable them to acquire knowledge of or experience in their specialties, and that they be given pay for that time plus whatever vacation pay is due them. That is all there is to it.

Mr. HARNESS. I understand that a similar bill was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs and reported unanimously?

Mr. MAY. Unanimously, and it is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. HARNESS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. When the facilities of the Army for instruction and training in aviation are deemed by the Secretary of War to be insufficient he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and without reference to any limitation contained in section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), detail personnel of the Army of the United States as students of any technical, professional, or other educational institution, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants or other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire a knowledge of or experience in the specialties incident to aviation in which the training of such personnel is essential: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in addition to the authorized emoluments of the personnel so detailed except for the cost of tuition at such educational institutions, and the cost of maintenance of necessary personnel who may be detailed as supervisors or inspectors and of the equipment assigned to them for their official use: *Provided further*, That the tuition for the personnel during the period of their detail may be paid from any funds which may hereafter be made available for the procurement branches."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Walter Trohan appearing in the Chicago Tribune of June 14, entitled "What Happens to a War Order Marked 'Rush'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by a man by the name of Pegler appearing in the Chicago Daily News of June 21.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon a summary description of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its functions, prepared by that Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader entitled "Morgenthau Magic."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR UNITY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the President's plan for public employment as outlined by George Morris, of Washington, D. C., and published in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., in its issue of June 20, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, in our all-out defense effort the administration has called for the unity of our people on numerous occasions, and when it comes to paying for their defense effort every citizen will be expected to do his duty for his country. But participation in the administrative and executive ends of the program would seem hereafter to be a strictly New Deal affair. I am sorry that I must arrive at this conclusion. I feel sure that every Member of Congress will be interested in the special article which Mr. Morris has written and which is entitled "Do you Want a Federal Job? Only Democrats Need Apply."

Mr. Speaker, how can we have unity in the face of this brazen attempt to deny those outside the Democratic Party opportunities to share in the increased public employment which the defense program provides? The article by Mr. George Morris follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal]

DO YOU WANT A FEDERAL JOB? ONLY DEMOCRATS NEED APPLY

(By George Morris)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Every official and employee, except those with civil-service classification, added to the Government pay roll in the future will be required to clear through the Democratic National Committee. Only exception is the Office of Production Management.

The President is reported to have given notice to all departments that this procedure must be followed in every instance. It is understood that the action was taken upon insistence of Chairman Flynn of the Democratic National Committee.

PROCEDURE OUTLINED

Before anyone outside the civil-service classification is employed, he will first have to be cleared through the Department of Prospective Employment. Should he be approved the name is sent to the Democratic National Committee. If approved by the State committee, the national committee is advised and it in turn notifies the department he may be employed.

Chairman Flynn is understood to have become alarmed over infiltration of governmental departments by individuals who have no identity with the States from which they come. While the new rule may be interpreted as a political move, it is said to be not Mr. Flynn's objective.

CONGRESSMEN SLIGHTED

For a long time Congressmen have complained that their indorsement not only does not help an applicant for a job but frequently prevents him from obtaining one.

Chairman Flynn has no patience with subversive groups. Furthermore, he is said to be concerned over danger of party disintegration as a result of contempt in which the Congressman is held by the average bureaucrat.

The situation was reported to have been brought to a head by the discovery that David Lasser, former president of the defunct Communistic Workers' Alliance, was given a $4,000 job in the Government when his organization was abolished.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOLBROOK, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m. in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

684. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Susannah Sanchez, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 207. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American republics, other than the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4873. A bill to promote the national defense by limiting the entry of certain aliens into the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Norman Carlin Brown, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Franklin G. Galpin; with amendment (Rept. No. 854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Eleanor J. Griggs, Dorothy L. Griggs, and Vernon M. Griggs; with amendment (Rept. No. 855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Michael Lewenczuk; with amendment (Rept. No. 856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Coppel Coal Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson; with amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of the estate of Max Adams Shepard; without amendment (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Raymond Peschke; with amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2754. A bill for the relief of Bessie Myers; with amendment (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3697. A bill for the relief of John E. Newman; with amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3761. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye; with amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Formhals; with amendment (Rept. No. 864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4179. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the Louis Puccinelli Bail Bond Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. S. 127. An act for the relief of Joseph Petrin, Joseph A. Petrin, Rudolph Petrin, Angus LeBlanc, William J. Demelle, Samuel Fishman, and Hector LaPointe; without amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. S. 176. An act for the relief of Samuel M. Lipton; without amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 281. An act for the relief of the St. Nicholas Park Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. S. 1142. An act for the relief of J. Mae Chambers and Retta E. Hultgren; without amendment (Rept. No. 871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. S. 1348. An act for the relief of J. M. Swinney; without amendment (Rept. No. 872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on Claims. S. 1352. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher; without amendment (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 5178. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5179. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 5180. A bill to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burdens of furnishing reports and information to governmental agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 5181. A bill to prohibit those who believe in the overthrowing of the Government by force from becoming members of labor unions or holding office in any part of our Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5182. A bill regulating installment contracts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5183. A bill authorizing subsistence allowance provided for aviation cadets to be paid to messes in manner as prescribed by the act of March 14, 1940 (Public, No. 433, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5184. A bill relating to minimum cotton acreage for farm marketing quota purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5185. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 5186. A bill to authorize the President to order members and units of Reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into additional active military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5187. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. R. 5188. A bill to regulate interstate commerce and to provide regulations for any business the operation of which affects the free flow of commerce between the States, to protect small business and small industry, promote orderly and nondiscriminatory marketing, encourage individual initiative, decentralize business, and give to the consumers the benefit of free competition denied them by chain merchandising ownership and operation, holding companies, and interlocking directorates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 5189. A bill to authorize the issuance of a medal and ribbon for members of the Army of Occupation of Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5190 (by request). A bill to authorize the President of the United States to requisition certain property for the purpose of equipping the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5191. A bill to provide retirement pay for certain permanently and totally disabled emergency officers in the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5192. A bill to authorize employees of the United States to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia to testify on behalf of the United States and of the District of Columbia without loss of salary or annual leave; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 5193. A bill to provide domiciliary or hospital care and medical treatment for certain persons inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the coming of Rev. Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg to the American Colonies; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 5194. A bill for the relief of Otto Goetz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LMHOFF:

H. R. 5195. A bill for the relief of James Mickey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1524. By Mr. DIMOND: Petition of the Ketchikan (Alaska) Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging immediate entry by the United States into the war to help other liberty-loving peoples and to preserve our own free Government and individual liberties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1525. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Silverlake Young Democrats, Silverlake, Calif., endorsing the principle of having the United States Army take over with a minimum of necessary force any industrial plant vital to national defense which is lying idle because of an unjustifiable strike or for other causes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1526. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting that Congress make the necessary amendments to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act in order that the State of California may make amendments in the Unemployment Insurance Act of this State granting an exemption from the contribution and benefit provisions of the State act to real-estate brokers and salesmen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1527. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting that the President and the Congress of the United States include the necessary flood-control work necessary for the San Fernando Valley district, due to recent floods, and also include the rectification of the Los Angeles River channel, the two afore-mentioned projects be made a part of the Federal construction projects, and that Federal moneys be appropriated in sum sufficient to provide therefor at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1528. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, making known that the legislature of the State urges the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States and the Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Reclamation to investigate further the economic and engineering feasibility of serving water to the land lying south of the Pit River with water to be impounded in the Shasta Reservoir and, if found feasible, to make provision for this service; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1529. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, proclaiming that the legislature of the State endorses the recommendations of the congressional subcommittee on social security and old-age pensions of the House conference on unemployment, and respectfully requests that the President and the Congress of the United States of America take the necessary steps at once to enact legislation to put them into effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1530. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of California, and the Assembly concurring, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture to examine the problem presented by the impassable condition of the stretch of highway between Niland and Highway 60 and consider the advisability of making the necessary construction and repairs as part of the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1531. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, advising and informing the Federal Social Security Board that it is opposed to the proposed merit system and to any interference with local governmental activities in this State, whether by a State agency or a Federal

agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1532. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, solemnly and firmly asserting the title of the State and its grantees in such lands within the State, and that the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General of the United States be, and are hereby, respectfully urged not to initiate or authorize the initiation of any litigation that would becloud such title of the State and its grantees, however temporarily; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1533. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, urging the President and the Congress of the United States and the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior to take such steps as are necessary to provide that the brush, debris, and other materials in the area to be covered by the water impounded by the Shasta Dam be removed prior to the time that the area is flooded; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1534. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing Congress to appropriate the sum of $38,750,000 to the Central Valley project in accordance with the recommendations of President Roosevelt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1535. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to make such appropriation as may be necessary to provide for the dredging of Bodega Bay, in Sonoma, Calif., such improvement to establish harbor facilities such as have been approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1536. Also, petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps looking to the abolishment of tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1537. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Joseph L. Irving and others of Mount Ayr, Iowa, urging favorable consideration of House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1538. By Mr. LICH: Petition of sundry citizens of McKean County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1539. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Wellsboro, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1540. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. W. Oresek and others of the Morningside Methodist Church, East End, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to conscientious objectors to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who dost command the light to shine out of darkness to awaken the earth to the beauty of the day: We beseech Thee to shine anew in the hearts of all men, and especially of these Thy Servants, that they, being illuminated by the light of Thy truth, may lead us in the paths of righteousness.

Lift up Thy countenance, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon the people of America, dispelling any darkness that may o'ershadow, and so fill them with the knowledge of Thy truth that in all things they shall be the Children of Light in the radiant dawn of Thy glorious Kingdom.

Again, dear Father, we remember before Thee another who in the fullness of his years has been taken from our midst by the silent messenger. We thank Thee for his noble character, his loyalty and devotion to duty, and for the example of willing service which he has left to us. Do Thou comfort those whom he has left behind with a continual sense of Thine abiding presence and sustain them by Thine everlasting arms. We ask in the name of Him who for our sake bore our sorrow, Thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 26, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 25, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 879. An act relating to certain Carey Act lands in Wyoming.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that he had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House:

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4590. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BYRNES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bunker	Danaher
Aiken	Burton	Davis
Andrews	Butler	Downey
Bailey	Byrd	George
Barbour	Byrnes	Glass
Bone	Capper	Green
Brewster	Caraway	Guffey
Bridges	Chandler	Gurney
Brown	Chavez	Hatch
Hayden	Mead	Smith
Herring	Murdock	Stewart
Hughes	Norris	Taft
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	Overton	Thomas, Utah
La Follette	Pepper	Tunnell
Lodge	Radcliffe	Tydings
Lucas	Rosier	Vandenberg
McFarland	Russell	Van Nuys
McNary	Schwartz	Walsh
Maloney	Shipstead	Wiley

Mr. BYRNES. I announce that the the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF SENATOR ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it is with sincere regret that I have to announce to the Senate the death of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, the Honorable ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON.

The family of Senator HOUSTON have requested me to state to the Senate that they realized that Monday next will be the end of the fiscal year, and that a the fiscal year expires. It is their denumber of bills must be passed before sire that the Senate should proceed with its business. They believe they are expressing what would have been the desire of Senator HOUSTON.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lula M. Threekel, of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that persons about 50 years of age or over be not removed from the W. P. A. rolls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from several citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation granting $75 a month national recovery pensions for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of the Northeastern Interstate Assembly of the Council of State Governments at New York City, favoring the speedy enactment of legislation to support the President in terminating stoppage in defense industries, including the removal therefrom of individuals and elements subversive and opposed to the American form of Government, etc., to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Chelmsford and Lowell, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of proposed legislation to prohibit the sale and possession of feathers used as artificial lures in the sport of fishing; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the proposals of the Treasury Department of the United States now pending before the Congress in respect to the raising of additional revenue by increases in income-tax rates and by reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes

"Whereas it has been proposed by the Treasury Department of the United States, as appears in a statement of the Assistant Secretary before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on April 24, 1941, to raise approximately $3,600,000,000 of additional revenue primarily by drastic increases in income-tax rates and by substantial reduction of exemptions and increase of rates of estate and gift taxes; and

"Whereas income and death taxes have been relied upon as sources of revenue for the respective States of the Union from times long antedating the entering of the Federal Government into these fields and the ever-growing inroads upon such sources have already reached such proportions as to impede the several States in the maintenance of their tax structures; and

"Whereas the joint burden of Federal and State governments upon these sources of revenue has reached a point which threatens seriously to destroy the incentive to industry and thrift and to dry up the very sources upon which both the Federal and State governments must depend during the critical financial period now confronting them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes Congress against the adoption of the proposals above outlined, hereby representing that although the general court approves the policy of financing the cost of the defense program by increased taxation rather than by borrowing, nevertheless it requests that Congress refrain from raising the necessary additional revenue in direct competition with the States in the manner proposed, thereby stifling every incentive to industry, enterprise, and saving at a time when these attributes should be encouraged to the utmost if our entire financial structure, both State and national, is not to collapse; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof representing this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted June 5, 1941.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, June 9, 1941."

(Mr. LODGE presented a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. LODGE:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress in opposition to proposed legislation curtailing our cane-sugar refining industry

"Whereas it is the established policy of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to preserve the domestic sugar refining industry in Massachusetts, as evidenced by Massachusetts House Document No. 1296 of 1934, favoring Federal legislation for the preservation of the cane-sugar refining industry, which legislation the Congress subsequently enacted in 1934, thereby protecting consumers in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the United States on the supply and price of sugar; and

"Whereas existing Federal law provides a readily accessible supply of raw cane sugar from Central and South American countries, which, as our Government experts on defense and consumers' needs have stated, is ample for United States consumption; and

"Whereas legislation by the Congress is being considered and which, if enacted, would deprive this sound Massachusetts industry of much of its raw material, would deprive our good neighbors of Latin-American countries of the market for their product, and would add millions of dollars to the huge subsidy now given to the beet-sugar industry, thereby increasing the burden upon the American consumer: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts respectfully urges upon the Congress of the United States to oppose any change in existing Federal law that would create unemployment in this Commonwealth, further overburden the consumer, and detract from existing good will between the United States and the Latin-American countries so necessary in this time of national emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, June 5, 1941."

By Mr. HATCH:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Chaves County, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Kingman and Reno Counties, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Attica, Harper, Pleasanton, and Manhattan, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of House bill 2475, to provide for the common defense in relation to the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

By Mr. WILEY:

A resolution of the Assembly of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Office of Production Management to use the resources of skill and manpower of the Negro race in the defense program; to the Committee on Education and Labor. (See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Secretary on the 26th inst., p. 5528, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF CHEESE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, about a week ago the Secretary of Agriculture made a certain statement in relation to cheese production, and asked that the people of this country cut down their consumption of cheese. I have in my hand, and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this time, a communication from the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association under date of June 19, 1941, consisting of a letter and a resolution. I also have a letter from the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture which includes a resolution which was adopted and a release dated June 20, 1941. All these matters I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the matters were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN DAIRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., June 19, 1941.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We wish to congratulate you on your stand in protesting to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard regarding his recent declaration that consumption of cheese in this country should be reduced. Wisconsin farmers have spent many thousands of dollars to create an American appetite for cheese and other dairy products.

I am enclosing copy of resolution unanimously adopted on June 16, by the directors of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association.

Yours very truly,
WISCONSIN DAIRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
LEE I. YORKSON,
Executive Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

Resolution directed to Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., passed by the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, June 16, 1941

Wisconsin dairy farmers, producing more than one-half of the Nation's cheese, are alarmed at your recent statement in which you urged the people of this country to consume less cheese as a matter of patriotic duty. Over 100,000 dairymen of this State, together with hundreds of thousands of producers in other States, realizing the health and economic necessity of increasing the per capita consumption of cheese, have been contributing of their finances to a Nation-wide health education program.

In the face of these conscientious efforts on the part of our dairymen, we, the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, feel extreme disappointment in your recent statement asking for a curtailment of the consumption of this economic, highly nutritious, and health fortifying food.

We believe your pronouncement is contrary to the basic principles of national defense, harmful to the health of the American people, and detrimental to the welfare of our great dairy industry. In the light of agriculture's determined preparedness and ability to produce cheese and other dairy products, we ask you to reconsider your position and correct this detrimental statement before the progress of our health education program has been unnecessarily ruined.

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., June 18, 1941.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture meeting in Madison, Saturday, June 14, discussed at length the recent statement of the United States Secretary of Agriculture which urged decreased consumption of cheese in the United States as a matter of patriotic duty. The basis for their concern was very definitely expressed in the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"Throughout the centuries cheese has been a most essential food for man. Today more than ever before the consumption of cheese is vitally important in maintaining an adequate and economical diet for our American people. The large percentage of men rejected as unfit for military service bears evidence of the need for increasing the consumption of such protective foods as cheese and all other dairy products.

"To increase the per capita use of cheese and other dairy products has long been a major objective of dairymen everywhere and has been considered the serious responsibility of public officials, dietitians, health officers, and others interested in improving the health and general well-being of our people.

"To this end the dairy farmers of America have devoted their efforts by producing ample quantities of wholesome cheese and other dairy products, and they have pledged their assistance in the promotion of a Nation-wide health education program.

"On the basis of a remunerative price there is no substantial evidence to indicate that there will not be sufficient cheese for both domestic and foreign consumption.

"Therefore the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, which consists of 38 major cooperative farm organizations, and, in turn, represents more than 80,000 Wisconsin farm families, vigorously protests to Secretary Wickard against his recent pronouncement urging Americans to curtail their consumption of cheese as a matter of patriotic duty. We believe the statement of the United States Secretary of Agriculture was ill-advised, being detrimental to the health of the Nation and contrary to the economic well-being of dairymen everywhere."

A copy of this resolution has been forwarded to Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, June 20, 1941.

Re Cheese production.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I enclose copy of a release from the College of Agriculture appearing in dailies today. We think it represents general sentiment of the cheese industry and officials of the State as well as college people.

I have written Secretary Wickard that we have sufficient milk and adequate cheese-making equipment to produce the additional cheese needed from Wisconsin for defense purposes, provided the Department will buy its cheese on long-time contracts rather than on offers or in the open market.

If the Department will work with us here in the State on this situation, it can be handled without requiring a reduction in domestic consumption of cheese. The State department of agriculture has already sent Wickard an estimate of large increases in cheese proudction for the next few months. To bring the increase up to the amount required will necessitate some special cooperation, however.

I am sending this because I know how much interested you are in the dairy business of the State.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. CLARK,
Associate Director.

[Enclosure.]

MADISON, WIS.—Wisconsin dairymen and dairy manufacturers could produce enough cheddar cheese and evaporated milk to meet their full share of current demands for home consumption and also for export to Britain—if sufficiently long-term buying contracts were made with the plants producing the needed products.

This is the message which Wisconsin agricultural extension leaders are giving to Federal officials concerned with securing increased supplies of Wisconsin cheese and canned milk. This was the word taken to Washington by Warren Clark, director of Wisconsin agricultural extension, who has just returned from conferences there with the Federal officials. This will be the plea made to M. L. Wilson, Federal director of the agricultural Extension Service, when he comes here this week end and holds a conference with extension workers. These are also the recommendations made to Federal departments several weeks ago by Wisconsin extension and experiment station workers.

Wisconsin extension officials believe that the present Government purchasing program, which asks the industry for current offers of cheese and condensed milk, does not give the assurance needed to warrant long-term commitments necessary to divert large amounts of milk from other dairy plants to condenseries and cheese factories. They are also urging that this diversion be made as far as possible on the plant to plant basis rather than by farmers shifting from one plant to another.

R. K. Froker, of the agricultural economics staff of the University of Wisconsin, is the authority for the statement that there is adequate plant capacity for the production of these needed products. In the current issue of Economic Information for Wisconsin Farmers, published by the Wisconsin College of Agriculture, he expresses the belief that the main problem is to divert milk from other channels into the making of evaporated milk and cheese. He is certain that there is no need for artificial curtailment of cheese consumption if every effort is made to accomplish the needed diversion. He believes, however, that this will require the full cooperation of the Government and those engaged in the industry.

The Wisconsin marketing specialist insists that Wisconsin dairymen will supply more than her proportionate share of the needed increase if the proper adjustments are made, and if there is full cooperation all along the line. He calls attention to the fact that although having only 11 percent of the country's total milk production, the State normally produces over half of the Nation's cheese and one-third of its evaporated milk.

"The marketing problem, as far as plant facilities go, is not one of having adequate total plant capacity, but rather in the distribution of desired plant capacity, both as to type of product manufactured and geographic location of these plants," declares Froker. He points out a striking similarity in the areas served by the condenseries and the cheddar-cheese factories in Wisconsin. This, he believes, presents an assembling and transportation problem, in getting milk from the butter and surplus fluid milk areas of the State to the cheddar-cheese and evaporated-milk plants.

Froker suggests that the possibility of tremendous expansion in both evaporated milk and cheddar cheese is at once evident if one thinks of maximum day-to-day production in these plants throughout the year. To make maximum expansion possible, the economist proposes that plants would have to operate on more than one shift per day, and that some of the other plants would have to be used as receiving stations. Developments along this line are already under way, but it is thought that far more adjustments of this kind are necessary. Froker agrees with farmers and plant operators that Government officials should recognize that dairy plants will find it easier and less expensive to make the adjustments if they have long-term commitments and considerable advance notice of exactly what is expected, and if Government purchases are made for specific dates of delivery, definite times of payment, and on grades, containers and packages that are now in general use in the trade.

"Without some care along this line, Government purchases may serve to enhance the profits of the processors and the speculators, and will not be fully reflected in price to producers," concludes Froker.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1605. A bill to amend the act approved March 5, 1940, entitled "An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense"; without amendment (Rept. No. 482);

H. R. 3537. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 486); and

H. R. 4473. A bill authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 483).

By Mr. BYRNES (for Mr. BARKLEY), from the Committee on the Library:

H. R. 4841. An act to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes; without amendment.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4700. An act to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 484).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1601. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 485).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain lands to the State of West Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 487).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GLASS:

S. 1671. A bill to amend section 5153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 90), to authorize national banks to pledge assets to secure deposits of funds in official custody of public officers of a State or political subdivision thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Dr. W. E. Kramer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 1673. A bill granting an increase in pension to George M. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1674. A bill authorizing appropriations for payments to counties supplemental to those authorized by the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 500); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of John L. Stafford, a World War veteran; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 1676. A bill making an appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service for emergency repair and rehabilitation work in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1677. A bill authorizing subsistence allowance provided for aviation cadets to be paid to messes in manner as prescribed by the act of March 14, 1940 (Public, No. 433, 76th Cong.); and

S. 1678. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1679. A bill granting a pension to Minnie L. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1680. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1681. A bill to authorize the waiver of physical disabilities of certain men who have heretofore served in the land or naval forces of the United States and who are called or ordered to active duty in the Army or Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1682. A bill for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by suspending section 24b of the National Defense Act and authorizing a more expeditious procedure to vitalize the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MAILING OF PROPAGANDA DISSEMINATED BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 14, 1941, I introduced a bill (S. 313) to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to that bill and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and printed.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5166, the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. No part of the appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation,' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

HAZEL MERKER OSBOURNE

Mr. BARBOUR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hazel Merker Osbourne, widow of John D. Osbourne, late clerk in the office of Senator BARBOUR, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. BYRNES subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HARRISON

Mr. BYRNES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF IDAHO BEFORE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Committee on Reciprocity Information on June 23, 1941, protesting against reduction of tariffs on farm products and minerals, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM MANCHESTER (N. H.) UNION LEADER ON RUSSIAN ENTRANCE INTO EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester, N. H., Union Leader, entitled "Still Intolerable," which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC WORKS IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENSE PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20; and agree to the same.

FRANCIS MALONEY,
MILLARD TYDINGS,
WARREN BARBOUR,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

FRITZ G. LANHAM,
JASPER BELL,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9 and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(2) striking out the word 'unless' in clause (2) of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'where the loan, advance of credit, or purchase does not exceed $2,500, or has a maturity in excess of five years and thirty-two days, where the loan, advance of credit, or purchase exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000; except that such maturity limitations shall not apply if', and (3)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 11.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
P. M. BROWN,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, very briefly, I may say that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], representing the minority, who was on the conference committee with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and myself, agrees that the conference report should be adopted. We were unable to persuade the House conferees to accept the Bankhead amendment relating to farm tenancy. They insisted that the House vote upon the proposition separately. This was done and the amendment was rejected. As I understand the procedure now, we should agree to the conference report, and then recede from our insistence on Senate amendment numbered 11.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the House voted upon the proposition?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; it did.

Mr. NYE. What was the result?

Mr. BROWN. There were 202 votes against the amendment to 130 for it.

I greatly regret that the House did not accept this amendment. It was a start toward solving the farm-tenancy problem. But inasmuch as some F. H. A. authority will expire unless this bill is passed, we do not feel that we should further insist on the Bankhead amendment, although we are unanimously for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 11.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1246. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; and

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. CLASON had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k), vice Mr. ANDREWS, excused.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands; and

H. R. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4965, the military appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I shall make a very brief explanation. The committee report on this bill seeks to give as much information as we thought perhaps the Senate would desire to consider.

On page 2 of the committee report there is found a break-down of the present personnel of the Army. That break-down was of date June 19. Since June 19 there have been some changes which I will indicate for the RECORD.

The strength of the Army today is estimated at 1,518,799, and the break-down is as follows:

Officers in the Regular Army	14,700
National Guard	21,800
Reserve officers	53,000
Making a total of	89,500

That, it will be noted, is a change from the committee report; and that change has been made since the 19th of June.

The break-down for the enlisted men is as follows:

Regular Army, 3-year enlistments	473,000
Regular Army, Reserve and 1-year enlistments	18,000
National Guard in Federal service	267,000
Selective-service trainees	594,000
Making a total of	1,352,000

The total combined strength is as follows:

Regular Army	503,700
National Guard	288,800
Reserve officers	53,000
Selective-service trainees	594,000
Making a total of	1,441,500

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the portion of page 2 of the committee report under the heading "Functional break-down of funds provided," and all of pages 3, 4, 5, and 6 down to the words "increases and limitations."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FUNCTIONAL BREAK-DOWN OF FUNDS PROVIDED

The funds provided under the act cover in general the following:

(1) Payment of prior fiscal year obligations	$3,357,372,132
(2) 12,856 airplanes with accessory equipment	2,790,890,000
(3) Pay, military personnel	1,208,000,000
(4) Subsistence, forage, and clothing	424,700,000
(5) New equipment	735,600,000
(6) New construction	284,000,000
(7) Atlantic bases	51,000,000
(8) Civilians to replace soldiers	43,900,000
(9) Seacoast defense	92,000,000
(10) Research and development	67,000,000
(11) Training	136,000,000
(12) Maintenance, aviation pilot and technician program	141,249,000
(13) Maintenance and operation of plant and equipment	867,500,000
(14) Expediting production	500,000,000

PAYMENT OF PRIOR FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATIONS, $3,357,372,132

As of July 1, 1940, there remained $533,036,278 of prior-year contract authorizations granted under military appropriations not financed. The major items included $213,351,978 Air Corps and $233,860,199 Ordnance.

During the fiscal year 1941, $4,495,183,254 additional contract authorization was granted; and provision was made for liquidating $203,626,456 contract authorization previously granted. The major items of the $4,495,183,254 included $1,733,065,751 for the Ordnance Department, $1,586,625,000 for the Air Corps, and $828,896,000 for "Expediting production." The major items of the $203,626,456 subsequently liquidated included $107,000,000 for "Expediting production," $50,700,000 for "Clothing and equipage," $17,436,910 for the Chemical Warfare Service, and $14,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers.

The major items of the $3,357,372,132 provided for liquidation under this act include $1,201,951,978 for the Air Corps, $1,103,925,950 for the Ordnance Department, $771,896,000 for "Expediting production," $134,382,500 for "Military posts," $66,181,194 for "Signal service, Army," $28,628,047 for "Seacoast defense," and $25,993,50 for the Corps of Engineers. Approximately one-half of this total sum is to liquidate contract authorizations granted for the purchase of deferred critical and essential items authorized by the munitions program of June 30, 1940, as authorized under the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941. The remainder provides in general for the liquidation of contracts granted in other 1941 and prior acts for plants for the production of equipment; for equipment and for construction.

Provision of this $3,357,372,132 leaves $1,650,365,695 of contract authorization previously granted including $183,145,695 granted in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, not yet financed. This sum includes $920,000,000 for the Ordnance Department, $702,283,995 for the Air Corps, $27,106,700 for seacoast defense, and $975,000 for the Medical Department.

12,856 AIRPLANES WITH ACCESSORY EQUIPMENT, $2,790,890,000

This item includes $2,506,868,000 for the Air Corps for the procurement of 12,856 airplanes, $207,937,190 for the procurement

of signal equipment and $76,085,595 for the procurement of ordnance equipment for the 12,856 airplanes.

While the airplanes to be procured include several types the principal items are modern combat airplanes including a large number of heavy bombers, many of the long-range type. Provision is made for the necessary spare engines and spare parts for the airplanes being procured.

The signal equipment includes the necessary radio installations for the airplanes.

The ordnance equipment includes the most modern type of armament for the airplanes being procured.

PAY, MILITARY PERSONNEL, $1,208,000,000

This item provides pay and allowances for an average of 98,968 officers, including 14,305 Regular Army, 7,043 National Guard, and 77,620 Reserve; 935 warrant officers, including 112 of the National Guard; 5,998 nurses, including 4,863 Reserve nurses, 1,420,331 enlisted men, including 6,415 Philippine Scouts, 25,122 flying cadets, 28,608 air mechanics, 27,113 enlisted men, and 16,131 officers, including 15,510 Air Corps officers on flying status, for retired officers and enlisted men, and for various miscellaneous items such as retired nurses and enlisted men and contract surgeons.

Of the total amount, $92,354,097 is to provide the increase in the pay of enlisted men granted by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

SUBSISTENCE, FORAGE, AND CLOTHING, $424,700,000

Approximately $236,000,000 of the total provides rations at a rate of $0.409 per day for the average enlisted strength of 1,420,331, including some provision for stockage.

The Appropriations Committee of the House added $17,167,382 to allow for an increase in the per diem ration cost from $0.409 to $0.4419.

Approximately $4,062,000 provides forage, bedding, etc., for an average strength of 40,934 animals.

Approximately $171,000,000 of the total is to provide the clothing and individual items of equipment required to maintain the Army for fiscal year 1942.

NEW EQUIPMENT, $735,600,000

The principal items include: $277,800,000, including some liquidation of prior fiscal year obligations, for remainining requirements of critical items deferred in the munitions program of June 30, 1940 (Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941); $81,000,000 for critical items and approximately $44,000,000 for essential items for new units to be formed during fiscal year 1942; $22,200,000 for new boats, including several freight and passenger boats and miscellaneous smaller boats for the Atlantic bases; $15,278,000 for 12,773 motor vehicles; $245,000,000 for spare engines and spare parts for the 3,600 bombers authorized in the Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, and for which no prior provision has been made; and $45,000,000 for the procurement of 3,000 barrage balloons.

NEW CONSTRUCTION, $277,300,000

This item (exclusive of $134,382,500 for the payment of prior fiscal year obligations) includes: $11,219,870 for the construction of 25 items other than for the Air Corps noted on page 403 of the hearings before the House committee; $25,651,000 for the construction of 25 items for the Air Corps noted on page 420 of the same document; $3,715,000 for the acquisition including rental of land other than Air Corps noted on page 19 and page 423 of the same document; $1,363,000 for the acquisition including rental of land for the Air Corps noted on page 19 and page 423 of the same document; $50,767,000 for the construction of storage deferred under the munitions program of June 30, 1940 (Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941), and $17,156,000 added by the Appropriations Committee of the House in order to increase by $1 per square foot the cost of the deferred storage program; and the following additional items added by the House Committee on Appropriations (pp. 12–13 of the committee report), $66,308,000 for 12 items other than Air Corps; $19,478,370 for 6 items for the Air Corps; and $2,995,500 for the acquisition of 2 tracts of land. One million dollars added by the War Department subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the acquisition of the Washington-Hoover Airport.

ATLANTIC BASES, $51,000,000

The total estimated cost of the eight bases being established is approximately $200,000,000. Of this sum, $112,825,000 has previously been financed. Fifty-one million dollars is included in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, leaving a balance to be subsequently financed of approximately $40,000,000.

CIVILIANS TO REPLACE SOLDIERS, $43,900,000

This item provides for 30,000 civilian employees at an average wage of $1,510 per annum in order to release enlisted men for military duty. The type of employee for whom provision is made includes: Clerks and stenographers, telephone operators, radio operators and electricians, storekeepers, auditors, statisticians, messengers, engineers and draftsmen, blacksmiths, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, etc. These employees will release enlisted men, including those of the National Guard and trainees for military training, to the equivalent of about three combat divisions.

SEACOAST DEFENSE, $92,000,006

This item, exclusive of $28,600,000 for the payment of prior fiscal-year obligations, provides for the continuation of the program for the manufacture and construction of seacoast batteries and their allied fire-control equipment, for the completion of the installation of antiaircraft material procured with 1941 funds in the Panama Canal Department, for the completion of the underwater defense installations in fortified harbors and for the continuation of the program for the modernization of our seacoast fortifications.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, $67,000,000

This item includes $42,500,000 for the Air Corps for the procurement and development of new aircraft, armament, and power plants for aircraft and accessory equipment; $12,100,000 for the Signal Corps primarily, for the development of communication equipment for the Air Corps and for the Armored Force; and $9,500,000 for the Ordnance for the development of artillery, of fire-control instruments, combat vehicles, and ammunition.

TRAINING, $136,000,000

This item provides for the direct expenses incident to the training of the Army. It includes provision for the operation of all service schools including those of the Infantry, the Cavalry, the Field Artillery, the Coast Artillery, the Engineers, the Armored Force, the Signal Corps and the Air Corps, the Command and General Staff School, the Army War College, and for expenses incident to special field exercises including the Army, corps, and division maneuvers to be held during the fiscal year 1942. A complete statement of these maneuvers appears on page 14 of the hearings of the House.

MAINTENANCE AVIATION PILOT AND TECHNICIAN PROGRAM, $141,249,000

Provision was made by the Congress in the Fifth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, for the facilities to increase the production of pilots for the Air Corps from 12,000 to 30,000 per year and of technicians from 48,000 to 100,000 per year. This item provides for the maintenance of those facilities including the increase of 152,000 in the enlisted strength of the Army authorized to carry the program for the fiscal year 1942.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF PLANT AND EQUIPMENT, $867,500,000

This item provides the operating funds, exclusive of those few items previously mentioned. It includes among its more important provisions gasoline and oil for operating airplanes and motor vehicles, maintenance and repair of buildings and grounds, operation of the transport service, the medical service, including all hospitals, travel of personnel, transportation of supplies, replacement and repair of equipment, and supplies required for operation; and operating civilian personnel.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION, $500,000,000

This item is to carry on plant construction such as plants for the production of small-arms ammunition, smokeless powder plants, shell-loading plants, and other plants necessary in order to carry out the ordnance and chemical-warfare program.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the consideration of this bill the Senate committee has added the sum of $558,212,132 to the bill as it came from the House. The break-down of this item is as follows:

For new construction	$500,000,000
	2,450,000
For Quartermaster Corps	1,000,000
	54,762,132
For correspondence courses	100,000
Making the total sum of the increase	558,212,132

With this statement, I ask for the consideration of the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military activities—Contingencies of the Army", on page 2, line 11, after the word "officers", to insert a comma and "warrant officers and enlisted men."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Expediting production", on page 2, after line 13, to strike out:

For the payment of contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941, $771,896,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to insert:

Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense: To enable the Secretary of War, with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended Revised Statutes, to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national-defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the War Department during the fiscal year 1942, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of War are desirable in expediting production for military purposes and are approved by the

President, $1,271,896,000, of which amount not to exceed $771,896,000 shall be for payments under contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941: *Provided*, That the appropriations and contract authorizations provided under this head in the appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941, and the appropriation provided by this act, are hereby consolidated and shall constitute one fund and one contract authorization, respectively, and remain available until June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That an account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized under the several appropriations herein consolidated and reports thereon shall be submitted to Congress on or before July 1, 1942.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in my opinion, this amendment offends paragraph 4 of Senate Rule XVI.

There has been an unwritten practice—a practice almost unbroken—in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the chairman should make the point of order when legislation is incorporated in an appropriation bill. The able Senator in charge of the pending bill probably has some reason for the insertion of this item. It is an increase of $500,000,000—half a billion dollars—without any explanation of the increase. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee to state the reason for the insertion of this language and the increase of the amount, and whether he does not think it is in violation of the rule of the Senate prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills.

I have great confidence in the chairman of the subcommittee. I do not want to delay the consideration of the measure, but there is imposed upon all of us a duty to invoke a plain rule of the Senate when it is clearly being offended. For that reason I only intimate what might occur later, leaving the matter at this time largely to the able Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as to one point suggested by the Senator from Oregon, the point that this section contains legislation, I have to admit that it does. It changes two provisions of the present civil-service law, and if the point of order shall be made, I shall have to ask unanimous consent to delete those two sections from the proposal carrying the total amount of $500,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. What is the language the Senator suggests may be deleted?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On page 2, line 17, beginning with the word "with", next to the last word in the line, the words "with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes."

I shall only ask unanimous consent to delete those words on the assurance that a point of order is about to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the words are deleted.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator to ask to modify the amendment. He was merely stating to the Senator from Oregon that if the point of order were insisted upon, he would request permission to modify the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I merely stated that unless I had assurance that a point of order would be made, I would not ask that the words in question be omitted.

Mr. McNARY. I thought I made it clear that I did not desire to take away the responsibility of the able Senator in charge of the bill. It is a duty cast upon every Senator, whether he is a Member of the Committee on Appropriations or not, to raise the point of order if it is found that some proposed action would offend the rule of the Senate. Certainly I shall make the point of order if the Senator himself, realizing that it is proper, does not desire to make it. I made the way easy for him. I have no hesitancy in making the point of order. I assume that responsibility. I thought perhaps the Senator would like to clear up the section of his own volition, at his own election. If he does not, I stand on the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment on page 2, beginning with the word "with" in line 3, be amended by deleting the words "with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as to the reasons for the insertion of this section, carrying such a large sum, I may say that heretofore Congress has made available to the War Department a very large sum of money. The War Department had its program fairly well formulated, and intended that the sums appropriated should be used for specific purposes. But in the rapid development and expansion of the program, the Department has seen fit to make alterations and changes, and to transfer some of the funds heretofore appropriated. For example, about $50,000,000 was transferred to the Maritime Commission, a transfer which was not contemplated when the moneys were originally appropriated. Some other funds have been likewise transferred in the discretion of the War Department and the President. So when the War Department found that it did not have sufficient money with which to construct the plants contemplated in the program it had planned, there were only two ways to get the money. Believing it was too late to get the money from the Congress, the responsible officials of the War Department contacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, suggested that they needed money immediately, that it would take a long time to get it from the Congress, and that Congress had passed the appropriation bills it had been asked to pass. So, believing they could not get the money in time to do the work they had in contemplation, negotiations were entered into between the responsible officials of the War Department and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation officials. Under the plan proposed the War Department was to put up 40 percent and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was to put up the other 60 percent, in which event, I am advised, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would furnish the money necessary to complete the construction program.

When this matter was gone into by the committee, it seemed to the committee that if that plan became operative it would make it necessary for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to set up its own architectural and engineering and contracting organization to perfect the plans and carry on the construction work. The plants in question are for the manufacture of weapons, armaments, ammunition, ammonia, powder, for shell loading and bag loading, and so forth.

When the committee ascertained that the plan, which was very complicated, had been partially carried out, it found that the rules and regulations which the Congress imposed upon expenditures would not be followed in regard to the money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The restrictions Congress placed upon money appropriated for the War Department would not apply to the money which came from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the laws applicable to funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would not apply to funds in the War Department construction program. Therefore, it seemed to the committee that if the program should be carried out as planned, we would be placing a very large amount of construction in the hands of an organization practically without any restrictions and limitations as to contracting fees, architectural fees, and other limitations. So the committee, having the bill under consideration, and being able to add the money necessary for the War Department—and the request for this amount comes as a direct recommendation from the War Department—saw fit to add this sum to the bill, so that the War Department may continue its program in regular order, without having to negotiate and do business with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Although it might have been done as well, or perhaps better—and I am not prepared to say as to that—it would be a departure from the program we are now following. This is the regular way in which the work should be done, and being the regular way, the committee has added this amendment to the bill. The War Department asks that we give them this additional fund with which to build the plants which the War Department thinks necessary to perfect our national-defense program.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Does this item have the approval of the Director of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; it does not. The officials of the Department did not have time to secure the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. McNARY. Was it submitted to the Director of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think it was not; but I am not sure.

Mr. McNARY. Was the matter presented to the House committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am somewhat reluctant to go very much into that detail, but I presume, since I am asked the question, I must do so.

Mr. McNARY. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I received my first information with regard to the program of dealing with the R. F. C. from the members of the House Committee on Appropriations. I think I am safe in saying—indeed, I know I am safe in saying, but I am not sure I should say it—that the House committee, after the bill passed the House, called some of the high officials of the War Department, either before the committee or otherwise, and interrogated them and ascertained the plan which was being proposed. After learning of and considering the plan, the members of the House committee did not look with favor upon it, whereupon I was contacted and advised of the plan. So, knowing the facts, when the time came to act upon the bill, we interrogated the officials of the War Department as to its plans, and found that the disclosures to me by the members of the House committee were substantially correct; indeed, so far as I know, they were 100-percent correct. The House committee are not agreeable to the plan being worked out, and the House committee was responsible for calling this matter to my attention. Had it not been for them, so far as I am concerned, unless I had received the information from some other source, the amendment would not be in the bill; but no one else contacted me about the matter.

Mr. President, unless there be some question, I have completed my statement and given my explanation for the amendment being in the bill at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps—Contingent Fund, Chief of Staff", on page 3, line 25, after the figures "$25,000,000", to strike out the comma and "and expenditures from such amount for any specific purpose may be reimbursed with the approval of the Secretary of War, by transfer from any other fund available to the War Department, such reimbursed amounts to be available for the purposes of this appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Travel of the Army", on page 12, line 13, after the word "and", to strike out "dependents," and insert "dependents."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 6, after the word "amount", to strike out "$4,000,000 shall be available immediately" and insert "not to exceed $4,000,000, shall be available for fiscal year 1941 obligations."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to make a correction of the committee amendment on page 13, line 7. I ask unanimous consent that the comma after the figures "$4,000,000" be stricken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 24, after the word "locations", to strike out "in continental United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps", on page 21, line 14, after the figures "$286,309,000", to strike out the comma and "of which amount not exceeding $50,000,000 shall be available immediately."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, after the words "in all", to strike out "$228,751,383" and insert "$231,201,383"; in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,591,454" and insert "$15,041,454."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, in line 12, after the words "in the", to strike out "Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, and of which amount not exceeding $15,250,000 shall be available immediately" and insert "appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think we should not proceed quite so rapidly. I should like to know from the Senator in charge of the bill what was the reason for striking out the words "Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941", and inserting the words "appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941", in the committee amendment now pending before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, answering the question submitted by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say that former supplemental appropriation bills appropriated money and then authorized contracts to be made. Our committee decided to take care in this bill of some of those contract authorizations. The Department contends that a contract authorization requires a very large amount of bookkeeping, and unless there is some good reason for the contract authorization and not the appropriation, the Department believes that the cost incident to keeping books on the contracts is not justified. Inasmuch as this bill carries a very large sum, the contracts have been authorized, and this money is appropriated to take care of such contracts as have been entered into.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was not only complaint from the War Department; there was complaint from the Treasury Department, because, under contract authorizations it is necessary to keep two sets of books, one set of books to make sure that the authorization is not exceeded and then the other to show the actual cash expenditures as the appropriations are made. Complaint came to me first from the Treasury Department that they were not only embarrassed in their accounting in Washington but also in the field, and that it was very much better to appropriate the money if it was certain that the money would be expended during the fiscal year. It would be necessary, then, to have only one accounting. For that reason I brought the matter up before the committee. In two instances particularly, in connection with the Ordnance Bureau and the Quartermaster's Department, this amount of money ought to be appropriated rather than merely to make contract authorizations. That is why the appropriation is recommended, because the money will be expended during the fiscal year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, beginning in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military posts", on page 24, line 23, after the word "thereof", to strike out "without regard to the provisions of sections 355, 1136, and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 255; 31 U. S. C. 529" and insert "without regard to sections 1136 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 31 U. S. C. 529), and the land and interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended"; on page 25, line 10, after the name "Quartermaster General", to strike out "$276,378,424" and insert "$332,140,556"; and in line 12, before the word "shall", to strike out "$79,620,368" and insert "$134,382,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, in line 15, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That engineering and overhead expenses shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of any project: *Provided further*,".

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that amendment. Why did the committee think it necessary to cut out the limitation of 7 percent?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the testimony is that in some cases on the smaller contracts 7 percent is not high enough. On the larger contracts it is not necessary to have a 7-percent limitation. The testimony was that in the case of the larger contracts the fee is around 4 percent, while in the case of some of the smaller ones, the engineering fee and the servicing fee in some instances might, for the public interest, be required to be above 7 percent.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I may be pardoned, I wish to say, in addition to what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, that no one could define the words "and overhead." This "engineering and overhead" amendment was offered on the floor of the House. What is "overhead"? There is a statute which limits the engineering fee alone to 6 percent. The House limited "engineering and overhead" expenses to 7 percent. It would be impractical to administer the provision with respect to "and overhead"; the term is so vague and indefinite that no one would know what it was.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona to give me a citation to the statute which limits the engineering fee to 6 percent?

Mr. HAYDEN. I may have been mistaken. On the cost-plus and fixed-fee contract the limitation is 6 percent. The testimony before our committee was that in no instance had 7 percent been paid.

Mr. McNARY. But there is no statute, as the Senator stated a moment ago, covering contracts similar to the ones proposed in this bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. My own judgment would be that there could be no harm in enacting a 7-percent limitation if the words "and overhead" are deleted. Those words make it vague and indefinite.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not aware of a limitation, and I have asked for the citation of any act of Congress which limits the engineering fee to 6 percent. I think the limitation of 7 percent is a proper one. If there is any question about the definition and understanding of "overhead", I suggest that we delete the word "overhead" and let the remaining language stand.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator from Arizona will permit, I should like to read one paragraph from the testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Gesler, of the office of the Chief of Engineers. He testified as follows:

> But if we assume that "overhead" is all Government costs outside of the contract—which is perhaps what the layman would usually consider "overhead"—the experience in the Corps of Engineers has shown, over a period of years and on the average type of project, that the Government costs alone are a little over 11 percent. In addition to the Government costs, the costs of engineering may be 3 or 4 percent; so that the actual cost to the Government, aside from the contract costs, may be up to 14 or 15 percent.

It is because of a restriction which the Department thought too low and cumbersome, and which in some cases might cause delay in construction, that the committee was asked to strike out the limitation of 7 percent.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not true that in naval construction work there is a limitation? This is an absolute removal of any limitation on these costs covering an appropriation of $10,500,000,000? I think there ought to be something in the measure which would safeguard the public against exorbitant charges and fees. I suggest to the able Senator that if there is any doubt about the meaning of the word "overhead," that the word be eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If that should be done this item would not be in conference. The committee struck this item out so we could obtain more information about the item, and then take it up in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator permit me to read what occurred in the hearings, to show why I made the statement I made a moment ago? The following occurred during the statement of Lieutenant Colonel Gesler:

> Senator HAYDEN. If the word "overhead" were eliminated, and if we simply said, "engineering expenses shall not exceed," what would be the proper percentage?
>
> Colonel GESLER. That language would be entirely sufficient——
>
> Senator ADAMS. Four percent would cover it?
>
> Colonel GESLER. Yes, sir; considering averages only. We have existing law which limits such expenses to 6 percent. In that connection we notice another inconsistency; because existing law limits it to 6 percent, and this language provides for overhead, including engineering, of 7 percent.

I suggest that the limitation be eliminated. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has said, we struck it out with the idea that we would take the matter to conference and agree on what is a proper figure, knowing what we were doing. But if we simply strike out the words "and overhead", 7 percent may be too high, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not see any inclination on the part of the able Senator from Arizona or the able Senator from Oklahoma to limit it, or even decrease the 7 percent. The language says "shall not exceed 7 per centum." It is then left to the officials to determine the correct percentage which should be paid for this service.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee amendment is subject to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as the language says "shall not exceed 7 per centum", I suggest that the Army officials could agree upon a lesser sum in the case of a large contract; but there ought to be some limitation. If we merely omit the words "and overhead", then we shall have something in conference which will assure the Members of the House and of the Senate that the Government will not be mulcted for a huge percentage in these times of emergency. I insist that there ought to be some limitation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Would it be satisfactory to delete the words "and overhead" and allow the other part to stand?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then in conference we might agree on what overhead expenses are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me suggest that perhaps a better plan would be to fix a definite percentage. The amendment which the committee has reported takes the ceiling off altogether. If 7 percent is too low, 10 percent may not be too high. Would the Senator from Oklahoma agree to a modification by which the limitation would be 10 percent, so that the whole matter might be in conference?

Mr. McNARY. I could not agree to that suggestion. I think 7 percent is ample. There is a statute which fixes the percentage at 6 percent. We are adding 1 percent. I should like to have the limitation fixed; otherwise 50 percent might be charged.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the amendment is made as I suggested, by omitting the words "and overhead," then in conference if an agreement can be reached as to a definition of the term "overhead," that definition can be placed in a proviso reading "*Provided*, That the term 'overhead' shall mean," and so forth. If we can agree upon a meaning, it may be that 7 percent is ample. In any event, if my amendment were agreed to, the words "and overhead" would be stricken out, and we should then have a straight limitation of 7 percent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the able Senator, I want the committee amendment rejected, and then an amendment offered deleting the words "and overhead."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon should be agreed to, that the committee amendment be rejected, then may I reoffer the amendment, using the same language and leaving out the two words "and overhead"?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a simpler way to accomplish the same result would be to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "and overhead," so that nothing would be deleted except the words "and overhead."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, the simplest way would be to reject the committee amendment, and then amend by striking out the words "and overhead."

Mr. McNARY. Certainly; the committee amendment would have to be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 25, beginning in line 15, is rejected.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, in line 15, after the word "engineering", to strike out the words "and overhead," so that the provision would read:

> That engineering expenses shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of any project: *Provided further*,

The effect of my amendment is to delete the two words "and overhead."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is that we have now restored the House language, which places a ceiling on the percentage that may be charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], in line 15, after the word "engineering", to strike out "and overhead", so as to read:

> *Provided*, That engineering expenses shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of any project: *Provided further*,

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 24, after the figures "$168,475,083" to strike out "of which amount $2,500,000 shall be available immediately."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 1, after the word "War," to strike out "including such additional sum as the Surgeon General may determine to be necessary for assisting financially

civilian schools on account of student nurses undergoing training therein for duty in Army hospitals, and for assisting such student nurses"; and in line 5, after the word "interns" to strike out "who are graduates of or have successfully completed at least 4 years professional training in reputable schools of medicine or osteopathy."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment apparently changes the law so that the graduates of schools of osteopathy will not be considered for appointment in the Army. I seriously doubt whether that should be done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. There is no present law which permits graduates of osteopathy to be considered for appointment in the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The language in the bill as it passed the House, beginning in line 5 on page 37, apparently provides for the pay of interns "who are graduates of or have successfully completed at least 4 years' professional training in reputable schools of medicine or osteopathy."

That language is proposed to be stricken out. In the report, at the bottom of page 8, I find that the reasons given for the deletion of this language are as follows:

(1) The War Department maintains a high standard for its medical officers. They must be graduates of schools which have the sanction of the committee on medical education and licensure of the American Medical Association.

This is quite obviously an amendment which would put into the hands of a committee of the American Medical Association the power to determine what schools may graduate applicants for appointment as internes in Army hospitals. I doubt whether the committee or the Senate wants to do that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not present when the matter was considered in the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are two propositions. One is to pay sums of money to various civilian schools on account of nurses undergoing training for the Army and Army hospitals. We eliminated that part because the War Department officials stated that there are too many such schools and that they can get all the nurses they need anyway.

The second proposition is for the pay of internes at not to exceed $720 per annum each. An interne is a graduate of a medical school who can be trained in an Army hospital or any other hospital to do the usual year's work of an interne before he enters upon the practice of medicine. But if he enters an Army hospital, he has to contract that if they keep him for a year and his services are satisfactory and he is commissioned, the Army will then have the right to demand that he remain 3 years longer. The Army takes the point of view that, if he were a graduate of a school of osteopathy, it would not utilize his services after the year. It would not want him and it would not make a contract with him. We should simply be wasting $720 on a man whom the Army does not intend to take into the Army because he does not meet the Army qualifications.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is merely saying that, without regard to what may be in the bill, the Army authorities will not accept the graduates of schools of osteopathy.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. They will not take into the service and give commissions as Army surgeons to men who are merely graduates of a school of osteopathy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly what I am pointing out. The amendment which the committee has reported would provide by law that graduates of schools of osteopathy may not receive commissions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we strike from the bill the provision that pay may be given to graduates of reputable schools of medicine or of osteopathy, we fortify the position which the Senator from Arizona says the Medical Corps of the Army has taken against graduates of schools of osteopathy.

I feel that the Senate of the United States should not take such a position. I am merely arguing that the language should be allowed to remain as it is. To do so will not affect the action of the Army or of the War Department with respect to its policy of issuing commissions. I might question the desirability of that policy. The graduates of schools of osteopathy might question that policy and I am sure they do question it. If the law remains as it is, they may be able to persuade the Department that it is not a waste of money to take osteopaths into the Army; and I am ready to testify from experience which has come within my personal view that osteopaths have been able to render assistance in cases in which medical doctors have failed.

My whole objection is that the Senate should not close the door. I see no reason for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, this provision was offered as an amendment on the floor of the House without consideration by the House committee at all, and it does not accomplish what whoever offered it thought it would accomplish—that is, that it would open the door to commissions in the Army for osteopaths as Army surgeons, so that they could go into the Army and stay in it for the rest of their lives without being graduates of any school except a school of osteopathy.

The truth is that all the amendment does is to say that $720 each may be paid for 1 year to graduates of a school of osteopathy; but if that were done the Army would not take such graduates under their present policy, and they would not offer them contracts to enter the service. For that reason the Army officials said that to pay money to osteopaths under such circumstances would be simply a waste of money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I have pointed out to the Senator, my position is simply that we should not by language in an appropriation bill absolutely close the door to the graduates of schools of osteopathy. If I should succeed in persuading the Senate to reject this particular language, that action would not have the effect of changing the policy at all, but it would protect a reputable branch of a professional service in the opportunity to present its case to the War Department.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to express my approbation of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and to join him in his opposition to this committee amendment. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he should also include in the RECORD the first paragraph, on page 9 of the committee report. This paragraph is a continuation of what the Senator from Wyoming already has read. It reads as follows:

None of the schools of osteopathy have applied to this committee for inclusion in the list of standard medical schools. Therefore, all of the schools of osteopathy are now substandard as far as medical education is concerned. Until schools of osteopathy are recognized by the American Medical Association as equal to the standard schools of medicine, their graduates are not acceptable for service in the Army.

So what the committee report is saying is not that schools of osteopathy do not properly train physicians and that the graduates of such schools are not acceptable to the Army, but that the graduates of such schools are not acceptable because they are not acceptable to the American Medical Association. It is virtually a declaration of law—because the amendment must be read in conjunction with the committee report—that we will turn over to the American Medical Association the right to determine what schools of medicine shall be acceptable to the Army of the United States.

If the Senator will further yield, I should like to ask the representative of the committee whether or not the schools of osteopathy or their association were given a notification that this question was to come up and that they would be heard by the committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the fact is that this provision was placed in the bill by a motion made from the floor of the House of Representatives. The only discussion by the House committee was in conjunction with consideration of the bill on the floor of the House. The amendment was not considered by the House committee in committee, because it was not added in the committee. Therefore, when the bill came to the Senate it contained this provision.

My personal viewpoint is that under the present law there is no discrimination between any two groups in favor of one or against the other; but this provision, if it remains in the bill, will open the door to discrimination.

So, Mr. President, because the House had not considered the matter, because the Senate had no time to send out notices inviting consideration of this provision and long hearings upon it, and

because the amendment will do nothing new, we leave the law as it is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, the Senator does something new. He writes into the report two or three paragraphs which undertake to condemn the whole profession of osteopathy and all the schools of osteopathy. Not a single word of testimony was heard to enable the committees of Congress to pass upon that very important question; and it seems to me that in writing this provision into the law we shall be going altogether beyond the jurisdiction of an appropriations committee. If this amendment and the report sustaining it stand, then it is perfectly obvious that osteopathy is completely condemned, and it is condemned without a hearing.

I submit that that is not the proper way of legislating. It may very well be, as the Senator from Oklahoma says, that the language proposed to be stricken out was inserted in the House from the floor of the House without any hearing; but it is also true, as the Senator from Arizona says, that the inclusion of the language would not compel the Army to grant commissions, nor would it compel the Army to change its present policy.

If, as is now indicated, the Army chooses to recruit all its medical officers only from schools which are approved by the American Medical Association, nothing we do in rejecting this amendment will change that policy, as the Senator from Arizona has said; but if we adopt the committee amendment, then the Senate will have taken official action to condemn the schools of osteopathy. I do not believe we have any right to do that, and it is altogether beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wholly concur in the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming. I hope the able chairman of the subcommittee, in charge of the bill, will restore the language of the House bill, because I believe that in its present form the provision would work a great hardship on a very fine professional group.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, since this matter was acted upon by the committee I have had not only interviews but telegrams and letters from practitioners and advocates of other groups of medicine seeking to have inserted in this bill some recognition of their groups and of their value to medical science. The chiropractors want to be considered in connection with Army activities, as do the chiropodists. Our committee did not have time to go into any general hearing of medical science with various groups and hear them discuss their viewpoints perhaps for an indefinite period; and, because we had not time, we simply left the law as it stands, so that in the future some committee may take up this question and decide which of these groups shall be eligible to receive commissions in the United States Army.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. If, as the Senator says, the committee did not have time to go into the consideration of the matter as affecting the various groups referred to, then it seems to me the committee should not have singled out the osteopaths, for that is what the committee amendment does, as it seems to me. Why not give them at least as much consideration as is given all the other groups which the committee could not hear. As I understand, the committee amendment would absolutely prevent osteopaths from being considered at all or given any employment under this amendment. That, I think, violates the law as it stands today on the statute books.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me read what General McAfee said:

> That change is objectionable because it defeats the purposes of the intern system in Army hospitals. The intern system in Army hospitals was inaugurated shortly after the first World War, in order to act as a feeder, a means of securing medical men, doctors, of class A standard, for the Regular Medical Corps. Many of them were not acquainted with the life in the Army or the practice in our hospitals; and by taking them as interns and giving them a year's course, and then surveying them with the idea of tendering them commissions in the Regular service, we were able to stimulate our procurement.
>
> Along in November we select these interns from 4-year medical men; and each intern selected makes a statement that if tendered a commission following his internship in an Army hospital he will accept the same and will serve for at least 3 years.
>
> If the provision were extended to include graduates of a school of osteopathy we could not, under our standards, use such graduates in the Medical Corps; and with such an authorization we would be put in the position of training men whom we could not accept in the Regular Medical Corps or in the Reserve Corps.

It would be a waste of $720 to pay an intern who would not get a commission at the expiration of his year of service.

Mr. NORRIS. But the language the Senator has read proceeds on the theory, it seems to me, that these interns, while they are serving and get $720 a year, do no good to the Government; that they are merely going to school and are not in the Army for the purpose of helping the Army. It is true they are getting experience and all that, but they do something to earn the $720 they get a year, do they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not the purpose of an Army internship; it is to prepare a man for his Army medical career hereafter. It is simply a question whether the Government shall pay them $720 a year for doing that.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Army does not want these interns, if they are, so to speak, merely going to school where they are being educated, why have any interns? What do they do?

Mr. HAYDEN. They study and prepare themselves for commissions in the Regular Army?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but while they are doing that, they are performing such work as interns in hospitals perform; and I think I know something, from my close observation of hospitals, that the interns earn fully the small salary which they get because of the work they do. That does not mean to say that they are any better educated when they get through than they were when they started, but they get the benefit of the experience, as does every doctor from his own practice, whatever it is; but does it follow that he should not charge for his practice while he is getting the experience? It is the same with the lawyer and every other professional man. The more experience he has the more education he gets, but it does not follow that while he is getting that experience he is not performing a service for somebody for which he is entitled to pay.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONE. I have been very curious about one matter that seems rather important. I have seen the announcement that the Army was sadly in need of more physicians and that it needed interns. I was wondering if any provision had been worked out whereby a young graduate of a medical school could work out his internship in the Army because of the need of the Army for that type of work? Suppose a young fellow graduated from medical school that was acceptable, could he work out his internship in the Army and give his services in a fashion which might be very valuable in an emergency?

Mr. HAYDEN. This item appropriates some $60,000,000 for all purposes of the medical department of the Army. The Army can hire as many interns as they need at $720 a year; and that is exactly what they propose to do.

Mr. BONE. As I recollect, I have written the White House about this matter, and it seems to me to be desirable that medical graduates should be able to work out internship in the base hospitals where there would be ample room for their services.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me make a brief statement and then I shall be glad to yield. At the present time there is no law on the subject matter. If this provision in the House bill is permitted to remain in the proposed law, then, there will be law upon the question. This is the first attempt, so far as I know, to go into this matter legally and officially. If the provision is stricken out, then, it remains for the legislative committees of the House and the Senate to take up this matter, consider it, and pass upon it after full and complete hearing.

I may suggest that there is now pending in the other body House bill 4476, introduced by Mr. MAY, a bill providing for sundry matters affecting the military establishment, and on page one of that bill there is a provision relating to this identical question. So, Mr. President, the House committee has considered this subject matter, but, so far as I know, the Senate committee has not given consideration to it; and it was because of the fact that there is no law on the question, because the House provision seeks to make a law, and because the committee did not have time to go into it to satisfy itself as to what should be done that the committee recommended

that it be stricken out so that the proper committees hereafter may go into the matter, pass upon it, and then make recommendations to the Congress for its consideration. That is the theory upon which the committee acted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. O'MAHONEY, addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I did not hear the beginning of this discussion, but, from what I have heard, there seems to be a good deal of confusion, and, apparently, there was no hearing of this matter before the committee. The committee seems to have stricken out this provision because they were not determined in their own mind what ought to be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is well known that the Appropriations Committee is not accustomed to dealing with legislative matters. It is only in unusual cases of emergency and in cases that appeal to some member as being meritorious that the committee feels itself called on to consider matters of legislation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But as the law now is, without this provision in the bill, is there anything that interferes with the Medical Corps acting in connection with their own employees and training their own members?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Only the regulations that have been prescribed by the military authorities, as I understand.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So this is entirely in the hands of the Medical Corps of the Army or the Navy, as the case may be?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. They can hire these men even now if they want to?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. They do not have to hire them if they do not want to; they are in control in medical matters; so why should we now put this prohibition upon them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no prohibition proposed by this bill. We are striking out the language that seeks to give preference or standing to two groups, and to ignore, perhaps, other groups that would be here asking for preferential consideration if they knew that this matter was being discussed and considered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma says the committee had no time to go into this matter. That, of course, is exactly the fact; but, in spite of the fact that the committee had no time to go into the matter, it brings to the floor of the Senate a report which condemns in the most explicit language the whole branch of osteopathy.

As an example of a non sequitur, I should like to call attention again to the language in the report which was read by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. It is on the top of page 9:

> None of the schools of osteopathy have applied to this committee for inclusion in the list of standard medical schools. Therefore—
>
> Because none of these schools applied—
>
> Therefore, all of the schools of osteopathy are now substandard as far as medical education is concerned.

It is perfectly obvious that that conclusion is not supported by the sentence which precedes it. It was not supported by any evidence which was taken by the committee; and, if the committee amendment stands, the Senate is deciding that the schools of osteopathy are substandard, although we have no information upon which to base any such conclusion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As I understand, at the present time, under the law, the Army Medical Board decides upon the fitness of anyone to work in a hospital or to become a member of the Medical Corps.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Minnesota is quite right; and the defeat of the committee amendment will not in the slightest degree affect the power and authority of the Medical Board to commission whom they please.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If we pass this legislation, we take a position superior to the Medical Board of the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then we take the position that even though the Medical Board of the Army should be permitted by the American Medical Association to change its mind, it cannot change its mind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should hate to believe that the Army Medical Board was dictated to by anyone. I have confidence in that Board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator to the first paragraph of this part of the report:

> The War Department maintains a high standard for its medical officers. They must be graduates of schools which have the sanction of the Committee on Medical Education and Licensure of the American Medical Association.

We know perfectly well that the American Medical Association objects to permitting the practice of any other form of medicine except that upon which the American Medical Association desires to put its seal of approval. We also know that all through our economy we are bothered by that sort of restrictive activity. This organization and that organization in business, in commerce, in all the fields with which we deal, want to exclude from the opportunities of participating in any benefits that may be extended by the Government those who do not belong to the particular branch or group that happens to be in power. On this floor, as one of the Senators just a moment ago called to my attention, we have frequently had debates about oleomargarine. The idea is to have a law enacted to exclude other people from an opportunity.

I submit that we have not had sufficient hearing upon this subject, or sufficient evidence, to justify support of the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I take it from what the Senator says that he expects, as the result of the Senate rejecting this amendment, that the osteopaths will win a perfectly empty victory. He never expects one of them to get a commission in the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I base that conclusion upon what the Senator from Arizona says, that the War Department does not want to appoint them; but I do not want, by congressional action, to close the door to the osteopaths, and I do not think there is any need for it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As I understand, the rejection of this amendment would not change the status of the osteopaths.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. It would not, because, if the Senator from Arizona is correct, the Medical Board of the Army will not accept anybody unless the American Medical Association has placed its seal of approval upon the school from which he graduates. That is a condition which I think ought to be changed. We cannot change it in this bill, but I certainly do not want to lock the door to the osteopaths.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to see that the record is made clear, if possible.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] indicated that the committee placed in its report certain language in support of the amendment suggested by the committee. That is correct, but the language placed in the report is the exact language submitted to the committee by the Secretary of War.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That does not give it any added dignity.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the hearings, he will find this identical language in the recommendations submitted by the Secretary of War. The language of his recommendation is identical with the language on page 9 of the committee report. Because we did not have time to go into the subject in the hearings, and because we did not want to raise this question between these groups—and it is now evident what would have occurred had we raised the question—we thought it best to strike out the language, and let the future legislative committees of the House and Senate consider the matter, hold full hearings, as full as they care to hold, and then submit their recommendations to the Senate for consideration later on. For that reason we struck out the provision.

We had not the semblance of an intent to discredit or criticize or condemn any medical group. We are not prepared to do that. If there are Members of the Senate who have knowledge about medicine, they may make statements giving their viewpoints, but it so happened that no member of the subcommittee was a physician. Not having this matter under our jurisdiction, and not

being qualified to pass upon it, we refused to take sides and to do by law anything which is not now done by law.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that in reality what the committee has done is just the reverse of what the Senator said the committee wanted and desired to do. If this amendment is not rejected, and the language remains as the committee has reported it, is it not true that so far as the osteopath is concerned, any opportunity he may have to get into the Army as an intern or as a medical man will be absolutely obliterated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Answering that inquiry, I will say that osteopaths are not now admitted to the Army as interns or otherwise, as I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. Suppose they are not now admitted. At least they are not prohibited by law from getting into the Army. It may be that the officials who make the rules and who admit or exclude them are against osteopaths because they belong to a different school of medicine; but this amendment puts the prohibition into the law, and the officials will not have any right then to admit an osteopath. Even if the Board wanted to do it they could not do it, because it would violate this law.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the committee amendment is agreed to, there will not be a word in the law relative to this subject matter. We leave it exactly where we found it. We put nothing in the statutes in any way, shape, or form regarding osteopaths. They are not approved, they are not condemned, and they are not criticized. The only reason why we wrote the report as we did was to give the reasons of the Secretary of War for asking for the deletion of the language.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me suggest to the Senator that the matter has come up in a rather unfortunate way. While the deletion of the provision might not indicate any disapproval of osteopathy by the Senate of the United States, certainly the report of the committee stating its reason for changing the language of the House constitutes just as strong a condemnation of schools of osteopathy as one could imagine, and almost a bitter condemnation. For that reason, I believe, under all the circumstances that nothing will be lost, and certainly something may be gained, by the rejection of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are two amendments proposed on page 37. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 1, after the word "War", it is proposed to strike out the words "including such additional sum as the Surgeon General may determine to be necessary for assisting financially civilian schools on account of student nurses and undergoing training therein for duty in Army hospitals, and for assisting such student nurses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the second amendment on page 37.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 5, after the word "internes", it is proposed to strike out "who are graduates of or have successfully completed at least 4 years' professional training in reputable schools of medicine or osteopathy."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is the amendment upon which the debate was taking place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not my intention to speak again upon the matter. I merely wish to express the hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 37, line 5.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 40, line 1, after the word "thereof", to strike out "without regard to sections 355, 1136, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255; 10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 267)" and insert "without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 267), and the land, and interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Guard—Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," on page 51, line 24, after the name "United States", to strike out the comma and "or, who, being an officer or enlisted man of the National Guard and 18 years of age or over at the time the organization to which he was attached was ordered into active military service in the Army of the United States in consequence of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, did not enter upon and satisfactorily complete such active military service, except (1) officers or enlisted men who were excused by competent authority for the reason that their civil employment was deemed to be of greater value to the national defense than active military service; and (2) such officers and enlisted men who were unable satisfactorily to complete such active military service because of physical incapacity of a temporary nature growing out of such active military service: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as barring the continuance of adjutants general in a federally recognized status without pay under this act:" and insert: "*Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may surrender said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the period of his service in the National Guard: *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this act."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have the able Senator in charge of the bill tell us why this change is proposed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as to this particular amendment, the committee was advised that the language in the provisions carried in the bill as it passed the House was very cumbersome—I do not believe they said it was unworkable—and the committee was advised that it should attempt to simplify the language, and the simplified language is found in the proposed amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the idea of transporting at Government expense the families of National Guard officers and Reserve officers to cantonments, where the housing conditions are now in many places very bad, did not appeal to the committee. We wanted to give the National Guard officers the same right Regular Army officers have, but not to go further than that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I may suggest also that General Marshall gave his interpretation of the language found in the bill as it passed the House. His interpretation is found on page 10 of the committee report, which I read:

> General Marshall stated that the language is somewhat involved, and its implications will require thorough study and experience under decisions of the Comptroller General. It is his judgment that the language as written will not accomplish the purpose desired, but must be supplemented by administrative regulations. The Secretary of War has broad powers under existing legislation to remedy the situation. Because the matter is one requiring considerable study and because the difficulties in disbursement are practically insuperable, it is recommended that the language be stricken from the bill.

That was about the extent of the hearing on this particular language.

Mr. McNARY. The language will go to conference, so that the conferees can work out something.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves", on page 55, line 2, after the word "for", to insert "conducting correspondence or extension courses for instruction of members of the Reserve Corps, including necessary supplies, procurement of maps and textbooks, and transportation and traveling expenses of employees"; and in line 22, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,667,000" and insert "$1,767,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 6, after the words "Organized Reserves", to strike out "(1)"; and in line 8, after the name "United States", to strike out the comma and "(2) who, pursuant to orders, did not enter upon and satisfactorily complete active military service in the Army of the United States in consequence of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, except (a) such officers who were excused by competent authority for the reason that their civil employment was deemed to be of greater value to the national defense than active military service, and (b) such officers who were unable satisfactorily to complete such active military service because of physical incapacity of a temporary nature growing out of such active military service, and (3) who, not having been ordered to active military service in consequence of the aforementioned public resolution, does not within 90 days of the approval of this act reestablish his eligibility for active military service from a professional, physical, and freedom of dependency standpoint", and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the Reserve Corps who may surrender said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the period of his active duty in the Reserve Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 6, before the word "pay", to strike out "that the" and insert "the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department — Salaries, War Department", on page 63, line 10, after the word "Assistant", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Secretaries", and in line 18, after the word "persons", to insert "(at not to exceed $50 per day)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 14, after the word "available", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the War Department or the Military Establishment for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, or of funds allotted to the War Department, shall be available after June 5, 1941, for any additional positions in the District of Columbia or elsewhere at rates of compensation in excess of $5,000 per annum, either on a per diem or per annum basis, except in pursuance of specific authorization herein or hereafter granted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 8. Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, the Secretary of War should deem it to be advantageous to the national defense, and if in his opinion the existing facilities of the War Department are inadequate, he is hereby authorized to employ, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and at such rates of compensation as he may determine, architectural, engineering, technical, or professional corporations, firms, or individuals for the production of plans and specifications required for any War Department project, and for the supervision of its accomplishment.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 8. Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, the Secretary of War should deem it to be advantageous to the national defense, and if in his opinion the existing facilities of the War Department are inadequate, he is hereby authorized to employ, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and at such rates of compensation (not to exceed $50 per day for individuals) as he may determine, the services of architects, engineers, or firms or corporations thereof, and other technical and professional personnel as may be necessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment on page 73?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The reason for this change was given in the testimony of General Somervell, who is at the head of the construction division of the Army improvement program.

While it is true that the War Department has a great number of the highest class engineers and consultants, yet the expanded program makes it necessary to have even more such persons in the program than can be found in the War Department. General Somervell, in conducting his work, finds it necessary to call in the highest type of specialists, and he says he cannot get the class of service he desires under the language of the bill as passed by the House. In order to make the language sufficiently flexible to take care of the expansion program under General Somervell, he recommends that the House language be stricken and that new language be inserted to accomplish the purpose he has in view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 73.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 24, to strike out:

SEC. 11. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Act No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Defense Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 12. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation who shall, for as long as 10 days, fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 18, to change the section number from 13 to 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 23, to change the section number from 14 to 12, and on page 76, line 1, before the word "except", to insert "in continental United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 13, to change the section number from 15 to 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

That completes the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will renumber the sections to correspond to the amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, while we think the bill can be sent to conference, the differences composed, and the bill reach the President in ample time to be signed before the first of the fiscal year, for fear something might happen I desire to suggest an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 13. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, and for purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may rearrange the sections, if it is found necessary, to make the bill harmonious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4965) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5049, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in general explanation of the bill. The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee carries the largest appropriation for the District of Columbia government in the history of the District. The total appropriations for all purposes aggregate $54,783,086. The bill exceeds the appropriation for 1941 by $4,325,451. Notwithstanding this increased appropriation over the appropriation in the bill enacted for the present fiscal year, I am happy to make the observation that there will still remain unexpended to the credit of the District of Columbia a reserve for supplemental deficiencies that may arise during the coming fiscal year, of $500,000, and that there also will remain an unobligated balance estimated at $65,237.

Mr. President, this bill came from the House to the Senate on June 19. After it reached the Senate it was necessary for the members of the subcommittee handling the bill to obtain a report from the Commissioners showing what amendments they desired to the bill, and justifications for those amendments, and after the committee had received the report of the Commissioners it was necessary to hold hearings. It is customary for the hearings to be conducted for a period of some 3 weeks, because the subcommittee undertakes to give an opportunity to be heard to the representatives of different civic organizations in the District of Columbia, and citizens generally, in addition to the Commissioners and the heads of the different departments of the city government. The reason is, of course, that the District of Columbia has no representation in the Congress, and the Congress is vested with exclusive legislative authority over the District of Columbia. We regret therefore that we did not, under the circumstances, have the opportunity to give as full a consideration to the bill as we usually give. I do not make that statement in criticism of any action on the part of the House, because I am quite sure that the House would have sent the bill over sooner had it had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that the outlays out of the general fund for capital improvements in the District aggregate $7,145,725, as against capital outlays from the general fund for the fiscal year 1941 of $5,274,000. There is, therefore, an increase in round figures of approximately $2,000,000 for general fund capital outlays. It has been the effort of the subcommittee to undertake to increase appropriations for capital outlays in the District of Columbia. At one time, a number of years back, the capital outlays annually were around the $10,000,000 mark. They have gradually decreased, and the last few years they have shrunk to approximately $5,000,000 per annum. There are many capital improvements needed in the District of Columbia, and if we have not made more adequate provision for such expenditures it is because the District did not have the funds on hand with which to do so.

There is another circumstance to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate, and that is that after the bill reached the Senate the Commissioners of the District of Columbia were advised by the Work Projects Administration that the quota for the District of Columbia would be reduced by almost 50 percent. It therefore became necessary for this bill to provide additional appropriations for public assistance, for dependent children, and for old-age assistance. It also became necessary that added personnel be given to such institutions as Gallinger Hospital, and to the Home for the Aged and Infirm, and that added appropriations be made for such construction work as sewers, because the District of Columbia, during the present fiscal year and several years prior thereto, has been dependent to a substantial extent upon W. P. A. labor for work in those eleemosynary institutions and for various kinds of construction projects. Therefore, we have to make provision for additional personnel to take the place of diminished W. P. A. labor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "General Expenses—Executive Office", on page 2, line 10, after the word "services", to strike out "$87,020" and to insert "$95,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the word "including" to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$7,000."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in explanation of that amendment. The House bill carries an appropriation of $3,500 for budgetary assistance to be rendered to the subcommittee of the House in checking up on appropriations and in aiding the subcommittee in the preparation of the appropriation bill. Without any suggestion upon my part as chairman of the subcommittee, the subcommittee and the full committee of the Senate have approved the addition of $3,500, which would authorize, presumably, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill to employ additional help in the way of clerical or expert service in the preparation of the annual appropriation bill. This item is carried as a charge against the District of Columbia instead of a charge against the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Inspections", on page 3, line 24, after the word "services", to strike out "$254,660" and insert "$256,960."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of poundmaster", on page 4, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$12,420" and insert "$13,620."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public convenience stations", on page 4, line 21, after the word "employees", to strike out "$14,000" and insert "$16,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 21, to insert:

For the construction of three new public convenience stations, including not to exceed $2,500 for the purchase of necessary additional land, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Care of the District Buildings", on page 5, line 4, after the word "hour", to strike out "$247,284" and insert "$254,004."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Auditor's Office", on page 5, line 24, after the word "services", to strike out "$124,880" and insert "$130,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Corporation Counsel", on page 6, line 6, after the word "services", to strike out "$115,225" and insert "$127,225."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Municipal Architect's Office", on page 8, line 10, after the word "appropriations", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That employment of personal services from this fund may be made during the fiscal year 1942 without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Utilities Commission", line 18, to increase the appropriation for two commissioners, and for other personal services, from $69,920 to $73,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, at the end of line 7, to increase the appropriation for personal services, Department of Insurance, from $24,200 to $30,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveyor's Office", on page 9, line 9, after the word "including", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$12,700"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out the article "a" and insert "two"; and in the same line, after the word "field", to strike out "party, $85,820" and insert "parties, $93,520."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses", on page 12, line 8, after the word "including", to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,000", and on page 13, line

7, after the word "offices", to strike out "$39,700" and insert "$40,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Central Garage", on page 15, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$55,280" and insert "$55,520"; in line 12, after the word "and", to strike out "one field wagon" and insert "two field wagons"; in line 13, after the word "office", to strike out "$850" and insert "$1,700", and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$65,530" and insert "$66,620."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Free Public Library", on page 18, line 11, after the word "librarian", to strike out "$444,000" and insert "$445,480."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 25, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 18, after the word "library", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sewers", on page 20, line 3, before the word "including", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection and Disposal of Refuse", on page 22, line 4, after the word "streets", to strike out "purchase and exchange" and insert "purchase of and purchase including exchange"; and in line 7, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$494,800" and insert "$508,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 14, after the words "for the", to strike out "purchase and exchange" and insert "purchase of and purchase including exchange"; and in line 16, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$988,000" and insert "$1,017,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 21, after the word "For", to strike out "beginning the"; in line 24, after the word "refuse", to strike out "$150,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the completion of such incinerator at a cost not to exceed $300,000" and insert "$300,000"; on page 23, line 2, before the word "of", to strike out "$6,300" and insert "$9,000", and in line 6, after the word "incinerator", to insert a comma and "including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Electrical Department", on page 23, line 25, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$73,600" and insert "$86,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$789,900" and insert "$794,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Schools", on page 25, line 10, to increase the appropriation for personal services of clerks and other employees in the public schools, from $200,000 to $201,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 24, after the word "west", to strike out "$7,397,105" and insert "$7,409,105", and on page 26, line 5, after the word "examination", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to appoint three additional teachers, class 2–A, for instruction in automobile driving at a beginning salary of $2,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Night Schools", on page 27, line 3, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Community Center Department", on page 28, line 13, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$280,320" and insert "$282,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 29, line 12, after the word "therewith", to insert "purchase of two automobiles with dual-control equipment for use in driver-training courses at not to exceed $675 each", and in line 17, after the word "courses", to strike out "$70,675" and insert "$72,025."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 19, after the word "power", to increase the appropriation for fuel, gas, and electric light and power in the public schools, from $315,000 to $323,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$204,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$3,600" and insert "$4,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000"; in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$10,125"; in line 15, before the word "School", to strike out "Van Ness" and insert "Blow"; and in line 21, after the name "Francis Junior High School", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$510,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The deaf, dumb, and blind," on page 35, after line 7, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings and grounds", on page 35, line 23, after the word "building", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$152,500" and in line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "$230,000" and insert "$247,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "$969,000" and insert "$1,090,125."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 11, after the word "Northeast", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000"; in line 13, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$1,030,000" and insert "$1,158,750"; and in line 17, after the word "building", to insert a comma and "including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$562,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 10, after the word "Building", to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, at the end of line 12, to increase the appropriation for the completion of six unfinished classrooms at the Woodrow Wilson High School, from $30,000 to $33,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 17, after the word "building", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$130,625"; and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$245,000" and insert "$275,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 2, after the word "building", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$130,625"; and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$245,000" and insert "$275,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 8, to insert:

For beginning the construction of a new elementary-school building in the vicinity of Eleventh and G Streets SE., to replace the Cranch, Tyler, and Van Ness Schools, $200,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the construction of such building at a total cost not to exceed $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 14, to strike out:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new extensible elementary-school building to be located on a site to be acquired in the vicinity of Hillside Road and Alabama Avenue SE., $3,990, which amount may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account "Municipal Architect's Office, construction services," and be available for such purposes.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For a new extensible eight-room elementary-school building, four rooms to be left unfinished, to be located on a site to be acquired in the vicinity of Hillside Road and Alabama Avenue SE., $167,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 16, after the words "In all", to strike out "$1,485,417" and insert "$2,133,427."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 17, to insert:

For the purchase of a site for elementary-school purposes in the vicinity of New Jersey Avenue and P Street NW., for the replacement of the Morse and Twining Schools.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 21, after the words "In all", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$280,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Metropolitan Police—Salaries", on page 42, line 23, after the word "sergeant", to strike out "$3,046,888" and insert "$3,123,728, including the employment of not to exceed four detectives in the salary grade of captain to be appointed by the Board of Commissioners after a special examination conducted by the Civil Service Commission in criminal law, practical police work, and crime detection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 3, after the word "services", to strike out "$164,860" and insert "$167,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 44, line 9, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$94,720" and insert "$103,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two" and insert "four", and in line 20, after the word "each", to strike out "$76,885" and insert "$78,965."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 2, after the word "another", to strike out "$52,475" and insert "$55,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire Department—Salaries", on page 45, line 24, to strike out "$2,167,000" and insert "$2,203,940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 46, line 9, after the word "another", to strike out "$21,625" and insert "$22,975."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 1, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$61,700" and insert "$79,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 2, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new fire-engine house to be constructed at a total cost of not to exceed $100,000 on a site already owned by the District of Columbia located in the vicinity of North Capitol and Crittenden Streets Northwest, $2,000, which amount may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account "Municipal Architect's Office, construction services" and be available for such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Health Department", on page 47, line 16, after the word "motortruck", to strike out "87,300" and insert "$88,740."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 22, after the word "travel", to strike out "$127,341" and insert "$129,691."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 3, to strike out:

For the purchase of a site and the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building at a total cost of not to exceed $210,000 for a health center in northwest Washington, $20,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For the purchase of a site for a health center in northwest Washington, $14,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 9, to insert:

For beginning the construction of a building for a health center in northwest Washing, $120,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such building at a total cost not to exceed $250,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,250 of the amount herein appropriated may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account, "Municipal Architect's Office, construction services," and be available for the preparation of plans and specifications for said building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 23, after the name "Commissioners", to strike out "$432,420" and insert "$437,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 13, after the word "labor", to strike out "$802,720" and insert "$878,020."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 8, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 20, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$70,000" and insert "$78,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 20, to insert:

For beginning the construction of quarters for internes and physicians, $100,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such construction at a total cost not to exceed $192,375: *Provided*, That not to exceed $4,040 of the amount herein appropriated may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account, "Municipal Architect's Office, construction services," and be available for the preparation of plans and specifications for such construction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Courts—Juvenile Court", on page 53, line 3, after the word "services", to strike out "$101,630" and insert "$103,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Police court", on page 53, line 20, after the word "services", to strike out "$105,520" and insert "$107,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Welfare—Board of Public Welfare", on page 55, line 4, after the words "per annum", to insert "to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements,"; and at the end of line 8, to strike out "$162,460" and insert "$166,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Child Welfare", on page 55, line 24, after the word "District", to insert "including, after September 15, 1941, white girls committed to the National Training School for Girls,", and in line 7, after the word "Board", to strike out "$316,000" and insert "$320,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 7, after the word "children", to strike out "$108,800" and insert "$121,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Jail", on page 57, line 20, after the word "services", to strike out "$118,940" and insert "$108,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 4, after the word "electrocutions", to strike out "$77,500" and insert "$83,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 5, after the word "jail", to increase the appropriation for construction of a wall to surround the jail, from $27,000 to $30,375.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Training School for Girls", on page 62, line 6, after the word "girls", to strike out "$50,550", and insert "$41,920"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$27,740", and insert "$23,060", and in line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "*Provided*, That the total cost of maintaining inmates in said school, including all administrative expenses, shall not exceed an average per capita of $575 per annum" and insert "*Provided*, That on and after September 15, 1941, the National Training School for Girls located on Conduit Road in the District of Columbia shall be used exclusively for colored inmates."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "District of Columbia Training School", on page 63, line 16, after the word "one", to strike out "American 41210".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial Home School", on page 63, line 22, after the word "services", to strike out "$37,690" and insert "$40,290"; and in line 23, after the words "in all", to strike out "$38,690" and insert "$41,290."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm", on page 64, after line 19, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for the replacement of dormitory and infirmary buildings at the Home for Aged and Infirm, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Assistance", on page 65, line 10, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 13, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$163,000" and insert "$213,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 26, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$605,000" and insert "$630,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 5, after "(49 Stat. 744)", to strike out "$42,500" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Militia", on page 72, line 9, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$600" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Parks—Salaries, public parks, District of Columbia", on page 73, line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "$358,010" and insert "$360,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, public parks", on page 74, line 4, after the word "parks", to insert "including the President's Cup Regatta"; and in line 19, after the words "and so forth", to strike out "$365,322" and to insert "$375,962."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fees—Department of Vehicles and Traffic," on page 78, line 7, after the word "when", to strike out "such work is undertaken in connection with roadway paving, repaving, or resurfacing, and plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further,* That the street railway company shall pay the cost of maintenance, marking, and lighting after construction" and insert in lieu "plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further,* That the street-railway company shall after construction maintain and mark the same at its expense."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Police traffic control", on page 79, line 4, before the word "which", to strike out "$537,686" and insert "$551,246."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Street improvements", on page 85, line 9, after the word "Company", to insert "except that the entire cost of paving the track area, including the cost of laying the base, shall be borne by the District of Columbia, the cost of laying the base within the track area to be computed on the basis of the cost of laying the base for the adjoining paving."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for grading, paving, etc., streets, avenues, and roads, on page 86, line 4, after the word "services", to insert "by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for construction of and changes in drainage structures, etc., on page 87, line 15, after the word "system", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for grading, paving, surfacing, etc., unpaved or inadequately surfaced streets, etc., on page 88, line 7, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for beginning construction of a grade separation structure at Fourteenth Street and Maine Avenue and Fourteenth Street and East Potomac Park Drive, on page 90, line 17, after the words "(47 Stat. 161)," to insert:

Provided further, That the Commissioners are authorized to employ necessary engineering and other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements;

For all necessary expenses for studies, preparation of plans and specifications, surveys, and estimates, and for the investigation of foundation conditions, and the acquisition of the necessary land for approach roadways and rights-of-way, by either purchase or condemnation, for a vehicular crossing of the Anacostia River between the general vicinity of South Capitol and P Streets and the proposed Anacostia Parkway at the northern end of the naval air station ground (old Bolling Field), with connections to Firth Sterling Avenue and other District thoroughfares east of the Anacostia River, including the employment of engineering or other professional services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 8, after the words "in all", to strike out "$4,605,000" and insert "$4,805,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, after line 19, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations contained in this act shall be used for the operation of a testing laboratory of the highways department for making tests of materials in connection with any activity of the District government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for contingent expenses, trees and parkings, on page 94, line 6, after the word "items", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water service—Washington Aqueduct," in the item for continuing the development of a plan to insure an adequate future water supply for the District of Columbia, on page 96, line 25, after the word "otherwise", to insert "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for the construction of a covered reservoir of approximately 20,000,000-gallon capacity on United States Government-owned land adjacent to the present filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan Filter Plant, on page 97, line 18, after the words "Secretary of War", to insert "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was unable to be present at the meeting of the committee, and therefore I do not know the reason for inserting the provision on page 97, reading as follows:

Without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements, $400,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is in order that the Commissioners may be in a position to employ certain technical experts in the construction of this project. The provision is one which usually appears in a number of places in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, in cases in which it is necessary to employ experts without regard to the Classification Act and also in cases in which temporary labor is employed at compensation less than that called for by the Classification Act.

There were similar provisions in the bill as reported to the House; and for the first time in the history of District of Columbia appropriation bills, so I am informed, some one raised the point of order against them, and the point of order was sustained. So, it becomes necessary for us to reinsert these provisions in the Senate bill. It is the usual and customary provision in District of Columbia appropriation bills; it runs through a number of other appropriation bills enacted by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 97, line 18, which has just been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Water Department", in the item for the maintenance of the Water Department distribution system, on page 98, line 13, after the word "vehicles", to insert "and the purchase of two additional motor vehicles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for the extension of the Water Department distribution system, on page 99, line 1, after the word "system", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$475,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the committee, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, line 25, after the word *"Provided"*, it is proposed to insert:

That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation, together with $25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, may be used during the fiscal year 1942 as a revolving fund for the purchase of food stamps from the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the food-stamp plan of that Department for the distribution of surplus commodities, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, said revolving fund to be reimbursed from time to time from the proceeds of sale of such stamps: *Provided further.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the authority of the committee, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

: *Provided,* That the commanding general is hereby authorized to receive, also, the compensation to which he may be otherwise entitled as State Director of Selective Service for the District of Columbia under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. At the request of the committee, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 78, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That fees from parking meters shall be deposited to the credit of the highway fund of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. At the request of the committee, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

Hereafter when any Capital Transit Co. street-railway operation shall have been ordered abandoned by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have ordered the removal of abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of removing such abandoned tracks and regarding the track area, and, if the street or bridge in which the said tracks have been ordered abandoned is not being paved, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of paving the abandoned track areas, which cost, however, shall not exceed the cost of repaving such abandoned track areas with the type, character, and thickness of the paving of the adjacent roadway left in place, and, if the roadway of the street or bridge is being paved at the time of removal of said abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay one-half of the actual cost of paving the abandoned track areas, irrespective of whether the paving is of the type, character, and thickness as that existing at the time of said removal. The Commissioners of the District are authorized to settle in conformity with the principles herein set forth, any claims it now has, or in the future may have, for the paving of abandoned track areas, upon such terms and conditions as to time of payment or payments as the Commissioners may determine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the request of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 107, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 11. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to extend for not to exceed 60 days the time for payment of any installment of taxes on real property, and tangible personal property, and other taxes, payable in September 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. At the suggestion of the committee, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 107, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 12. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at the request of a colleague who happens to be absent, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$459,782" and insert "$462,382."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the item provides for an increase of $2,600 to provide for a dentist at the clinic in the District Building. It appears that the man who now is doing the work is only a part-time employee. The work has tremendously increased, and I understand that it is necessary to have a full-time man. The amendment provides only for $2,600 for his salary.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator from New Mexico if the amendment has been requested by the District officials.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that they did not request it at the time their requests were submitted to the Budget Bureau, but that they are favorable to the item. They neglected to request it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the clerks be authorized to make the necessary changes in section numbers, and that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5049) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to resolution of the House, the Speaker had appointed Mr. SUMNERS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. DIES, Mr. KLEBERG, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. WEST, Mr. MAHON, Mr. PATTON, Mr. SOUTH, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POAGE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. WORLEY members of a committee to join with such Members of the Senate as may be appointed, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota

were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. LAMBERTSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1246. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States;

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; and

H. R. 4545. An act to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

STABILIZATION FUND AND ALTERATION OF WEIGHT OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4646.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	George	Nye
Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Barbour	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bone	Hatch	Rosier
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Herring	Schwartz
Brown	Hughes	Shipstead
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrnes	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McNary	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Norris	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency without amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, this bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a substantial majority after extended hearings and very considerable debate. It was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and by that committee has been reported favorably.

As I understand, there is no objection whatsoever to the first section of the bill, which deals with the stabilization fund. There is a division of judgment as to the second section of the bill, which deals with the devaluation of the dollar.

The original act of devaluation has been extended now three times, twice for 2 years and once for 1 year, by the President under the law. This measure involves the proposed fourth extension for 2 years.

I venture to remind the Senate that on the original proposition, which has not been altered, I spoke very bitterly against it as being immoral and unnecessary, and I voted against the extension of the authority repeatedly; but the situation now is different from any which has heretofore confronted us.

The President of the United States, who ought to be, and, I assume, is, intimately familiar with the requirements of the time, and in contact with foreign relations, on the 28th day of April addressed a letter to the Vice President, in which he urged the extension of the power for 2 years, and the Secretary of the Treasury and his major assistants appeared before the committee and advocated the same procedure.

I think the power should be now extended, although I was opposed to the original devaluation, which I did not think was called for by any emergency. But the Secretary of the Treasury told us that if there was an emergency in the first instance, there is a 10 times greater emergency now; and, having confidence in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the President, I shall advocate the extension. I shall not talk a great deal about it, however, because it is not a new question. It has been discussed over and over again; and I propose to let the minority, the opponents of the bill, do the talking.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. The second sentence added to paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, by section 12 of said Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The powers of the President specified in this paragraph shall be deemed to be separate, distinct, and continuing powers, and may be exercised by him, from time to time, severally or together, whenever and as the expressed objects of this section in his judgment may require; except that such powers shall expire June 30, 1943, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the provision of the bill which the amendment I have offered seeks to strike out is the portion extending the power of the President to devalue the dollar.

I followed the very able and distinguished leader of the Committee on Banking and Currency in voting against previous extensions of this power, and I was convinced that he was thoroughly right then. I felt, as he said, that it was both immoral and unnecessary to do what was then proposed. I have been unable to see anything in the situation to justify a reversal of that position.

Mr. President, the devaluation resolves itself into rather simple terms. It is a question as to whether or not the Congress shall delegate certain authority vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The question for the Congress to decide is whether it wishes to delegate certain power. The fact that some other agency would like to have the power is beside the point.

I have no fault to find with the President. He has a perfect right to come to Congress and ask for the extension of the power. Congress has an equal right to decline to grant the extension.

What is involved in this bill is that we delegate the power to reduce the amount of gold in our gold dollars 15 percent. The term "devaluation" is very accurate. That is, it means an increase of 15 percent in the dollar value of our gold. No citizen of the United States has any gold. Congress has made it unlawful for a citizen of the United States to hold or own gold. The only place where there is an increase even in dollar value by devaluation is in the holder of gold, and in this country the United States is the only holder of gold. So the United States Government alone can profit by devaluation in this country; but every holder of gold in other countries will profit, whether he be an individual or a government.

The United States has some $22,600,000,000 of gold. If devaluation should be brought about—and, of course, it is useless to consider the grant of a power unless we consider what the effect of the power will be when exercised—the United States Government, upon the exercise of this power, would have a mark-up in dollar value of the gold in its various vaults of some $4,000,000,000. That is the benefit the Government would derive; but the dollars which the Government then would have would be 85-cent dollars as compared with the 100-cent dollars which it now has. There would be no increase in the actual wealth of the United States; but the 85-cent dollars which the Government would create in place of the 100-cent dollars would be legal tender, and could be used to pay debts.

The first section of the bill provides for the extension of the stabilization fund. The stabilization fund contains some $2,000,000,000. The purpose of the stabilization fund is to maintain in the markets of the world the exchange value of the dollar. The purpose is to maintain the dollar against any attack of any kind. It is a very wise, a very proper thing—perhaps unnecessary, but wise—that we should maintain the American dollar as the one standard of value not only in the United States but throughout the world. The stabilization fund puts behind the dollar this tremendous fiscal power to maintain the dollar should it be attacked, which is unlikely; but devaluation is utterly and completely inconsistent with the purpose of the stabilization fund. The stabilization fund is to maintain the dollar. Devaluation is to unstabilize the dollar.

There is in this bill one provision intending that we shall insist upon our dollar being worth 100 cents throughout the world, and then a second provision that the administration itself may strike down the very purpose of the stabilization fund and reduce the value of our dollar.

So far as I know from my reading of fiscal history, no nation has ever devalued its currency unless it was in desperate circumstances and was unable to maintain its currency. Devaluation is the act of a country in distress, and desperately in distress. This country is not in distress. Our dollar is at par throughout the world. It is practically the only currency—so far as I know, the only currency—to which the world can tie today. We have no occasion, we have no excuse in the wide world, to devalue our dollar as a matter of necessity.

It is said that we should devalue our dollar. Why? To stimulate foreign trade. Of course, any merchant can increase his trade by selling his goods for less than they are worth. When we reduce the selling price of American goods 15 percent, of course, there will be more purchasers; and that is all this measure means. If we cut the price of our dollar 15 cents we make available to the foreign purchaser American goods at 15 percent less than their normal and their fair value, and we make it the more difficult for the American to buy abroad. We make it easier for the foreigner to buy American goods; but he will buy them with 85-cent dollars, and that is what we shall get for our goods.

There has been much discussion as to why we have had a flood of gold into this country. A large part of the gold came in because of the former devaluation, which enabled the foreigner to buy American securities and American goods with devalued dollars. The foreigners sent in gold, and they took our securities and our goods at less than they were worth. Of course those things gradually level off; but foreign exchange instantly responds to shifts in the valuation of currencies. There is a monetary inertia within a country to adjust to changes in value. But gold, to the extent of billions upon billions of dollars, has been coming into the United States, gold with a value abroad of practically 85 cents, the 85 cents buying a dollar's worth of American securities and American goods. Of course we can sell. If we want to devalue more than that, we can sell still more.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the proposal is most unwise. What is it that is proposed? We owe over $50,000,000,000. The bonds which we have outstanding were purchased largely by American citizens, and institutions owned by American citizens, and for every dollar of the outstanding bonds a hundred-cent dollar was given the Government. What is proposed here? It is proposed that we pay 85 cents on the dollar to those who have bought our bonds at 100 cents on the dollar. It is proposed that, by our legal powers, we simply make the holders of our bonds take 85 cents for the dollar which they paid.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. I have heard that argument made many times in former debates, and I have heard it in the hearings in the subcommittee. The Senator realizes that at least since 1934 the power to devalue 15 percent, as the Senator puts it—I think it is 9 percent on the original basis——

Mr. ADAMS. We are dealing with an existing dollar, and the devaluation is 15 percent of the existing dollar.

Mr. BROWN. That is what I am talking about—devaluation. If further devaluation should be undertaken in the future, it would probably be in an attempt to readjust prices upward. That was one of the original purposes of devaluation, to attempt to some extent to raise low prices. At least all of the bonds which have been bought since 1934 have been bought with knowledge on the part of every bond purchaser that there existed in the President the power to devalue to the extent of 15 percent. We are not changing the present law at all. We are extending it for 2 years. So I do not think any bondholder would have the right to complain about that situation, because if the conditions which are provided in the statute are existent the power to devalue exists now, and it has existed for the past 7 years. Therefore, I do not quite understand the argument which the Senator is now making, to the effect that a bondholder has a right to complain about the situation when he knew all the time that the power to devalue existed in the President of the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the power to devalue rests in the Congress, under the Constitution, and it has always been in the Congress. It is in the Congress today. If Congress sees fit to disregard all its moral obligations it can devalue the currency 15 percent, 50 percent, or 75 percent. So that the bond purchaser who buys naturally knows that the power rests in Congress. He knows it was put there by the Constitution. He also knew that the power given to the Executive was given with a limit in time.

If the pending bill shall not be enacted, or if the pending amendment shall be sustained, then the power to devalue will exist, but it will require the joint action of the Congress and the President, in the ordinary legislative way. The question of the existence of the power is not involved. It is the exercise of the power, whether Congress shall turn over to a single individual this power, with its tremendous implications.

I question whether the framers of the Constitution ever thought, when they put into the Constitution the provision that Congress shall have the power to coin money and fix the value thereof, that the Congress would at some time manipulate values as it might see fit.

We have the problem; we have the bondholder. I think that in the year 1934, which the Senator from Michigan has mentioned, there were outstanding some $20,000,000,000 of bonds. We have increased that amount by at least $30,000,000,000. And that is not all. If one goes into the post office today, he will find on the wall a printed solicitation to buy defense bonds. If we listen to the radio, we are urged to buy defense bonds in order to protect our country in its time of need. Citizens are expected to put up 100-cent dollars. But here it is proposed that we pay back with 85-cent dollars the people who are urged to put up their 100-cent dollars out of their savings for patriotic reasons. It does not seem to me right for the Congress and the administration one day to urge citizens to lend the Government hundred-cent dollars and at the same time say we are going to pay them back in 85-cent dollars next week.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Very gladly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to know on what basis the Senator says they are to get back an 85-cent dollar.

Mr. ADAMS. That is the maximum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is only in terms of the one commodity, that is, it is worth 85 cents in gold.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In 1933 we had a hundred-cent dollar, and the gold content of the dollar was 25 and eight-tenths grains. So at that time 25.8 grains of gold was a dollar of a hundred cents. We cut that dollar approximately 40 percent, and reduced the weight to 15 5/21 grains of gold. But still we did not reduce the value of the dollar. We still had a hundred-cent dollar, except as to one commodity, namely, gold.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I do not agree about that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I doubt whether the people of the country are very much interested in just how much gold they can buy with their dollars. They can buy everything else today with a dollar, and get for that dollar 114.6 cents worth of commodities with a dollar such as that the Senator has in his pocket. They cannot get as much gold, but they can get everything else they desire, 114.6 cents worth, even today, with inflation on, as some people claim.

The only change this makes is in the one commodity, and that commodity is

gold. As to everything else, a dollar today is worth more than 100 cents. I contend that people are not much concerned with how much gold their dollars will buy.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I have a fundamental variance of opinion. We differ as to what is the cause and what is the effect. In this country we are on a gold standard. Every transaction in the United States is based upon the gold standard. It is measured in terms of dollars of a certain fixed weight.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. What is proposed now is that we reduce the weight of the standard. Necessarily we reduce the purchasing power of the American dollar, and the prosperity of the country depends not upon the number of dollars but upon the purchasing power both of the dollars and of the other properties which the people have. In other words, if we reduce the gold content of the dollar 15 percent, we are reducing the purchasing power of that dollar 15 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does not the Senator concede that when we reduced the content of gold in the gold dollar in 1934 the dollar we had was not thereby reduced in purchasing power?

Mr. ADAMS. Why, of course not.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator just said it was.

Mr. ADAMS. Let us not become confused about terms. When we reduced the gold dollar from 25 grains of gold to 15 grains of gold we reduced the purchasing power of the dollar, roughly, 40 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In terms of gold, and nothing else.

Mr. ADAMS. No; in terms of everything exchanged for the gold.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Oklahoma is going back to the 1929 prices as compared with the prices that existed in 1934 when the gold dollar was devalued. The prices are considerably higher now than they were when the dollar was devalued.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In 1933, when the measure was passed giving the President these powers, the dollar was worth 167 cents in terms of commodities, as measured by the yardstick of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The people then could not live and pay their taxes and buy their insurance and pay their debts, when they were forced to give up 167 cents worth of labor or goods or commodities in order to get a single dollar with which to pay a dollar's worth of debt. The depression lingered. The administration was convinced that we must cheapen the dollar in order to raise prices. So a measure was introduced in this body, passed by the Senate, and later by the House, and became the law, providing for the cheapening of the dollar and thereby raising prices. It had the effect of starting a trend downward in the value of the dollar and a trend upward in commodity prices. From 1933 to 1937 the dollar lost value only in one commodity, and that was gold. In everything else the dollar did not lose very much value. From 1933 until 1937 the index showed that the dollar was worth 114 cents. We had cheapened the dollar from 1933 to 1937 the difference between 167 cents and 114 cents.

In 1937 someone became afraid that we were going to have inflation; that the dollar was becoming worthless; and that prices would go skyrocketing. So the administration—I do not now say who—stopped the decline in the value of the dollar, stopped the rise of prices; the trend was changed in 1937, and that brought on the second depression.

Mr. President, it cannot be disputed that the dollar by devaluation has lost value in only one commodity, and that single commodity is gold. Yesterday, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the dollar had a value of 114 cents plus. Notwithstanding the fact that we have cut the dollar almost in two, that it is not worth as much gold as it used to be, yet in everything else save gold, according to the statistics, the dollar has a value of 114 cents plus. So the argument of the distinguished Senator from Colorado is not exactly borne out by the facts.

It is my contention we cannot live on the dollar we have today. The farmers of the country can never live on $1 wheat. The cotton growers can never live on 14-cent cotton. The people of this country cannot live and pay their debts and their taxes and become prosperous on the present-valued dollar. The dollar must be cheapened and prices further raised before the Budget will ever be balanced in the Nation, in the States, in the counties, in the cities, and in the pocketbooks of the people.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the problem is not so complicated as that. If, when I go to the bank and put $100 in the bank, the bank agrees to pay me $100, I expect, and have a right to expect, to be paid in the same kind of dollars I put into the bank. If I get a Federal Reserve note, the common form of currency which is carried in the pocket, there is contained in it the agreement to pay me $10 or $20. Of course, at this time, in view of the legal prohibition against the ownership of gold, one cannot get gold, but ultimately the only thing that the Federal Reserve note looks to as payment is gold. The promise is there to pay in the dollar of the kind, of the standard, in effect when it is issued. If they pay in a dollar which is 15 percent less in value than the dollar put into the bank, they are simply taking 15 percent away from the depositor.

The question of the relative purchasing power of the dollar in terms of commodities has been referred to, but we are dealing with one specific thing. Necessarily, if there are 25 grains of gold in a dollar, it is worth more than a dollar which has 15 grains in it. A dollar which has 15 grains of gold in it is of more value than one which has 13 grains of gold in it.

Mr. President, the question simply is, Shall we pay the people back in a depreciated gold dollar? The United States has $50,000,000,000 of bonds outstanding, bonds bought with good dollars, the kind of dollars we deal with now, not going back to 1934.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. We deal with a particular kind of a dollar. We buy a bond. What have we a right to expect to be paid back—the kind of dollar we use to buy the bond or a depreciated dollar, which has a lower gold content, and which is consequently lower in its purchasing power? Or course, the purchasing power of any quantity of gold shifts from time to time as the quantity of purchaseable material increases or decreases, and as demand increases or decreases. The problem of supply and demand continually affects the purchasing power of a specific quantity of gold, but when the quantity of gold in the dollar is changed there is an added element of change.

In addition to those who hold bonds there are 40,000,000 persons having deposits in the banks of the United States, aggregating $65,000,000,000. We propose to pay those depositors in what? In the 100-cent dollars which they put in the bank, or in 85-cent dollars? That is the proposal.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. By some unusual or fortuitous circumstance I find that I have a $10 bill, a Federal Reserve note. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Government contracts to pay me $10 in gold coin for that note?

Mr. ADAMS. No; that is not set out on the face of the note. There is no question of gold on the face of the note. But, I ask the Senator, in what does the Government agree to pay him?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The Government agrees to pay me in dollars.

Mr. ADAMS. In what kind of dollars?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In whatever kind of dollars the Government issues at the time of redemption.

Mr. GLASS. Payment will be made with the same kind of dollar that was put in the bank.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. That is the same sort of dollar the Senator will be paid in.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. What was put in the bank as against this note?

Mr. GLASS. Payment will be made in the same kind of dollar that was deposited in the bank. The idea that we are on the gold-standard basis is a mere myth. There is no foundation for it. We have had written on a note that the note will be redeemed in gold at the Treasury of the United States or at any national bank in the United States, but if one goes there and tries to redeem it he is picked up under another law and put in jail.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I do not find anything on this note which says the Government will pay me in gold.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no; those words have been removed because the Government is not going to pay in gold.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I know that I can use this dollar to pay my taxes, or to buy

products with it, or for every other conceivable purpose, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, except to buy gold on some former standard.

Mr. GLASS. When the Senator deposits his dollar in the bank and goes there with a check he gets out the same sort of dollar he put in.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; and they are dandy dollars. Everybody can use them.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator can speak of the standard dollar, and wave a piece of paper, but that paper is good for one reason, and that is that back of it is the agreement of the United States to make good now. There is gold enough in the possession and control of the Government and the Federal Reserve bank to pay every outstanding note in gold. This is one of the countries in the world which has gold enough to pay every single outstanding dollar.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Of course, there is not that amount of gold. Everybody knows there is not.

Mr. ADAMS. I am telling the Senator that this Government has more than enough gold to pay every single outstanding note.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. There is something behind our dollar better than gold, and that is the people of the United States and the credit of the United States. When that dollar is not good, gold will not help us.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me say to the Senator that the United States has gold enough to pay in full—in gold—every piece of paper outstanding by which it promises to pay.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I understood the Senator to say that there was not sufficient gold.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator did not correctly understand me. I have said that there is $22,000,000,000 of gold back of the notes, and there is only $9,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 of currency outstanding.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, awhile ago the Senator intimated that we were on the gold standard.

Mr. ADAMS. I think we are.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator think we are on the gold standard?

Mr. ADAMS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. What does the Senator mean by the gold standard?

Mr. ADAMS. I mean that it is the unit of value, made so by a statute; and we have the parity provisions of the statute, that parity with the gold standard shall be maintained.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was true in the act of 1900, the Gold Standard Act; but subsequent law has changed that act, and today we are on the gold standard on an exchange basis, and that is all. We are on a commodity dollar domestically, for the reason that we cannot obtain gold for our paper currency; we cannot obtain gold for our Federal Reserve notes; and we cannot obtain gold for greenbacks. We cannot obtain gold for silver certificates. So we are not on the gold standard domestically. We are on the gold standard on an exchange basis. When a dollar of American money leaves the United States it becomes a gold dollar, because it is then on an exchange basis; and that dollar is worth 15 5/21 grains of gold; but the dollar must leave the United States before it becomes an exchange dollar. Then if the foreigner still has our dollar and desires gold, he can obtain it on the basis of 15 5/21 grains of gold. The exchange dollar and the domestic dollar are two entirely different things. Each dollar has its own value, and those values do not coincide. The domestic dollar is a more valuable dollar than the foreign dollar, which is evidenced by the fact that the foreign dollar has been reduced 40 percent. So it is 40 percent less valuable than it was in 1934. The domestic dollar now has more than 100 cents of value in it, by the yardstick by which we measure value.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has a very clear, definite theory in his mind, a theory with which I thoroughly disagree. We are on the gold standard. Every dollar which we have, every bond which we issue, is measured in terms of American dollars, and the statute prescribes the amount of gold in the dollar. There is no difference between the domestic dollar and the exchange dollar. I am insisting that we shall not permit a difference, and that we shall have a dollar which is good all over the world. There is a difference, perhaps, in purchasing power from place to place; but it is the same dollar, with the same ultimate value in this country. There is a legal-tender power behind the dollar which does not necessarily exist abroad; but in the final analysis, when time has run, in order to allow things to settle, the gold dollar will buy that which its gold content is worth. When we cut the gold content we cut the purchasing power of the dollar.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Colorado to say that approximately $10,000,000,000 of our money, so called, could readily be redeemed in gold.

Mr. ADAMS. That is all the money that is outstanding in the hands of the people and in the banks.

Mr. BONE. Wherein does that money differ from the other money?

Mr. ADAMS. That is all the money that is outstanding.

Mr. BONE. It has been my understanding—and if I am in error I should like to be corrected—that the Federal Government itself owns about $2,000,000,000 of the gold, and that the remainder of the gold is the property of private owners, which is held by the Federal Government. Therefore the total amount of gold available to the Federal Government itself, by which it might redeem money, is limited to $2,000,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator has now entered a field in which many persons are confused. I was very careful in my statement. The substance of it is that the Federal Reserve note which the Senator has in his pocket—I trust he has many of them—obligates the Government. The $22,000,000,000 is available for paying every one of those notes.

The Senator is quite correct as to the technical ownership; but the Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve have behind them the ownership of the Federal Reserve in the gold. The Federal Reserve has gold certificates, issued by the United States, representing some $19,000,000,000 of gold.

Mr. BONE. The Federal Reserve note which I hold in my hand carries on its face the statement that the note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money of the United States at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the Senator read the statement at the top, as to who promises to pay?

Mr. BONE. It says that the United States of America will pay to the bearer, on demand, $10.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. BONE. It does not say what sort of dollars.

Mr. ADAMS. What sort of dollars are there?

Mr. BONE. The only sort of dollars with which we have been familiar for several years are the so-called commodity dollars. I suppose that term would apply as well as any other term of definitive expression that could be employed. The Senator from Oklahoma has used the term "commodity dollar."

Mr. ADAMS. Where does the Senator get the idea that there is a commodity dollar? There is not a word in any statute, on any bond, or on any bank note or note of the Federal Reserve that says anything about commodities.

Mr. BONE. I understand that; but is it not rather the working out of a system which Congress has very definitely adopted? It is perhaps not purely definitive, but is it not the result of the system of legislation which has been worked out since 1934? We no longer recognize gold as a substance with which we will redeem our money.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not agree with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. BONE. Is it not a fact that we are not redeeming our money in gold? The ordinary citizen cannot obtain gold.

Mr. ADAMS. But we are obligated to redeem it ultimately in gold or silver.

Mr. BONE. The paper that is being put out by the Government itself and by the Federal Reserve System does not promise to redeem in gold.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; it does. I think every Federal Reserve note contains the promise of this Government to pay either in gold or silver.

Mr. BONE. Where is it found?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator has just read it.

Mr. BONE. It simply says "lawful money."

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I mean by lawful money.

Mr. BONE. Does the Senator think that the only lawful money is the gold at Fort Knox? Is that the only lawful money?

Mr. ADAMS. Of course not; but the ultimate analysis involves any money that is of any value and has some ultimate redemption provision in terms of something which of itself is valuable.

Mr. BONE. That is an assumption that has been indulged all along; but it seems to me that by legislation which we have adopted over the years we have completely transformed that system and have set up in this country what the Senator from Oklahoma refers to as the commodity dollar, which purchases as much as it has ever purchased and will continue to do so unless we have a spiral of inflation.

Mr. ADAMS. It would not continue to purchase without the assurance that the holder may some day obtain metal for it.

Mr. BONE. Are there not other factors, such as an increase in demand for commodities, which in itself would tend to create an upward spiral of commodity prices; and is not that a factor which must be considered in any system?

Mr. ADAMS. I am trying to get down to one thing. The question is, Shall we take away the gold dollar and reduce its value from 100 cents to 85 cents? That is the only question. We agree to pay a dollar. Whatever we are going to pay, if we pass this bill we provide that, instead of paying back 100 cents on the dollar, we shall pay back 85 cents. In other words, we say to the creditors of the United States Government, "We will pay you only a depreciated price." I do not care upon what basis the Senator puts it; we are seeking to authorize a degradation of our currency.

Mr. BONE. Has not the Supreme Court passed upon that question?

Mr. ADAMS. There is no question of the legality of it. I am not questioning the legality of the course. I am talking about morality and commercial benefits.

Mr. BONE. I do not think we ought to confuse abstract morality with Supreme Court decisions, since the decisions of the Supreme Court are the only things on which we can base our action.

Mr. ADAMS. Nothing could be further from my thought than the view that the decisions of the Supreme Court are declarations of morality.

Mr. BONE. I know that the Supreme Court has made the gold clause, so-called, ineffective.

Mr. ADAMS. That is perfectly true, except that in one case the Supreme Court said that the United States is violating its plighted faith when it refuses to pay its own obligations in gold when it has said it would do so. That is what the Supreme Court said. All the Supreme Court said to the individual was, "You have not been able to make a case." But it said that, when the United States failed to pay its own bonds in gold of a certain weight and fineness, it was violating its own contract to do so.

Mr. BONE. All it said was that that violated the contract. The Court was dealing with the question of the sovereign power of the Federal Government.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; it said that the Government violated its own contract.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senate ought to give a vote of thanks to the Senator from Colorado for his persistent refusal to agree to the doing of these things which have been done over and over again. The economic aspect has been talked of for over 8 years, and yet here we are doing the same things.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to extend my sincere apologies to the Senator from Virginia for going over these old things. But the Constitution of the United States is an old, old thing; commercial morality is an old, old thing. I think preaching is needed in this body in connection with the consideration of this doctrine.

Mr. GLASS. Let me ask the Senator a question. Did not the Congress of the United States fix the value of the dollar?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. Then we complied with the Constitution.

Mr. ADAMS. What I am objecting to is giving to the President the authority to do that which the Constitution has vested in the Congress.

Mr. GLASS. Did not the Congress exercise its constitutional authority when it told the President how much and to what extent he could reduce the value of the dollar?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct; and I am in favor of having Congress say to the President, "Your time for further reduction of the value of the dollar runs out on the 30th of June, 1941."

Mr. GLASS. I am in favor of extending for 2 years the President's power in that respect and to vote on the matter now.

Mr. ADAMS. No; we are not going to vote on it yet. The Senator will have to stay in the Chamber and be patient with me.

Mr. GLASS. I will not be patient with the Senator, but I am going to stay. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. My difficulty, of course, is that I have followed the Senator from Virginia so faithfully, and I am now preaching the doctrine which he preached so eloquently on this floor, the doctrine of national integrity and the keeping by the Government of its own plighted word.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma not to make a speech again, because I should like to conclude, since I am under pressure from my boss over there. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Wherein does the Senator from Colorado construe that the integrity of the Government would be violated if the Congress should exercise its constitutional power in the regulation of the value of money by reducing the size of the dollar or increasing the size of the dollar?

Mr. ADAMS. It is perfectly clear to me, I will say to the Senator—I will not speak for anyone else—that if the Government promises to pay me 10 ounces of gold for a certain thing, and then passes legislation to the effect that the payment of 5 ounces of gold to me is full payment of its obligation, such action is dishonest, even though legal.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if one person should make a contract with another person, agreeing to pay so many ounces of gold, that would not mean of necessity the payment of any particular number of dollars. There are two kinds of contracts, and the Supreme Court so held.

Mr. ADAMS. May I ask the Senator please to let me make my own speech, and then I shall be glad to be corrected, insofar as I can be. The Senator from Oklahoma is so filled with this subject that he knows more facts than all the rest of us put together. I bow to his knowledge, but I have a little, narrow theory which I think is involved in this particular bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did I understand the Senator to say that today the paper dollar and the gold dollar are equal in value?

Mr. ADAMS. I do say so.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Equal in value?

Mr. ADAMS. I do say so.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did I understand the Senator to say that the gold dollar does not change in value so long as it maintains a certain fixed content of gold?

Mr. ADAMS. I said that what we should do is maintain the gold dollar at the same content right along, so that the man who deals in dollars knows what he is going to get; that when we say to him, "You are going to get so many dollars," that has a definite meaning not only today but on the day when the contract is carried out.

Of course, there may be a change in relative values. It depends on how they are measured. The Senator from Oklahoma wants to measure the value of gold in terms of commodities. I want to regard the dollar as the fixed term, and I desire to have commodity values measured in terms of dollars of a fixed value.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At that point, if the Senator will yield, let me ask if, every day, every year, we do not measure the value of the gold dollar in terms of commodities?

Mr. ADAMS. We do not. Perhaps I should not make the statement quite so positively for the dollar has its relationship to every market to which we go, whether it is the market for wheat, cotton, or anything else. There is a standard. Wheat or corn or cotton is worth so much in terms of a fixed dollar, and I want the dollar to stay fixed. I do not want uncertainty at both ends; that is, if the content of the gold dollar is varied, then there is uncertainty both as to monetary values and as to commodity values.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator will yield further, I understand the Senator to say that today the value of the gold dollar and the value of the paper dollar are the same.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make one further inquiry? In order to make the inquiry, I shall have to state a predicate.

Mr. ADAMS. Very well; I give up.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Suppose the United States should begin to pay for the preparedness program by issuing greenbacks, as was done under the Lincoln administration. Does not the Senator from Colorado agree that the more

greenbacks we put in circulation—a billion or two billion—and the bill which we passed this afternoon would increase it to almost eleven billion——

Mr. ADAMS. That is the bill the Senator from Oklahoma piloted through.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That was done with the acquiescence of the Senator from Colorado. I heard no "nay" vote against it.

If we should begin to pay for that program by the issuance of greenbacks, does not the Senator agree that prices would skyrocket and that the value of the dollar would fall?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator previously asked me if I believe that today the value of the paper dollar and the gold dollar are the same. Of course, today my $10 check is as good as Mr. Rockefeller's. If I attempted to issue a great many such checks, of course the value of my checks would decrease.

The same thing is true as to the Government: It can continue to issue paper money beyond the point of redemption, and, of course, when that point is passed paper dollars cease to be redeemable.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then, as I understand, the Senator agrees that if we begin the issuance of more paper money, the more paper money we issue the cheaper becomes the dollar and the higher become prices?

Mr. ADAMS. Oh no; I do not agree with the Senator's quantitative theory of money, that every time a few more thousand dollars of money are issued prices are correspondingly affected. I do agree that when we issue unprecedented amounts of money and when we reach the point where we know that such money cannot be redeemed, prices will skyrocket.

The Senator from Oklahoma has his absolutely fixed theory that the price of commodities can be regulated by regulating the price of money. He and I have very different theories as to what is the cause and what is the effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. We have in circulation $10,000,000,000 worth of paper money and other kinds of money. If we should issue an additional $10,000,000,000 in paper money to help pay for the defense program that would place approximately $20,000,000,000 in circulation. Does not the Senator agree that if we did so the result would be that instead of having $1 wheat we would have $2 wheat?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not agree.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And instead of having 14-cent cotton we would have 28-cent cotton?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not agree. I think that is absolutely opposed to the facts.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then I say that the point of view of those who favor such a proposal is absolutely out of tune with the point of view of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. I am presenting the argument of no one but the Senator from Colorado. I think that so long as the dollar continues sound, so long as it is redeemable, prices are not necessarily affected by the number of units outstanding. The Senator from Oklahoma and I definitely disagree about that.

But I am going back, if I may, to point out the consequences. Sixty-five billion dollars—the savings of the people—are in the banks. We propose to say that the banks can pay them back with 85-cent dollars.

There are sixty-odd million insurance policies in this country. The savings of the people have gone into paying the premiums on those policies in order that when the day of disaster or misfortune comes they may have some money paid back. When we devalue the dollar we lessen the amount which will be paid back to such unfortunate people under their insurance policies. I am not willing to do that. I am not willing to say that those who paid 100-cent dollars to the insurance companies shall be paid back in 85-cent dollars when their day of distress comes.

Men and women are paying into unemployment fund of the Government; we have old-age pensions; we have various pension funds; we are taking by statute a certain share of the wages of the workmen and putting them into a fund. What do they expect to be paid back with? A hundred-cent dollar, of course; but we propose to pay them back in 85-cent dollars. I say to you, Mr. President, it is not honest; and the Senator from Virginia agrees it is an immoral thing to do.

That, however, is not all. Every person with a fixed wage, every teacher, every public official, even every W. P. A. worker, if this bill shall become a law and devaluation shall follow, will get 85-cent dollars where they are now getting 100-cent dollars. I am not willing that the good faith of the Government shall suffer that dishonor, for that is what it is.

I will go one step further. We are drafting the boys of this land; we are taking them from their occupations and their opportunities, putting them into training camps, and placing guns on their shoulders. We promised to pay them the munificent sum of $21 a month. We propose by this bill to take 15 percent off their $21, and pay them $17.85. I am not willing to do that; but that is what it means, because when we decrease the gold content of the dollar we reduce by that percentage the honest purchasing power of every dollar which is paid out.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. BONE. I do not profess to know very much about the mathematics of money.

Mr. ADAMS. I may say to the Senator that nearly everyone who makes a special study of money and reaches the point where he thinks he has mastered it will probably land at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. BONE. I once read two books on money, and I came to the conclusion that I knew less after reading them than before. But I am wondering if this matter will not become more or less a moot question. I would not attempt to state the point, and I never found anyone yet who would attempt to find the point where the national debt would have to stop in order to avoid trouble; but would it become so vitally material whether we had an 85-cent dollar or a 100-cent dollar if the national debt should reach the point where it becomes almost an impossibility to finance and to service it?

Mr. ADAMS. I can illustrate the Senator's point. A gentleman who was Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Hubert Work, who had some fine cattle, who lived in my town went to a man selling hay and he said, "What is the price of timothy hay?" The reply was $28 a ton; they argued back and forth and back and forth, and the man insisted on that price. Finally Dr. Work said, "Well, I will take so many tons." The answer was, "I do not have any." So it does not make any difference, of course, if nothing is going to be paid, what the price is.

To follow the Senator a step further, if we can reduce the gold content of the dollar 15 percent, as is now proposed, we can pay in 85-cent dollars four billion dollars on the national debt or four billion dollars elsewhere. That is so easy, why should we not do it? We have $50,000,000,000 of indebtedness; reduce the gold content of the dollar down to about four grains, then, the dollar value is multiplied and we can pay the entire national debt by the reduction of the gold content; but we would also destroy the entire prosperity of the people of the United States. That has been done abroad.

Consider the history of French currency. What is now the French franc several hundred years ago was the equivalent of the British pound; it represented one pound of silver; that is the origin of the term "pound"; but the governments in France, because of their various financial and political vicissitudes, have reduced the franc from what was a value of, roughly, $14 to a value of 3 cents. If we, in this country, a solvent country, want to pursue the course which has been forced upon other countries, then we will go the way of all those who have disregarded their integrity or who have yielded to their necessities.

Mr. BONE. What was the prime cause of that devaluation? Was it the presence of a debt which they felt they could not meet? Was that the primary cause of it?

Mr. ADAMS. Debt and tremendous expenses; and, of course, France went through the John Law episode, and through the episode which preceded the Napoleonic wars, a course which we are now following. I will say to the Senator, if he will take his history, beginning in 1789, and read the course of events for about 20 years, he will see the course on which we are now embarked.

Mr. BONE. I recall that period, when the assignats, as I believe they were called, were issued in vast numbers, but I was tempted to ask the question, for I am not sufficiently well informed to be able even to formulate an answer in my own mind. I was thinking that beyond a certain point the existence of a vast and what seems like an unlimitable debt enters as a new factor which brings about certain compulsions. I do not know when that point may or would be reached, but obviously it will become an

important factor if the people of the country shall suddenly decide that it is impossible to service the debt.

Mr. ADAMS. I will tell the Senator my own formula. A nation can continue as can an individual. If the Senator and I continue to increase our indebtedness until we are not able to pay it, either we go into bankruptcy or we make a composition with our creditors. That is the individual case. Now, in the case of Government the result is the same. If it cannot pay its debts, it goes through some form of repudiation, and the process which we are now talking about is simply the first or the second step in the process of repudiation; that is, we continue to devalue our dollar until we make it small enough that, having all the gold here, we can create enough dollar value, given legal tender value, to pay the indebtedness of the Government. In other words, we will have repudiated our indebtedness. The measure of the Nation's willingness or that of the people to pay is what? We are frequently told that the indebtedness we have, great as it is, is not of any concern, because of the assets of from $300,000,000,000 to $400,000,000,000, all of which is behind it. Unfortunately, that is not true. The country will pay through its taxing powers just up to the point where the people cease to be willing to pay the taxes; and whenever the people reach the point when they will pay no more taxes, or when taxes cannot be raised, and there is an increasing debt, then there comes repudiation, either in the form of unlimited printing-press money or devaluation.

Mr. President, as a final word, let me say that the plan originally was not honest, and its operation was disastrous to the country. This proposed plan is not honest, and its operation will be disastrous to the country. It simply means that the United States is putting itself in the class of the monarchs and the countries in the past who clipped their dollars and depreciated and debased their currencies in order that they might have a profit or pay their bills without regard to what happened to the welfare and prosperity of their people. I do not want the United States to be classed as a coin clipper or a debaser of its currency or a repudiator of its credit.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for just a moment? I have to attend a conference at 3:30 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that the conclusions drawn from this bill by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] are wholly unfounded. The speech made today is exactly the same speech which was made against the original legislation in 1933. At that time we were told that if we devalued the gold dollar we would pay our debts in 50-cent dollars.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, of course the difference was that we did not pay our debt. We proceeded to continue to increase it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the gold dollar was cut 40 percent. There has not been a single day from that time until now when the dollar has not been worth more than 100 cents in every thing save one, and that is gold.

The Senator from Colorado said it was dishonest to pay the soldiers in 85-cent dollars. During the World War they were paid in 64-cent dollars in terms of commodities. No complaint was made at that time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator is in error about that. I heard a great deal of complaint.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The record bears out my statement. In 1920, 1919, 1918, and 1917 the dollar, in terms of value as measured by commodities, was worth from 64 to 70 cents. Today, Mr. President, the soldiers are not getting a 59-cent gold dollar. They are not getting any kind of a gold dollar. They are getting a paper dollar; and every dollar they get today—$21 per month—buys 114 cents' worth of supplies, clothing, hats, shoes, food, and the other things they desire to buy.

I do not know what the dollar will be worth 3 months from now. Nobody knows. We may stay on gold, and the American dollar 1 year from now may not be worth 50 percent of what it is worth today.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator says the dollar today will buy 114 cents' worth of supplies. May I ask him, simply for my own information, upon what standard he figures the 114 cents? I simply want to get the standard.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Every nation in the world worthy of the name of a nation has a system or a yardstick by which that nation measures values. Some nations have a system of statistics with only a few commodities in the system—50 commodities, 25 commodities, or 150 commodities. In America we have a thousand commodities in our system. Each month the Bureau of Labor Statistics gets the price of a certain quantity of a thousand different articles. The prices are added and divided by 1,000. If the average is up, the dollar goes down in value. If the average is down, the dollar goes up in value. That is the system by which we measure values today. It is the system by which we have measured values for the past 50, 75, or 100 years.

Mr. President, this bill is very simple. All the bill does is to extend the power which the President now has. The President now, today, tomorrow, or on Monday, may sign his name to a simple little proclamation devaluing the gold dollar about 3 grains per dollar, and make a profit to the Treasury of between 4 and 5 billion dollars. He has not done it. He does not propose to do it. If this power is extended, he will not use the power save and unless the other nations of the world proceed to devalue their coins, giving them an advantage in world trade. Then he may consider a further devaluation of the gold dollar. So, all the bill does is to extend in the hands of the President the power he now has and will have, whether or not the bill passes, until the end of the 30th day of this month. If the bill is not passed, the power will expire at that time. If the bill passes, the power the President now has still further to devalue the gold dollar down to 50 percent of what it formerly was will be carried over for 2 more years, and he will not use that power unless he is justified in using it because of depreciation of currencies in other lands throughout the world.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator uses the word "devalue." The gold dollar in circulation is worth the Government stamp; that is all. The Senator agrees to that, does he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. If we take a certain number of grains of gold and say that is worth a dollar, and then Congress, having the right to coin and to regulate the value of the dollar, takes half the gold content of that dollar and stamps it a dollar, I am not cheated. I still have my dollar.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And it is a constitutional dollar.

Mr. SMITH. Constitutional or not, it is a dollar that I go out and trade with. I have here one or two $1 bills. The Government cut the size of those dollar bills. I remember when the paper dollar was a little smaller than a rug, but the Government cut it down. It is still as valuable as the big dollar, however. I happen to get in trade a gold dollar that has a certain gold content, the value of which is determined by the stamp of the Government. If the Government wants to call it in and cut it in two and make $2 out of it, I am not entitled to $2 simply because I originally had $1 with the Government stamp on it. When the Government took that dollar and restamped half of it a dollar, I was just as well off as I was before; and talk about devaluing. We place the cart before the horse. The Government is going to revamp the dollar, not devalue it. It is the Government stamp that makes it valuable.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator from South Carolina had made a contract with me by which I was——

Mr. SMITH. Oh, the question of contracts is another matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Will not the Senator let me ask him the question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator had made a contract with me to deliver to him a thousand yards of woolen goods, and before it was delivered the Government should pass an act saying that the yard hereafter should be 18 inches instead of 36 inches, would the Senator feel that when he received half the original quantity, which was a thousand yards, he had gotten what he contracted for?

Mr. SMITH. No; I should think that between us the private contract ought to be fulfilled; but we cannot, by a private

contract, prevent the Government from performing its constitutional function. The Government has the right to coin money and regulate its value; and when I have a gold coin that has twice as much gold as is necessary, in the opinion of Congress, that extra gold does not belong to me because it is stamped a dollar. I cannot take it and make $2 out of it, but the Government can. Therefore, when the Government makes $2 out of it, I am not entitled to the extra dollar. I am entitled only to what the Government determines is a dollar.

What is the use of going on here about the Government robbing us? I know it is robbing us, but not with that kind of doings. I should be very much obliged if the Government would dig up the gold out yonder in Kentucky and devalue it, as the Senator calls it, make it twice as much as it is, and divide it up among the Senators, and let me get my first whack. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, devaluation simply means reducing the size and weight of the content of the gold dollar.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado injected a suggestion which we ought to consider. When we sold gold bonds and agreed to pay them in gold of a certain weight and fineness, we ought to take care of that situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Supreme Court has passed upon that question, and has held that it is impossible to make a binding contract by agreeing to pay two kinds of dollars or make two kinds of payment. When we made a contract agreeing to pay a thousand dollars 10 years hence in gold dollars of the present weight and fineness—which at that time was 25.8 grains of gold—the Supreme Court held that that contract was a dollar contract, and not a gold-weight contract.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, is not the Senator overlooking the Perry case, which said that while private individuals could not do that, as they were subject to Government regulation, the Government's own contracts must be kept—it had no right to repudiate its gold contracts?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator has made the statement upon the floor that it is immoral, unjust, dishonest, and criminal for the Government to alter the value of the dollar. Of course, he meant to change and reduce the size of the gold dollar. The Constitution gives the Congress the power to do that.

The Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate its value, and if it is necessary to reduce the size and weight of the gold dollar, to cheapen it, to regulate it, then in the exercise of that power Congress is not performing a dishonest act. It must be constitutional, or the Supreme Court would not have sustained it. So I cannot go along with the distinguished Senator when he says that Congress has performed a dishonorable, an unworthy, an unjustified, and a wrongful act, in devaluing the dollar.

Mr. President, that is all beside the question. The President has the power now to devalue the gold dollar, and make it smaller. He is not doing it, but he has had the power since 1933, I think it was the 12th of May 1933. He has exercised the power only once. He has the power now, and all the bill does is to extend for another 2 years the power which he now has.

I have been speaking of the first provision of the bill. It is very simple, and I have stated all it does. It merely extends the power the President now has for 2 years, beginning on the 1st day of July, and ending on June 30, 1943.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the value of the dollar should be reduced to the limit, does the Senator think that would have any effect on the price of gold?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It would, in terms of dollars. If the President should exercise the power he has today, and devalue to the limit of his power, gold immediately would rise from $35 an ounce to $41.34 an ounce. It would be twice $20.67, and the Senator can make the multiplication.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Would it do so automatically?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Absolutely, in terms of gold; not in terms of prices of commodities. The President could use his power today still further to devalue the gold dollar. The price of gold would rise in terms of dollars, the prices of world commodities would rise in terms of dollars, such things as wheat, a world commodity, sold throughout the world today at a certain price in terms of gold, and cotton would rise. But only the commodities which have a gold value from day to day throughout the world would be affected by the devaluation. Automobiles would not be affected. Were automobiles affected by the devaluation in 1934? Not at all. It is possible to buy a better car today for $1,000 than could have been bought then for $1,000. We can buy a suit of clothes, we can buy hats, we can buy shoes, we can buy everything that is not on a world basis, at about the same price today for which we bought it before devaluation took place. The devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold would have no effect whatever on prices of domestic commodities. If devaluation should take place, it would have an effect on the prices of world commodities. In terms of dollars, it would affect the price of gold. If the President should take about 3 more grains from the present dollar, I think the dollar would have left about 12 or 13, instead of 15 grains.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. How many dollars would one have to pay for an ounce of gold then?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. An ounce of gold is worth $41 and some cents in terms of gold.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Would one have to pay that for it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; if the President should exercise his power; but if he should exercise the power, the price of commodities would jump approximately the same percentage. Instead of having dollar wheat, it would jump to $1.15, or $1.25, perhaps; cotton would go from 15 cents, as it is today, to 16½ cents, perhaps. The higher the price we put on gold, the higher we raise prices, and the lower the price we put on gold, the cheaper we make other prices.

I cannot understand how anyone from a farming section is not in favor of increasing prices at least in some degree, in order to help the people back home. The people in the farming sections are not paying their debts, with commodities at present values. The census chart of 1920 shows a number of States in the Central West marked in white, meaning that those States have lost population, while the States along the seacoast are shown in black, or are shaded, which means they have gained in population. Why have the Central States lost in population? The reason is clear. It is because the farmers and the people who live off the farmers in those States are not prosperous. People do not leave a prosperous community without cause, and when whole populations are leaving a section, there must be a reason. The reason why people have been leaving the Central Western States is that during the past 10 years wheat has not sold for enough to make raising wheat profitable; the same thing may be said of corn, and of hogs, and of cotton in the South. People cannot live on present prices and pay the interest on their debts, and in time they lose their land. Then what do they do? They go on W. P. A., or, perchance, move to some seacoast town, where they will have a chance to get jobs in the more prosperous areas.

Mr. President, the bill is very simple. It merely proposes to extend for 2 years the power the President now has. That has been done on two or three occasions. The power has been extended at least on three occasions heretofore. We are merely proposing to do again what has already been done by this administration three times already. That is the first provision.

The second provision is intended to continue in the Treasury Department the stabilization fund. When the President acted in 1934 and devalued the dollar, he made a profit for the Treasury of $2,800,000,000-plus. Congress, on the recommendation of the President, placed $2,000,000,000 of that in the stabilization fund, and gave that fund to the Treasury Department to be used to stabilize, so far as was humanly possible, the buying power of the American dollar in foreign exchange. That stabilization fund is still intact. Only $200,000,000 have been drawn from the fund, to be used in stabilization. The balance of the fund, $1,800,000,000, is in the Treasury; it has been invested; it is drawing interest for the Treasury Department. So power No. 2 is to extend the life of the stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000 for another term of 2 years.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not mean the stabilization fund is drawing interest?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is invested, I understand, in some form of securities.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no; it is all in gold. There is no interest on the stabilization fund. About $10,000,000 of it is invested

in bonds, but the fund itself is all in gold, and no income is coming from it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am advised that the fund has been so handled that it has made a profit for the Treasury of about $25,000,000. But whether it has made a penny is beside the question, because we have the fund, it is being used for a specific purpose, and the bill proposes that the fund be continued for another period of 2 years.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Can the Senator tell us how much the Federal Government has borrowed in order to buy this gold?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not a single copper cent. I will explain the way it is handled.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. How did the Government get possession of it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will explain the matter as briefly as I can.

The Government has never purchased a single ounce of gold. The Government has received a great many ounces of gold, and this is the way the Government receives the gold: Gold is worth $35 an ounce. J. P. Morgan once said that gold is money, and that nothing else but gold is money. There is some truth in that statement. The Senator from Colorado will admit that there is nothing else except gold that is of much worth as a monetary medium.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Gold is money. It is so recognized by all the nations of the world. No nation anywhere, no person in any nation anywhere, will refuse to accept gold. It is the best metal, it is the best money in the world, and no one need fear that we are going to lose because we have $22,600,000,000 in gold. We cannot lose, Mr. President, because the law fixes 15 grains plus to the dollar. As the Senator said, we owe $50,000,000,000 in national debt. All we have to do is to coin this gold into present-size dollars of 15 grains to the dollar and begin to pay our obligations, and long before we shall have paid all our obligations our gold will be gone. How can we lose on the acquisition of this gold? This is how it comes about.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Did I understand the Senator to say that the United States has not bought 1 penny's worth of gold.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As such, yes.

Mr. ADAMS. My recollection is that Mr. Morgenthau presented to us a table of the operations of the stabilization fund, showing that the Government had bought over $3,000,000,000 worth of gold.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the explanation of that matter is very simple. In the United States and in Alaska, where we produce gold, our nationals cannot keep it. They can produce gold, but they cannot keep it. Under the law the gold must be turned into the Treasury. When that is done the Treasury accepts the gold and pays the producer $35 an ounce, in dollars, credit dollars, Federal Reserve dollars, greenback dollars, or silver certificates, or whatever kind of money it may have. So in that sense, under the law the Treasury accepts the gold and pays for it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Where did the Treasury get the money to pay for the gold?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let us say that a brick of gold weighing enough to be worth $10,000 is turned into the Treasury. When that is done the Treasury issues a check upon some Federal Reserve bank or some Federal agency for the sum of money of the value of that brick, say $10,000. Immediately the gold then becomes the property of the Treasury Department, and the check becomes the property of the producer, or the person who delivered the gold to the Treasury. The Treasury Department takes the gold, puts it in its own vault, wherever it may be, at Fort Knox, at New York, in the Treasury Department in Washington, in the Denver Mint, in the Philadelphia Mint, in the San Francisco Mint, or some other place. The gold is put on deposit in the Treasury's vaults. The Treasury then says to the Federal Reserve bank, "We have a block of gold here worth $10,000. We will give you a gold certificate. Take this gold certificate, which is a bond, a mortgage on this gold block." The bank takes the gold certificate and puts it in its vault. Then the Treasury has the power to draw checks on that Federal Reserve bank for the sum of $10,000. Not a copper cent has been involved in the transaction. The Government issues no bonds to pay for the gold. It pays no interest on it. It owns the gold and holds the gold. Before the Government can get a good title to the gold certificate it would perhaps have to make a bond issue, sell the bonds, and raise the money to redeem the gold certificate in the bank where the certificate is deposited.

Does that make the procedure clear?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then the bank would have title to the gold?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; in that event we would pay the bank, and we would have clear title to the gold in the Treasury. Under the law the gold belongs to the Treasury.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then the procedure is financed by the bank without interest, is it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is financed by the Treasury Department without interest. One might say it is financed by the Federal Reserve bank, because it has the gold certificate. The gold certificate can serve the same purpose to the Federal Reserve bank as solid gold can. That is the first point.

The second point is this: If some foreign nation, Japan, Russia, or China, should send to this country an order of purchase, and with that order of purchase were to send the gold with which to make the purchase, the gold would come through a bank, the Chase National Bank, or the City National Bank, or some other bank in America, which would receive the gold, but that bank could not hold the gold. The bank would send it to the mint in Philadelphia and have it assayed. That is a precaution which the Government takes. When that is done the mint writes a check upon the Treasury for the value of the gold, and the check goes to the bank which makes the deposit. The mint turns the gold into the Treasury. The Treasury issues certificates against it. The bank writes checks on those certificates. That is how simple the transaction is. Not in any one place is a single penny of debt involved by way of interest.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Government wants to take title would it have to redeem these certificates by paying for them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It would have to redeem the gold certificates exactly as an individual would have to do if he had a piece of property and mortgaged it. He would hold the property and use the property, but someone would hold the obligation. In order to clear the property which he is using he would have to get the money somehow with which to clear the title and obtain a release. That is exactly the situation with relation to the gold. The Government owns every ounce of gold in America that is in the Treasury, and there is now $22,600,000,000 of gold in the Treasury. Some of it is obligated, as I have explained. To get that free of all indebtedness we would have to raise the money by means of issuance of bonds, and pay the Federal Reserve banks and get them to surrender the gold certificates. Then we would have the gold free, clear, and unencumbered.

Mr. President, there are only two purposes in this bill. One is to extend the powers the President now has. The other is to extend the life of the stabilization fund in exactly the form in which it now exists in the Treasury Department. All the talk about devaluing the gold dollar and paying off in 85-cent dollars is entirely beside the point, because we can keep our present size gold dollar, and in 6 months from now or a year from now the gold dollar which we have may not be worth 50 percent of its present value in terms of property. That is easily explained.

If we place in circulation enough real money, or credit money, to bring about inflation, and raise prices of wheat, corn, cabbage, hogs, and what not, then, as the value of the paper dollar falls and prices go up, the value of the gold dollar falls, because, as the Senator from Minnesota said, and he is correct, an ounce of gold is worth $35 in paper money. It makes no difference what each dollar is worth—the gold is still worth $35 an ounce in paper money. If the paper dollars are cheapened the gold dollar is cheapened, because an ounce of gold is still worth $35. If we come to the time in this emergency when wheat is selling for $5 a bushel, and cotton selling for $1 a pound, and other commodities are selling in proportion, the gold will be worth exactly what it is now, $35 an ounce. So long as we can buy and sell gold at $35 an ounce, we can change the value of the gold in terms of property

any time we see fit, but such a provision is not in this bill. That would have to be done in some other measure.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We do not sell gold, do we?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; we do.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. To whom do we sell it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the national of some foreign nation has a claim against the United States in terms of dollars, and he does not want to make use of that claim in terms of dollars in buying radios or automobiles, he can ask for gold. Under exchange conditions he can get gold. A foreign nation can get gold for its favorable credit against the United States. A foreign national, if he has dollars, can convert them, through his bank, into gold.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Gold can be used to settle unfavorable trade balances, but otherwise we cannot sell gold?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Dentists can buy gold. Manufacturers can buy gold for certain purposes. No one else can obtain gold.

Mr. President, there is nothing complicated about this bill whatever. I am confident the President will not use the power proposed to be given to him unless and until other nations begin to reduce the value of their currency in terms of gold. Other nations do not have their currencies now measured in terms of gold. Their currencies fluctuate. If the British pound should fall and be worth one and one-half dollars in gold as measured in terms of our dollar, or if the franc should fall one-half, or if other currencies should fall one-half, those nations would have a 50-percent advantage in the world market, because of their cheap currencies. Then the President, in order to protect the foreign trade of America, the factories of America, and the workers of America, would be justified in still further depreciating the dollar in terms of gold if he so desired. He would not have to do so. He could place more paper money in circulation and make the paper dollar cheaper, and as he did that he would make the gold dollar cheaper because one is convertible to the other so far as exchange is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, if possible without discussing the gold standard, a subject which seems to involve considerable difference of opinion and many implications.

In the first place, this is a bill to renew the power of the President to operate the stabilization fund and devalue the dollar. To say that we have renewed that power before and that there is no reason why we should not do so again, because the President already has the power, is no answer. The act had a specific limitation in it, because when Congress originally enacted the law it felt that at the end of 2 years we should reexamine the situation as it should exist at that time. The power given the President was so extraordinary that we must consider it again and determine whether, under the conditions which now exist, we ought to delegate this power, which is specifically conferred upon Congress by the Constitution.

In the first place, I believe that we should continue the stabilization fund. I think the present condition makes the continuation of that fund more desirable than it was 2 years ago. The fund was established by setting aside $2,000,000,000 in gold; and it is still mostly in gold. It is more than we really need. We could operate the fund with $200,000,000. The remaining $1,800,000,000 in gold has never been touched since the fund was established.

The only objection made 2 years ago to the stabilization fund was that the terms of the law were so broad that the Secretary of the Treasury claimed the right to use the fund to lend money to foreign countries; and since the passage of the law 2 years ago, although that power is very doubtful, he has actually used the fund to lend $50,000,000 to China and $50,000,000 to Argentina. In technical form the transaction is not a loan. What the Secretary did was to make an agreement with China that we would pay the Chinese $50,000,000 in exchange for $50,000,000 worth of Chinese yuan, on no security except the agreement of the Chinese Government to buy back those yuan at some time and pay us in dollars. A similar agreement was made with Argentina.

So in effect the fund has been used to lend $100,000,000 to foreign countries. I do not think the fund was intended for that purpose. Nevertheless, since the passage of the law we have passed the Lease Lend Act, appropriating $7,000,000,000, and the Export-Import Bank Act. We have established the policy of permitting the Government to lend practically any sum it sees fit to lend to foreign countries. If the stabilization fund is also used for that purpose, I see no tremendous harm resulting from that fact, although I do not think that the fund itself was intended for that purpose or ought to be used for that purpose.

There is one other point about the stabilization fund. It can be used to buy Government bonds. The control of credit in the United States is largely determined by what are called open-market operations—the sale by the Government of bonds and the purchase of Government bonds on the open market. It is one of the most important functions in credit control and in maintaining the price level, in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is so interested.

Under the existing provisions this power is confined primarily to the Federal Reserve banks. The bill gives it also to the Secretary of the Treasury. It is proposed to have two independent agencies exercising the same power. One might sell when the other was buying and might nullify the action of the other. The Secretary has assured us that he will consult the Federal Open Market Committee before he acts; so I feel fairly certain that during the next 2 years, at least, that conflict will not arise. But the time must come when we must concentrate in one department all the powers relating to operations in buying and selling Government bonds on the open market; and I think that power ought to be in the Federal Reserve Board.

On the question of devaluing the dollar, in the first place it seems to me that if anybody will read the hearings which were held before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee he will find set forth in those hearings no single reason for giving this power at the present time.

This is not necessarily a Government recommendation, because the Federal Reserve Board is opposed to the continuation of the power to devalue the dollar. It will be found on page 26 of the hearings that on January 1, for the first time since the creation of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Governors, the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks from all parts of the United States, and the members of the Federal Advisory Council, which represents the private banks throughout the United States, presented a joint report to Congress. They were very much concerned about the danger of inflation in the United States under present conditions, as I am, and as I think everyone ought to be. They presented a series of recommendations, which they said should be enacted into law in order to prevent or reduce the inflation which inevitably must result from the defense program. Among their other recommendations they said this:

> Various sources of potential increases in excess reserves should be removed. These include the power to issue three billions of greenbacks, further monetization of foreign silver. * * * In view of the completely changed international situation during the past year, the power further to devalue the dollar in terms of gold is no longer necessary or desirable and should be permitted to lapse.

That is the unanimous opinion of 5 members of the Federal Reserve Board, and is still their unanimous opinion. It is the opinion of 12 presidents of Federal Reserve banks throughout the United States. It is the opinion of bankers throughout the United States.

On page 53 of the hearings will be found the report of the American Bankers' Association. The Committee on Banking and Currency is now engaged in a general study of the entire banking problem. It submitted to everybody who could be considered an expert on the subject a questionnaire asking various questions about what should be done in the banking system. On page 51 will be found a list of persons to whom questionnaires were submitted. Their reply is on page 52. I shall not read it all. Among other recommendations is the following:

> The repeal of the inflation provisions of the Thomas amendment of 1933 including the repeal of the power to issue greenbacks, to buy silver, and to devalue the dollar.

So we have the unanimous banking opinion throughout the United States, beside that of the Federal Reserve Board, to the effect that this power should not be continued.

The Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy submitted a letter to the committee, which will be found on page 81 of the hearings. On page 83 is a list of some 50 of the leading economists of the United States, all of whom urge upon Congress the view that the power to devalue the dollar should not be continued.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I remind the Senator from Ohio, with his permission, that 2 years ago the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] incorporated in the record of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee a practically identical letter, except that it was signed by 55 members of the same committee.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

We had before our committee two economists—Prof. Edwin W. Kemmerer, of Princeton, and Prof. B. H. Beckhart, of Columbia, who testified to the same effect, very forcefully, that the power to devalue the dollar should be discontinued. Mr. Harry Scherman, a businessman and writer on monetary subjects, testified very effectively to the same thing.

There is no public demand whatsoever for the continuation of the power to devalue the dollar. I do not know any responsible person in the United States, except the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, who today is urging upon Congress the passage of this bill.

The Senator from Virginia has said that it is enough for him that the President is asking for this power. The President asked for the power 2 years ago. He asked for it 4 years ago. He asked for it 8 years ago; and at that time the mere fact that the President asked for it was not sufficient for the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator knows that the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before our committee and testified that there are now one hundred times as many reasons why the power should be continued than there were for originally granting the power.

Mr. TAFT. I do not remember any such testimony.

Mr. GLASS. If the Senator will look at the testimony, he will find it.

Mr. TAFT. The testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury is found on pages 5 and 6.

Mr. GLASS. I will read to the Senator the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senator seems to have forgotten it. Secretary Morgenthau testified as follows:

> In 1939 I said to Congress:
> "This power is a weapon in reserve needed for protection of American interests. In the monetary field, it is as important as a powerful Navy in the field of defense against armed attack."
> That statement is as true now as in 1939.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator to say that now it is 100 times more true, whereas what the Secretary says is that the statement is as true now as it was in 1939.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; but I will read the other statement to the Senator if he will give me time to do so. He is always so impatient about these matters.

On page 16, in the next to the last paragraph, Mr. Morgenthau said:

> Mr. MORGENTHAU. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, if there was an emergency when Congress did this originally, the emergency is ten times or a hundred times as great now as it was then.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not question that the emergency today is 100 times what it was 2 years ago; but it is not an emergency relating to the devaluation of the dollar.

Mr. GLASS. But the Secretary of the Treasury said so.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Secretary of the Treasury did not say so. He simply said that there is an emergency today 10 times or 100 times as great; but he does not relate today's emergency in any way to the problem of devaluing the dollar. He is referring to the World War.

Mr. GLASS. But he was talking about devaluing the dollar.

Mr. TAFT. I am quite willing to let anyone read the record and draw his own conclusions. I think he will reach the conclusion I have reached.

In any event, the argument is that today there is an emergency. As a matter of fact, today there is very much less emergency requiring this kind of power than there was 2 years ago. Today we face no danger of deflation. Today we face a world war, and we face inflation. The Secretary of the Treasury himself said, as shown in his own testimony on page 6 of the record:

> Obviously the administration has no present intent whatsoever to reduce the gold content of the dollar.

How can he say that there is any emergency requiring the passage of the bill when he says that the administration has no intent whatsoever of using this power?

Mr. GLASS. But he does say that there is 100 times more emergency.

Mr. TAFT. He says:

> I feel very strongly that for Congress to remove this power at the present time because there is no immediate use for it would be an unwise step in the face of an uncertain future.

That is a weak statement of emergency. As a matter of fact, there is no such emergency. The existence of a world war does not justify the granting of every power the President may ask. It justifies the granting of only such powers as relate in some way to the particular emergency, and the one measure which is not a war measure today is the devaluation of the dollar. We face no deflation. What we are facing today is a threatened inflation. The power to devalue the dollar is more dangerous today, with the danger of inflation facing us, than it was 2 years ago.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. What effect does the Senator think the existence or nonexistence of the so-called gold standard has upon price levels? I am tempted to ask that question because the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has stated within the past year that the present dollar would buy twice as much as the dollar of 1920, a year of very high prices. At that time we were operating under the gold standard. Does the existence or nonexistence of the gold standard in itself constitute the only important factor in the maintenance or lack of maintenance of price levels?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that problem has an immediate effect on the question before us. Of course, the devaluation of the dollar tends to raise price levels. There is no question about that.

Mr. BONE. But are there not many other factors which enter into the picture?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, other factors besides the devaluation of the dollar affect the price level.

Mr. BONE. I do not wish to intrude upon the Senator's time, but the existence of an emergency such as we now confront, or the presence of war, is a vital factor. First, we have the Government entering into contracts and bidding for the services of men. That in itself has a tendency to raise wage levels. We have a demand for a million automobiles, and the factories are able to turn out only 750,000 automobiles. The very existence of that fact has a tendency immediately to raise the price of automobiles, because people want them and are willing to pay for them. Unless there are the most drastic price controls, which are devices of questionable value, we then have a rise in prices due to completely outside factors, and not due to the existence or nonexistence of the gold standard.

I think that aspect is very confusing to the people. I have listened to the argument here in and out of season, and I have wondered how the existence or nonexistence of the gold standard has to do with price levels. Originally the price levels dropped abysmally at a time when we were operating under a gold standard, and we have seen changes in price levels both at times when we were operating with a gold standard and at times when we were operating without a gold standard.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct in saying that there are many factors which affect the price level. But there can be no doubt that the devaluation of the gold dollar can only raise the price level. It cannot reduce it. It is a deliberate raising of the price level by the Government itself.

If the Senator will wait a few moments I will come back to the general question of the inflation which we face.

In the meantime I desire to point out first that the Constitution confers upon Congress the power to regulate and fix the value of the dollar and to coin money. It does not confer that power upon the President. The only justification for our conferring that power upon the President is the existence today of some kind of an emergency relating to that power.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Did not the Congress act under its constitutional authority when it fixed the value of the gold dollar?

Mr. TAFT. Congress has, of course, during 150 years fixed the value of the gold dollar. It was not until 1934 that anyone thought that Congress ought to delegate that power to the President.

Mr. GLASS. But did not Congress delegate that power to the President?

Mr. TAFT. It delegated the power to the President. We are now considering whether we should continue that delegation.

Mr. GLASS. Did not Congress delegate that power to the President under a distinct determination as to what the reduction should be?

Mr. TAFT. The power was delegated to the President to reduce the value of the dollar from 59 to 50 cents. He cannot reduce it further than that.

Mr. GLASS. Congress determined that question; did it not?

Mr. TAFT. Congress delegated that power to the President. I do not question the constitutional right of Congress to do so; but I say that Congress should not do so except in an emergency relating to that matter. Today there is no such emergency.

Mr. GLASS. The Secretary of the Treasury says that today there is an emergency which is 100 times greater than that which existed at the time when the devaluation was originally done.

Mr. TAFT. There is no reason why Congress should delegate this power. We are here perpetually; we can pass on the question at any time.

No other deliberate action of the Government can have such a direct effect on the price level, and on the purchasing power of the money of 130,000,000 people. Such action should be debated; and Senators should not overnight, simply because someone sells them an economic theory, as Professor Warren sold the President an economic theory in 1933, delegate to one man the power suddenly to raise the price level throughout the United States. It is a question which should be debated in Congress. It is a power which should be retained in Congress.

The Secretary of the Treasury goes further. If one reads the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, outside of saying that there is an emergency—and of course there is one—without relating it to the need for devaluing the dollar, about the only argument is this:

> But certainly this is not the time to remove flexible powers from the Executive, when the executives of all other nations possess virtually complete powers over the domestic and external monetary affairs of their countries.

That argument seems to go too far. Under that argument we apparently delegate to the President every power which Mr. Hitler has, or which Mr. Stalin has, or which Mr. Mussolini, or anybody else has. We have a constitutional system in this country. Congress has the power, and is given the power and the duty, to regulate the value of money, and unless there is some extraordinary emergency requiring this action to be taken, and to be taken in a hurry, we ought to retain it. We are here; we can pass on the question in a very short time, in just as short a time as any such change ought to be made. There is no reason why such a change should ever, under any circumstances, have to be made overnight. We can consider the question, and we can pass on it.

This is distinctly an inflationary power. It not only raises the price level but it increases the amount of gold, that is, the paper book value of the gold the United States owns, by $4,000,000,000. If this power should be exercised by the President, instead of having twenty-two and one-half billion dollars' worth of gold we would have $26,500,000,000 worth of gold. The very effect of thus increasing the value of the gold is inflationary. It would increase in effect, the currency in the United States by $4,000,000,000, and, necessarily, it would tend to raise prices.

Today we face a real crisis. In the year which is just ending, the Treasury figures of today show that the deficit yesterday was $4,938,000,000, which means a deficit in the year ending on the 30th of June of approximately $5,000,000,000. I estimate—and I do not think I am far wrong—that there will be a deficit next year of $10,000,000,000, even after we shall have increased the taxes by about three and one-half billion dollars, as we are proposing to do. That necessarily will create an inflationary boom. We cannot escape a very considerable amount of inflation. We can tax, to some extent, and we ought to hold expenses down as much as we can, but Congress has not reduced any nondefense expenditures except a small amount in the case of the W. P. A.

We can raise some taxes to help meet the $10,000,000,000 deficit; it is possible that the Secretary of the Treasury may sell three or four billion dollars of bonds to the people back home; but the remainder of it, six or seven billion dollars, will be borrowed from the banks. Bank deposits will be increased by that amount; by Government fiat purchasing power will be increased out of thin air, so that there will be a tremendously increased demand for every nondefense article—automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and every other thing the people want to buy. The effect will be to push up the price, and prices are being pushed up now. That process will steadily increase to the extent, practically, of our ability to produce; and our ability to produce will no doubt be increased. There are various things we could do if that goes on, but, to a great extent, it means that when the defense program comes to an end then we will have the worst depression we have ever had in the United States. The bigger the boom, the longer the boom is, the greater the depression is going to be after the war.

So we want to hold down inflation just as much as we can, and that is what the Federal Reserve Board says. They propose various means. Of course, the most obvious means is to tax; and we are trying to tax as much as we can. The next thing is to sell bonds to the people back home, to sell them bonds out of their savings so that their savings will not be spent to add to the inflation. But no matter what we do, we are going to have inflation. The Federal Reserve Board says, and every other expert of whom I know says, that we should do everything to restrain it and hold down the making of private loans by banks. Today there are tremendous reserves in the different banks. We ought to give the Federal Reserve Board or some other agency power to increase the necessary reserves, so that all that money cannot be loaned at once. We ought to do everything we can to assure the people that there will be no inflation. We ought to repeal inflationary powers which might be used to increase further the inflationary boom which we face.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I raised the question I did a few moments ago because the assertion is frequently made on the floor that in 1920, under the gold standard, wheat was selling for about $2 a bushel. I have today's Wall Street Journal in my hand, and the price for wheat yesterday was $1.03. In 1920, as I recall, corn was selling for a dollar. Corn is quoted at 74 cents in today's Wall Street Journal. I confess I am really unable to bring myself to believe that the presence of too much gold in this land is the most important factor. I think the Senator from Ohio puts his finger on a very important item when he talks about the demand which cannot be filled and which, in itself, is a tremendous impetus to price raising. When a million people want automobiles, and only 700,000 can be built because of war conditions or some other conditions, as a matter of course the price immediately goes up because the demand is there. The Government is bidding for men to work in war industries, private industries want men, and they are competing against one another for the labor of men. So the price of labor goes up and wages go up. Those are the factors which, it seems to me, present the most convincing evidence that the pure abstract question of money is not necessarily the most vital part of our difficulties.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree with the Senator that it is not the most vital factor, and I tried to set out half a dozen other factors. I say it is only one factor; but the continual exercise of this power is going to add to the inflationary danger; it is going to push prices up even farther than they would otherwise go. The very existence of the power, and the thought that it may be used, has proved in the past to be somewhat inflationary.

So it seems to me that the Congress ought to say now it is going to do everything it can to check inflation; it is going to hold down this boom. There is going to be a boom, anyway, and we must look to the time after the war when it will be necessary for us to do everything we can to bolster things up. We should put off any expenditures, such as the St. Lawrence seaway project which can be avoided, so that they may come

after the war, and bolster up, as in 1920, when we had a little reserve of housing and other kinds of projects which had been postponed during the World War, and which when undertaken made the depression of 1920 a short one and made our recovery rapid, although later on it developed that what we did after all was only of temporary effect, but the final depression was still the result of the inflation of the World War. Anything we can do should be done. The stopping of this power is only one thing, as the Senator from Washington says, but we can discontinue that power and we can adopt now a policy against any inflationary measures at a time when inflation happens to be the particular danger which we face.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado that it would be immoral to make this change at this time. When we sell bonds to a bank it does not make much difference to the bank whether we pay them in 85-cent dollars or 100-cent dollars. The banks trade in dollars, and if the dollar goes up and down, they adjust their requirements to it; but the man back home who puts his money into bonds which are to be paid off 10 years from now will have the purchasing power of his dollar affected; and we ought not to do anything deliberately that will pay back to him dollars less valuable than are those we are asking him to give the Government today.

There is no conceivable reason of which I know for extending this power today, for there is no condition under which the President ought to exercise the power. The Secretary did not even talk this year about competitive devaluation; but I say that it is a mistake for us to lower the value of our currency even if other countries do devalue their currencies. Suppose England, for instance, should devalue the pound, what would that mean? They could undersell us in South America, certainly. Why? Because they would be selling their goods cheaper than they were before, and, incidentally, they would be paying more for the food they have to import with which to feed their workers. It means, if they do that, they are giving their workers a lower standard of living, and they are underselling us in South America under those circumstances because their workers are willing to accept a lower standard of living.

Mr. President, certainly the way to meet devaluation of the English pound is not to devalue the dollar. The same thing could have been accomplished by the British by subsidizing their exports. If we want to meet that situation, we can subsidize our exports. All that devaluation of a competitive currency means is that the country which devalues is willing to take less money for its goods. If we carry out to its logical conclusion this devaluation business, it means that we are willing to sell our goods for nothing to people abroad, and are willing to pay them a hundred times more for the goods we have to buy from them. If we want to meet that competition, let us subsidize our exports. We are doing it now. Certainly that is a sounder method than to upset our whole internal economy, as well as our foreign trade, by proceeding to devalue the dollar and repudiate the promises we have made.

It is said that this is a club that the President ought to have. Of course, as a club against Hitler, Stalin, the British, or anybody else, it is a very weak club, because it lets the President devalue only 15 percent. He can accomplish all the ills of devaluation, all the disturbance of devaluation, all the lack of stabilization of devaluation; but as a club against a foreign nation which can devalue 100 percent it is probably worse than useless.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand that the totalitarian nations do not use gold at all; so what difference does it make?

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for the thought.

Finally, Mr. President, the effect of devaluing the dollar, supposing this should be done, is to raise the price of gold from $35 an ounce to $41.34 an ounce. What does that mean? It means that more gold is coming to this country, and that we shall pay more for that gold. Of all the idiotic moves in the world, that would seem to me to be the most idiotic. We now have more gold than we can possibly use. We paid for it more than it is worth. Gold probably will always have value. I do not agree with those who think it will come to have no value at all; but I very much doubt if it will ever be worth $35 an ounce when it can be mined in South Africa for $15 an ounce. The effect of further devaluing the dollar, of increasing the price of gold from $35 to $41, will be be to bring into production all the low-cost mines in South Africa and Russia and everywhere else in the world, and it will therefore increase the amount of gold they produce. Today we are buying every ounce of gold that is produced in the entire world. Of all the idiotic proposals imaginable, the proposal to increase the price of gold from $35 to $41 seems to me the most ridiculous.

Mr. President, in conclusion, it seems to me the Senate should say now that we are going to do everything we can to prevent inflation, to prevent this boom that is occurring from getting beyond all reason. I think we ought to tax. I think we cught to support Mr. Morgenthau in his campaign to sell bonds. Personally, I think we ought to grant the power to fix prices to some responsible board that will consider the whole policy, and hold prices down as much as they can hold them down; but even then they will not be able to do it, because, if they do not have power to fix wages, prices inevitably will push up, only somewhat more slowly if we have price-fixing power. I think we should end inflationary power. We should say now that we are not going to suggest to anybody that we are going, deliberately, to do anything to increase the danger of inflation which we now face. I think we should affirm to the entire world the fact that we intend to make the dollar stable and keep it stable. I think it will be of far more value to our foreign trade to have the American dollar the most stable currency in the world, the standard upon which all business transactions are based, than ever to engage, at any time, in any competitive devaluation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have here some data which I wish to present to the Senate. I shall not detain the Senate very long, because it will not be necessary.

In 1938 a friend of mine, a European, told me that when we devalued gold he had $1,000 in American eagles. He sold them on the London market, and got in exchange $1,800 in American money. I do not know what he did with it. I never have been able to understand what good that did the United States. It may be that I fail to understand it because I am a very simple-minded man from the country.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said that we now buy all the gold in the world. That man got a premium of 80 percent on his American eagles. He got 10 percent premium because it was said that there was 10 percent of surplus gold in the old American eagle. Other people, who sold dollars based upon gold, got $1,700, or a profit of 70 percent.

It is interesting to try to find out what this gold policy means. It is said that it has raised the price level. It has always seemed to me that the money we borrowed to pay the bonus was responsible for the so-called boom of 1937. It sent money into every corner of the United States. The money which we borrowed, and which we still owe on bonds, and spent for public works and for relief, has had, in my opinion, more to do with spreading purchasing power than has the devaluation of gold. The question is, What are we going to do with the gold? We are buying it. Nobody else wants it at the present price we pay of $35 an ounce. Foreigners are dumping it here. They have been dumping it here ever since we started to buy.

For instance, 1934 was the year when we raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce from $20.67. That is a bonus of 70 percent. In a total of seven years and three months, down to March 31, 1941, approximately $16,300,000,000 in gold was acquired by us; and of this total the major five-eighths, or $10,334,500,000 came from the British Empire. The bulk of this gold was mined in British South Africa, Rhodesia, Canada, Australia, and British India. On its way to Washington this $10,334,500,000 of British gold has come through the following channels: $5,547,500,000 through the United Kingdom, $3,577,700,000 through Canada, $279,700,000 from Australia, $208,000,000 from South Africa, and $347,985,000 from British India.

Bought by the United States at the 70 percent premium price of $35 an ounce, amounting to $10,334,500,000, at the United States Treasury, the bonus paid—the difference between the price of $20.67 an ounce and $45 an ounce—makes a clean bonus or premium of $4,233,300,000 that we have paid in American dollars for gold that no one else wanted at the

price at which we bought it. On an average, that amounts to about 25 percent of Great Britain's yearly tax levy. We have spent more in paying a bonus to the British Empire for the gold than we have spent on all our expenditures for farm relief in those seven years. Whether that money has been spent here for goods, I do not know, but I know we have the gold, and if we are to use it as a government and take possession of it we shall have to pay for it.

The interesting thing is that we have nearly $23,000,000,000 in gold which we have gathered from all the corners of the earth, which other people have dumped upon us. Great Britain in 1939 had about two and a half billion dollars in gold reserve. They have turned over most of it to the stabilization fund, and they now have left in reserve $1,000,000 while we have nearly $23,000,000,000.

Canada had a gold reserve of about $212,000,000 in April 1940, and in May 1940 that had been reduced to $5,000,000. The rest had been turned over to the Foreign Exchange Control Board, and that is controlled by the Minister of Finance of Canada.

The British Government gold reserves, outside of the stabilization fund, have remained at $1,000,000. Everything else has been dumped upon us at a premium of 70 percent per ounce.

The question is, what are we going to do with the gold? We have drained the countries of Europe of gold. I have not been able to get any idea as to what gold is in Germany. That is not given in the Federal Reserve Bulletin. But Mexico has only $54,000,000, New Zealand has only $23,000,000, Peru has $20,000,000, Portugal has $63,000,000, South Africa has $388,000,000, which is very little compared with what she produces, but she dumps it here.

Mr. President, I have a table showing the gold reserves of various countries, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gold reserves

Argentina	$353,000,000
Brazil	51,000,000
British India	274,000,000
Chili	30,000,000
Colombia	18,000,000
Hungary	24,000,000
Japan	164,000,000
Java	171,000,000
Mexico	54,000,000
New Zealand	23,000,000
Peru	20,000,000
Portugal	63,000,000
South Africa	388,000,000
Sweden	171,000,000
Switzerland	524,000,000
Turkey	87,000,000
Uruguay	88,000,000

Other countries (a few hundred million).

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I seek more information. I understood the Senator from Ohio to express fear over a possible inflationary boom under existing conditions. If his fear should be realized, and there should be a spiral of inflation and a great boom such as we had in years past, under our present system of the commodity dollar, or controlled currency, or whatever one wishes to call it—and we had the same experience under a gold standard—how would the money experts ever explain that, except by a most violent oversimplification of the problem?

We are assured that our fears are well grounded in one case. Then we have a boom under diametrically opposite conditions, and we attribute it to exactly opposite causes. I have begun to wonder whether we are not all going to be horribly befuddled by this sort of reasoning. If we should have the violent boom which the Senator from Ohio fears may come, we would have it under our system of controlled currency. But we had a violent boom under the gold standard. After awhile the folks who do not understand these things will begin to wonder if we had not better stop talking about money and get down to more fundamental things, because the shifting price levels are frequently the results of many forces—wage demands, and changing wage levels, and a hundred other things which are not directly connected with the mechanics of money.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield, I wish to say that I agree entirely with the Senator from Washington that the effect of the currency is grossly exaggerated, in my opinion. As a rule the currency is rather the result than the cause of the changes in price levels.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if I may do so, I wish to remind the Senator from Washington that during the last war we borrowed a great deal of money. We issued bonds of all kinds, as we are doing now; and, of course, with all the war buying, creating a demand and a shortage in the supply of almost everything, we drove prices up; and in order to pay we borrowed more money.

Mr. BONE. We would have precisely that condition under any monetary system.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, and I think we will have as long as we borrow money at the rate at which we are borrowing now and at the rate at which we borrowed during the last World War. We had the gold standard at that time, with gold supposed to be worth only $20.47 an ounce. But that had nothing to do with stopping the credit inflation.

Mr. BONE. As soon as demand exceeds supply a new force is brought to bear on production, and it is an almost irresistible force. We would endeavor to counter that by price controls. I think we are going to run into squally weather if we put into effect a system of price control and clamp down a police regulation and say, "You shall charge so much and no more." If a business says that wages are going up and it is going broke as a result of contractual obligations and prevailing prices, what is the answer? We find that factors are present which we cannot very greatly simplify. They are there. They affect both business and labor. If prices go up, then labor presents a just demand for wage increases. We may find that taxation is about the only regulator that really regulates, and the answer is not to be found in money mechanism.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like to see the Treasury or the Federal Reserve Board give us as idea of what they are going to use the gold for if and when the time comes when we are going to use it for something. When that time comes, what are we going to do with the gold? At the price we have paid for the gold, I do not think any foreign government will want it. The chances are they will make arrangements for international exchange without gold, because the fact that we started to buy their gold, and drained the other countries of gold, made it necessary to indulge in barter, if they would trade at all. They could not deal in gold exchange, they could not buy it, because the United States would give more for gold than would any other country in the world. I think that had a great deal to do with international exchange. It has been based on gold. Nations were driven to barter, which we are led to believe by our great expert economists is a crime. It seems to me it was inevitable. If we have something to sell and no one will buy except those who have no gold, and they will exchange for something which we want, and we make a trade, that is the old-fashioned method of barter. What else will people do when Uncle Sam buys gold at 70 percent more than anyone else will pay for it? Gold is driven from the international market into the United States.

The question is, What are we going to do with this gold, what are we going to use it for? Evidently England, and the British Empire, producing most of the gold of the world, are perfectly willing to dump it upon us and get a 70-percent premium in American dollars. Are they going to buy this gold back? Are we going finally to use it as a basis for stabilizing our currency? If so, the sooner we do it the better. It will be better the sooner we do it, and start a market for the buying and selling of gold, letting it go at the value nations will pay for it, a natural level, instead of building up an artificial value, so that we do not know what value it will have, burying it down in Kentucky. That is a conundrum to all our people. They are wondering what we are going to do about it. It is not money now, and we are getting along without it as money so far, until this day, although we are still borrowing, and borrowing, and spending.

These are some of the questions about which I think the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board should enlighten the people. It would dispel a great deal of apprehension, a great deal of the mystery about the tower built of gold in Kentucky.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the situation in connection with the pending bill which is of most startling interest is the complete dearth of evidence in the record to justify it. I do not intend to engage in a discussion of the economic reasons against the bill, but only wish to point out to those Members of the Senate who are not on the Banking and Currency Committee that there was no evidence whatever before us as to why we should continue the President's power further to devalue the dollar.

Two years ago the Senator from Virginia, who is in charge of the bill today, argued to us that continuation of the President's power further to devalue the dollar was both unnecessary and immoral. Today he tells us that he wants to continue the power, and the only reason he can think of is that he trusts the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before us. I asked the Secretary of the Treasury some questions about this matter, and I put it up to the Secretary in these words:

Senator DANAHER. So it comes to this really, that despite whatever disadvantages there may be implicit in our questions or in our answers, you feel that the continuation of that power should be had to deal with unforeseen and unpredictable emergencies which you cannot now define?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Absolutely. That is what I was trying to say. I could not say it as well as you have put it.

Mr. President, it narrows down to this, that the senior Senator from Virginia, who 2 years ago found this continuation of power unnecessary and immoral, has this time espoused it, and asked that we adopt the proposal on the ground that he trusts the Secretary, who says that, in his judgment, there are no perceptible factors upon which to justify the bill, but there may be some unpredictable situation in the future which he might like to meet. That is the situation as it stands of record.

Mr. President, Mr. Morgenthau appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Over there he said:

The greatest use for it—

That is, this power—

I have always claimed, is the fact that he—

Meaning the President—

has had it. It is like the fire engine. A man in a town where there is a good fire engine and a good police department is going to hesitate a long time before he sets fire to somebody's place, because he knows, first, he may get caught; and second, there is good apparatus to put it out. That is the way I feel on this gold devaluation.

I do not suppose that argument is what swayed the Senator from Virginia, but that is what the Secretary of the Treasury told the House committee.

Mr. President, last year we were told in our committee that this power was needed to preserve and protect the commerce of the United States. Previous to that, the proposal was advanced on the theory that we were going to raise the market price of goods in our country. This year the proponents cannot think of any reason whatever except that the future is unpredictable, and therefore we should continue the power. The Secretary of the Treasury further said before the House committee:

And it is more against the day when the fighting ceases and people sit back and again want to do business through normal channels of trade that I think it is important that the President of the United States through Congress be allowed to continue to have this power. Against the day—not today or tomorrow—but against the day when there once more is peace and we find what kind of competition we are up against in the world markets to do business with American merchandise. Now nobody knows what that competition will be, but I believe it would be a mistake at this time to take that authority away from the President.

Mr. President, that is exactly the sum total of the basis upon which Congress is now asked to continue in the hands of the Executive the power to inflate our currency by the extent of at least $4,300,000,000, applying it only against the gold stock pile alone. It seems to me the Senate ought to have some more reason, some more justification for the continuation of such vast powers in the hands of the President than an unpredictable future.

Let it be pointed out further that should the President by the proposed legislation be given the power to devalue the 59-cent dollar to the 50-cent ratio, so far as I am able to interpret the pending legislation, there would be no restriction upon the President's power to increase the value of the dollar thereafter, and consequently, Mr. President, we find ourselves confronted with the situation that into the hands of one man we will have given the power to play with—that is the the term by which to describe it—to play with the security of the United States in terms of its fiscal status to the extent of a full 15 percent in either direction from its present dollar.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have said before, and I cannot help but repeat it in the form of a question, that the American people should have some explanation from those who want this gold devaluation and gold purchase policy. What is it for? Ever since the beginning of the gold purchase policy I have been trying to find out what it is for. I have gotten no answer which is satisfactory to me, and I have found no one who has gotten an answer satisfactory to him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is wholly right. I ask him if he will authorize me to join himself with me in asking the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Virginia, if he will now give us a reason why we should continue the power to devalue the dollar? May we have a reason?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; I will give it to the Senator in the language of the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. DANAHER. What did he say, Mr. President?

Mr. GLASS. He said:

Moreover, now that the administration, which bears the primary public responsibility for economic and monetary policy, has requested renewal of the authority to devalue the dollar in terms of gold, I recognize that it would be inappropriate and ineffectual to press further for a contrary decision.

The Senator can quote the Federal Reserve Board. Why does not the Senator accept what it says?

Mr. DANAHER. What does the Senator from Virginia say is the reason? Give us one, I ask respectfully.

Mr. GLASS. I have given the Senator the quotation which I read as a reason. I have adopted the recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board as a reason.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator now feel as he did 2 years ago, that continuation of these powers is neither necessary nor moral?

Mr. GLASS. I will tell the Senator what I feel. If there has not been any abuse under the powers for 8 years why should the Senator expect there would be a great abuse in the next 2 years?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, of course the fact remains that in the past 8 years the powers have not been used at all.

Mr. GLASS. The powers were used.

Mr. DANAHER. But that is no reason why the powers should be continued even for another 2 years.

Mr. GLASS. The powers were used. The value of the gold dollar was reduced to 59 cents.

Mr. DANAHER. That was under the authority of the Congress, was it not?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; under the authority of Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; precisely.

Mr. GLASS. And this would be under the authority of Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President; that is just where the whole point of differentiation arises, I beg to say to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's counsel and I appreciate his zeal, and I think I sense something of the reasons for the change in his attitude, but I will say to the Senate, as the Senator from Minnesota has said to the country, that there is not one single reason of record why the Senate should continue this enormous grant of power.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is necessarily absent from the Senate Chamber. He requested of me to announce that he did not wish to press his amendment to the pending bill, which was offered on May 29. The reasons why he does not care to press his amendment are set out in a letter addressed by the Senator from Nevada to the Secretary of the Treasury and in the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury to that letter.

On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the amendment, as well as the two letters mentioned, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment and the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCARRAN to the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, viz: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised,' approved July 6, 1939."

JUNE 5, 1941.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing herewith for your comment copy of a proposed amendment which I have introduced to the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time

within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

I am convinced that under a strict application of the law, section 4 of the Stabilization Act of 1939 will remain in full force and effect and continue to govern the statutory price of silver at 71 cents per fine ounce. However, because H. R. 4646 fails to make mention of the act of 1939, I should not want it construed, by implication or otherwise, that section 4 of that act would likewise expire. I am therefore taking the liberty of drawing this matter to your attention prior to your appearance before the Senate Finance Committee in order that this question may be clarified before the committee and corrected in the bill.

As you will note, my amendment merely provides that nothing in H. R. 4646 shall be construed to affect in any manner the provisions of section 4 of the Stabilization Act of 1939.

Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation in this matter.

Respectfully,

PAT MCCARRAN.

[Enclosure.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have your letter dated June 5, 1941, and your telegram of June 9, 1941, both relative to the amendment to H. R. 4646, "To extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised," which you intend to submit when that bill is considered in the Senate. You request my comments.

Your proposed amendment would add a new section at the end of the bill reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner any of the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised,' approved July 6, 1939."

Section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, 53 Stat. 998 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 316c) provides for the coinage of silver mined subsequent to July 1, 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction. The act directs that upon delivery of silver to any mint for coinage, 45 percent of the silver shall be deducted as seigniorage, the other 55 percent is to be coined into silver dollars, and an equal amount of silver dollars delivered to the owner of the silver.

Section 4 of the act of July 6, 1939, is permanent legislation and is in no wise affected by H. R. 4646, which extends the stabilization-fund powers and the powers vested in the President by section 43 (b) (2) of the act of May 12, 1933, as amended. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the amendment which you propose is unnecessary.

Very truly yours,

HENRY MORGENTHAU,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at 12 o'clock, upon the convening of the Senate and the development of a quorum, a vote be had on the pending bill and all amendments thereto, and that the rule requiring the presence of a quorum at this time be waived.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the able Senator from South Carolina. I think it is eminently proper that we should not try to obtain a quorum this afternoon, but that we should agree upon a vote tomorrow after the development of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator mind confining his unanimous-consent agreement to the Adams amendment, which, after all, is the main feature? There are one or two other amendments which may require a few minutes to discuss. I do not like to agree now that there may be no discussion of any subsequent amendment. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. My only purpose in presenting the request was to avoid an attempt to obtain a quorum this afternoon. It is questionable whether a quorum could be developed at this time if we should proceed to dispose of the bill this afternoon. I hope the Senator will agree to let the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with respect to the vote on the Adams amendment. I am quite willing to agree to vote on the bill at half past 12 or 1 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that upon the development of a quorum after the convening of the Senate tomorrow a vote be had upon the Adams amendment, and that not later than 1 o'clock p. m. a vote be had upon the bill and all other amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPORTATION OF MEAT FROM ARGENTINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with respect to the importation of meat from Argentina.

There was handed to me this afternoon a copy of an Associated Press dispatch which was sent out from Buenos Aires last evening. It reads as follows:

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA, June 26.—Daniel Amadeo Videla, Argentina's Minister of Agriculture, announced tonight that the United States had agreed to permit importation of meat from Tierra del Fuego territory at the southernmost tip of South America.

Since it is a sheep-raising section, only fresh frozen or chilled lamb will be available for export from Tierra del Fuego. No immediate shipments were expected, since the territory's output all goes to Britain at present.

The Minister termed the agreement an important step in dissolving the years-long dispute between Argentina and the United States after the latter barred importation of Argentine meat due to prevalence of hoof-and-mouth disease.

Mr. President, I was asked by the newspaper correspondent who handed me this report if I had any comment to make. I presume the request for comment was directed to me, because last February I stood on the floor of the Senate and urged a relaxation of the prohibition that was carried in the naval appropriation bill against the purchase of Argentine canned meat for the naval forces of the United States, although before the present war I had opposed such importations.

At that time I had been cooperating with the representatives of the American National Livestock Association in the effort to obtain an understanding with the officials of this Government with respect to the program of purchasing meat supplies for the armed forces of the United States. I was very happy to announce on this floor that the cattlemen of America were ready to cooperate with the executive arm of the Government in making as easy as possible the purchase of necessary food supplies for the Army and Navy; and that as the result of the conferences which had been held a clear understanding had been reached that would guarantee adequate supplies of meat and at the same time safeguard the livestock industry. Thereafter opposition was withdrawn by the great American National Livestock Association and by some of us in the Congress who represent the meat-producing areas of the country.

DANGER OF HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

These conferences were held by the representatives of the livestock industry with representatives of O. P. M., the Army, and the Navy. They were chiefly and primarily concerned that there should be no relaxation of the prohibition contained in the present law against the importation of fresh meat from a country in which hoof-and-mouth disease exists. Their objection to the importation of such meat was not in any sense whatsoever a reflection upon the Government of Argentina, the people of Argentina, or the cattle industry of Argentina. It was the result of the fact, acknowledged in the dispatch I have just read, that the hoof-and-mouth disease is prevalent in Argentina. It was based upon a comprehension of the fact that if the hoof-and-mouth disease should be introduced into the United States by the importation of fresh meat or live animals, the livestock herds of this country would be seriously endangered. We knew, as a matter of scientific fact, that the disease might be altogether mild in one area, but if introduced into another area which was free could and, indeed, most probably would have a devastating effect upon livestock.

It was in the understanding of this fact that in 1930 the livestock producers of the United States secured the enactment of a statute which prohibits the importation of fresh meat from countries in which this disease exists. It is important that the law itself should be clearly understood. I wish to read it. It is section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930:

(a) Rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease: If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country, is prohibited.

Mr. President, the language of that statute seems to be very clear. It was understood by those who supported it, and apparently it was understood by the Department of State. It was understood by the Government of Argentina. Because the clear prohibition against the

importation of livestock or of chilled or frozen beef was understood by all; because the Government of Argentina, I think without reason, regarded this act as a reflection upon the livestock industry of Argentina, and because the Secretary of State—a former Member of this body, our good and respected and able friend, the Honorable Cordell Hull—desired to promote trade with foreign countries, a treaty was negotiated by the Department of State with the Government of Argentina with the express object of modifying that statute.

The statute said that these products, live or chilled or frozen, should not be imported from a country in which the disease exists.

OPPOSITION TO ZONING

The argument then was made, "But there are some areas of Argentina in which the disease does not exist. Let us zone Argentina and permit the importation of livestock and fresh and frozen meats from the areas which are free from the disease."

The livestock industry in the United States objected to that, for the simple reason that there is no way by which the United States can govern the transportation of livestock or of chilled and frozen meat from an infected to a noninfected area in a foreign country. There is no means by which the Secretary of Agriculture can supervise the enforcement of such a rule by the employees of a foreign government. But the treaty was negotiated. It is important that we should understand just what it was proposed to do by the treaty.

I read article III of the treaty. I shall ask unanimous consent that the full treaty may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

WHAT THE TREATY SOUGHT TO ACCOMPLISH

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At this point I read article III:

Each contracting party—

Namely, the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Argentina—

Each contracting party recognizes the right of the other party to prohibit the importation of animal or plant products originating in or coming from territories or zones which the importing country considers to be affected with or exposed to plant or animal diseases or insect pests dangerous to plant, animal, or human life, until it has been proved to the satisfaction of the party exercising such right that such territory or zone of the other party is free from such contagion or infestation or exposure to contagion or infestation. Neither contracting party may prohibit the importation of animal or plant products originating in and coming from territories or zones of the other country which the importing country finds to be free from animal or plant diseases or insect pests or from exposure to such diseases or pests for the reason that such diseases or pests exist in other territories or zones of the other country.

The purpose of this language of this pact was to modify section 306 (a) of the act of 1930. It had no other purpose. The treaty was sent to the Senate on June 5, 1935, and was properly and regularly referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Foreign Relations, impressed with the correctness of the point of view which I have just expressed here, namely, that it would be dangerous to the livestock herds and flocks of this country to permit the importation of these products from a country in which disease exists, did not act upon the treaty. It was never reported to the Senate. It has never been ratified.

During the negotiations over the importation of canned meat which took place early this year, one of the questions raised on behalf of the livestock industry was whether or not there was to be any effort to revive this treaty which had come to be known as the sanitary pact; and the understanding was clearly given to us that there was no intention to revive that pact. Among those with whom I talked at that time was Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, who had been brought to Washington to take charge of fostering good will relations with Latin America, and who, I understand, has been doing a very excellent piece of work in that regard. I had the clear impression from him that there was no longer any interest in the question of the importation of chilled or frozen meat or of livestock from Latin America, or the revival of the sanitary pact.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from Mr. Rockefeller on this subject, a letter in which he acknowledges the contribution of the livestock industry to the objective for which he was working.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Negotiations were held with the O. P. M.; and when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration, I read into the RECORD a letter which I had received from Mr. Donald Nelson, Director of the Division of Purchases of the O. P. M. This letter was dated February 19, 1941, and I ask that this letter also may be printed again in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the concluding sentence of this letter Mr. Nelson said:

I have investigated this matter, and I can inform you that it is not contemplated to purchase more than 20,000,000 pounds of canned corned beef from South America for defense purposes for the fiscal year 1941, and with respect to the purchase of fresh meat for the armed services that no change is contemplated in the present plans of the Government to obtain such supplies from domestic sources.

Having in mind these negotiations, having in mind the whole history of this transaction, my impulse, when I was asked this afternoon for a comment on the dispatch from Buenos Aires, was to respond and say, "Why, there is nothing to that. The Argentine official must have been misinformed." It occurred to me, however, that it might be wise for me to make sure of my ground; and so I called the Department of State and talked with Under Secretary Welles.

It will be observed that according to the news dispatch from Buenos Aires, the Department of Agriculture of Argentina was apparently the authority for the statement that all the available supply of fresh meat from Tierra del Fuego is now going to Britain, and that there was no thought of sending any into the United States, although permission was said to have been granted by the United States.

Under Secretary Welles immediately undertook to set my fears at rest by saying: "There is no intention of bringing in any fresh meat from Tierra del Fuego." Naturally, the question in my mind then was, "Why, then, grant permission for the importation of such meat?"

I then made inquiry as to how it came about that such a change of policy had been made. I was advised that the Department of Justice had been requested by the Department of Agriculture to render an opinion construing section 306 (a) of the 1930 act and to determine whether or not Tierra del Fuego—which is separated from the body of Argentina as Long Island is separated from the State of New York by a body of water—was indeed a separate foreign country within the meaning of this section, and whether the Secretary of Agriculture could find that Tierra del Fuego, though a part of Argentina, was not the same foreign country, under this law and that livestock could be imported therefrom to the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ADVICE

Then I discovered, by inquiry at the Department of Justice, that the request was received from the Department of Agriculture by the Department of Justice on the 14th or 15th of May. It was on May 14 that the Secretary of Agriculture wrote a letter making the inquiry. To that inquiry he received a response dated May 16, signed by the Attorney General. This opinion, I understand, was written by Judge Newman A. Townsend, a special assistant to the Attorney General, the gentleman with whom I talked.

It is a significant thing that this opinion, which was rendered on the 16th of May, with respect to a subject in which the residents of many States are vitally interested, did not become public except through the means of a newspaper dispatch from Buenos Aires. Nobody in the Senate was advised. The Foreign Relations Committee was not advised. The livestock industry was not advised.

I called the Bureau of Animal Industry and said to Dr. Mohler, the head of that Bureau, "Have you seen an opinion from the Department of Justice construing section 306 (a) of the 1930 Tariff Act?" His answer was a question: "Where did you hear of such an opinion? No such opinion has been printed in the Federal Register." I said, "I heard about it through the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Welles." I had not at that time obtained a copy of the opinion; so my inquiry to Dr. Mohler was merely to determine what, in his judgment, the effect of this opinion was.

Later I received the document which Judge Townsend was good enough to send me by special messenger. It is interesting and important enough to read:

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In your letter of May 14 you request my opinion "whether Tierra del Fuego may be regarded as a country, separate from continental Argentina and Chile, within the meaning of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1306 (a))," which reads as follows:

And then the statute, which I have already read, is set forth at length.

A somewhat similar question under the same statute was dealt with in the Attorney General's opinion of August 11, 1933, 37 Op. 225, and I quote therefrom the following paragraph:

"The Republic of Argentina, of course, is a foreign country, and no reasons have been presented to me which, in my opinion, would justify a conclusion that the southern part, referred to as Patagonia, may be considered a separate country. It appears from the Encyclopædia Britannica and from Nelson's Perpetual Loose Leaf Encyclopædia (corrected to 1933) that 'Patagonia' is a name commonly applied to the southern part of South America, embracing territory within both Chile and Argentina, and it further appears that the Patagonian portion of Argentina is geographically contiguous to the remainder of Argentina, the whole constituting a single political entity, one country, the Republic of Argentina."

That is the end of the quotation from the opinion of August 11 1933.

The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture in an opinion submitted with your letter points out that Tierra del Fuego, unlike Patagonia, is not geographically contiguous to either Argentina or Chile (save, perhaps, in a very broad sense), being wholly separated from the mainland of South America by the Magellan Strait, and that it is far removed from territory in which the foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent.

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Burnet* v. *Chicago Portrait Co.* (285 U. S. 1, 5) pointed out that the term "foreign country" has no fixed meaning when used in a statute.

The meaning to be given the term depends upon the purpose of the particular legislation in which the expression is used. The following excerpt is from the opinion of the Court:

"The word 'country,' in the expression 'foreign country,' is ambiguous. It may be taken to mean foreign territory or a foreign government. In the sense of territory, it may embrace all the territory subject to a foreign sovereign power. When referring more particularly to a foreign government, it may describe a foreign state in the international sense, that is, one that has the status of an international person with the rights and responsibilities under international law of a member of the family of nations; or it may mean a foreign government which has authority over a particular area or subject-matter, although not an international person but only a component part, or a political subdivision, of the larger international unit. The term 'foreign country' is not a technical or artificial one, and the sense in which it is used in a statute must be determined by reference to the purpose of the particular legislation."

THE LANGUAGE OF THE SUPREME COURT

I pause in reading the letter from the Department of Justice to call attention to that language of the Supreme Court:

The term "foreign country" is not a technical or artificial one, and the sense in which it is used in a statute must be determined by reference to the purpose of the particular legislation.

Naturally, in these circumstances, I sent to the Senate Library for a copy of the United States report containing the decision of the Supreme Court from which this quotation was taken. I find that this decision, written by the Honorable then Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, was in a case which attempted to construe and did construe the meaning of the term "foreign country" in an internal-revenue statute which gives credit on the income tax to taxpayers who pay a tax in a foreign country.

In the particular instance, the taxpayer had paid a tax in the state of New South Wales. It was contended that since the state of New South Wales was a state, a part of another country, this statute, which was intended to give credit for income tax paid in foreign countries, did not apply and that credits should not be allowed.

The Supreme Court did not uphold that contention. The Chief Justice said:

The sole question is whether New South Wales is a "foreign country" within the meaning of the applicable statute.

Without reading all of this opinion I quote only from the syllabus, in which it is set forth that the Court held; referring to this internal revenue particular statute, which was being considered:

The purpose is to mitigate the evil of double taxation and to facilitate the foreign enterprises of domestic corporations, and

That the term "foreign country" is not limited to international states, but embraces any foreign government competent to lay the tax sought to be credited.

Mr. President, we have, then, a ruling of the Supreme Court which says in plain language that the meaning of the term "foreign country" in a statute is to be determined by a reference to the purpose of the particular statute; and we find this decision cited as a reason for defeating, not upholding, the purpose of the statute of 1930. That is so plain that there can be no dispute about it.

The purpose of the statute, the Court construed, was to facilitate the foreign enterprises of American corporations. The purpose of the statute of 1930 was not to facilitate the importation of livestock and livestock products from a foreign country. The purpose of that statute was to protect the livestock herds and flocks of the United States from the danger of infection from foreign meats by prohibiting importation from infected countries.

Let me proceed now with the reading of the opinion:

Having in mind the obvious purpose of the statute, the geographical meaning of the term rather than its political meaning conforms with such purpose, where, in any event, the political meaning includes noncontiguous geographical areas, or where contiguous geographical areas encompass more than one political entity. Under this view, continental Argentina is a foreign country and Tierra del Fuego is also a foreign country notwithstanding that Tierra del Fuego is in part under the sovereignty of Argentina and in part under the sovereignty of Chile. Importations from all or any of these foreign areas may be prevented under the conditions stated in the statute; and political jurisdiction is not the controlling factor. Your solicitor indicates that the practice of your Department in the administration of the statute has been to this effect; that is, to regard the term "foreign country" as used primarily in a geographical rather than a political sense, as evidenced by the list of such countries from which importations are now forbidden (5 Fed. Reg. 4260). Accordingly, the present question is not controlled by the fact that a part of Tierra del Fuego is politically a part of Argentina.

If, therefore, having in mind the purpose of the statute to avoid risk of introduction of the disease into this country—

The Department of Justice recognized the purpose of the statute—

you find that the disease does not exist in Tierra del Fuego and that the geographical separation of it from continental Argentina and Chile is sufficient to avoid such risk, it is my opinion that it is within your discretion to treat Tierra del Fuego separately and that it need not necessarily be included in provisions which apply to continental Argentina and Chile.

Respectfully,

And it is signed by the Attorney General.

It will be observed from this opinion that the responsibility is placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether or not the separation of Tierra del Fuego from Patagonia—which formerly the Department of Justice would not regard as a separate foreign country—was sufficient to make it possible to risk the importation of livestock from that area. It will be a heavy responsibility, indeed, for him to declare that fresh meat and livestock may be imported without danger, just as it was a heavy responsibility for the Department of Justice to rule that a prohibitory statute directed against a foreign country may be relaxed for part of it.

POSITION OF O. P. M.

Mr. President, I want to add that having asked for a copy of this opinion from the Attorney General, while waiting for it to be delivered to me, I put in a telephone call for Mr. MacKeachie, of the O. P. M., who is the assistant to Mr. Donald Nelson, Mr. Nelson being out of town to my knowledge. I asked Mr. MacKeachie if there had been any change in the policy with respect to the purchase of meat. He told me that there had been no change. He said, "There is sufficient lamb in the United States for all our purposes." He assured me that it was the intention of O. P. M. to observe religiously the spirit and the letter of the understanding which was reached at the time the question of the importing of Argentine canned beef was under consideration.

The members of the O. P. M., and of every other executive agency with which I discussed this matter, did not hesitate to express in the warmest terms their gratification at what had been done by the livestock industry in rising above what many people had been led to believe was a narrow and sectional and selfish position. How easily do those words come to the lips of those who desire to condemn the actions of Members of the House and Members of the Senate who, having been elected to the Congress of the United States, undertake to observe their oaths of office in defending the interests of their constituents. The livestock industry of this country is one of

the most important branches of American agriculture. Those who are engaged in it will bear—and cheerfully—the tax burden we are about to levy. They are entitled to have their interests defended on this floor. They are entitled to know what their Government proposes to do with their interests, particularly when a statutory policy is to be changed.

TREATY RATIFICATION OR STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION?

Mr. President, what I wish to point out is that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has had this treaty before it since 1935, and has not seen fit to recommend to the Senate that the treaty be ratified, or the law changed or modified in any particular. Are we to believe now that what could not be done by the ratification of a treaty is about to be done by the construction of a statute? The statute prohibits the importation of livestock or fresh meat. The treaty sought to modify that prohibition, and the treaty sought to do it by creating a zone system in Argentina. The Senate of the United States has not seen fit to create that zone system. So naturally I inquired of the Secretary of Agriculture why the Department of Agriculture should be concerned about seeking a modification of the statute, and I learned what I had believed was the case from the beginning, that the Secretary of Agriculture wrote his letter asking for the opinion of the Department of Justice at the request of the Department of State. I asked for a copy of that letter. It has not yet been delivered to me.

Of course, I can understand that the Secretary of Agriculture might be reluctant to give out a copy of a letter which he had received from the head of the State Department without consulting the head of the State Department, so I am not surprised that the letter has not yet come to me, but the fact is that the State Department asked for this interpretation.

During the negotiations of last February we had an understanding with the State Department that this question would not be reopened. That was my understanding. It was the understanding of the representatives of the livestock industry. And I contend that it is of the utmost importance that Members of the Senate and citizens of the United States may with confidence depend upon the statements and assurances that are given to them by members of the executive arm of the Government. But it is of greater importance than that, Mr. President, to know whether or not it was the purpose of the State Department, by seeking this opinion, to secure an action which it could not get, or thought it could not get, from the Senate of the United States. The sanitary pact was out by agreement. There was to be no further consideration of it. But under the guise of an opinion from the Department of Justice reconstruing the law we are going to obtain, are we?—I ask that as a question—we are going to obtain, are we, a ruling which the Senate of the United States as a coordinate branch of the Government has not seen fit to give?

HEMISPHERIC DEFENSE

Mr. President, let me add one word. By the acts which the leaders of the livestock industry of this country have taken they have demonstrated their desire to promote hemispheric defense and national defense. There are many of us on this floor who have supported every movement that has been made in the defense program. Speaking for myself, I want to promote the good-neighbor policy, and I shall do everything I can to promote it, consistent with the vital interests of our own people. I gave evidence of my desire to promote it by the attitude which I took with respect to Argentine canned beef, and other Senators from areas in which the livestock industry is of great importance gave the same type of assurance.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for hemisphere defense to lay open the herds and flocks of the farmers and ranchers of this country to the danger of infection. Let no one say that this danger is only a figment of the imagination. The facts of the matter are that when the disease comes into a country which is clear of it, it is almost impossible to eradicate it without great loss, without great disaster.

But we have this curious condition existing now. The Minister of Agriculture of Argentina is apparently, in the dispatch, authority for the statement that there is no intention to send fresh meat in. Under Secretary of State Welles told me there is no intention to purchase it. I know with respect to O. P. M. that it is the purpose of that organization to keep faith with the industry with which it made this engagement. I believe that the State Department will also keep faith. I believe that the Department of Agriculture will also keep faith and defend the livestock properties of this country, and if they keep faith they may continue to depend upon the cooperation they have been receiving. It is of tremendous importance that confidence in the good faith of our officials be maintained.

We all know, of course, that in this great world crisis the parliamentary system of government is being undermined. We know that that is the very root of the war.

THE PRESERVATION OF DEMOCRACY

When I read the statement which Under Secretary Welles gave out only Sunday or Monday, after the attack of Germany upon Russia, I echoed and reechoed every word that was contained in that statement. Mr. Welles expressed my opinion when he announced the belief that the attack of Germany upon Russia brings about the greatest danger that has yet confronted this country in the present crisis, because the conquest of Russia will strengthen the hands of Hitler in his war on democracy everywhere. But, Mr. President, if we are defending democracy and the democratic method of making law and determining the policy which this country shall follow, then we cannot dare to permit activities such as are apparently represented in the correspondence I have laid before the Senate today. It is much more important for democracy in the Western Hemisphere, it is much more important for democracy in Argentina and in Tierra del Fuego, that democracy shall be maintained in the United States of America than it is that the State Department should go through the empty gesture of saying to Argentina, "We permit the importation of chilled meat which we do not intend to import."

EXHIBIT 1

The United States of America and the Republic of Argentina, being desirous of cooperating to prevent the introduction and spread of infectious and contagious plant and animal diseases and of insect pests, have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose, and have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America: Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America;

The President of the Republic of Argentina: His Excellency Dr. Felipe A. Espil, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Argentina at Washington;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Argentina will notify each other promptly, through the usual diplomatic channels, of the appearance and extent of plant and animal diseases and of insect pests dangerous to human, animal, or plant life.

ARTICLE II

The two contracting Governments will exchange the official regulations, periodicals, and other publications that may be issued in the respective countries on the subject-matter of this convention and likewise information concerning changes and substitutions which may be developed in the methods of prophylaxis, control, and care of plant and animal diseases and insect pests.

Each Government will permit visits to or stationing in its territories of experts and representatives of the other Government for the purpose of studying and observing on the ground the existence, distribution and methods of control and eradication of such diseases and pests as may appear in its territory. Each Government will facilitate so far as possible, the studies and observations of the experts or representatives of the other Government.

ARTICLE III

Each contracting party recognizes the right of the other party to prohibit the importation of animal or plant products, originating in or coming from territories or zones which the importing country considers to be affected with or exposed to plant or animal diseases or insect pests dangerous to plant, animal, or human life, until it has been proved to the satisfaction of the party exercising such right that such territory or zone of the other party is free from such contagion or infestation or exposure to contagion or infestation. Neither contracting party may prohibit the importation of animal or plant products originating in and coming from territories or zones of the other country which the importing country finds to be free from animal or plant diseases or insect pests or from exposure to such diseases or pests, for the reason that such diseases or pests exist in other territories or zones of the other country.

ARTICLE IV

Certificates of origin or inspection of plant and animal products, issued by duly authorized sanitary officials of either of the contracting countries, shall be accepted by the authorities of the other country as proof of such

origin or inspection, as the case may be, but the issuance of such certificates by the authorities of one of the contracting countries shall not preclude further inspection of the products by the authorities of the other country, or further investigation with respect to them, to determine their freedom from infection or infestation or exposure to disease or insect pests, before entry is permitted.

ARTICLE V

The Government of the United States of America or the Government of the Republic of Argentina, as the case may be, will accord sympathetic consideration to such representations as the other Government may make regarding the application of sanitary laws and regulations for the protection of human, animal, or plant life.

In the event that the Government of either of the contracting countries makes representations to the Government of the other country in respect of the application of any sanitary law or regulation for the protection of human, animal, or plant life, and if there is disagreement with respect thereto, a committee of technical experts on which each contracting Government will be represented shall, on the request of either Government, be established to consider the matter and to submit recommendations to the two Governments.

Whenever practicable each Government, before applying any new measure of a sanitary character, will consult with the Government of the other country with a view to insuring that there will be as little injury to the commerce of the latter country as may be consistent with the purpose of the proposed measure. The provisions of this paragraph do not apply to actions affecting individual shipments under sanitary measures already in effect or to actions based on pure food and drug laws.

ARTICLE VI

This convention shall be ratified and the ratifications shall be exchanged at the city of Washington as soon as possible.

The convention shall come into force on the day of exchange of ratifications and shall remain in force until sixty days after either contracting party shall have given notice to the other party of its intention to terminate the convention.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at the city of Washington this twenty-fourth day of May in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-five.

CORDELL HULL [SEAL]
FELIPE A. ESPIL [SEAL]

EXHIBIT 2

LETTER FROM NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,
COORDINATOR OF COMMERCIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS,
March 11, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I believe you will be interested in knowing that the announcement made February 22 concerning the purchase of canned corned beef from South America for the Army has created an extremely favorable impression throughout the Americas.

I have had comment not only from representatives of the countries directly affected, but also from representatives of other countries which are not producers of canned corned beef.

Apparently the action indicated has been received by the other American Republics as one more evidence that the good-neighbor policy is being implemented by deeds, not words.

I have carefully checked the reaction in the United States to the announcement, as, of course, you have also, and I have not found any unfavorable comment in any of the press reports that have come to my attention.

Your very helpful cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Coordinator.

EXHIBIT 3

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: When you informed me last week that your recent discussions with representatives of our cattle producers indicated that they would have no objections in the present emergency to the purchase of necessary Army and Navy supplies of canned corned beef in South America if such purchases are made in such a way as not to be injurious to the American cattle producers, you inquired concerning the plans of the Government. I have investigated this matter and I can inform you that it is not contemplated to purchase more than 20,000,000 pounds of canned corned beef from South America for defense purposes for the fiscal year 1941, and with respect to the purchase of fresh meat for the armed services that no change is contemplated in the present plans of the Government to obtain such supplies from domestic sources.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD M. NELSON,
Director, Division of Purchases.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Wyoming for his splendid statement of what the livestock interests of the country did in trying to cooperate in the good-neighbor policy. I wish to impress on the Senate that the livestock industry is the most important agricultural industry in America. The thing the people of the West, particularly in the range States, fear most is the hoof-and-mouth disease, and any effort made to tear down the sanitary wall, whereby that industry would be exposed, might be fatal to the entire western section of the United States. Because of the efforts of the Senator from Wyoming, as well as those of the representatives of the cattle-growing industry, in negotiating with the State Department, we from the West finally accepted the compromise that was made in connection with the purchase of Argentine meats by the Army when a recent appropriation bill was under consideration.

Mr. President, I think I am safe in saying that had it not been for the efforts of the Senator from Wyoming, and the assurances which he then gave that the sanitary regulations which had been issued in an effort to keep the foot-and-mouth disease out of this country would not be interfered with, that compromise would not have been arrived at. The Senate of the United States would no doubt be on record as opposed to the purchase by our Army of any canned beef for importation into our country, had it not been for the splendid work of the Senator from Wyoming, and the assurances he gave not only to the livestock growers in the West but to the Senators from the West representing the livestock industry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry officers for appointment or promotion in the Coast Guard.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment or promotion in the Navy and in the Marine Corps.

By Mr HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harlan F. Stone to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the nomination by the President of Mr. Justice Stone to become Chief Justice of the United States is a very proper and commendable recognition of the ability, courage, and wisdom of Mr. Justice Stone, who has served as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court for quite a number of years.

When Mr. Stone was appointed an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, many years ago, I opposed the confirmation of his nomination and voted against it. In the years that have passed I became convinced, and am now convinced, that in my opposition to the confirmation of his nomination I was entirely in error.

I am now about to perform one of the most pleasant duties that has ever come to me in my official life when I cast a vote in favor of his elevation to the highest judicial office in our land. I do this because, while it may not affect the country or the Senate, or even Mr. Justice Stone, it is a great satisfaction to me to rectify, in a very small degree, perhaps, the wrong which I did him years ago when I voted against the confirmation of his nomination to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I am voting for his elevation to the office of Chief Justice of the United States with great satisfaction to myself, even though it may not affect anyone else. As I have said, it is one of the greatest satisfactions in my public life now to vote in favor of his elevation to the office of Chief Justice of the United States, heading the great tribunal on which he has served so

worthily and commendably for all these years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harlan F. Stone to be Chief Justice of the United States? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul P. Rao to be Assistant Attorney General, in charge of Customs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY—UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mathias F. Correa to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. McNamara to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Al. W. Hosinski to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy McNamara to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] reported a list of routine Army nominations. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed at this session or the previous session, as to which he has not been notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the President will be notified.

DEATH OF SENATOR ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON

The Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. BYRNES. On behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I send to the desk a resolution for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 134) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Andrew Jackson Houston, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LEE, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 28, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of June 26), 1941:

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Maj. Clarence Edgar Crumrine, Air Corps.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. George Fletcher Schlatter, Air Corps.
Capt. Howard Monroe McCoy, Air Corps.

NOTE.—The dates of rank are omitted as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the dates of rank and necessitate the renomination of these officers.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named Reserve officers and honor graduates for appointment in the Regular Army, in the arm or service specified, under the provisions of section 24e, National Defense Act, as amended, and in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 25, 1939:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Air Corps

Henry John Amen
James Carlton Barham
Arthur Louis Birleff
Russell Keith Brock
Grover Cleveland Brown
Robert Wiygul Burns
Carver Thaxton Bussey
Marshall Pyron Camp
Robert Brown Coen
William Allen Daniel
Robert Gabel Emmens
Quinter Paul Gerhart
James William Guthrie
Louis Henry Hansman
David Warren Hassemer
Nathan Bourne Hays
John Bailey Henry, Jr.
William John Kennedy
James Raymond Lyons
Franklin H. MacNaughton
Robert Haynes McCutcheon
Ralph Leslie Michaelis
Jack Gillespie Milne
Albert James Moye
James Wyatt Newsome
Frank Leslie Nims
Kenneth Walter Northamer
Arthur Clarke Perry
Harry MacCulloch Pike
Luther Henry Richmond
Harry James Sands, Jr.
William Frank Savoie
Charles David Sonnkalb
Harry Hunt Towler, Jr.
Lindsey Hartford Vereen
Edward Raymond Woolery
William Elmer Zins.

Infantry

James Lester Ballard, Jr.
Harry Vaughn Beck
George Eugene Bostwick
James Moore Boyd
Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold
Richard Boyd Bullock
George Alexander Clayton
Alvin Ethelbert Cowan
James Erwin Crosby, Jr.
Richard James Darnell
William Robertson Desobry
George Lindsay Disharoon, Jr.
Francis Loring Douglass
Donald Dean Dunlop
Keith Philip Fabianich
Robert Clare Foulston, Jr.
Alexis Michael Gagarine
Robert Usher Gaines, Jr.
Bernard Paul Haley
James William Haley
Lloyd LeRoy Hanes
Max George Hensel
Frank Selden Holcombe
Otho Eugene Holmes
John Geoffrey Keating
George Serge Koushnareff
Joe Vandiver Langston
Carlo Alfred LaPorta
Daniel Seward LaShelle
Glen Carl Long
Laurence Arthur Madill
Henry Van Middleworth
Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr.
Joseph Douglas Mitchell
Arthur McMurrough Murphy
Robert Eldon Phelps
Fred Allan Pierce, Jr.
Harold Ralph Rock
DeWitt Javan Ross
Ernest Samusson, Jr.
Herman Richard Schell
Terry Schiff
John Logan Schutz
John Wesley Simmons
James Turner Skipworth
Charles Sumner Smart, Jr.
Floyd Allison Soulé
James William Sutherland, Jr.
Henry Price Tucker
Warren Earl Walters
Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr.
Robert Blaine Wells
Leonard Shirley Wilhelm
John Michener Wilson
William Barker Wootton, Jr.

Field Artillery

Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr.
Joseph Lowery Amell, Jr.

Louis Edward Aull
William Albert Becker
Chester Henry Bigger
Richard Johnson Binnicker, Jr.
William Fredrick Cathrae
Wilson Freeman
Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr.
James Willard Guest
Arthur Wendell Gunn
Arthur John Howland
James Miller Hustead 2d
Edward August Huwaldt
Wilburt James Irwin
Jean Albert Jack
Leo Bond Jones
Paul Allard Kirk
Owen Beall Knight
Leon Francis Kosmacki
Joseph Ruane McGuire
Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller
James Penquitte Mulcahy
Robert Alroy Olson
Charles Frederick Ostner
John Robin Overstreet, Jr.
Allan Gardner Pixton
Joseph Cummins Richard
Quentin Roosevelt
James Victor Sanden
Thomas John Sharpe
Morris Cowan Stout
Douglas Hugh Sullivan
Benjamin Alan Swartz
George Ira Taylor
Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr.
Harry Kelly Thomson
Ernest Lee Wehner

Coast Artillery Corps

Charles Warren Adcock
John Arthur Benner
Hugh Woodrow Benson
Harold Broudy
Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr.
Edmund Louis DuBois
Jules Maurice DuParc
William Marks Hutson
Donald Henry Janz
William Franklin LaHatte
Eugene Francis Lawrence
Bliss Leon Mehr
Eugene Philip Palmer
William Bernard Pohlman, Jr.
Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr.
Peter Leon Urban
William Donald Ward
Harlan Glen Wood

Corps of Engineers

Jeff William Boucher
William E. Feeman
Lewis Warner Fogg 3d
Russell Samuel Gribble
Edward Bernard Jennings
Byron Mark Kirkpatrick
Joseph Theodore McQuaide
Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr.
Albro Lefils Parsons, Jr.
John William Paxton
Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr.
Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott
Frederick John Wells

Cavalry

Burton Bryant Chandler
Glenn Smith Finley, Jr.
Gerald Elbert Gowell
Toma David Harris, Jr.
Albin Felix Irzyk
Chester Elwood Kennedy
Robert Arnold Martin
James Francis McCarthy, Jr.
Frank Jacob Schaefer, Jr.
Maxie Thurmond

Quartermaster Corps

Arnold Beverly Addlestone
James Collins Bagg
John William O'Neill
William Neville Sloan, Jr.
John Carl Sparrow
Reuben Eugene Wheelis

Signal Corps

Robert Charles Barthle
Gordon B. Cauble
Donald Heck
John Taylor Newman

Ordnance Department

Ray C. Conner
Philip Wendell Constance
Carl Erwin Drewes
John Herbert Savage

Chemical Warfare Service

Karekin Gaspar Arabian

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of June 26), 1941:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Harlan F. Stone to be Chief Justice of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Paul P. Rao to be Assistant Attorney General, in charge of customs.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Mathias F. Correa to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

Joseph A. McNamara to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Al. W. Hosinski to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana.

James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

Guy McNamara to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Guy C. Williams, Kensett.

CALIFORNIA

Herbert F. Kenny, Balboa.
John H. Vaughan, Chico.
Mary L. Jordan, Fairfax.
Charles M. Gorham, Mar Vista.

INDIANA

Robert T. Phillippe, Bicknell.
Harry O. Storm, Clay City.
Robert C. Mayhall, Edinburg.
Mel M. Carter, Greensburg.

IOWA

Charles Monroe Boyer, Clutier.

KENTUCKY

Lucy W. Dyer, Sturgis.

MARYLAND

M. Elizabeth Gorsuch, Glencoe.
A. Franklin Bowers, Riverdale.

MICHIGAN

Carl H. Renbarger, Galien.
William J. Barber, Mason.

MINNESOTA

Earl J. O'Brien, Brainerd.
Arthur G. Johnson, Litchfield.
Howard R. Terrill, Nopeming.
Mae M. Stewart, Pine River.
Edwin H. Mielke, Wheaton.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam D. Hamilton, Tutwiler.

NEBRASKA

Rex Shubert, Fairfield.
Clive E. Lantz, Hildreth.
Bessie A. Freed, Pender.

NEW MEXICO

Byron F. Hughes, Eunice.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fred L. Key, Boonville.
Claude W. Walston, Pinetops.
George C. Herritage, Trenton.

OKLAHOMA

Lewis E. Sloan, Alex.
Wilson G. Gray, Anadarko.
Otis E. Cox, Barnsdall.
Thomas J. Hurst, Calumet.
Nettie I. McHenry, Chelsea.
Esther L. Hatchett, Gracemont.
Ernest F. Lyon, Hinton.
Samuel M. Scholl, Lookeba.
Walter G. Baustert, Okeene.
Douglas Thomas, Ryan.
Floyd G. Ransbarger, Verden.
Alfred Claude Davis, Woodward.

OREGON

Kathleen M. Barrett, Athena.
Ivan L. Swift, Gresham.
Donald E. Miller, Maupin.
Elizabeth G. Howard, Milton.
Florence A. Parker, North Powder.
Arthur H. Tifft, Redmond.

RHODE ISLAND

Arnold Sherman Knowles, Jr., Kingston.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grady R. Hogue, Blacksburg.
Carl W. Reeves, Gray Court.

TENNESSEE

Robert L. Woods, Concord.
Frank Rickman, Chapel Hill.
Hugh N. Reeves, Dickson.
Jesse S. McMurry, Hartsville.
Edward B. Weisiger, Hendersonville.
John E. Hale, Liberty.
Charles B. Stone, Woodbury.

VERMONT

Neal B. Smith, Williamstown.

VIRGINIA

Leo A. Arthur, Altavista.
Charles W. Crush, Christiansburg.
William F. Cox, Jonesville.

WISCONSIN

Allen G. Wald, Alma.
Alice S. Port, Amberg.
Andy J. Fogerty, Dresser.
Reinhold R. Hoffman, Fairchild.
John Lindow, Manawa.
Ernest G. Henline, Medford.
Delia G. Guay, Peshtigo.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Allen Wood Rigsby, to be captain, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from date of appointment.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Richard Byington Carhart, to be captain with rank from June 11, 1941, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Clarence Edgar Crumrine, Air Corps.

TO BE MAJORS

George Fletcher Schlatter, Air Corps.
Howard Monroe McCoy, Air Corps.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Cummings.
Lt. Col. Willard Stewart Paul.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. George Henry Dietz.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Elmo Stewart Mathews, Signal Corps.
First Lt. Daniel Light Hine.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Maurice Wuchter Musgrave.
Second Lt. William Calvin Banning.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Geoffrey Cooke Bunting, Coast Artillery Corps.
Orion Lee Davidson, Infantry.
×Thomas Francis Hickey, Field Artillery.
×Leander Larson, Quartermaster Corps.
Arthur Kay Chambers, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Emmett Michael Connor, Infantry.
×Thomas Newton Stark, Infantry.
Paul Thomas Hogge, Infantry.

To be first lieutenants

(All officers listed below hold rank as temporary first lieutenants, Army of the United States.)

Lloyd Hilary Gomes, Infantry.
×Felix Moses Hardison, Air Corps.
Herman Huebner Hauck, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Vincent Roddy, Field Artillery.
×Perry Elmer Conant, Cavalry.
×Howard Monroe Means, Air Corps.
Melvin Charles Helfers, Infantry.
Edward Bruce Bissell, Infantry.
M. Griffith Berg, Infantry.
×George Ellis Deshon, Infantry.
×Amos George Johnson, Infantry.
Carolus Adams Brown, Signal Corps.
×John Harris Griffith, Air Corps.
×William Raymond Peers, Infantry.
John Edwin Jarmin, Infantry.
John Ernest Walker, Corps of Engineers.
×William Morgan Summers, Infantry.
×Leland Wayne Cramer, Cavalry.
×Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, Field Artillery.
×Laverne Arthur Parks, Chemical Warfare Service.
Robert Peter Hagen, Infantry.
×Murray Elroy Sparks, Field Artillery.
Charles Albert Armstrong, Corps of Engineers.
×Charles Peter Stone, Infantry.
James Robert Wergin, Field Artillery.
×Frank George White, Field Artillery.
Arthur Theodore Sauser, Infantry.
×Elwin Thomas Knight, Cavalry.
Samuel McGraw Swearingen, Infantry.
Wayne Gill Springer, Infantry.
×Leland Gordon Fiegel, Air Corps.
×Thomas Danville Brown, Air Corps.
×Gregory Leo Higgins, Field Artillery.
Robert Joseph Chandler, Corps of Engineers.
John Dudley Wood, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Harry Philip Leber, Jr., Air Corps.
×McClellan Ferguson Stunkard, Jr., Air Corps.
Aaron Alexander Abston, Coast Artillery Corps.
Thomas Patrick Bell, Infantry.
John Richardson Alison, Air Corps.
Michael Joseph Coffield, Air Corps.
×Winfred Alban Ross, Signal Corps.
Steele Roy Patterson, Air Corps.
×Waymond Austin Davis, Air Corps.
×Leo Bernard Burkett, Field Artillery.
Thornton Kise Myers, Air Corps.
×Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., Air Corps.
Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
×John Ray Kilgore, Air Corps.
×Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., Air Corps.
Jerome Stanley Byrne, Coast Artillery Corps.
×Edwin Shepard Chickering, Air Corps.
×Joseph Harold Stangle, Field Artillery.
×Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., Air Corps.
×Meredith Ernest Allen, Field Artillery.
×Elton Woodrow Ringsak, Infantry.
×Henry Gordon Barrett, Air Corps.
×Robert Carl Orth, Air Corps.
×Jack Emerson Babcock, Chemical Warfare Service.
×Stanley Robert Kelley, Corps of Engineers.
John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×Rollie Neel Blancett, Corps of Engineers.
×Horace Malcolm Witbeck, Corps of Engineers.
×Charles Benjamin Schweizer, Corps of Engineers.
×Alfred Matthew Eschbach, Corps of Engineers.
×Harold Kenneth Howell, Corps of Engineers.
×William Brennan Stelzenmuller, Corps of Engineers.
×Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
Charles Thomas Bagley, Corps of Engineers.
×Harry Ellsworth Skinner, Corps of Engineers.
Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×Carroll Hilton Dunn, Corps of Engineers.
×Judson Woodring Wark, Corps of Engineers.
×John Chris Pappas, Corps of Engineers.
×Gilbert Byron Hall, Corps of Engineers.
×Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×Harry George Woodbury, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×William Chipman Holley, Corps of Engineers.
George Wright Bennett, Corps of Engineers.
×Joseph Ernest Veale, Corps of Engineers.
Robert Nendel Anderson, Corps of Engineers.
Herbert Evans Brown, Corps of Engineers.
×Andrew Olaf Lerche, Air Corps.
×John Claude Potter, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×William John Ellison, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
×Frank Milner, Corps of Engineers.
×R. Ernest Leffel, Corps of Engineers.
×Perry Bradbury Hackett, Corps of Engineers.
×Frederick Zitzer, Corps of Engineers.
×James Russell Rorabaugh, Corps of Engineers.
×James Henderson Beddow, Corps of Engineers.
×Earl Carpenter Paules, Corps of Engineers.
×Andrew Vaiden Inge, Corps of Engineers.

To be first lieutenants

×Milton Irving Wallace, Corps of Engineers.
Roy Tinsley Dodge, Corps of Engineers.
×Donald Harry Kauffman, Air Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

×Jesse Benton Helfrich, Medical Corps.
Thomas Albert Wildman, Medical Corps.
×Duran H. Summers, Medical Corps.
×James Hedges Forsee, Medical Corps.
Walter Atwater Carlson, Medical Corps.
×Robert Moore Allott, Medical Corps.
×Steven Vincent Guzak, Medical Corps.
×Edward Joseph Tracy, Medical Corps.
×Arnold Archibald Albright, Medical Corps.
×Robert Cabaniss Gaskill, Medical Corps.
×Dan Clark Ogle, Medical Corps.
×William Spencer Stone, Medical Corps.
×Milford T. Kubin, Medical Corps.
×John Edward Pluenneke, Medical Corps.
×James Donley Gardner, Medical Corps.
×Emmett Bryan Litteral, Medical Corps.
×Austin Lowrey, Jr., Medical Corps.
×Jasper Newman Knox, Medical Corps.
×Carl Willard Tempel, Medical Corps.
×Nuel Pazdral, Medical Corps.
×George Dewey Newton, Medical Corps.
×George Edward Leone, Medical Corps.
×Albert Henry Schwichtenberg, Medical Corps.
×Ehrling Lloyd Bergquist, Medical Corps.
×Wendell Axline Weller, Medical Corps.
×Clinton Stone Lyter, Medical Corps.
×Walter Lee Peterson, Medical Corps.
×Russell Samuel Leone, Medical Corps.
×Dwight Moody Kuhns, Medical Corps.
×Lawrence Abraham Matternes, Medical Corps.
×Arthur Lyman Streeter, Medical Corps.
×John Alexander Isherwood, Medical Corps.
×Harold Bradley Luscombe, Medical Corps.
×Charles Lewis Baird, Medical Corps.
×Thomas Neilson Page, Medical Corps.
×Samuel Leonard Cooke, Medical Corps.
×Harold Eastman Coder, Medical Corps.
×Victor Allen Byrnes, Medical Corps.
×William Smith George, Medical Corps.
×Kenneth George Gould, Medical Corps.
×Gustave Everett Ledfors, Medical Corps.
×Herbert Theodore Berwald, Medical Corps.

To be captains

George Andrew Rader, Medical Corps.
×William Enloe Strozier, Medical Corps.
×Robert Sexton Higdon, Medical Corps.
Fred James Fielding, Medical Corps.
Herbert Downing Edger, Medical Corps.
Ernest Martin Nielsen, Medical Corps.
Robert McAllister Davis, Medical Corps.
Edwin Wayne Hakala, Medical Corps.
×William Clinton White, Medical Corps.
×Homan Elfred Leech, Medical Corps.
Philip Jack Smith, Medical Corps.
×Frank Paul Pipia, Medical Corps.
×Myles Patton Moursund, Medical Corps.
×Josephus Bartow Talley, Jr., Medical Corps.
×Fred George Lahourcade, Medical Corps.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

×Donald Charles Hudson, Dental Corps.
Leon Guin McConnell, Dental Corps.
×Winlaw Archiebald Priebe, Dental Corps.
Benjamin Walter Dunn, Dental Corps.

CHAPLAINS

To be major

Christian Anthony Wachter, United States Army.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captain

×Paul Christian Borup, Medical Administrative Corps.

To be first lieutenant

Glenn Keith Smith, Medical Administrative Corps.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Reserve officers and honor graduates to be second lieutenants in the Regular Army in the arm or service specified:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Henry John Amen et al.

NOTE.—For a full list of the names of the persons whose appointments to the foregoing title were today confirmed, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today under the caption "Nominations."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bless Thee that Thine only begotten Son is constantly moved with compassion for the children of earth. We praise Thee that of all the world's wonders and beauty, there is still a higher, loftier range of knowledge which sustains us and enables us to endure the deficiencies of human experience, finding a refuge in Thy Fatherhood. We pray Thee so to abide with us that

our high purpose shall be to follow after love, the one pursuit that never loses its enchantment, the one task and goal that ever yields soul-deep satisfaction. Along the road of experience, more forcibly effective than genius, which so often goes sounding on its dim and perilous way, is this heavenly lyric of the divine heart. O come, Immanuel, and cause us in Thy way to go; bid envy and strife to cease. As the devout one counts the beads of the rosary, so may we receive this immortal chime of love in our living souls. Now abideth faith, hope, love—these three—but the greatest of these is love. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 25, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of the heirs of George P. Eddy;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of J. W. and Robert W. Gillespie;

H. R. 2279. An act to amend section 17 of the Joint Service Pay Act approved June 10, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 2709. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Howard Burkette;

H. R. 2710. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Kerley;

H. R. 3233. An act for the relief of Charles H. Wright and William Francis Agard;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Gustav Schmidt;

H. R. 3846. An act for the relief of certain former certifying and disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 4064. An act for the relief of W. R. Larkin and Dora Larkin in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Jones, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Act of 1941."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4693) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 11 to said bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of June 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech I made over the radio last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program of the House today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech I am making over the radio this evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in support of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and to include therein an editorial as contained in the Worthington Globe, of Worthington, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made at Flint, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Altoona Mirror on the subject of thieves fall out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and its effect on the coal and railroad industries of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ACTION ON CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House at the conferences on several general appropriation bills, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1942, and House Joint Resolution 194, Tennessee Valley Authority appropriations, which are now in conference, or that may be sent to conference, may have until midnight tonight and midnight tomorrow night to file their respective reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRAVER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House that the bills outstanding as of June 27 are as follows: The Agriculture appropriation bill is in conference. The report has been adopted by the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. TABER. But the Senate conferees have not filed their report.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. So that we cannot tell anything about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. As to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the Senate has not yet passed that bill.

The Labor-Federal Security bill is pending in conference.

The legislative bill is pending in conference.

The military bill has just been passed by the Senate.

The emergency relief bill is pending in conference.

The second deficiency bill is pending in the Senate committee.

The Tennessee Valley Authority additional appropriation—House Joint Resolution 194—is pending in the Senate committee.

Due to the death of Senator Harrison and the absence of a large membership of the Senate in attendance at his funeral, the Senate has not transacted business so far this week in connection with appropriations. The Senate committee has been working on these bills. There are only 3 days remaining before the beginning of the new fiscal year—today, tomorrow, and Monday. It is my hope that this unfinished business can

be cleaned up in these 3 days without placing too great a burden on the House. I ask your indulgence and cooperation in assisting the committee to get these remaining matters disposed of so that the Government may go along in an orderly way commencing July 1.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. RICH. As I figure it out, the bills that are in conference total $24,719,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know the exact amount.

Mr. RICH. The 10 appropriation bills that the House has passed amount to $18,092,000,000, which makes a total of $32,011,000,000. With an income of about $6,500,000,000 and with a tax bill of $3,500,000,000, making a total of about $10,000,000,000, we are still going to be short next year about $22,000,000,000. Does the chairman of the Appropriations Committee know where you are going to get the money?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can say that I do not know now specifically just how we are going to get the money, but we are going to get whatever is necessary. I may say that the figures the gentleman has given as constituting what we would be short are very wide of the mark. Our total appropriations at this session, exclusive of permanent appropriations, but including the Postal Service, covering part of the fiscal year 1941 and all of the fiscal year 1942 will approximate $33,000,000,000. Some of that will be expended in the fiscal year 1941, some in 1942, and some in fiscal 1943. According to the most recent calculation, our estimated expenditures in the fiscal year 1942 will be approximately $22,000,000,000. That may have to be changed later in the light of newer conditions. Assuming that we have a new tax bill for additional revenue of three and a half billion dollars—of which $2,600,000,000 would be collected in fiscal 1942—we would have to borrow approximately $10,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942. That is much less than the $32,000,000,000 the gentleman figures we would be short.

Furthermore, I say that, insofar as I am concerned, I am thinking about the defense of this country. At one time in the darkest days of our history, when Abraham Lincoln was questioned about how we were going to get out of the difficulty in which the country had found itself, he said that he had an abiding faith that the American people ultimately would wobble around right. So, Mr. Speaker, I assure the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvani· [Mr. RICH] that I have an abiding faith that the American people after this war is over will h·ve the patriotism and the brains and the courage to h·ndle our financial destinies in an American way.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], says that he has an abiding faith in the American people, that they will pay the bill. I say that they will not be able to pay the bill if the Congress continues to squander the savings of the people that they have earned from the year 1492 down to date. We are dissipating the savings of the American people, and instead of having abiding faith in the American people that they can meet the situation, I say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we are going to wreck the American people, and nothing under God's heaven will stop it if we do not stop squandering their savings. We are appropriating four times the amount of our income. No one with common sense could do that and exist. No country can do it, either. There is no business in this administration. I charge this administration as being the most inefficient, incompetent, and wasteful administration the world has ever known. You are wrecking our country fast. Will you ever stop it? Will you get down to common sense very soon? The American people should see that we get common sense in our Government places of responsibility. Wake up, America, before you are all wrecked and the Nation is wrecked.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a poem written by a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Mack Sauer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, one sentence from Mark Sullivan's article in this morning's Post, under the caption "The U. S. and Russia," deserves emphasis. It reads as follows—and he is speaking now of the President's announcement of aid to Russia:

> Our statement can have no practical effect on Moscow. But it can have a most serious effect on Moscow in the United States. How can we say we are going to help Stalin—and at the same time go on with our prosecution of Stalin's agents in the United States?

This morning there came to me a form of the personal affidavit that most of the personnel of the Government must now execute and certify.

> I, John Doe, do solemnly swear that I do not advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and that I am not a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

That makes a pretty interesting and a curious situation when we demand this of our Government employees and at the same time express such solicitude for the very exponents of the gospel of subversion and destruction. There must be no abatement in the crusade against those who would destroy the Government of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PENALTIES ON WHEAT, ETC.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to repeal all penalties against farmers on wheat, corn, and all other crops.

Farmers in my district are up in arms against these penalties. They are holding mass meetings, protesting against them, and asking for their repeal. The independent and liberty-loving farmers throughout the United States are opposed to this communistic program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there ob·ection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the May monthly survey of business of the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico points out that the Federal Government is by long odds Puerto Rico's greatest industry today. All departments and bureaus combined—the Army, the Navy, the W. P. A., the P. R. R. A., and the regular departments and bureaus, including the Post Office, combine to make a pay roll which is being met by the Federal Government of something between $125,000 and $130,000 a day. This is at the rate of $40,000,000 a year.

The Royal Bank of Canada in Puerto Rico also points out in its May bulletin that the tempo of business in Puerto Rico is extraordinarily high.

Mr. Speaker, I call these facts to the attention of the House in connection with the shift which I understand is being made in the Governorship of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

STRIKES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am terribly upset over the continual stream of strikes that seems to be coming along. There seems to be nothing else, and they apply to practically every defense item there is. If we are going to have any defense for the United States of America, the Congress has got to do something very pronounced and get rid of the communistic trend of the National Labor Relations Board. The only way that we can get rid of it is to abolish it. It has been a menace to free labor and to the

production program of national defense. I hope, before it is too late, that the Congress will wake up to its responsibility and that the administration will realize the crime it has committed against the American working man and the defense program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ALFRED T. JOHNSTON—VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 296)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1674, "For the relief of Alfred T. Johnston."

The bill would provide for the payment of $200 to Alfred T. Johnston as a reward for alleged services to the Government in connection with the arrest and conviction of one Ernest F. Smith, upon the charge of theft of parcel-post mail.

The Post Office Department denied the application presented to it by Mr. Johnston for the payment of a reward from the appropriation made available for that purpose by the Congress. The Department has in the regular course paid rewards to many individuals rendering aid in the solution of postal offenses and I think it fully appreciates that the policy of paying rewards in meritorious cases is of considerable aid in the solution of postal offenses. The record in this case, however, establishes apparently that Post Office Inspectors were already in possession of clues placing Smith under suspicion; that such clues led them, on their own volition, to appear at the depot of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., at Lincoln, Calif., for the purpose of getting additional evidence; that Mr. Johnston in truthfully answering the inquiries of the Post Office Inspectors did no more than his plain duty as a law-abiding citizen; that the losses of mail involved having been from the premises of the railroad company which was the employer both of Johnston and Smith, there was a special obligation upon Johnston to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Post Office Inspectors, and that Mr. Johnston is not entitled to be rewarded for the part taken by him in the case.

The refusal of the Post Office Department to pay a reward in this case and the subsequent adverse recommendation made by it upon this bill seems to me to have been justified, and I feel, therefore, that I must withhold approval of this enactment.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and the accompanying bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY PRICES PAID FOR NECESSITIES OF LIFE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 212 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life (hereafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee—

(a) To make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to problems facing the purchasers of goods in the markets of this country; and

(b) To make recommendation to Congress with respect to legislation upon the foregoing subject.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall have power to appoint subcommittees to assist the committee in its work. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member thereof designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The members of the committee shall serve without additional compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions vested in the committee.

(b) The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties.

(c) The committee shall have power to require the furnishing to the committee by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States of such information and reports as in the opinion of the committee are necessary to assist the committee in carrying out its powers and duties under this resolution.

(d) In carrying out its powers and duties the committee or any subcommittee thereof may call upon any department, agency, or establishment of the United States to perform clerical, stenographic, and statistical work and to furnish facilities and assistance to aid in such investigation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 79]

Anderson, Calif.	Cartwright	Domengeaux
Andresen, August H.	Celler	Douglas
Andrews	Clark	Duncan
Arnold	Cole, N. Y.	Eaton
Baldwin	Collins	Edmiston
Barden	Colmer	Fellows
Bates, Mass.	Costello	Fish
Bloom	Crosser	Flaherty
Bolles	Culkin	Ford, Leland M.
Bolton	Cunningham	Gathings
Buckley, N. Y.	Curtis	Geyer, Calif.
Burdick	Davis, Tenn.	Granger
Byrne	Delaney	Green
Capozzoli	Dickstein	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.	Marcantonio	Sikes
Harrington	Merritt	Smith, Va.
Harris, Va.	Mitchell	Somers, N. Y.
Heidinger	Myers, Pa.	Stearns, N. H.
Hess	Nelson	Stratton
Hinshaw	Nichols	Sumners, Tex.
Holbrook	Norton	Sutphin
Hook	O'Day	Sweeney
Hope	Oliver	Tenerowicz
Houston	Pace	Thom
Jacobsen	Plauché	Thomas, N. J.
Jenks, N. H.	Plumley	Tolan
Johns	Poage	Traynor
Johnson, Ind.	Randolph	Vinson, Ga.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
	Rivers	Ward
	Rockefeller	Wasielewski
Johnson, W. Va.	Romjue	Weiss
Jonkman	Sacks	Wene
Kleberg	Sasscer	West
Kopplemann	Schaefer, Ill.	Wheat
McGehee	Schuetz	Wolfenden, Pa.
McGranery	Scott	Wright
Maas	Scrugham	
Maciora	Sheridan	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider, immediately upon its being reported, any conference report on any of the general appropriation bills now in conference or which may hereafter be sent to conference, as well as House Joint Resolution 193 and House Joint Resolution 194.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this simply to call the attention of the membership to the request so that they will all understand it has been made and that that will be the procedure for the next 2 or 3 days. In view of the fact that there are a large number of bills from the Committee on Appropriations which should be enacted before the 1st of July, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has asked that those conference reports may be taken up forthwith when they are presented, without laying over. That means that the membership, during the time that the House is in session, must be expecting them all the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Buffalo Evening News by James L. Wright, on the subject War Supplies Held Up By Red Tape.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the close of the business of the day I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks and include a Memorial Day address made by me at Mount Holly Springs, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article published in The Tablet, a Catholic weekly, under date of June 7, 1941, entitled "What Is the Catholic Stand on War for America?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members, as well as myself, have received a communication from the local office of the Aluminum Co. of America, transmitting a statement from the vice president, Mr. Wilson, attempting to justify their policies and activities. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in this connection to revise and extend my remarks and to include that statement from the Aluminum Co. of America and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include my statement before the committee for information of the Tariff Commission on reciprocal trade agreements, concerning the negotiations between Argentina and the United States on tariff reductions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution recently adopted by the Council of Defense for Wyoming.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the Birmingham Aero Club, of Birmingham, Ala.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks and to include a letter received from Mr. Paul F. Smith, editor of the Locomotive Engineers' Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a short letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Missouri Farmer; and, second, to include addresses made on the Farm and Home Hour over the radio, including my own remarks and those of Senator BANKHEAD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY PRICES PAID FOR NECESSITIES OF LIFE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a few minutes to present the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman, of course, controls the time and can move the previous question when he desires, but as he knows, I discussed two amendments with the gentleman from Illinois, and the author of the resolution, and both amendments seem to be agreeable. Will the gentleman yield so that these amendments can be offered?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. The amendments to which the gentleman refers are first to strike out the last provision of the resolution; and, second, in line 17 to insert the words "subject to the provisions of the Classification Act." I shall yield either to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] or to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] for the purpose of offering such amendments at the proper time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would the gentleman also be kind enough to yield to me to offer one amendment?

Mr. SABATH. I will confer with the gentleman as soon as I finish this brief statement.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Certainly.

Mr. COX. I take it the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has in mind including in the resolution some language to protect the farmer. There are lots of us, including myself, although I voted to report the resolution, who have a suspicion that this is something of a drive against the people who stir the soil and make it produce the food that feed the people. Now, that is the suspicion I have about it; and I feel that if the gentleman is going to yield to Members to offer amendments for the purpose of getting votes for the resolution he ought to be willing to agree that an amendment be offered for the purpose of doing something for agriculture.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman from Georgia that if I thought this would operate against the farmer in any way I would not have voted to report out the resolution.

Mr. COX. I gladly accept the gentleman's statement and I know that it is true.

Mr. SABATH. I am willing to yield for any constructive amendment, but I cannot agree to yield without knowing what the amendments are.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska because he asked me whether he could have some time.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I read the first three lines of this resolution:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life.

The gentleman says he does not see how this resolution is going to affect the farmer. Is not the farmer affected any time you investigate agricultural commodities which are the necessities of life?

Mr. SABATH. I will explain my viewpoint to the gentleman. Personally, I feel the farmer is not receiving too high a price for the things he produces. The unfortunate thing is that the consumers are obliged to pay several times more than what the farmer receives, and the spread is too great.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Would the gentleman be willing to consider an amendment, say in line 2, after the word "study" insert "prices, and causes, and factors affecting prices" paid for the necessities of life?

Mr. SABATH. I think that is a good amendment. I will have to consult with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], the author of this resolution, before I can give the gentleman a positive answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri is a very good one.

Mr. SABATH. So do I.

Mr. McCORMACK. But my purpose in rising was to say that I believe those who are advancing these arguments to create fear in the farmer's heart are doing so without justification. There is not in this body any better friend of the farmer than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]; and as between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE], I would rather take the side of the gentleman from Massachusetts any time.

Mr. SABATH. I may say that before we considered this resolution I myself had several talks with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] as to whether this would not affect the farmer. He stated to me that he was just as much interested in the farmer as in the consumer. He stated further that it was his belief that it was the speculators who were responsible for the unjustifiably high prices which work injustice to the farmer as well as to the consumer. Upon that statement he obtained a hearing.

He made his position clear, and that is the reason the resolution is here.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman thought of the matter of duplication of effort? We recently appropriated about $750,000 to the Department of Justice for an investigation of this same subject matter. Mr. Henderson is working on prices. I fear this will create a tremendous amount of duplication if it is passed.

So far as the proposition of being a friend to the farmer is concerned, some insinuation has been made here that I feel is absolutely unjustified so far as my colleague from Nebraska is concerned. He has been on the floor of the House fighting for the interests of the farmers continually.

Mr. SABATH. I hope so. I have confidence that when this investigation takes place the farmers of this country as well as the consumers will be benefited. I do not think there will be any duplication. I feel that the House and the country should know why such high prices are exacted from the consuming public for the necessities of life and the reasons for the large spread in the prices the farmer receives and the consumer pays.

I recollect that when we passed the act increasing to a small degree the tax on some of the necessities of life, where the increase was about one-quarter of a cent, the article went up from 2 to 5 cents unjustifiably and unwarrantedly, and I hope that this investigation will be conducted by a gentleman who has the interest not only of the consumers but the farmers at heart.

I have in my possession many resolutions from consumers and even from farm organizations who feel that this resolution is timely and should receive favorable consideration at the hands of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am interested in the gentleman's statement and I am wondering if he would object to broadening this resolution to permit the committee to investigate, for example, profiteering among some of the manufacturing interests of the country?

Mr. SABATH. I think this resolution will include that. If it does not I am ready to yield to anyone for the offering of an amendment such as suggested by the gentleman who propounded the query to me awhile ago.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will yield to someone to offer an amendment to investigate the jacking up of labor costs which the consumer has to pay for.

Mr. SABATH. That would be going far afield, and I do not think it would be in order. The gentleman is a good parliamentarian and knows that.

Mr. Speaker, I observed the activity on the part of some gentlemen on our side and nearly all of the Members on the other side against this resolution. They are the same gentlemen who, at all times, are opposed to the cause of labor and fear that if this investigation is made it may affect the prices of farm commodities, which is not intended, but may, on the contrary, hold down the prices of the necessities of life, which would include wearing apparel and even farm implements. For these gentlemen to assume this position so soon after we voted to increase the amount of parity prices to 85 percent, as well as the loaning power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant higher farm loans due to the increased parity prices, is manifestly unfair. I regret and deplore this unjustifiable and unwarranted joint action against a resolution which, if enacted, would be wholesome and beneficial not only to the consumers but to the farmers as well. It seems to me that many of these gentlemen fear that this investigation may accomplish some good to the consumers of the Nation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, I appreciate that in these days money does not mean anything; but may I ask the gentleman if he has given any consideration to what the possible cost of this investigation will be?

Mr. SABATH. We have been informed that the cost will not be great, because we are giving the committee the right to ask aid from the Department and giving the committee the right to request information from any department, which will reduce the cost of the investigation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does the gentleman mean by "great"?

Mr. SABATH. I have been informed that it should not be more than about $15,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Fifteen thousand dollars?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly amazed to hear the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], make the statement, in substance, that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] was not as much interested in the farmer as was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]. Comparisons are odious, always. I do not intend to make any. I have no criticism at all of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]. I believe he is a friend of the farmers. But if ever a man in this House has fought the battle of the farmer, day in and day out, session after session, in committee and on the floor, it has been the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

In my judgment, this resolution is not necessary. If we would enact the legislation which was offered on the 19th day of November last, when we were in session over in the House Office Building, asking for the stabilization of prices, we would not need anything of this kind. At that time, and while we were in session over there on several occasions, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] called the attention of the Members to the danger of an ever-increasing spiral of prices.

On the 19th day of November last I offered H. R. 10680 and reintroduced it on January 6, 1941, as H. R. 1408. That bill, it is true, provided only for the stabilization of prices of those things which were needed by the Federal Government for national defense, but it could easily have been amended to apply to all commodities. Section 4 of that bill reads as follows:

SEC. 4. Within 10 days after the date of the passage of this act, it shall be the duty of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor to meet and, based upon the last 10 years, determine and publish, within 30 days of such meeting, a schedule of prices which shall represent the true and fair average price of all materials and services which may be needed by the Federal Government in any of its activities looking toward preparation for national defense.

If enacted, it would have prevented lawful profiteering by anyone and would have provided drastic punishment for unlawful profiteering.

This investigation, if ordered, will but repeat conclusions which we have all reached from the existence of facts with which all who care to read the press are familiar.

In the last few days we have had an illustration of how this administration is hamstringing industry so that it cannot produce the things we must have. I refer to the automotive industry. That industry led this Nation on the march back toward prosperity not so long ago. That industry is the one industry which has the buildings, the executive ability, the financial resources, the machine tools, the equipment, and the skilled workers, who are ready and willing to produce.

Then what does this administration do? It joins with a labor organization which demands an increase in wages, an increase which will give the workers three, four, and five times the income the farmer gets, $2,000 or $2,500 per year in General Motors. I find no fault with that if other wage earners and farmers are to receive a like increase in their earnings.

Then, having granted that increase and placed that burden of an increase in wages upon the automotive industry, the administration turns around and tells it that it must limit production 50 percent. A school child knows that you must have mass production if you are going to pay high wages to many men and make a success of a business.

Not content with increasing the wages and limiting production, then what does Leon Henderson do? He goes one step farther and says, "You must keep the price of your finished product down."

Can you increase wages, limit production, and then limit the price and still do business?

I say to you men from the city of Detroit on the majority side, you had better get in the harness, get up in the collar, and do something to defend your automobile industry, or the first thing you know you are going to be in the same condition as your friend Joe Stalin, unable to produce anything much less get national defense.

If, once in awhile, if once in a blue moon, some of those on the majority side would listen to some of the suggestions which come from the minority, they might find something of value in them.

Price stabilization is the real, the only, remedy to prevent profiteering, inequality, and to bring all to a realization that each and every individual must contribute his share toward national defense and that he will not be permitted to profit unduly out of our national misfortune.

I offered the bill in good faith. I stand ready to back the administration in any reasonable plan for price-fixing, or, more properly, price stabilization. But I do not believe that Congress should ignore its duty and turn over to the administrative branch of the Government the power to destroy a business or to make millionaires out of its friends and those whom it may choose to favor.

This resolution should be defeated.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY,]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LANHAM]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of confusion about this bill. The gentleman from Michigan started talking about the administration. Somebody else talked about the farmers. It shows how excited you can get over nothing. It may be in the air nowadays.

This is a resolution which I hope will not meet with your disfavor, because it originated here on Capitol Hill among the legislators and in a legislator's mind. It is not, and has not been, so far as I know, an administration proposition. I am the author of the resolution and I have got it this far through the committee without any administrative assistance or consultation whatsoever.

The idea that I am advancing a resolution like this to hurt the farmer is ridiculous. I will match my record with respect to votes—and that is what talks—with any man in this House on bills that have been brought in here to aid the farmer. There is nothing in this resolution that will hurt the farmer, but on the contrary there is a lot about the work of this committee that will help the farmer.

Let us see why this is necessary. We all know, of course, that costs are going up by leaps and bounds. The New York Times states, "Rise in living costs parallels last war."

Business index shows in 1 year that the index on foods has gone from 111 to 149.

I have here Hugh Johnson talking about Oklahoma, where, he says—

> Prices of what these people buy are going to be painful and threaten to soar. Prices and markets for what they sell are not going up and the prospect is sour. They are being pinched on every hand.

The farmer is the consumer, we are all consumers, and when you get this terrific impact of the Government into the buying and when you get the shortage that comes from ordinary businesses now being engaged in building the things that destroy rather than the things that create, and when you get the rise in wages bringing additional purchasing power into the market, you are going to have prices soar. What I am trying to investigate is not what Mr. Henderson deals with in his department. He is in charge of something that has to do with price fixing. Let me say right here and now that I am opposed to price fixing by government or by private monopoly. I do not stand for price fixing, but what I would like to do is to let Henderson have charge of battleships, of lumber, of copper, of steel, of the big basic things going into the defense program, while I want to take care of the little fellow. And in taking care of the little consumer, the Mr. and Mrs. America, no farmer is going to be hurt.

How in God's name can the farmer be hurt by a publication of the truth as to the difference between the cost of production and the price paid by the ultimate purchaser.

In this connection, here is a colloquy that happened when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had the floor. You gentlemen know that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is a friend of the farmer. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I think recognizes the merit behind this resolution. It was only a few days ago in the House that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

> I sell eggs from my farm out home for 18 cents a dozen and pay 40 cents a dozen in Washington. I get 10 cents for my hogs and pay Washington merchants 35 cents for bacon. I get $1 for wheat and pay at the rate of $16 for breakfast food.

It would be most interesting to find out what causes the great increase between the cost of production and the price that the American consumer pays. It is way above parity when you put the goods on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the situation which the gentleman is discussing now a situation which has existed all through the years and one that has not been caused by this emergency?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I think definitely it has been caused by this emergency, and certainly it is startling for me to hear this theory that price rises are not happening because of this emergency.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any facts and figures he can give the House indicating that this emergency has caused any abnormal increase in the price of any particular commodity?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes; I have just given what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said about farm prices.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has been reading from some newspaper clippings, but I am talking now about farm commodities. We have been trying to advance the price of farm commodities and have been appropriating millions of dollars for parity payments, but the very moment it is indicated that the price of farm commodities might advance somewhat, some people are getting excited about it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I would like to answer that right here and now by stating that I do not see how in the world any logical line of reasoning can lead to such a conclusion, because this is going to help the farmer to get more of the purchasers' dollars into the hands of the farmers. I do not believe the farmer is getting enough for what he is producing.

Mr. COOLEY. I quite agree with the gentleman about that. Were there any hearings held on this resolution before any legislative committee?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Like all such resolutions, it went before the Rules Committee, and there were two hearings held.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he anticipates that by any stretch of the imagination such a committee would find that the farmers are getting too much for their commodities.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I could not envisage that by any stretch of my imagination.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What the gentleman then meant is that consumers are paying too much for certain commodities and that the farmers are not getting any considerable proportion of that amount. Is not that true?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And may I ask just one more question, and that is whether it is not the gentleman's opinion that it is a good idea for the Congress to exercise some initiative, and take some responsibility for some of these things and not always leave it to somebody else?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. It certainly is.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. COX. I wonder when the gentleman from California arrived at the conclusion that Congress ought to take responsibility for anything.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I do not want to go into these collateral matters, but I can say that I believe the gentleman from California, as much as any Member of either the House or the Senate, believes in congressional responsibility.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman not think that if he had something in the resolution concerning the spread between what agriculture receives, what the producer receives, and what the consumer must pay, that that would show definitely what the gentleman is after?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is offering an amendment which I shall accept, along that line.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman had something of that kind in the resolution, I do not think he would have the opposition of the agricultural bloc.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am surprised at the opposition that has developed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I shall have to oppose the resolution as it is at present.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] has an amendment which I think will take care of that.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel that you can crack down on the price being paid by the consumer without that being reflected back to the producer in the price that he receives?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman shows by his question that he is under a misapprehension in respect to this resolution. The gentleman has asked a question that shows that he is entirely without knowledge of what the resolution intends. As I said, I am opposed to price fixing. I am opposed to the Government fixing prices, and I am opposed to private fixing of prices, industry fixing prices, and I do not see how the gentleman can be greatly concerned about an investigation of the spread between the cost of production and the price that the consumer pays. How can that hurt the farmer? It will surely help him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has now put his finger on the spot, when he says that it is an investigation of the spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays, and that spread has been prevalent over many years, and ought to be investigated. This resolution, however, does not say that. It throws the whole thing wide open to an investigation not only of the cost of production and what the farmer gets, but the whole thing, and there is the danger.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. And may I say to the gentleman that I shall be very happy to accept an amendment stating that specifically, because that is the intent behind the resolution and in the mind of the author of the resolution.

Mr. MASON. Then the intent should be written into the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want the gentleman to yield to me only to say that I am ashamed of the reference I made to my friend from California [Mr. VOORHIS] a moment ago, and I want to withdraw it and apologize to the gentleman. It carries an unfair and an untruthful implication against one for whom I have great respect and deep affection. The statement was entirely unjustified.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to refer to a matter of cause and effect in respect to an investigation of costs, as was developed before our committee by Mr. Thurman Arnold. In one place, where they went in, the price of groceries fell, but it had no effect upon the farmer's market. The fall was from 17 to 11 percent. Just the mere fact that they went into a certain place had that effect but it had no effect upon the farmer's market.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes; although I would like to make a complete statement.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman address himself to just exactly what he means by the establishment of—

a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life.

What has the gentleman in mind to include within that description—necessities of life?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin. I had in mind the distinction between what Mr. Henderson is doing in the large basic materials that go into defense and what the little fellow buys in the way of shoes, in the way of medicine and in the way of food, because you have a serious problem here. About half of the people of this country are spending 40 percent of their incomes just for food. I want to help the farmer. I come from a district that is a dairy farming district, strange as that may seem to you. I am not an enemy of the farmer. It never was in my heart to be an enemy of the farmer. I say that under this investigation the farmer's price will not go down, but I hope it will go up, because we will disclose to the light of day the true facts where the farmer does not get a fair share of what the consumer pays.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, the gentleman does not intend to include within the scope of his investigation the things the farmer must buy, so as to show that the farmer who used to pay $48 for a mower now has to pay $150——

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is right. We intend to go into what the farmer purchases and the price he pays, and find out whether or not it is in a free market at a decent price.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, does the gentleman consider that when the farmer buys a mower or a reaper or a plow he is buying a necessity of life?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KEEFE. Are those items to be included within the description "necessities of life"?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I certainly think so.

Mr. KEEFE. You will have to put an interpretation on it different from anything I have ever heard, if you can include those things.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I think they are necessities of life for the farmer. I never heard anybody except the gentleman contend that they were luxuries.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Permit me to suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts has agreed to an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] to broaden that provision that will cover the fear of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Now, if I may continue for just a moment.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I cannot refuse to yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to clarify this thing that has been bothering me. Recently we appropriated money to Thurman Arnold in the Antitrust Division for an investigation of these very specific things the gentleman has been discussing—the amount of money given to the farmer for what he produces and what the consumer pays for it after it gets to the market, in order to eliminate these price-fixing rackets, and so forth. Is there going to be any duplication here?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. No. Where we find an area in the field of economy where there is price fixing, that will be turned over to Mr. Arnold. But the problem goes beyond the problem of monopolies. It goes beyond the problem of securing information, such as the two consumer divisions secure and disseminate. We only have two consumer divisions in the Government. One is in the Department of Agriculture and the other is under Mr. Elliott in O. P. A. C. S. Mr. Henderson does not have anything to do with the consumer divisions, except incidentally. What I want to do is to have this information as to actual costs go before the consumers of this country so that they can know what it is all about and stop all attempts to gouge the people with unconscionably high prices.

This committee proposed by my resolution should be dedicated to a study of all factors which keep the American consumer from purchasing goods at a decent and fair price in a competitive market. Congress cannot and should not abdicate in this time of crisis. If it does, it will mean boosted prices—profits and inventories—patriotism notwithstanding.

In accordance with consent granted I herewith insert a few of the many letters received by me which show the American people are interested.

DENVER, COLO.

Representative CASEY of Massachusetts,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: Please accept the appreciation and thanks of myself and the many consumers who are in urgent need of representation during these days when distributors are running out of storage space for commodities which are needed, and when prices are rising due to real and fictitious shortages. We commend your plan for getting Congress to accept some responsibility for what is happening to consumers, through the two resolutions which you introduced in Congress authorizing an inquiry into the cost of living.

Today, I have sent an airmail letter to the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, urging that one of these two resolutions (H. Res. 177 and H. Res. 212) be reported out of committee so that it can be voted on, and to our Congressmen asking

them to vote for it when it reaches the floor of the House.

Again, kindly accept our sincere appreciation,

Yours very truly,
HELENE POWNER MANN (Mrs. C. W.)

BRONX, N. Y., *June 24, 1941.*

Re: H. Res. 177 and 212.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CASEY: I should like to let you know that many people are deeply appreciative and cognizant of your efforts to help the American people by helping the consumer. After all, every American is a consumer to some degree, and to the greater portion of the American people, the dangerous rapidity with which the cost of living is rising is of desperate significance, in the face of fixed salaries and income.

Thank you for your interest in a very important problem.

Very truly yours,
EVELYN F. PARKES,
(Mrs. E. Parkes.)

NEWARK, N. J., *June 21, 1941.*

Representative CASEY,
Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: Just a line to encourage you in your plan to have Congress take its responsibilities seriously in the matter of consumer costs during the present national emergency.

Yours truly,
JOHN A. FERRARO.

JUNE 24, 1941.

Representative CASEY of Massachusetts,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was glad to read of your two resolutions introduced into Congress calling for a five-man committee to make a full study of the prices of necessities and to report back to Congress recommending legislation.

We of the white collar class are already desperately pushed with the increased cost of living, and from all indications these costs will rapidly rise. There need be no acute shortage in the necessities of living. Prices can be maintained, so that our American standard of living won't be lowered to the detriment of the common people and the profit of a few.

My friends and I are following the progress of your resolutions very closely. We appreciate your understanding of the situation and give you our full support.

Yours very truly,
RHESA M. LUNDELIUS,
(Mrs.) Rhesa M. Lundelius,
SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4545) entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program."

COMMITTEE TO STUDY PRICES PAID FOR NECESSITIES OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state for the information of the House that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 2, line 17, after the word "power", insert "subject to the provision of the Classification Act."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] both agree to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were ayes 64 and noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN: On page 3, beginning in line 1, strike out all of subparagraph (d).

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I can say that the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts agree to this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, can amendments be offered and run over the time allotted for debate? They were supposed to have 3 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yielded to me to offer an amendment. If he had not yielded to me, nobody could have offered an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] having yielded a part of his time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to offer an amendment accords the gentleman that privilege. He is entitled to recognition for 1 hour on his amendment.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. This provision is too broad. It does not belong in this resolution. The Committee on Accounts takes care of this feature when it reports the resolution providing money to carry out the purposes of this resolution, if this resolution is passed by the House; and I will guarantee that the Committee on Accounts will place language in the resolution when it brings it in appropriating money that will take care of the committee and at the same time stay within the policy generally followed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. For a question only.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, in the beginning, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, had an hour. When the gentleman from Illinois yielded to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of offering an amendment he lost the floor. The gentleman from Missouri has an hour on his amendment, except for the time he has already consumed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] had 2 or 3 minutes remaining of his hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has 20 minutes out of his half hour yielded by the gentleman from Illinois. Am I correct?

Mr. SABATH. If the Chair will permit, I yielded the gentleman from Missouri 1 minute to offer his amendment; that was all. I reserved the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan is correct in his interpretation of the rules. In yielding to the gentleman from Missouri to offer an amendment the gentleman from Illinois thereby resigned the floor to the gentleman from Missouri who was recognized for 1 hour. Three minutes did remain of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and 20 minutes remain of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; but the gentleman from Michigan is correct in his interpretation of the rules, that in yielding for an amendment the gentleman from Illinois yielded the floor to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MICHENER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Any Member of the House recognized in his own right to offer an amendment to this resolution is entitled to be recognized for an hour and may in turn yield time if he sees fit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After this amendment is disposed of the Chair feels that in view of the misunderstanding it might be well to yield to the gentlemen from Illinois, as their rights appear, the balance of the original hour.

The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is agreed to will it not prevent the committee to be established by the adoption of this resolution from calling upon the other departments of Government?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; because if this resolution passes the House then they come to the Committee on Accounts and ask for money to carry out the purposes of the resolution; and a provision somewhat similar to this will be contained in the resolution reported by the Committee on Accounts, as it always is. The language contained in the pending resolution, however, is too broad. We want to use the regular form of the Committee on Accounts that the Committee on Accounts always uses. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair will recognize the gentlemen from Illinois for their respective remaining portions of the original hour.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], is sincere in trying to secure beneficial results for his constituency by this investigation. The purpose of the resolution is disclosed in the first three lines:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life.

I should like to know the attitude of this committee if it is established. I feel rather certain that this investigating committee is not going to be in the interests of agriculture. I am convinced that this is no time to investigate agricultural or livestock commodity prices, for markets are jittery. Everybody is jittery. The markets are so sensitive that an investigation of this nature would be reflected in lower prices to the farmers and livestock producers of the country.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the best information I have with respect to the membership of the committee would indicate that in its membership would be only one man from Massachusetts or the Northeast. The great majority of the membership of this committee would be farmers from the farming sections.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I cannot yield for the moment. I can only see duplication of effort in setting up this investigating committee.

Mr. Henderson and his organization are investigating price levels and fixing ceiling prices. I have questioned their statutory authority and fear the exercise of this power. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] has indicated that Mr. Henderson would look after certain phases of price increases, and this committee probably would look after other phases. That is the way I interpreted the gentleman's first statement.

This is no time to set up a congressional committee to investigate the price of ham, eggs, beef, flour and other necessities of life. Ever since the last war, agriculture has been in the slough of depression. Livestock prices from 1930 to 1939 were below parity. Farmers and livestock producers have been selling their products so long below cost of production that when prices begin to advance toward profitable levels some people feel an investigation should be made.

I know there is a wide discrepancy between what the livestock producer receives and what the consumer pays for meat, but you cannot keep on adding higher labor costs, higher taxes, and increased burdens of various descriptions on the processors and distributors without these extra costs being reflected in the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer. The farmer and livestock producer are among the few who are unable to determine the price of their commodities. The consumer is the one who actually sets the price that will be paid for these commodities. The law of demand and supply determines the price a certain quantity of a given commodity can be moved into consumptive channels. I think there is too great a spread in price between the consumer and producer. This has been a subject of investigation for years by various organizations. The scope of this resolution is too broad to accomplish any beneficial results.

An investigation of food prices at this time can have only one result, and that is in preventing the farmer from obtaining his fair share of the national income. Lower prices to consumers will mean lower prices to the producers. This resolution should be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, one finds himself in a rather embarrassing position this morning. The merits of this legislation are not being properly considered. I call the attention of the membership to the fact that on various and sundry occasions I have taken it upon myself to criticize on the floor of this House the things that Mr. Henderson is doing. I do not want to be in the position of criticizing any governmental agency with making an effort to correct the situation.

Last week the Wisconsin delegation went down to the Secretary of Agriculture's office, and it included all parties, and in as gentlemanly a way as we could we paid our respects to the Secretary and his price-fixing activities. I do not want to get into any controversy with anybody. I do not care who originated this resolution. I am not interested in anything except the objectives of this legislation. But may I say right here that I am not going to be stampeded out of anything I believe in. If this committee is set up in the right way with people who have an interest in trying to perform a certain service for the producer, distributor, and consumer, it can be done. Yesterday we brought under the scope of the provisions of a bill price protection for 65 percent of the farmers of this country. We still have the other 35 percent out on the end of the limb, and they are entitled to protection and consideration as well as the 65 percent are entitled to it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems obvious to me, from information that has already been presented and put in the RECORD, that the spread between consumer prices and agricultural prices is not a matter for one committee to investigate, but for several committees. During this week the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in answer to a question of what caused the rise in prices, said:

In order to reduce industrial prices and wages to parity with agriculture it would be necessary to revise the legislation which has enabled other commodities to rise to artificial heights—quotas, tariffs, franchises, patents, collective-bargaining laws and minimum-wage laws.

It seems to me that is a matter obviously for several committees rather than one committee, and that those committees are already established.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think this committee will be set up in the interest of the farmer or in the interest of the consumer, or in whose interest does the gentleman think it will be set up?

Mr. MURRAY. I will answer that question very frankly. So far since I have been a Member of this body, if there is any one man among the many here I have great confidence in it is the present Speaker of the House. As far as I am concerned, being a farmer and a livestock man as he is, and interested as he is in those things, I have plenty of confidence in the Speaker to select a committee of five who will look after the producer as well as the consumer and the distributor in this matter.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think an investigation of the butter market right now might be helpful to that price structure?

Mr. MURRAY. If we had this committee 60 days ago, I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would have pegged the price of butter at 31 cents on the day it was 33¼ cents, and, when it was 37.1 cents the day he pegged it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman's delegation find out, when it visited the Secretary of Agriculture, who it was fixed the price of chickens at 15 cents?

Mr. MURRAY. No; but we had a rather frank conference. There was not any heat to it. I think the Secretary appreciated our visit. I think those people lots of times need a guiding hand. They do not want to harm intentionally the farmer or any other group.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think this investigating committee will discover any facts that are not generally known to the membership of this House at the present time?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. What, for instance?

Mr. MURRAY. That would take a long while to answer?

Mr. COOLEY. Just name one thing.

Mr. MURRAY. Here are some facts and situations to consider.

First. We have for several years had agricultural legislation to protect the so-called basic commodities—cotton, wheat,

corn, tobacco, and rice. This protection has been extended to 27 percent of our agriculture.

Second. Yesterday this House passed H. R. 244, that not only extended the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation but also implemented it by not only protecting the basic commodities mentioned above but also the farm products that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked the farmers to increase. This includes pork products, cheese, and other dairy products, canned tomatoes, corn, peas, and poultry and eggs. The latter include about 38 percent of the farm products of this country. We then have about 65 percent of the farm products protected.

Third. This resolution—House Resolution 212—we now have up for consideration is an opportunity to offer the 35 percent of our producers that are not included in 65 percent already partially protected, some small protection they most assuredly deserve and are entitled to as are the 65-percent groups.

Fourth. If legislation is to be based on common sense and common justice, we should be willing to afford this minority group of 35 percent some of the cushions and efforts toward a floor to their prices we have already extended to the 65 percent of the producers of the country.

Fifth. Price advances are always resisted by the consumer regardless of the fact that the advanced price obtained by the producer is a low price, below parity and below cost to him.

Sixth. When the consumer gets accustomed to low prices he does not like price advances for feed, even if he is in a position to pay the cost of producing the food.

Seventh. Irish potatoes are one of the most important crops included in the 35-percent unprotected group.

Eighth. The following should be of interest to all Members of this House:

POTATO PRICES AS LOW AS 1 CENT PER BUSHEL

The Federal Government has assumed the control of the market for most farm crops. Recently the farmers of Alabama received as low as 60 to 80 cents per hundredweight for new potatoes when the consumer was paying $2.50 per hundredweight in Washington and $3 per hundredweight in New York City.

A few years ago the producer received 55 cents out of the consumer's dollar, but now this has been reduced to 42 cents. With expenditures for nondefense purposes ever mounting and with the added costs of doing business due to the New Deal, greater spreads between producer and consumer will result.

The following article in the June 17, 1941, issue of the Wausau Record-Herald shows how little many farmers too many times received for the products of their labor:

POTATOES SOLD FOR CENT A BUSHEL TO ELDERON FARMER

Fifty bushels of potatoes were purchased for the total sum of 50 cents by Herman Hanke, town of Elderon, from one of his neighbors. The neighbor was about to cast the potatoes in a dump when Hanke interceded and decided that the potatoes—a mixed lot of several varieties and sizes—would be good for hog feed.

The neighbor had tried to use them for this purpose but found that his two small pigs would not eat the raw tubers. Hanke, who has a sow and nine pigs, aged 7 weeks, will cook the spuds before feeding them to the swine. He will supplement the potatoes with a grain ration.

Hanke has planted three acres of potatoes this spring, half of the acreage being of the Russet Rural variety and the remaining half of the Katahdin variety. He revealed that the latter variety was not in as keen demand this spring for seed purposes as the Chippewa variety. Several of Hanke's neighbors are growing the latter variety, he said.

Ninth. Wide price differentials between the producer and consumer cause criticism. If a producer getting 60 cents per hundredweight for his potatoes knows the consumer is paying five times as much for his product as he receives he feels he is being robbed. If the consumer knows he is paying five times more for his product than the producer obtains he also feels he is being robbed.

Tenth. This resolution, if passed, will give some small protection for the 35 percent of our producers that do not enjoy the beneficial price-protection cushion afforded to our other group, and should be passed.

Eleventh. A few years ago the producer received 55 cents of the consumer's dollar. He now receives 42 cents, and the time is now to begin to correct the situation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, an investigating committee is like a muskmelon. Merely because you have a muskmelon is no test of whether it is a good muskmelon or bad muskmelon. Because you have an investigating committee is no test of whether it is going to be any good. You test the inside, after it has been formed, to see whether it is good, mediocre, or rotten. To me the idea that this committee is to go out and make a broad investigation in the interest of one particular part of the public is unthinkable. If this committee is any good, it will make an investigation in the public interest.

About 5 years ago I invented a new "ism." I had heard so much about socialism, communism, capitalism, and others "isms" that I said that one "ism" we needed was consumerism. There is only one class in the economic structure that is universal. Only part of us are capitalists or laborers or farmers, but every one of us is a consumer, and the consumer is the fellow who has not had the comprehensive attention from the New Deal that he should have had.

The result is that you have Consumer Commissioner Elliott reporting last fall 49,000,000 Americans underfed, when it the same brochure it was shown that the farmers were not getting enough; and the report had to be suppressed very quickly.

I do not believe Leon Henderson should be legislating in behalf of the consumers of the United States. I think Congress should do any necessary legislating. If this committee is fairly set up and it does not carry either a whitewash bucket or a meat ax, but goes in without fear or favor, not in the interest of the farmer, not in the interest of labor, not in the interest of the city fellow, not in the interest of the manufacturer, but in the interest of the public, the one group that is universal, the consumer, it can collect some information that will be helpful to this House in, first of all, deciding whether any legislation at all is needed; and, if it is needed, in recommending legislation of some kind or another.

The trouble is that we have gotten so much in the habit of taking sides on matters that instead of refereeing impartially between the different groups that are competing for the consumer's dollar we say, "Who are you going to be impartial against in this investigation?"

This ought to be a fair investigation; and if it is, it will be extremely useful.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the word should go out today from the Congress of the United States that the House of Representatives has passed a resolution condemning the so-called high cost of living, which today, as far as the food produced by the farmer is concerned does not exist, you will see this resolution cost the farmers of America hundreds of millions of dollars in smashed-down prices on the boards of trade. These speculators will seize upon this opportunity as the greatest opportunity in recent weeks to knock at least 5 cents per bushel out from under the level of wheat prices, and on other farm commodities, merely because the House of Representatives has decreed, through this resolution, that the cost of living is too high. Farmers' products today are not even at parity, let alone being exorbitant.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in order to make this resolution conform to the statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], I believe it would be necessary to amend line 2 on page 1, following the word "study," in this manner—

to study "and investigate all factors contributing to the difference in unit costs and prices received by primary producers and"

and then proceed with the resolution. If I could get the opportunity I should be glad to offer such an amendment.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the resolution in its present form should not be approved, and certainly I would not vote for it, but should be delighted to vote against it. The price-fixing operations of Mr. Henderson, in my opinion, will completely fail. I believe he has reached the end of his rope. It seems to me it is time for the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department to proceed to take an interest in price levels. If you have this committee, or the O. P. A. C. S. we will call them, attempt to do this job, and leave the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury out of the picture, in my opinion you will completely fail in your efforts, and prices will continue to move forward on both raw materials and finished products.

If I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts correctly, he does not want the Government to fix prices. In my opinion, if this committee should be appointed and should proceed to carry out the language of the resolution as it is before us, they would have to largely duplicate the efforts of the T. N. E. C. and hundreds of days of effort on the part of the Federal Trade Commission. I believe the T. N. E. C. went into this subject and spent approximately $1,100,000 on a committee investigation expense account. I do not believe this job could be done for less than $1,000,000.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am glad to tell the gentleman, with reference to the T. N. E. C., that I spent the whole summer of 1939 in research here as a member of the committee at the request of Mr. O'MAHONEY.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. We have the report, and what have we done? Not a thing on earth. Here we propose to duplicate that work, and spending $15,000 or $20,000 on this resolution would not amount to a hill of beans, and I believe every Member of this House knows it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Would not the efforts of this committee likewise duplicate the work of the organization headed by Leon Henderson?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would duplicate a lot of effort and get nowhere.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Henderson is not getting anywhere, and each day his efforts will fail more and more and more. In due course, if he attempts to go further, he will not get anywhere unless the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department, in connection with money and credits, go along with him, and we ought to know that. Let us work on the proper departments of the Government for this type of operation and keep out of mudholes such as this resolution would call for.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, this is clearly an attempt to pound down the prices of food products. I call your attention to the language of the resolution:

> That there is hereby established a committee to study prices paid for the necessities of life. * * *
>
> It shall be the duty of the committee—
>
> (a) To make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to problems facing the purchasers of goods in the markets of this country.

There is not a word in the resolution that would authorize the committee to look into the cost of production to the farmer. I believe we should vote down this resolution. I hope all who have the best interests of the farmer at heart will vote against its passage, because it may upset the market if we delve into it at this particular time. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentlemen from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will not be agreed to. We have had the T. N. E. C. and they have spent upwards of $1,000,000. We have the Leon Henderson outfit and they are set up for $2,800,000. We have $700,000 for Thurman Arnold in the Department of Justice. About the only thing that could be found that might be stopped that I know of would be such things as walking delegates, demanding $200 a car for unloading produce in New York before they will allow it to be handled. This is all that might be stopped, and I honestly believe that if Mr. Arnold and Mr. Dewey could have proper support they could stop that better than any committee.

I think we are making things ridiculous by passing such a resolution, putting everybody who is trying to do a legitimate business, in the wholesale or retail trade, on the spot all the time by a dozen or 15 investigations. This is just going to raise prices instead of lowering them. Did anybody ever hear of fixing prices when it did not mean raising prices? I think we ought to think about these things when we go to authorizing such an investigation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman believe that the selling price can be controlled without first going into the cost price, setting it up and determining it and controlling it?

Mr. TABER. The cost-of-production price has to be controlled and the cost of distribution has to be controlled before there can be any effective consumer price fixing. If we try to go at this thing and monkey around with it we are just going to get into trouble and we are going to make the prices higher to the consumer instead of lower.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment it is about time that this House took some steps to ascertain at first hand by a committee of the House just what are the factors that enter into a gradual upward trend of prices that affect the general consuming public. House Resolution 212, I believe, will accomplish that object.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to lose control of the floor and still I desire to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] to offer an amendment which will take care of some of the objections on the part of different gentlemen here.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman yields the floor to the gentleman from Missouri to offer an amendment, he will lose the floor.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to offer his amendment, which will take care of all the objections, I believe, that have been made.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMERMAN: On page 1, line 2, after the word "prices", insert "and causes and factors affecting prices."

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] has agreed to this amendment.

The sole purpose of the amendment I have offered is to try to find out why there is such a wide spread between what the farmer gets for what he produces and sells and what the man in the city, the consumer, has to pay for what he eats or uses. When we talk about the necessities of life we are talking about food and clothing and we ought to know what causes the difference in prices with respect to what a farmer gets for his wool or his cotton and what he has to pay for the product when it goes on the backs of his children.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I gladly yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly the author of this resolution did not have in mind correcting the situation which the gentleman is attempting to correct by his amendment, for the reason that no such language or no such purpose is set forth in the resolution.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that that is what we had in mind, but it is in general language and I am willing to have it made specific so there can be no misunderstanding when you vote for or against this resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the gentleman of the opinion that this committee will completely duplicate the efforts of other agencies of the Government that are charged with the responsibility of making a particular study of the situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know the rules of the House with regard to the yielding of 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], and to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD], and then to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. I would like to know whether that comes under the rules of the House or not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, under his 1 hour, had 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman yielded to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] for the purpose of offering an amendment and therefore lost the floor. The gentleman from Missouri now has 1 hour at his disposal.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the Speaker will permit further, does that mean that the gentleman from Illinois can yield 1 minute to 30 people and each one of them

will have an hour and it will take 30 hours to consider this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has no more time to yield to anyone. The gentleman surrendered the floor when he yielded to the gentleman from Missouri to offer an amendment, and now the gentleman from Missouri has 1 hour if he desires to use it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is now consuming his time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has no more time to yield, because he surrendered the floor. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] has not yielded any time as yet. He has the floor. He has the right to yield such time as he desires to consume.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As the situation now stands, then, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is in complete charge of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; the gentleman has the floor for the time being.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] may yield time for debate, but he cannot yield for an amendment without losing the floor, as did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Suppose the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] proceeds, we will say, for 30 minutes, and his amendment is then put to a vote, and it is agreed to or rejected, either one, who then has the time?

The SPEAKER. Whomever the Chair recognizes.

Mr. COX rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] rise to a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. COX. Merely to make the statement that I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] should move to commit this resolution to some committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman any idea about the cost that will be involved in this investigation if the scope of the investigation is broadened as contemplated by the gentleman's amendment? If this committee undertakes to make a complete investigation, which will be worth something to the membership of the House, and the committee goes into the different factors that are to be considered in determining the final retail price, then I ask the gentleman if he does not believe it involves a great amount of work and perhaps a huge sum of money.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I do not care at this time to enter into a discussion of that phase of the question now before the House. The only reason that I am offering this amendment is to clarify as I thought the scope of the work of the committee. I feel that when we talk about investigating prices paid for the necessaries of life, we ought to know something about the causes and factors that enter into the prices paid by the consumer. With the farmer getting less in most instances than parity for his products and the cost of food products going up, it is high time the consuming public and the producer as well find out who or what groups are getting exorbitant profits.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's amendment, but even should the amendment be adopted I still feel that the efforts of this committee will amount to absolutely nothing, because we have an agency of the Government which is charged with the responsibility of making such an investigation.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I say to my friend that I am sure that that phase of the subject and matter will be considered by the House when a vote is taken on the resolution. My only purpose in offering the amendment is to specifically point out the matters and things which should be considered by the committee if authorized by the House.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. To say to the gentleman that in England they are confronted with the same proposition of how to give to the English purchaser a free, open, competitive market, so that he can buy at decent prices without unjustifiable gouging of the public, and that over there they have 24,000 people employed in what they consider a very important matter and some of their branches are legislative. Over here we have no legislative branch of this Government that seems to care a damn about the consumer or the price that he pays, and we want to find out the reasons for the spread, and what it is, between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer. We want to study those factors and find the reason for the spread between the cost of production and the price paid by the consumer.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further at this time and yield back to the chairman of this Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the remainder of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] having lost the floor under the rules of the House, can the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], who has been recognized for an hour under the rules, restore the gentleman from Illinois to the floor to which he would have been entitled had he not yielded for an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri had control of his time, and he has the right to yield such part of that time that he has not consumed to anyone he desires, and as a practical matter, the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] certainly has the right to yield the remainder of his time to the gentleman from Illinois, if he so desires.

Mr. MICHENER. If he does that, then does that place the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] to whom he has yielded time in charge of the bill? It is my contention that when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yielded for an amendment he lost the floor, and from that time he has no more control over this bill than any other Member of the House. Therefore when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] was recognized for an hour to amend the bill he automatically gained control of the bill, and he could move the previous question at any time, and if he did not move the previous question he could yield time, up to the 1-hour limit, but he could not transfer possession of the floor from himself to whomsoever he might choose. When the gentleman from Illinois lost the floor, he could only regain control of the bill by the action of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], thinking he would probably make a motion. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman did not make a mistake. He knew what he was doing. I desired to give the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] the right to offer an amendment, which I believe was a proper amendment to be adopted, which would satisfy some of the gentlemen who questioned whether this resolution was broad enough to cover the things in which they were interested. Consequently I feel that that has been accomplished. The House will have before it the resolution as amended, broadened in scope, and I do not see any possible objection that could be raised fairly against it. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts) there were ayes 4¢ and noes 121.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-one Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 100, nays 200, not voting 132, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—100

Bates, Ky.	Hunter	Ramsay
Beiter	Izac	Rankin, Mont.
Boggs	Jackson	Richards
Boren	Kee	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Kelley, Pa.	Rolph
Bryson	Kilday	Sabath
Burdick	Kirwan	Sanders
Burgin	Kramer	Sasscer
Byron	Larrabee	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Leavy	Schulte
Casey, Mass.	Lesinski	Secrest
Cochran	Ludlow	Shannon
Coffee, Wash.	Lynch	Sheppard
Connery	McArdle	Smith, Conn.
Crosser	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Cullen	McGehee	Smith, Pa.
D'Alesandro	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Dingell	McKeough	Snyder
Downs	McMillan	Sullivan
Eberharter	Maciejewski	Sweeney
Eliot, Mass.	Magnuson	Tenerowicz
Fitzgerald	Mills, La.	Thom
Fitzpatrick	Monroney	Thomas, Tex.
Fogarty	Murdock	Vincent, Ky.
Folger	Murray	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	O'Brien, Mich.	Vorys, Ohio
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Connor	Wasielewski
Granger	O'Leary	Welch
Hart	Oliver	Whelchel
Harter	O'Toole	Young
Healey	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman
Hébert	Pittenger	
Hendricks	Rabaut	

NAYS—200

Allen, Ill.	Elliott, Calif.	LeCompte
Allen, La.	Ellis	Lewis
Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	McGregor
	Engel	McLaughlin
Anderson, N. Mex.	Englebright	McLean
	Faddis	Mahon
Angell	Fenton	Martin, Iowa
Arends	Flannagan	Martin, Mass.
Barnes	Ford, Miss.	Mason
Baumhart	Fulmer	May
Beckworth	Gale	Meyer, Md.
Bell	Gamble	Michener
Bender	Gathings	Mills, Ark.
Bennett	Gearhart	Moser
Bishop	Gehrmann	Mott
Blackney	Gerlach	Mundt
Bland	Gibson	Norrell
Boehne	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolton	Gilchrist	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	O'Neal
Brown, Ga.	Gore	Patman
Brown, Ohio	Gossett	Patrick
Buck	Graham	Patton
Buckler, Minn.	Grant, Ala.	Pearson
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Burch	Gregory	Pierce
Butler	Guyer, Kans.	Ploeser
Canfield	Gwynne	Powers
Cannon, Mo.	Haines	Priest
Carlson	Halleck	Rankin, Miss.
Carter	Hancock	Reece, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Hare	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Harness	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Harris, Ark.	Rizley
Chiperfield	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Clason	Hill, Colo.	Rodgers, Pa.
Claypool	Hobbs	Rogers, Okla.
Clevenger	Holmes	Russell
Cluett	Howell	Rutherford
Coffee, Nebr.	Hull	Satterfield
Cooley	Imhoff	Shafer, Mich.
Cooper	Jarman	Short
Copeland	Jarrett	Simpson
Cox	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Jennings	South
Crawford	Jensen	Sparkman
Creal	Johnson, Calif.	Spence
Crowther	Johnson, Ill.	Springer
Culkin	Johnson, Luther A.	Starnes, Ala.
Cunningham		Stefan
Davis, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Stevenson
Day	Johnson, W. Va.	Sumner, Ill.
Dewey	Jones	Taber
Dirksen	Kean	Talle
Disney	Keefe	Tarver
Ditter	Kerr	Taylor
Dondero	Kilburn	Terry
Doughton	Knutson	Thill
Doxey	Kocialkowski	Thomason
Drewry	Kunkel	Tibbott
Duncan	Lambertson	Tinkham
Durham	Lanham	Treadway
Dworshak	Lea	Van Zandt
Weaver	Wilson	Woodruff, Mich.
West	Winter	Woodrum, Va.
Wickersham	Wolcott	Worley
Wigglesworth	Wolfenden, Pa.	Youngdahl
Williams	Wolverton, N. J.	

NOT VOTING—132

Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pheiffer, William T.
Andresen, August H.	Harrington	Plauché
Andrews	Harris, Va.	Plumley
Arnold	Heffernan	Poage
Baldwin	Heidinger	Ramspeck
Barden	Hess	Randolph
Barry	Hill, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Rich
Beam	Hoffman	Rivers
Bloom	Holbrock	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boland	Hook	
Bolles	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Bonner	Houston	Rockefeller
Boykin	Jacobsen	Romjue
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Sacks
Byrne	Johns	Sauthoff
Camp	Johnson, Ind.	Schaefer, Ill.
Capozzoli	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Cartwright		Scott
Celler	Jonkman	Scrugham
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Shanley
Cole, Md.	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.		Sikes
Collins	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Va.
Colmer		Smith, W. Va.
Costello	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Kinzer	Steagall
Curtis	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Davis, Tenn.	Kopplemann	Stratton
Delaney	Landis	Sumners, Tex.
Dickstein	McIntyre	Sutphin
Dies	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Maciora	Tolan
Douglas	Mansfield	Traynor
Eaton	Marcantonio	Vinson, Ga.
Edmiston	Merritt	Vreeland
Fellows	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Fish	Myers, Pa.	Walter
Flaherty	Nelson	Ward
Flannery	Nichols	Weiss
Ford, Leland M.	Norton	Wene
Gavagan	O'Day	Wheat
Geyer, Calif.	Osmers	White
Green	Pace	Whittington
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Paddock	Wright
	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Johns against.

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Hill of Washington for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois for, with Mr. William T. Pheiffer against.

Mr. Shanley for, with Mr. Plumley against

General pairs:

Mr. Boland with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Bolles.

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Paddock.

Mr. Poage with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Green with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Trayner with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Whittington with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Sauthoff.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. Sutphin.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Geyer of California.

Mr. Sachs with Mr. Byrne.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Dickstein.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Tolan.

Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sumners of Texas.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Hook with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Maciora with Mr. Costello.

Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Wene.

Mr. Flaherty with Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. Ward with Mr. Scrugham.

Mr. Holbrock with Mrs. O'Day.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. COX, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Jones, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN BUREAUS AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (Rept. No. 879) on House Joint Resolution 198, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas due to the national-defense program many new bureaus and agencies of the Government have been created, and established bureaus and agencies expanded in operation, necessitating the employment of approximately 35,000 additional employees

and resulting in a definite shortage in office facilities and housing accommodations and in acute traffic congestion in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the number of employees entering the Government service is increasing, making certain a still greater overcrowding and congestion of office facilities and housing accommodations therein, and tending to lowered efficiency and increased expenditures in such agencies and to higher living costs to such employees, and

Whereas the city of Chicago is the railroad center of the United States, centrally located and accessible from and to all sections of the country, and has available modern office buildings ready for immediate occupancy and obtainable at reasonable rentals as well as suitable and adequate housing accommodations to provide for any increase in numbers of Government employees with lowered living costs to them; and

Whereas various bureaus and agencies of the Government may be properly removed from the District of Columbia not only without impairing, but indeed to the improvement of, the efficiency of their operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a committee to be composed of nine members, three of whom shall be Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the remaining three of whom shall consist of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Coordinator of Defense Housing, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings. The committee shall select one of its members to act as chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to investigate—

(1) the feasibility and desirability of transferring from the District of Columbia to central locations outside the District of Columbia of any of the bureaus or agencies of the Government of the United States;

(2) the location, extent, and cost to the United States of office space and other facilities rented by the various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States, both within and without the District of Columbia.

The committee shall report from time to time during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with any recommendations for legislation which it may deem proper.

(c) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information facilities, and personnel of the departments and of any of the agencies of the Government.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAYS PROJECT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (Rept. No. 880) on House Resolution 248, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and survey of the St. Lawrence Waterways project.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as are deemed desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any members thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. TARVER, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. REES of Kansas were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include statements by Mr. Paul Scharrenberg, of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation; and Father McGowan, of the Catholic Welfare Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during this week, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive any messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker of the House be authorized to sign any enrolled bill passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I simply want to ask whether it is the plan of the majority leader to hold a session of the House tomorrow for the purpose of considering any conference report that may be reported?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the House will be in session tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will try to state as far as I know it the program for next week. It has been announced that we would adjourn from Thursday until Monday and that no controversial legislation would be brought up either on Thursday or the following Monday. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednseday of next week conference reports will be considered, and on Monday the wiretapping bill will be brought up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the particular legislation outside of conference reports to be considered next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from the City Council of the City of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address by Mr. George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, on Labor and the National Emergency, delivered on June 24.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CAN WE SHIFT OURSELVES FAST ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT DEMOCRACIES WE ARE TO AID IN OUR ALTRUISTIC APPROPRIATION OF $7,000,000,000?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the argument is now conclusive that we should have prepared this country to defend itself against any force that might be sent against it, and at the same time we should have kept our official mouth shut. The reason is that we do not know today what we will be talking about tomorrow and tomorrow we may have to take back what we have said today. If we had maintained a policy of saying nothing and had used our money to build bombing planes and tanks for our own use we could not possibly have any explaining to do.

The diplomatic "horse traders" in Europe and the rest of the world are coming too fast for us to figure out. If we persist in attempting to interpret international relationships across the water, we will probably have to back up farther than we can go ahead. Our friends of yesterday are our potential enemies of today. Our pictured enemies

of today may be our potential friends tomorrow. If we can go ahead and spend our $7,000,000,000 on democracies and make a hit, we shall have to be as agile as a one-armed man shooting skeets with a rifle. Can we play this European shell game and guess where the pea is? You have seen this game played at county fairs. The guesser never wins and goes home with a feeling that he has been "slickered."

It was only a short time ago that we were labeling the Finns the bravest little band of heroes to ever fire a gun. Today we have to officially say "shame on the blood-thirsty Finns for jumping upon the Russians whose women pray"—according to Secretary of State Hull.

It was only yesterday, figuratively, that this Congress voted to ship Harry Bridges out of the country, but today I presume the administration will send the gentleman from Texas [MARTIN DIES] out to the coast to apologize to Mr. Bridges and hereafter call him "Comrade."

All of the mean things we have said, officially, about the Russians we shall have to withdraw. We have put in this RECORD that the Russians shot 2,500,000 Russians since the advent of Stalin. Shall we now say that the Russians were not shot but that we were half shot when we made that statement? We have said on this floor that Russia is not a democracy and that it is the worst type of dictatorship operating under the power of force and terrorism. What shall we say now? We cannot spend any money on them unless they are a democracy. Can we prove to the satisfaction of the American people that Russia is a democracy? I confess this is a most difficult thing to prove. Personally, I do not have to prove it because I have been in favor of keeping our noses out of World War No. 2. But being a part of this official Government, we must find some way to prove Russia is a democracy. I think the actual work of submitting this proof lies with the administration although to aid them I shall be willing to state what I know. The leaders of the administration, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] ought to be able to submit this proof. If they do and really convince us that Russia is a democracy, it will be highly entertaining to see these two worthy Members walking down the aisle arm in arm with Bridges and "Comrade" Joe Stalin.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. COX. I apologize to the gentleman for not paying as close attention to his statement as I should, but for my benefit would he repeat what he said about me in order that I may make reply?

Mr. BURDICK. May I be assured that I shall have the gentleman's attention from now on?

Mr. COX. I wish to apologize to the gentleman for not having given him my full attention.

Mr. BURDICK. I suggested that we must have some way of proving that Russia is a democracy so we could know whether she is entitled to aid, and stated that I thought the duty of making that proof might be assumed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. COX. I am unwilling to undertake such burden.

Mr. BURDICK. It was only yesterday that we went away out of our road—a long way around—to tack onto an appropriation bill an amendment preventing any part of the appropriation from being paid to David Lasser, because he had communistic leanings. There was absolutely no proof before this House that he was a Communist. I say as a lawyer there was no proof. But he had been associated with Communists; that was enough for the judicial sense of this House. David Lasser was convicted on this floor and singled out as one man who would spend none of our money.

I presume it will be all right for communistic Russia to spend our money, for it to go to Stalin.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we are going to give it to the Communists, does not the gentleman believe it should go to headquarters?

Mr. BURDICK. I do not know from what I read in the newspapers who is a Communist, or where they are, or what we are going to do about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has not the gentleman reached the conclusion that Stalin is?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I do not know who is, right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is just speaking for himself, is he not?

Mr. BURDICK. No; I think I am speaking for this Congress.

I presume it will be all right for communistic Russia to spend our money.

Excuse me—that is not a fair statement because the administration is going to prove to us that Russia is not Russia. I confess now I am getting in where I cannot find my way in any direction. Is Russia Russia, or is she not? Are we what we are, or are we what we appear to be?

It was not so long ago that we were pitying poor France—we would do anything for France—that is, we would do what we could. Today poor France is throwing hot lead from land, sea, and sky against Chum Winston Churchill and his forces. A few months ago France and England were inseparable and there was even talk of consolidating the two countries. We did help France; we shipped them airplanes, and today those same planes are being driven against the British. This does not look right—it may be a good business move—it probably would, but we never have received any pay for the planes and never will. France owes us over $5,000,000,000 from the last World War. France has canceled the debt herself without our help. She canceled it so she could trade some more with us on time and still maintain a good business rating. Anyway, if we are for England, then we are against France. Italy was our friend in the last war and was slick enough to worm $2,000,000,000 out of us, which the people of this country have had to pay or will have to pay if the Government lasts long enough. Italy is against England now, and therefore against us, because we have seen fit to stake all our bets on England. We could have given England all the help we have given her without talking so much about it. We can help England most by fully protecting this country and the Western Hemisphere. If England really loved this country as much as Churchill says she does, why did not she pay us the $4,000,000,000 she owed us. It seems, in order to love us deeply, England had to cancel that debt. She has already canceled it and has now come back for much more. She is entitled to it because she loves us.

Churchill is very generous to this country. He says England and the United States will aid Russia, and he said that before we had officially spoken on the subject. If we cannot prove Russia is Russia, then the only reason we shall have left for supporting Russia is because Churchill said we would. If we can trust Joe Stalin it is more than any other government would do. There is not a single government in Europe, whether over-run by Hitler or not, who would trust Stalin right in front of them covered with a six-shooter. But since he is at the head of a great democracy—I presume this will be proven—we cannot possibly resist helping him.

We have coddled and petted England and yet I would not be at all surprised that before this war is over England and Germany will unite in saving the great democracies of England and Germany. If Russia is a democracy then Germany must be one also. Will England fire at us now that we are draining every dime we can scrape up for her benefit? She will if that seems the best way to save the British Empire. Will England engage in an economic war against us after this present war is over? She will if that seems to her to be the best way to preserve the British Empire.

Will we be allied with Germany before this war is over? It is altogether possible. If we can prove Russia is a democracy anything can happen. I refuse to guess any further on who our friends are in Europe or the rest of the world, if indeed we have any friends. I refuse to guess who our enemies will be because I know now that if we defend America we shall have to defend it against all powers on earth, including the republics of South America. We cannot keep on forever buying their friendship.

If these European intrigues continue to develop, switching partners in the mad dance of war, who knows but what Hitler and Roosevelt will be riding together down Pennsylvania Avenue where the gentleman with the third eyebrow will be presented to Congress. If and when that happens I presume the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON] will be on hand to shake hands with Herr Hitler and call him "cousin" as he did when he shook hands with the King of England at the Capitol here a short time ago.

With all of these complications which we cannot understand and which are foreign to a people who do business on the square and not by intrigues, we had better

not say anything about any nation which we shall have to take back tomorrow. Just for the present, anyway, we should not think out loud. Much less should we jump into the fracas and begin to shoot, for if we do we might be shooting our friends and not our enemies.

Is there anyone in this House who thinks we have anything in common with Russia whose every policy is in direct opposition to our own institutions? Is there anyone in this House who thinks we have anything in common with the Nazis whose sole aim, evidently, is to take what they want when they want it? Have we anything in common with France who loves us one day and shoots at our friends the next? Have we anything in common with England which exists on a world-wide empire on which the sun never sets, and which now or some day she cannot defend in the very nature of things? Must we defend it for her? And for what?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman aware of the fact it has been reported that in the State Legislature of North Carolina a resolution has recently been passed endorsing the so-called Union Now of the American Nation and the British Empire, and that a similar resolution has also been introduced in the State Legislature of Pennsylvania?

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman could not surprise me with anything just now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I believe all real Americans should oppose these plans to surrender American sovereignty.

Mr. BURDICK. This country does not want the territory of any government.

We have had to take some territory as a matter of self-defense, but we have given most of it back to the inhabitants of those territories and would like to give more of it back just as soon as we can honorably withdraw. This country is worth fighting for, and as Americans we are preparing to do it, and for all of these reasons our tax money, which will bleed every man and woman white, should be conserved for America and for no one else.

Instead of lavishing our energies on any country on the face of this earth, we should use our resources to protect our own country.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Did the gentleman happen to notice in yesterday morning's Washington Post a comment made by the dean of the British Labor Party to a gathering in New York City? The gentleman's name is Wedgewood, and the newspaper comment reads as follows:

> He asserted that England is through with the responsibility of solving the problems of Europe which she has done for the past 300 years. We have had enough of it. It is time we passed on the baby to the Americans.

What does the gentleman think of their baby?

Mr. BURDICK. I know they spent $150,000,000 25 years ago in this country to prepare us in a propaganda way to enter that war. They are spending more millions now, but we are paying for it.

From what evidence we now have, we do not know whom we are helping and the reason for it. This $7,000,000,000 was to help democracies, but who in this world can say what countries they will be tomorrow? Yesterday we loved Finland; today we hate her. What has Finland done—she has fought and bled and is now fighting to drive out an aggressor. But we do not like it because we say Finland is too blood-thirsty and rises up against our new-found love, the great democracy of Russia. Queen Elizabeth was, in many respects, the most unjust queen of England, yet she was smart. She once said:

> God save England from her friends.

If I were to announce a motto we should follow now it would be taken from Kipling's If.

> If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
> Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
> If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
> If all men count with you, but none too much;
> If you can fill the unforgiving minute
> With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
> Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
> And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son!

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by James N. Blissell, city editor of the Lima News, Lima, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish that every Member of the House could have been here during the last 15 or 20 minutes and listened to the gentleman from North Dakota. I wish the people everywhere throughout our country could have an opportunity to read his speech. Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with a subject that is purely domestic, and I am glad to have the opportunity to follow the gentleman who has delivered himself of some very wise comments upon the world situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture, on June 21, issued a response to inquiries concerning its policy on possible further revision of sugar-quota supplies under the Sugar Act of 1937. That response read as follows:

> On June 9, 1941, an increase in the total quota supplies of sugar was announced by the Department. The quantity of 7,125,561 short tons of sugar established was deemed, on the basis of information then available to the Department, to be sufficient to meet actual consumption requirements for the calendar year 1941 and to provide reserve stocks equal to the average of prior years. However, investigations of the Sugar Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, indicated that with the augmented industrial pace resulting from the national defense effort, buyers and consumers built up larger stocks of refined sugar than in previous years during the first 3 months of this year. Should this situation continue and if it becomes clear that for the duration of the emergency buyers and consumers wish to carry larger working stocks than in prior years, it will be the policy of the Department to increase quota supplies accordingly.
>
> With regard to the amount of available supplies to meet United States requirements, the Department has already pointed out in a recent survey of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, on the sugar situation, that this season's production, together with relatively large carry-over stocks "assures a total supply available to the United States well in excess of the current marketing quota and in excess of consumption during any year of the past. Besides this supply, there is in prospect well over a million tons of sugar available to the United States in other Western Hemisphere countries." It also pointed out that the world supply of sugar for the 1940–41 marketing year is the largest supply on record.

Mr. Speaker, let me now present to you a connected recital of the public expressions of the administration with regard to the sugar program and the part played by domestic producers.

On January 23, the Sugar Division of the A. A. A. announced that the amount of acreage which our domestic sugar-beet growers would be allowed to plant in 1941 would be 16.9 percent less than the average planted acres of the 1938–40 period. They added that—

> the reduction is required under the Sugar Act of 1937, because excessive stocks of beet sugar have accumulated following record production in the domestic beet area during the last 3 years.

Of course, those of us who remembered what had happened during the first World War with regard to sugar were amazed that, in the face of active participation in an undeclared war, the administration should even consider a policy of requiring producers to cut down their acreage. It has often been proved that the only protection American consumers have against high prices during emergencies is the domestic sugar industry. Therefore the more practical-minded among us felt this year was the time to stimulate and encourage the expansion of sugar production, rather than to restrict and limit our farmers. But this announcement in January was well in advance of the planting season of our Michigan growers, and, therefore, the feeling existed that developments would

show such drastic action to be unnecessary.

During February, men in the sugar trade became apprehensive about the Government continuing to follow a business-as-usual policy in the sugar program by refusing to recognize the effects of the national emergency on sugar. This time the spokesman for the administration was Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Council. Her contribution was:

> Existing stocks of sugar readily available to consumers in the United States are considerably larger than usual. If necessary, sugar production can be expanded materially in domestic areas as well as in nearby foreign areas.

This statement was interpreted by sugar producers as meaning that the Government was following the situation closely, and that any need for extra supplies of sugar would be anticipated by permitting domestic areas to expand sugar production. It was to be expected that naturally any necessity for curtailing beet production would be viewed more in the light of emergency conditions than in the regular routine of sugar control.

In the month of March it was becoming evident deliveries of sugar for consumption were running well ahead of previous years. Freight and insurance rates for transocean shipments were advancing rapidly, with proportionate advances in the price of sugar, because the United States still depends upon imports for 70 percent of the sugar we consume in this country.

On March 19, both consumption and prices having increased, the Secretary of Agriculture recognized the need for greater supplies of sugar and, accordingly, increased his estimate of consumption by 235,072 tons. This change in the estimate was announced as having—

> Been made following the receipt of complete official data on stocks, distribution, and other factors for the calendar year 1940.

But deliveries for consumption continued to rise above the averages of previous years, and the rise in the price of sugar had been only temporarily halted by the additional supplies made available by the change in the consumption estimate.

As the planting season progressed, growers very naturally became anxious about the policy of the Department of Agriculture with regard to acreage cuts. Discussions with officials of the Department created the impression that the January announcement might be superseded in view of changes in the situation, as shown by increases in consumption, advances in price which reflected advances in the costs of ocean transportation, and the scarcity of ships. But on April 19 the following announcement was released to the press. I quote:

> The Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture today announced that 1941 domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane production allotments previously established would remain unchanged. It was explained that in view of developments in the international situation and in the sugar market during recent months, officials had been considering the advisability of increasing 1941 production allotments, but that because of the availability of large reserve stocks in some of the domestic areas, as well as in nearby foreign areas, it had been decided to maintain the allotments at their present level.

As was to be expected, and for very good reasons, the producers protested vigorously against such a shortsighted policy. They appealed to the administration to remember what had happened in the period 1917–20, culminating in a retail price of as high as 32 cents per pound to the housewife.

With the Department of Agriculture buying surplus crops in order to stimulate their prices upward and to encourage greater production of corn-hog, dairy, and poultry products, as well as tomatoes and dry beans, it was manifestly outrageous discrimination to force acreage cuts averaging 17 percent in the beet area and 9 percent in the mainland cane area, where curtailment of 25 percent had been exacted in the 2 previous years, particularly in view of the fact that we are permitted to raise only 30 percent of our consumption of this splendid farm crop when we could raise 100 percent if we were permitted to do so. But the order stands, and the cuts have been made.

Now, the same Department of Agriculture issued later reports showing that the 4-month deliveries for the period January–April 1941 were running 922,000 tons ahead of the same period of 1940. A month later, the same Department of Agriculture announced that the distribution of sugar for consumption in the first 5 months of 1941 continues to run 829,000 tons ahead of the corresponding period of 1940. As was to be expected, a change in the estimate of consumption was soon forthcoming. On June 9, the Secretary of Agriculture raised his estimate up to 7,125,561 tons, an increase of 273,672 tons. This estimate is the highest ever made of consumption under the Sugar Act, and in no previous year in the history of the United States has that much sugar been consumed. Nevertheless, the general opinion in the sugar trade is that because of the established trend of the first 5 months, the consumption will be even higher than the latest estimate of the Secretary.

Now let us return to the statement issued on June 21 by the Department of Agriculture, which I read at the outset of these remarks. The Sugar Division apparently has finally accepted the fact that the unlimited national emergency, declared by the President, is having its effect upon sugar. They have finally, and unfortunately most belatedly, come around to the policy of increasing quota supplies. The fact that the time for planting the sugar crops in the 19 beet sugar States and in the two sugarcane States of the Nation is past, together with previous experiences with the Department, would indicate the continued determination to prevent the development, the expansion or even the continued life of this most important industry. The Sugar Division and the Secretary of Agriculture at long last have admitted that the claims of the domestic sugar industry made in January were based upon fact, and the action insisted upon in April should have been done. In January, the Department of Agriculture arbitrarily decided upon acreage curtailment. In April, those responsible lacked the courage, the foresight, and the administrative ability to read current events in terms of sugar and in terms of the rights of the American producer and of the American consumer. For instance, there are many sugar plants in this country today which cannot market one pound of this year's crop because of the hold-over crop of last year. It is utterly senseless, it is utterly asinine to increase quotas for countries from which we import sugar when domestic production cannot be sold because of administration restrictions. We have the price of sugar still going up; we have our sugar farms cut in acreage; we have a scarcity of ships to bring sugar to the United States; we have higher ocean freight and war-risk insurance rates; and, we have the need for greater reserve stocks in the ports and in the warehouses of the United States. Quite evidently it is for Congress, by proper enactments, to change the narrow and short-sighted policy of our Government with respect to this essential food and see to it that our farmers are not restricted in the production of domestic sugar. Such action will provide the only insurance our people can have of getting ample supplies of sugar at a reasonable price.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I requested time, because I am informed we are waiting for business. I can defer my remarks until some other time if there is other business now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman. There is no other business at this time.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will proceed on the assumption that this is an opportune time inasmuch as we are waiting for business from the Senate. I want to speak on a subject that I hope will bring forth from the membership some comment and some serious consideration.

The gentleman from North Dakota suggested the fact that we would have few friends anywhere and perhaps not even in South America. Several days ago I had the thought of making some remarks about the situation in South America. I am greatly indebted to an editor friend of mine who spent a large part of the late winter and spring visiting those nations. You may recall reading some of the articles by Basil Brewer, editor of the New Bedford Standard Times. He wrote a series of articles and later printed them in booklet form. One of the most interesting half days I ever spent was in the perusal of those articles. They were most persuasive.

May I say to the gentleman from North Dakota that we are indeed in very grave danger, perhaps not in the form of actual war, but at least in cultivating the friendships we all desire. No man in

this House, isolationist or otherwise, has done nor said anything but agree that we are to protect all lands in the Western Hemisphere, Canada certainly, and reaching out to Newfoundland and probably to Iceland. The President made the statement that in the event Dakar was threatened by the Axis Powers, he would consider their occupation too near our shores and would repel such occupancy. Dakar is within 1,700 miles of the easternmost point of Brazil, where there are large airports. Dakar will be the springboard unquestionably, whether from a military standpoint or economic standpoint, to the penetration of South America. When the President made the assertion that he would repel such occupancy, I heard no one criticize. We are indeed committed to protection for the entire Western Hemisphere. It is a large order.

We are and have been very deficient in our attitude toward South America. They are a very proud people, although we do not seem to realize it. When Lindbergh said lately that we should take bases in South America they were greatly aroused. They think highly of him and his words carry great weight in those regions. He should have qualified the statement, and we should qualify our own expressions by always adding, "with the cooperation, willingness, and desire," if you please, of the South American countries. Sovereignty to them is of the highest importance, and we must recognize it.

We should not talk about fortifying the Panama Canal by taking any of the Galapagos Islands without Ecuador being notified or without her invitation, else we would be in real trouble. As for Panama, we are not trying to smooth over as we should the difficulties there, which are rather serious at the moment. Our Army storekeepers are underselling goods to the natives. Much of bootlegging these goods is carried on, and real action should be taken in the matter. They do not regard us as favorably as might be expected. There are many differences there that should be adjusted.

We talk about the culture that ought to be exchanged with the South American countries. We are not doing enough. The gentleman from North Dakota stated that we cannot long buy their friendship. I suppose he had in mind the $500,000,000 that we permitted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to use to help them hold their goods when they lost the European market. We are tied in with them in a military sense, but we cannot get tied to them satisfactorily in an economic sense. They sell only millions to us, whereas they sell billions to Europe. We cannot absorb their exports.

Let us step into Argentina. We all know the principal trouble there. They are large exporters of meats. We have resorted to the indirect method of saying, "You cannot export any cattle where there is located the hoof-and-mouth disease." For some 5 long years a suggested agreement has been presented, and we have done little or nothing about it. Patagonia has no foot-and-mouth disease. Yet we will not allow any meats to be imported from there into this country. We would not allow the Army to buy any of their meat. Of course, they feel that their meat is superior to ours. I do not know, but this editor, with whom I had the pleasure of consulting, had a great deal to say about the fine quality of it. Perhaps we should import a quota of this article, in view of present high prices and to bring about a more satisfactory alliance with that Nation.

Our editor quoted other countries of South America where there was a kindly feeling toward us. But he feels we are walking on thin egg shells. But, as the gentleman from North Dakota argued, perhaps we should do only those things that are of benefit to ourselves without aiding others. Never mind what happens to the rest of the world's civilization; because we do not know from day to day with whom we may find ourselves allied. But our editor says that South America seems to have that same opinion. Whichever side wins, they want to be on that side. They prefer our side, because we are a democracy and they are nearest to us, but they say their economic life depends largely upon European friendship or alliance.

What are they doing toward their own defense? Brazil speaks of the United States Navy as "our Navy." Certainly they depend upon us to furnish the military protection.

After reading these articles and many others I feel greatly disturbed. Some of you know that I have often taken the floor and talked about the Monroe Doctrine and the dangers involved. This whole Western Hemisphere that we have taken over for protection forces us to determine what our first line of defense really is. Most of us still think that Great Britain is our first line of defense. Certainly I am personally convinced of this.

What joy some of you have in speaking of Comrade Stalin these last few days. Make the most of it.

I feel that I am as patriotic as any of you. I think you believe it. We have different points of view. Leaving all sentiment out of it, I want to support Great Britain as much as we can. The longer she can keep Hitler away from us the better. We would hardly appropriate vast sums for defense if there was no danger.

France is being forced to point the gun at her former friends because Hitler has hold of her arm, making her point the gun. You must know that. Let us not talk about France doing it willingly, of her own free will. The gentleman from North Dakota said, "She said she has decided that it is for her best interests." Indeed yes, she could only survive if she did not. If Hitler gets hold of England's arm England may have to point a gun at us, lest a million Englishmen be put against the wall. Of course that is a possibility.

I recognize those conditions that the gentleman portrayed. He argued in his very pleasant, agreeable way so we could all enjoy it. His veiled accusations are easily answered. We would wish we had some friends over there when we assume a protectorate over all the countries of this hemisphere. As we have stated, many of those countries may not have full confidence that an alliance with us is to their best interests. We must cultivate their friendship and bring about a better understanding. This is far more important than loaning money.

As to our present alliances so wittingly referred to by my friend from North Dakota, may I suggest: If my friend were in danger of his life, fighting the Indians, and we were attempting to help him, and if another tribe was also willing to help him, although he hated them, I think he would be quite willing for us to give that other tribe something to fight with that he might be rescued. I do not believe we would have to recognize them as comrades.

As I suggested recently, Andrew Jackson, at the battle of New Orleans, at first did not want to accept Lafitte the pirate as an ally, but finally accepted him gladly. Was Lafitte his comrade afterward? Certainly he did not want to make the United States safe for pirates. That may not be a good illustration. If I had time I surely could quote many other similar conditions.

I wanted to talk about South America and extend warning. We seem to be doing scarcely anything at all toward cultivating friendship and economic coalition. Words will not suffice. Our actions will count. We did start some 2 or 3 years ago a so-called good-neighbor policy. How far have we succeeded? Do they trust us to tie up with them in an economic sense?

Can we even dare attempt to force them? You have the Monroe Doctrine. It is no longer a unilateral doctrine. We can no longer act alone. It is now multilateral and there must be joint action. This may be most difficult. You cannot take over a protectorate of Martinique without full agreement with all of the South American countries. It appears to me prolific of much disagreement and trouble. The Monroe Doctrine provides that no foreign nation should ever gain further foothold on the soil of this continent. But there is little we can do to prevent them getting a foothold of economic influence. How successful those European countries have been in gaining that economic foothold. Can we change that present hold?

I should not criticize too much the present chaos in Europe as to present and changing allies. I wonder if I were conquered and the conquering one would force me to turn and shoot at you, who had come to my rescue, would I shoot? Would it not be for my own interest to shoot at you and save my own life? France may live only if she will fight England, but do not believe she desires to do so. That would be a tragedy. That would be something humanity will hesitate to believe.

In closing let me again say that I wish to express a warning about South America. I have been informed by a very able investigator, and the documents he sends us are altogether too persuasive to further doubt. We are also warned and well-informed from many other sources. I have gathered much material on the matter.

Let us be a little careful. Call me Comrade if you want to because of my desire to help Britain. Get all possible enjoyment out of it. It does not affect me much.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 134):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, BEAM, HARRINGTON, THOMAS of Texas, HOUSTON, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, and LAMBERTSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4545. An act to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program; and

H. R. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil-and-gas leases on certain lands;

S. 1246. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; and

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4276. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4590. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4693. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

THE LATE ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 253):

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, a Senator of the United States from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 21 members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members: The SPEAKER, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. DIES, Mr. KLEBERG, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. WEST, Mr. MAHON, Mr. PATTON, Mr. SOUTH, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Mr. POAGE, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. GOSSETT, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. WORLEY.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 28, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m. in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

685. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by suspending section 24b of the National Defense Act, and authorizing a more expeditious procedure to vitalize the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

686. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4946. A bill relating to the manning of certain seagoing barges; without amendment (Rept. No. 876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 198. Joint resolution creating a committee to investigate the feasibility of transferring certain bureaus and agencies of the Government from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 879). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the St. Lawrence waterways

project by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 880). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TARVER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4926. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4965. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with ammendment (Rept. No. 882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of certain creditors of the National Conference on Legalizing Lotteries, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4529. A bill for the relief of John Henry Hester; with amendment (Rept. No. 878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5196, a bill to establish a Commission on Taxation in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 5197. A bill providing that nothing contained in the antitrust laws or in any other provisions of law, Federal or State, shall forbid any cooperative action of the various groups and companies within the petroleum industry which is taken at the request of said Coordinator of Petroleum for National Defense; to the Commmittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois:

H. R. 5198. A bill to further amend the act entitled "An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5199. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5200 (by request). A bill for the relief of Ben White, Arch Robinson, Lee Wells, W. S. Wells, A. J. McLaren, A. J. Barkelew, Oscar Clayton, R. L. Culpepper, W. B. Edwards, the estate of John McLaren, the estate of C. E. Wells, and the estate of Theodore Bowen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5201. A bill to restore to 15 cents per bushel the penalty on excess marketings of certain commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 5202. A bill to create an industrial-accident-prevention board to foster, promote, and develop the safety of wage earners of the District of Columbia, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5203. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of February 24, 1933, and of the act of June 29, 1940, to proceedings to punish for criminal contempt of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 5204. A bill authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5205. A bill to provide for cheaper rail and bus transportation for officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when on leave of absence or furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to declare Saturday, July 5, 1941, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the small-loan business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY:

H. Res. 252. Resolution authorizing an appropriation for procurement of a marble bust of Frederick Huntington Gillett; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Nettie Woolfolk Montague and Jerry L. Woolfolk, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5207. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hettie Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Anton George Hodik; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Gilbert S. MacDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of E. M. Conroy; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1541. By Mr. OLIVER: Petition of H. L. Moulton, of Saco, Maine, and 915 other signers, requesting Congress not to pass any compulsory Sunday observation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1542. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Miss Nadine Ellis and 12 other citizens of Turner, Oreg., urging the passage of House bill 2475, a bill to prohibit prostitution within certain distances of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1543. Also, petition signed by Ethel O. Spencer and 24 other citizens of Oakland, Oreg., urging the passage of House bill 2475, a bill to prohibit prostitution within certain distances of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1544. Also, petition signed by Gerald R. Allen and 46 other citizens of the State of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1545. Also, petition signed by Mrs. A. L. Stephens and 80 other citizens of Lincoln County, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1546. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Petition of sundry citizens of Bozeman, Gallatin County, and adjacent cities in Montana, urging defense of the health and morale of the youth in the Army under the Selective Service Act from the trade in alcoholic beverages and from moral degradation by passing House bill 2475, a reenactment of the protective legislation of 1917, signed by Nellie P. Dawes and 157 others; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1547. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Native Sons of the Golden West, San Francisco, Calif., requesting that the lake to be formed by Friant Dam, a unit of the Central Valley's project, be dedicated and named as Lake Millerton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1548. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of Mrs. Walter Anthony, of Charleston, W. Va., and 56 citizens of Charleston, W. Va., supporting House bill 2475, as amended, and opposing Senator LA FOLLETTE's motion to reconsider the amendment in question, and also against any motion or amendment the effect of which will be to weaken or strike out any provision of this bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1549. By Mr. THILL: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Walter S. Lindsay, of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing the compulsory joint income-tax return for husband and wife under the Federal tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1550. By Mr. WARD: Petition of 25 citizens of Worcester and Dorchester Counties, Md., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1551. Also, petition signed by Lewis Roswell Jackson and 169 other citizens of Cecil County, Md., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1552. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, Cheyenne, Wyo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, Creator of all things, who hast made the world and placed man in it to see his duty as Thy will, and through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast revealed to all mankind the glorious vision of Thy Kingdom: We yield Thee humble thanks that of Thy great bounty Thou didst give unto our forefathers this fair land, and through Thy gracious providence didst make of them a mighty Nation. Pour out upon her citizens, we beseech Thee, O Lord, the fullness of Thy grace, that each in his

turn may be worthy of this great heritage, serving Thee faithfully in that state of life unto which it hast pleased Thee to call him.

More especially, O Lord, we beseech Thee to give Thy continual guidance to Thy servant, the President of the United States, and to all who bear responsibility of government, that the Spirit of Wisdom may save them from all false choices as they exercise their offices to the honor of their country and to the glory of Thy Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 26, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

STABILIZATION FUND AND ALTERATION OF WEIGHT OF THE DOLLAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of yesterday the clerk will call the roll to develop the presence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Bone	Gurney	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hatch	Rosier
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Brown	Herring	Schwartz
Bunker	Hughes	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Norris	Wheeler
George	Nye	Wiley
Glass	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BYRNES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent, in attendance at the funeral of his secretary and devoted associate, the late John D. Osbourne.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. The second sentence added to paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, by section 12 of said Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended to read as follows: "The powers of the President specified in this paragraph shall be deemed to be separate, distinct, and continuing powers and may be exercised by him, from time to time, severally or together, whenever and as the expressed objects of this section in his judgment may require; except that such powers shall expire June 30, 1943, unless the President shall sooner declare the existing emergency ended."

Mr. ADAMS. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, it was a part of the agreement entered into yesterday that following the roll call we should have a yea-and-nay vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MCNARY. It is the understanding of the Senator from Oregon, because I made a statement on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In any event, the call for the yeas and nays is sufficiently supported. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and vote "nay." I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If the Senator from Louisiana were present he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who if present would vote "yea," and I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. I announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who would vote "nay."

Mr. BYRNES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting they would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, Senators ANDREWS, BANKHEAD, BILBO, CONNALLY, ELLENDER, GILLETTE, HILL, LEE, MEAD, MURRAY, REYNOLDS, SMATHERS, SPENCER, and WALLGREN would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—22

Adams	Bridges	Byrd
Bailey	Burton	Capper
Brewster	Butler	Danaher

Davis	Nye	Vandenberg
Gurney	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Taft	Wiley
Lodge	Thomas, Idaho	
McNary	Tydings	

NAYS—40

Bone	Hayden	Pepper
Brown	Herring	Radcliffe
Bunker	Hughes	Rosier
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Caraway	Kilgore	Schwartz
Chandler	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
George	Maloney	Tunnell
Glass	Murdock	Walsh
Green	Norris	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Mahoney	
Hatch	Overton	

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Connally	Reed
Andrews	Ellender	Reynolds
Austin	Gerry	Smathers
Ball	Gillette	Spencer
Bankhead	Hill	Tobey
Barbour	Holman	Truman
Barkley	Langer	Wagner
Bilbo	Lee	Wallgren
Brooks	McCarran	White
Bulow	Mead	Willis
Clark, Idaho	Murray	

So Mr. ADAMS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have an amendment I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section to the bill to read as follows:

The power of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury under section 43 (b) (1) of the act approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 3152), with respect to the issuance of United States notes, shall expire on June 30, 1943.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the report of the Federal Reserve Board which is printed in the hearings, I introduced a bill providing not only for the repeal of the President's power to devalue the dollar, but also for the repeal of the President's power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks and the repeal of the President's power to issue additional silver certificates against the seigniorage. He has issued silver certificates for the entire cost of all the silver which has been purchased, but under the law he could today, without further action by the Congress, issue about a billion and a half dollars more silver certificates.

The Federal Reserve Board recommended that all those powers be repealed, together with the President's power to devalue the dollar. If the amendment which has just been rejected had been agreed to, I would have offered an amendment providing for a repeal of the President's power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks and to issue silver certificates against the seigniorage. Since the amendment was not adopted, I have offered an amendment which proposes that the President's power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks shall terminate at the same time with his power to devalue the dollar. There is today provided no termination of that power, and the only purpose of the amendment is to provide that when we again consider the question of devaluing the dollar, we shall also consider the question of the continuation of the President's power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks.

In my opinion, that is a wholly unnecessary power. It is only an inflationary power, which should never be used under any circumstances of which I can think. If we desire even to stimulate inflation, there is a much better way to do it than by issuing paper currency. I think the power should be terminated today, but since the Senate apparently desires to continue the power during the next 2 years, I feel that we should now say definitely that the power to issue greenbacks in the amount of $3,000,000,000 shall end on the 30th of June 1943, when the President's power to devalue the dollar will expire.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, not one dollar of greenbacks has been issued under the authorization referred to by the Senator from Ohio. Hence the only result that could ensue from the adoption of the proposed amendment would be to delay action on the bill, and send it to conference, which should not be done. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered. That was agreed to a day or so ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the yeas and nays have not been ordered. Does the Senator desire to have the yeas and nays?

Mr. McNARY. In a colloquy a day or two ago it was agreed, both in private conference and on the floor, that a quorum call should first be had, and then a roll call on the passage of the bill. I think that stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that is not the situation.

Mr. McNARY. Then I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and vote "yea." I am advised that the Senator from Oregon, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If the Senator from Louisiana were present, he would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who, if present, would vote "nay," and I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BYRNES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting, they would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. I announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who would vote "nay," with

the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who would vote "yea";

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "yea"; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont Mr. [AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent, in attendance at the funeral of his secretary and devoted associate, the late John D. Osbourne.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Bone	Hayden	Pepper
Brown	Herring	Radcliffe
Bunker	Hughes	Rosier
Byrnes	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Caraway	Kilgore	Schwartz
Chandler	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
George	Maloney	Tunnell
Glass	Murdock	Van Nuys
Green	Norris	Walsh
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

NAYS—20

Adams	Danaher	Shipstead
Brewster	Davis	Taft
Bridges	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Byrd	McNary	Wiley
Capper	Nye	

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Connally	Reed
Andrews	Ellender	Reynolds
Austin	Gerry	Smathers
Ball	Gillette	Spencer
Bankhead	Hill	Tobey
Barbour	Holman	Truman
Barkley	Langer	Wagner
Bilbo	Lee	Wallgren
Brooks	McCarran	White
Bulow	Mead	Willis
Clark, Idaho	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 4646) was passed.

INVESTIGATION OF OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM—MINIMUM PENSIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to the terms of Senate Resolution 129 (agreed to June 20, 1941), appointed Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, and Mr. BROOKS members of the special committee to investigate the operation of the old-age pension system and minimum pensions.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF REFUGEE RELIEF FUNDS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of operations under the appropriation of $50,000,000, contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, for the relief of men, women, and children who have been driven from their homes or otherwise rendered destitute by hostilities or invasion (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPLICATION OF STATE LAW TO LANDS, ETC., UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation making applicable to all lands or premises subject to the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, the law of the State within the exterior boundaries of which such land or premises is situated, pertaining to the recovery of damages for injury or death by wrongful act or omission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation requiring Federal governmental agencies to comply with California minimum-price laws for milk

"Whereas prior to 1935 unfair, unjust, destructive, and demoralizing trade practices had been carried on in the production and distribution of fluid milk and fluid cream, which practices constituted a constant menace to the health and welfare of the inhabitants of the State of California, and tended to undermine sanitary regulations and standards of content and purity of fluid milk and fluid cream; and

"Whereas in the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California, health regulations were insufficient to prevent disturbances in the milk industry, which disturbances threatened to destroy and seriously to impair the future supply of fluid milk; and

"Whereas to safeguard the consuming public from future inadequacy of supply of this necessary commodity, the Legislature of the State of California in 1935 declared that it was the policy of the State of California to promote, foster, and encourage the intelligent production and orderly marketing of commodities necessary to its citizens, including milk, and to eliminate speculation, waste, improper marketing, unfair and destructive trade practices, and improper accounting for milk purchased from producers of such milk; and

"Whereas, as a result of such declaration of policy, the Legislature of the State of California declared that the production, transportation, processing, storage, distribution, and sale of fluid milk and fluid cream in the State of California is an industry affecting the public health and welfare, and thereupon enacted a law providing for the stabilization of marketing of fluid milk and fluid cream; which law is Chapter 10 of Division 4 of the Agricultural Code of the State of California, and bestowed upon the Director of Agriculture of the State of California the administrative authority, after investigation and public hearing, to prescribe marketing areas wherein different prices and regulations should be defined; and

"Whereas under said law the Director of Agriculture of the State of California has established stabilization and marketing plans in 16 marketing areas within said State of California, providing minimum prices to be paid to producers of fluid milk, and in connection with said plans has established in 13 marketing areas within said State of California schedules of minimum wholesale and minimum retail prices for fluid milk; and

"Whereas approximately 85 percent of the fluid milk produced and distributed in the State of California is marketed under said market controls, said 85 percent being approximately equivalent to 73,000,000 pounds of milkfat yearly, to an approximate value of $42,000,000 to California producers of fluid milk; and

"Whereas since the adoption of the California State milk-control law, the dairy industry, with the aid of the State, has corrected certain evils and has developed and maintained satisfactory marketing conditions and has brought about a reasonable amount of stability and prosperity in the production and marketing of fluid milk and fluid cream; and

"Whereas the expansion and extension of the national-defense program has resulted in the great and continuing increase in the number and personnel of defense units quartered in the State of California and in milk-marketing areas thereof, and a great and continuing increase, in said areas, of the consumption of fluid milk, whereby a large and increasing percentage of the fluid milk marketed in California is sold to and consumed by said defense units; and

"Whereas quartermasters, purchasing officers, and other supply officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, C. C. C., Air Corps, flying schools, and of other military and naval units of the United States are directed or required by Federal law, rule, order, or regulation to make purchases of food supplies, including fluid milk, at competitive-bid prices, regardless of minimum-price regulations and schedules established by the Director of Agriculture of the State of California; and

"Whereas the attorney general of the State of California has advised the director of agriculture of the State of California that said director is without power or jurisdiction to apply or enforce minimum producer price schedules or minimum resale price schedules as to fluid milk sold or delivered to agencies or units of the United States Government quartered on property or premises ceded to or owned by the United States Government; and

"Whereas distributors of fluid milk in competing for the fluid-milk business of said defense units so situated make bids and offers of sales and actual sales of fluid milk for delivery to said units at prices below the minimum prices established by the director of agriculture, and in turn pay and return to the producers supplying such fluid milk prices below the minimum prices established and ordered by said director to be paid to said producers, resulting in severe operating losses which cannot at this time be approximated, but which may be estimated at many thousands of dollars per day to aggregate California producers supplying such milk for such purposes; and

"Whereas from the foregoing there have resulted enormous and continuing losses to California producers of fluid milk, unutterable confusion and chaotic marketing conditions, and break-down of the law and of minimum producer price and minimum resale schedules established thereunder; and

"Whereas if said situation is permitted to continue, California producers of fluid milk

face loss of income, possible bankruptcy, and financial disaster; and

"Whereas California producers of fluid milk are in the premises forced to shoulder an unfair and disproportionate part of the cost, duty, and burden imposed by the national-defense program on all citizens, thus resulting in disorganization and unstabilization of the fluid-milk business of the State of California, resulting in turn in great and inestimable losses to producers and distributors of fluid milk; and

"Whereas it is vital to the dairy industry of the State of California, which, as aforesaid, is an industry affecting the public health and welfare of the people of the State of California, that not less than the minimum prices fixed by the director of agriculture of the State of California be charged in such areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of this State hereby memorializes and recommends to the Congress of the United States that it pass and enact, forthwith and as an emergency measure, such laws, statutes, rules, or regulations, as will direct and require purchasing officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Corps, or such others as may be in authority over the purchasing of food supplies for the above and other defense units or other agencies of the United States quartered in the State of California, and in milk marketing areas in said State, to regard as unlawful and to refuse to entertain or consider or accept bids or offers from any distributor or producer of fluid milk, which bids or offers are below the minimum prices established by the director of agriculture pursuant to the provisions of California's milk-stabilization law or amendments thereof, and that said Congress declare, by joint congressional statute, or otherwise, that where the minimum price of fluid milk and fluid cream is fixed by competent State legal authority, said purchases by the Federal Government within the geographical areas of the State of California, and upon territory ceded by such State to the Federal Government, shall be at prices not less than the minimum prices declared by such competent State legal authority."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to provide for the dredging of Bodega Bay and to reestablish harbor facilities thereat

"Whereas in this period of uncertainty in international affairs, intensive rearmament and preparation for national defense it is of the utmost moment that suitable harbors and facilities be available on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas Bodega Bay in Sonoma County, Calif., is exceptionally well suited for harbor development; and

"Whereas plans for the dredging of Bodega Bay and for the reestablishment thereat of harbor facilities have been approved by the War Department who has also recommended that appropriations be made by Congress for this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and to make such appropriations as may be necessary to provide for such dredging and harbor reestablishment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of the State of California is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of War and Secretary of Navy."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish tax-exempt bonds

"Whereas it is being suggested that Federal taxes be increased sharply to meet the costs of the Nation's defense needs; and

"Whereas it is generally believed that numerous individuals and corporations having large incomes are escaping a considerable portion of their just taxes through the device of purchasing tax-exempt bonds; and

"Whereas it is unfair and inconsistent to increase the taxes of those in the lower- and middle-income brackets while those in the upper brackets thus escape a considerable share of their taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps looking to the abolishment of tax-exempt bonds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 25

"Joint resolution relative to proposed merit system for county welfare activities

"Whereas the merit system applicable to county welfare workers is being sponsored by the State department of social welfare of this State in accordance with orders of the Federal Social Security Board; and

"Whereas the members of the several boards of supervisors of this State are of the opinion that the proposed merit system is an interference with local county governmental activities; and

"Whereas there appears to be no good reason why the State department of social welfare should dictate to the counties as to whom should be employed by the supervisors, whether in accordance with the rules of the Federal Social Security Board or not; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California is of the opinion that this interference with local county governmental activities is unauthorized and unwarranted: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby advises and informs the Federal Social Security Board that it is opposed to the proposed merit system and to any interference with local governmental activities in this State, whether by a State agency or by a Federal agency: and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution shall be immediately dispatched to the members of the Federal Social Security Board by the secretary of state."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General with respect to the assertion of any pretended Federal claim to the submerged lands of the State of California

"Whereas on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence the original States, as successors to the English Crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution, and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

"Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

"Whereas such ownership has long been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States of America and by other Federal departments and agencies, and has not been questioned until recently, with the result that the State of California and its grantees, both public and private, relying thereon, have expended vast sums of money in the development of such lands, including harbor facilities, reclamation and filling in, and the erection of costly structures; and

"Whereas this legislature is informed that plans are being made to initiate litigation against the State of California, or its grantees, to assert a pretended Federal claim to such lands, whether with or without the authorization of the Congress; and

"Whereas any such litigation could only result in a decision in favor of this State or its grantees, would be unjust in view of the concomitant vexation and annoyance, and would seriously impair the further development of such lands and the financing thereof until the final decision: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California jointly, That the State of California hereby solemnly and firmly asserts the title of the State and its grantees in such lands within this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President, the Congress, and the Solicitor General of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully urged not to imitate or authorize the initiation of any litigation that would becloud such title of the State and its grantees, however temporarily; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

"Senate Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to national-defense highways

"Whereas United States Highways Nos. 93 and 95 are completely paved from the Canadian line to the Mexican border, with the exception of that portion lying between Niland and United States Highway No. 60, a distance of approximately 40 miles; and

"Whereas these highways passing through Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and California provide access to many major attractions of this country, including Boulder Dam, Zion and Bryce Canyons, Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks, and Lake Louise, Canada; and

"Whereas the importance of these highways in the program of national defense is increasing and becoming more apparent day by day; and

"Whereas it is important for national defense that these highways be in usable condition and particularly that this unpaved portion referred to be improved and made passable: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, the assembly thereof concurring, That the Senate and Assembly hereby respectfully request the President of the United

States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture, to examine the problem presented by the impassable condition of the stretch of highway mentioned and consider the advisability of making the necessary construction and repairs as a part of the national-defense program; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to each of the officials or bodies named herein."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate $38,750,000 for the Central Valley Project as recommended by President Roosevelt

"Whereas it is reported that President Roosevelt has recommended an appropriation of $38,750,000 for work on the Central Valley project, which recommendation is $13,750,000 greater than the original amount asked; and

"Whereas if an appropriation in the sum of $38,750,000 is made by Congress, the completion of the Central Valley project will be advanced 1 full year to some time in 1943; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable that this project be completed at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California jointly, That Congress be, and it hereby is memorialized to appropriate the sum of $38,750,000 to the Central Valley project in accordance with the recommendation of President Roosevelt; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby urged to support action by Congress to accomplish the intent of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the United States officials having jurisdiction of the matter in connection with the removal of brush and debris in the area to be flooded by Shasta Dam

"Whereas there now exists in the area which will be flooded by the water impounded by Shasta Dam a great quantity of brush, debris, and other loose material; and

"Whereas the water to be impounded by Shasta Dam is to be used as a water supply for urban and other areas in the portion of the State in which the dam is situated, and the presence of the brush, debris, and other material in said waters would impair the water-distribution systems involved and menace the potability of the water for drinking purposes; and

"Whereas the clarity of the water impounded by the dam will enhance the scenic value of the lake thereby created and add to the recreational value of the project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior are hereby respectfully urged to take such steps as are necessary to provide that the brush, debris, and other materials in the area to be covered by the water impounded by Shasta Dam be removed prior to the time the area is flooded; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior, and to each Member from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 27

"Joint resolution relative to the investigation by the joint committee on water problems of water service from Shasta Reservoir to the area lying south of the Pit River and memorializing Congress to investigate and make provision for serving water to this land

"Whereas in 1915 the United States Reclamation Service projected a dam at Sheeps Rock and a tunnel which would pass through the ridge that divides the Pit River Basin from those lands lying to the south, the tunnel to be about 13,000 feet long and 8 feet wide by 10 feet high; and

"Whereas the elevation of the mouth of the projected tunnel will be covered by the water in Shasta Reservoir upon the completion of Shasta Dam; and

"Whereas 80,000 acres of land presently semiarid may be converted into prosperous farming land by the application of water to be impounded in Shasta Reservoir thereto; and

"Whereas if this project is not immediately carried out, it will never be feasible from an engineering standpoint as the mouth of the tunnel will be covered by water nor from a legal standpoint as the land lying below Shasta Dam will become irrevocably entitled to the water to be impounded therein: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby respectfully urge the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Reclamation to investigate further the economic and engineering feasibility of serving water to the land lying south of the Pit River with water to be impounded in the Shasta Reservoir and if found to be feasible, to make provision for this service; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress, and the Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the joint committee on water problems created pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11 investigate and report upon the economic and engineering feasibility of serving water to the land lying south of the Pit River as a part of the Central Valley project."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, protesting against the enactment of legislation which would deprive the citizens of Texas of their rights under the community property laws of the State as applied to their income-tax returns and payments; to the Committee on Finance. (See similar senate resolution 167 of the Senate of Texas printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Secretary on the 26th instant, p. 5528, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., protesting against a cut in the W. P. A. rolls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that the United States keep out of war and that American boys be not sent to fight on foreign soil; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of House bill 1435, to amend existing law so as to provide for the exclusion and deportation of aliens who advocate basic changes in the form of the American Government; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring suspension of the naturalization of aliens during the period of the national emergency proclaimed by the President; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of House bill 3455, making membership in the Communist and certain other subversive organizations unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, assembled at Washington, D. C., commending the national-defense program and favoring the making of adequate appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Galena, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Milan, Morrill, and Topeka, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution of the Dickinson County, Mich., Board of Supervisors, favoring the construction of the proposed Au Train Canal through the central part of the Upper Peninsula to connect Lake Superior and Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Flint, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of the Mothers of the United States of America, at Detroit, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent the diversion abroad of any foodstuffs required by the citizens of the United States and to provide that foodstuffs diverted abroad be limited to actual surplus supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of sundry citizens of Allegan County, Mich., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alco-

holic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the table.

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

"Senate Resolution 48

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the lack of proper aviation facilities in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to properly protect the mining and shipping of copper and iron ore and the transportation of forest products, and the establishment of suitable facilities to guarantee such protection

"Whereas the products of the copper and iron mines of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and the lumber products of said territory are of vital importance to national defense; and

"Whereas vast quantities of coal are being delivered by boat to said copper- and iron-mining districts for use in such mining; and

"Whereas the Portage Canal and the Sault Ste. Marie locks during the year 1940 carried more tonnage than the entire tonnage of the Panama Canal for the same period; and

"Whereas present airport facilities in that territory are inadequate for use by military combat aircraft; and

"Whereas there are thousands of acres of State- and county-owned lands readily adaptable to aviation needs, such as bases, aerial gunnery bases, aerial gunnery ranges, and training centers; and

"Whereas the Michigan College of Mines now has a student pilot training program in progress, and Houghton County has now acquired an additional 400 acres of land to be added to its present airport at Calumet; and

"Whereas there is now an aviation training school at the Calumet Airport, from which 110 fliers will receive their secondary papers this spring, and at which school there are now six United States airships and four United States fliers training said students; and

"Whereas the products of the aforesaid Upper Peninsula of Michigan can be of little or no value to the national defense of the United States unless said copper, iron, and forest products in shipment are fully protected from points of origin to their destination, and the copper- and iron-ore docks are fully safeguarded: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to thoroughly investigate the lack of proper aviation facilities to safeguard the mining and shipping of iron, copper, and forest products in and from this territory and the desirability of establishing a sufficient number of suitable airports and other facilities to guarantee such protection; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Congress.

"Adopted by the senate on May 26, 1941."

INVOLVEMENT IN WAR—POSITION OF CONNECTICUT COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter which I have just received from the Reverend Stanley Manning, president of the Connecticut Council of Churches and Religious Education. The letter is dated June 27, 1941, and reads as follows:

THE CONNECTICUT COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION,
Hartford, Conn., June 27, 1941.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DANAHER: At a recent meeting of the executive committee of the Connecticut Council of Churches and Religious Education it was voted to poll the committee for their opinions regarding sending the following urgent message to you and the other Members of the Connecticut delegation in Congress.

"We respectfully urge that no further steps be taken to involve the United States of America in the present war."

Twenty-three members of the committee have registered their approval and seven disapproved. I believe that this is fairly indicative of the trend of sentiment and trust that you will do all you can to bring congressional action into conformity therewith.

Respectfully yours,

STANLEY MANNING,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 488).

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3191. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 489).

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 599. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Highway Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 491); and

S. 852. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for and the addition thereof to the Deschutes National Forest, in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. No. 492).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 27, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 178. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases on certain lands;

S. 239. An act to provide for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts in certain cases;

S. 1246. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), so as to make its provisions applicable to personnel of all components of the Army of the United States; and

S. 1471. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1683. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. Earl Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1684. A bill providing for equalization of taxes in counties wherein national forest lands are located; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1685. A bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to crimes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 1686. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of a naturalized wife residing abroad with her husband, a native-born national of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1687, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:

S. 1688. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1689. A bill to amend section 19 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of June 26, 1934;

S. 1690. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, approved August 15, 1921, as amended;

S. 1691. A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to make open-market procurements where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100;

S. 1692. A bill to amend section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities or products thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 1693. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate employees of the Department of Agriculture to make arrests for violation of the laws relating to and the rules and regulations established for the protection of lands acquired under or transferred for administration under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution establishing the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic National Shrine Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building to the memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5166, the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place, to insert the following:

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1942, the sum of $100,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, such sum to be in addition to any funds appropriated by such section 32 and to be subject to all the provisions of law relating to the expenditure of such funds."

INVESTIGATION OF VIOLATIONS OF THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY, ETC.—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 135), which was referred to the Committee to Audit

and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That, for the purpose of concluding the printing of hearings and reports, the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936, and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 154, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to August 12, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to May 18, 1938, and under Senate Resolution 126, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to August 4, 1939, to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively is hereby increased by $500.

ADDRESS BY THE MOST REV. FRANCIS J. L. BECKMAN AT DUBUQUE, IOWA

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, Archbishop of Dubuque, at the America First rally at Dubuque, Iowa, June 21, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIAN POLICY AND AMERICAN DEFENSE—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "Russian Policy and American Defense," which appears in the Appendix.]

LIFE AND RESOURCES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 490) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request for immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was on page 1, line 6, to strike out "1946" and insert "1945".

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, some statement should be made concerning the objectives of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I shall be pleased to make a statement. This bill carries out the previously expressed mandate of the Congress to provide 85 percent of parity loans. It also changes the Commodity Credit Act in two important respects. It extends the life of the Corporation for 4 years from 1941 to 1945. It differs from the bill which passed the House on June 26 in limiting the time to 1945 instead of 1946. It also provides for $1,250,000,000 additional credit to the Corporation to supply the funds necessary to carry out the purposes of previous legislation.

This sum of money is to be used, according to the estimates of Mr. Hutson, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as follows: Approximately $455,000,000 for cotton; $250,000,000 for corn; a maximum of $430,000,000 for wheat; a maximum of $83,000,000 for tobacco; and $170,000,000 for other commodities. That is an increase of $1,250,000,000 over the Corporation's present authority.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am not familiar with the record made in the committee hearings. Does the bill contemplate the loans provided for in the measure recently passed, whereby we authorized commodity loans at 85 percent of the value of the commodities?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. That is the reason why it is now proposed to increase the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct. It is proposed to increase the borrowing power of the Corporation by $1,250,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Are the estimates which the Senator is now mentioning to cover loans to be made on cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice in the next few years? How will the sum mentioned be reached, keeping in mind the recent act of Congress authorizing loans of 85 percent of parity on commodities?

Mr. BROWN. The estimate made by Mr. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is that the sum of $1,250,000,000 will be necessary to make the loans which I stated, of approximately $455,000,000 for cotton, $250,000,000 for corn, $430,000,000 for wheat, $83,000,000 for tobacco, and $170,000,000 for other commodities.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, that estimate was made on the basis of the crop year of 1941.

Mr. BROWN. I am unable to state that fact to the Senator. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is somewhat familiar with the matter. I will ask him if he has in mind whether the sum of $1,250,000,000 covers the coming year or the entire life of the corporation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it was our understanding that that figure was to cover the entire life of the proposed extended operations under the commodity-credit plan.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator. That was my impression, but I did not have that point directly in mind.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I favor the extension of credit to cover loans up to 85 percent of parity, but $1,250,000,000 would not cover the loans for 4 years. It would cover them only for 1 year.

Mr. BROWN. I am assuming that the fund is a revolving fund and will be used over and over again during that period of time. The hearings were very much more full in the House than in the Senate, because the bill did not reach us until June 26; but my impression is that the additional sum of $1,250,000,000 is to take care of the financial needs of the Corporation for the remainder of its contemplated life. I assume the fund will be used over and over again.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed in 1934, prior to the time the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional because it entered into the States in the matter of taking care of the acreage, $300,000,000 was appropriated for this purpose. In 1938, after the new act was passed, the sum was considerably increased. How much of the money heretofore appropriated has been lost by the Corporation by reason of loans made from 1934 to date? Are those figures available?

Mr. BROWN. They were presented to the committee. A statement was presented to the committee this morning. I greatly regret that because of the limitations of time we were unable to have the hearings printed.

Mr. McNARY. Has the original appropriation been exhausted by reason of losses; and is that why we are expanding the loan fund? Or is it because it is desired to reach a new situation created by the parity act?

Mr. BROWN. The latter statement of the Senator is the correct one. If we do not provide the additional $1,250,000,000, only $150,000,000 will be available for the purpose. That is the balance on hand; and, of course, that is totally inadequate to supply the needs created by the 85 percent parity loan act.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, that does not quite answer my inquiry, but I am not complaining. I am curious to know what amount of the original capital has been exhausted by reason of losses occurring from loans.

Mr. BROWN. I will obtain those figures and put them in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been reported to me that the new Commodity Credit organization proposes to change the method of handling the funds, turn them over to the A. A. A., and have them loaned to farmers by that agency of the Government rather than by the banks, as is now the practice. Does the Senator have any such information before him?

Mr. BROWN. By this bill the Banking and Currency Committee was only seeking to supply funds to carry out the legislation which was enacted a short time ago. The question raised by the Senator did not come before the Senate committee. I do not believe it came before the House committee. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. That question did not arise at all?

Mr. BROWN. It did not. Let me say to the Senator that I will obtain that information and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will do so. I understand that the new organization, of which Mr. Hutson is the head, proposes to revolutionize the pres-

ent system of dealing with loans. I am not sure of the correctness of my information. I received it from some of those interested in cotton in my home State. They say that Mr. Hutson proposes to revolutionize the present system of dealing with loans, and to have them all made by county agents under the A. A. A. set-up, which, I think, would be very detrimental to the whole system. If that be the case, we ought to be very slow about turning over so large a sum to be used in that way. I am heartily in favor of making the 85-percent loans, but I do not think the Federal agency ought to have the arbitrary power to change the entire system, which has worked so well in the past.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say to the Senator that there is nothing in the bill which authorizes any change in method. By this bill we merely seek to supply the money; and by granting the Corporation the right to borrow on the faith and credit of the United States, additional money will be provided.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I am afraid of is that under the present law the officials have the power to make such a change. If they have, it would work to the great detriment of all our cotton farmers, at least. I should like to be assured that no such change is expected. I do not think it ought to be made. I think it would be unwise from a business standpoint and hurtful to the interests of the Government. I think the present system is highly satisfactory. There is no complaint and there has been no complaint of any kind about the present system of lending the funds, and it ought to be continued. It ought not to be disrupted, as I have been told is proposed. I hope the Senator will obtain the information I have requested before the bill passes.

Mr. BROWN. I will call to the attention of Mr. Hutson the statement just made by the Senator from Tennessee and insert in the RECORD Mr. Hutson's reply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill closely, but it occurs to me that section 4 of the bill is an entirely new power.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously struck section 4 from the bill. It was the opinion of the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation that section 4 was merely directory, and that it laid down no definite rule of procedure or of law.

Mr. RUSSELL. It confers a most unusual power, because it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to change the parity price on any nonbasic commodity according to any rule he may adopt.

Mr. BROWN. That was one of the objections which was raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and that was one of the reasons why we felt that section 4 should be stricken from the bill.

My statement is that Mr. Hutson felt that the administration of this fund could be handled just as well with section 4 out of the bill, and possibly better, than with section 4 in it. So the Senator from Georgia need have no worry about section 4 unless the House insists upon it; and, if so, the conferees will bring it back to the Senate for further consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is an entirely new proposition; and I wanted to learn from the Senator what evidence was submitted to the committee to indicate how this very sweeping power is to be utilized.

Mr. BROWN. Sufficient evidence to cause us to feel that the section should be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then the section has been stricken from the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say, in line with what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said a moment ago, that it seems to me that information ought to be supplied to the Senate before the bill passes. The Senator from Michigan said he would get the information and put it in the RECORD; but after the bill passes it will be too late for the facts put into the RECORD to do us any good.

I not only agree with what the Senator from Tennessee said about the efficacy of the method of administering this power, but I have a further and additional reason for not being willing to grant the Secretary of Agriculture blanket powers in this connection, and to extend the powers he now has. It is well known that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, is actively organizing the county agents as a propaganda agency to try to drum up sentiment for getting the United States into war; and, so far as I am concerned, I am not going to vote to extend any powers Mr. Wickard has to enable him to do anything of that kind.

In addition, I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I should like to have some information as to the attitude of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the subject of cotton. I have been very much in sympathy with the basic principles involved in the establishment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I have been very much disappointed and very much outraged at the way in which that Corporation has been administered by the Department of Agriculture.

For example, in the matter of cotton warehousing, the storing of loan cotton, a deliberate attempt was made a few months ago to move all the loan cotton to the terminal warehouses at the ports—an action which could only have the effect of benefiting one particular cotton firm, namely, Anderson & Clayton. Practically all the Senators from all the cotton States, and a very great many Representatives from all the cotton States, who certainly were as familiar with the necessities of the cotton growers and the interior cotton producers as anyone possibly could be, went down to the Department of Agriculture and held a nearly all-day session with the Secretary of Agriculture and the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, at that time Dr. Robbins. They were treated with great arrogance, and were told it did not make any difference what the intention of Congress was, that they were going to make this move; although, as I say, it was the unanimous opinion of all concerned who were present, from all the cotton States, that such a move could only result in benefit to one particular firm, and would be of great detriment to the cotton growers and the cotton warehousemen of the interior. Even after a measure on the subject was passed by a unanimous vote, as I recall, in the House of Representatives and by a very substantial majority in the Senate, the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation still indicated their intention at every opportunity to disregard the plain will of Congress.

I should like to have some explanations in regard to these matters before, on the last day of their power, we tamely submit to the extension of this power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that in this particular instance the Banking and Currency Committee operates in much the same way that the Appropriations Committee does after a matter has been authorized. We did not go into any of the subject matter to which the Senator from Missouri refers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, that is precisely the point I am making, that the Banking and Currency Committee now, on the last day, brings in a measure to extend for 5 additional years this tremendous power to allow the Department of Agriculture, if it desires to do so, to flout the plain intention of Congress, and the members of the committee say, "Well, we did not have an opportunity to examine into that. This is the last day, boys, and if you raise any objection now it will result in a very great complication."

I think the Banking and Currency Committee should have gone into that matter in the hearings; and I do not think the Senate of the United States should pass such a measure, extending for 5 years more these vast powers to the Agricultural Department, or—which is, in effect, what it is—the Secretary of Agriculture, without a full discussion of all the facts involved in connection with the extension of the powers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not the floor.

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. The Congress passed an act forbidding this organization in reconcentrating cotton to do as they had done theretofore. I have not heard any complaint. Is the Senator advised that they are going to disregard that direction?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been advised that there has been considerable complaint in the Agriculture Department, and more particularly the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that it is their intention to go ahead and advertise for bids on the reconcentration of cotton. Of course, the Senator from South Carolina is as familiar as I am with the fact that there is one particular firm in this country that can underbid any other firm—that can afford to take the cotton for nothing, as a

matter of fact, and pay a premium on it, because we all know that what cotton "goes down their winding stair will ne'er return again." The Commodity Credit Corporation still clings to its idols; and I am not disposed to extend its power to flout the will of Congress for so long a term as 4 years without knowing more about what it is going to do with the power it now has. Since the Banking and Currency Committee did not find out about it, I think the bill ought to be recommitted, and some committee ought to find out about it.

Mr. SMITH. I take it that this bill is merely making an appropriation. It does not go into any of the details. It says something about the power of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will read the first sentence, he will see that it also strikes out the term "June 30, 1941", which is the limit of the authority of the Corporation, and inserts "June 30, 1945." I say it is not fair to these vast powers—practically the powers of life and death over not only the cotton producers but other commodity producers of the United States—to bring such a bill as this in here on the last day of the term, and say, "Now, boys, just take it or leave it."

Mr. SMITH. Would it not be more appropriate, if the Senator will allow me, for us to modify the law that this bill makes provision to support? Let us modify the whole thing. I think this thing of moving cotton at the sweet will of business is all cockeyed; and, as the Senator says, there is one firm that could take the cotton and pay a billion dollars for it and make money out of it. We all know that they are the boss of the cotton market; but I do not see that this bill has anything to do with the substantive law which grants the Commodity Credit Corporation the powers they now have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It extends those powers for 4 years.

Mr. SMITH. I know it extends them, but it is up to us to modify that phase of the legislation. That is the point I make.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. On behalf of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I simply want to say that we did not get the bill until this morning. The House held it up for over a month, and we did not get it until this morning, and there was no opportunity to discuss the details.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will permit me, I will say to the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Virginia that I had no intention whatever of reflecting in any way on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which I know to be an able, diligent committee. My only suggestion in that respect has to do with the fact that whoever is responsible the matter has been dragged along until the very last day of the fiscal year, and now is brought in here under whip and spur, to be passed without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," lest the matter may be delayed or may be sent to conference, when it involves some extremely important issues which should be carefully considered by the Senate of the United States, as to whether we should extend this tremendous power.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] says the way to handle that matter is by changing the basic law. I think the Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that after we once extend this tremendous power it is very much more difficult to change the basic law than it is at the time we are extending the power. It is very much easier in a legislative way to limit a grant of power when it is being extended than it is to secure a limitation after the power has been granted. In other words, we could do it now if we had opportunity to consider the matter by proper legislation—that is, by action of the Congress—and the President if he wanted to continue the organization would have to sign the bill. On the other hand, when we once grant this extension, while the Senate may be unanimously in favor of some limitation of the Corporation's authority, unless we could get an agreement with the House it would not go into effect, and if the President simply desired to continue to have the Secretary of Agriculture exercise this enormous power, all he would have to do would be to veto such a bill. It seems to me that we are sinning away our day of grace by permitting this bill to pass here today.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I take it that obtaining the parity price of the basic commodities is very essential, and an appropriation has been made for that purpose. If we delay that and leave it out until we can change the organic law, we may do more harm than we do good. I am not in favor of Mr. Hutson, or whoever is at the head of this organization, changing the basis of the loans from the banks to the field agents.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator knows that there is nothing in this bill that authorizes or prohibits that being done.

Mr. SMITH. That is the point I am making. It does not pertain to that; but, if we pass this bill and allow this amount of money to be used, we can change the organic law in any way we see fit hereafter. It is a commentary on the Senate that we have not already done that. We ought not to have let the Corporation have the power to concentrate cotton in the hands of those who were able to submit bids. We ought to have waited until now. I am for this bill; I think it is essential to pass it, and we can take care of the other things in regular order.

Mr. BROWN. I may add to what the Senator has said that the farm organizations have been urging us to pass the bill as soon as possible.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. As I read section 2 it changes the whole fundamental basis of making the loans. Previously the loans have been made on the basis of market prices at the time of appraisal. They are now to be made on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator I am not at all surprised that he falls into error with regard to section 2, because it is difficult to understand it if it is not read in conjunction with the entire statute. But that provision relates solely to the basis of valuing assets. I was just about to go into that subject.

Mr. BYRD. It is not a provision for making the loans?

Mr. BROWN. It is not a provision for making the loans. Heretofore the assets were based on market value at the time the Corporation's report was made. The bill, in the interest of good business procedure and practice, I think, and in conformity with what is commonly done by private corporations, adds a provision to the effect that the valuation of the assets shall be the market value or cost, whichever is lower.

Mr. BYRD. But who is going to determine the cost? I have been in the agricultural business for 30 years, and the most difficult thing in the world is to determine the cost of an agricultural product.

Mr. BROWN. The determination of cost is made by the Corporation. We add the provision that the valuation may not be greater than the original cost of the agricultural product, which I think the Senator from Virginia will realize is an improvement.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not mean the cost of production?

Mr. BROWN. I have reference to the cost of the commodities involved.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan to give a complete explanation of section 4.

Mr. BROWN. That is unnecessary, because the Banking and Currency Committee struck section 4 from the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. At the beginning of the Senator's remarks he said that he would supply certain figures for the Senator from Oregon relative to the total amount of losses by this Corporation on the basic commodities. I make the request, if I may, that when that information is furnished it be broken down, if possible, in line with the various commodities upon which the losses have been sustained, in order that we may ascertain what the loss has been upon each respective commodity.

Mr. BROWN. I will see that that is done. I may say that I have been advised that the losses have been comparatively slight.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in relation to this bill, the Senator from Oregon asked for a statement of the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. So far as I can find out, the losses of the Corporation have been slightly in excess of $200,000,000. The provision is that its assets shall be appraised on the 31st day of March; and if there is loss, the Treasury makes it up or we appropriate for it. The first time we appropriated $94,000,000; last year we appropriated $109,000,-

000; and we were told this morning that there is practically no loss, or only a million and a half dollars loss, for the current year. That would be a total of $204,000,000 loss since the Corporation began to operate.

So the need for this additional capital is not due to losses, because to the extent that there have been losses the capital has already been made up by appropriations. The need for the additional capital is due to the fact that there is now under loan or owned by the Corporation $1,300,000,000 worth of commodities. There may or may not be ultimate losses on those loans. We obviously cannot liquidate the loans, because, if we could, we would get the $1,300,000,000 back, and we would not need to have another $1,250,000,000.

The estimate made by the Department is that they will need this year, or may need, for loans on 6,500,000 bales of cotton, in addition to the 6,000,000 bales the Corporation already owns, $455,000,000; for loans on 350,000,000 bushels of corn, $250,000,000; for loans on 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, $430,000,000; and $82,000,000 for loans on tobacco, or a total of approximately $1,200,000,000.

Personally I do not think they will need that much money; I think the amount is excessive; I believe that some of the loans which are already held will be liquidated before the new loans are required. I am very hopeful that will happen, for prices have gone up and it ought therefore to be comparatively easy to liquidate some of the old loans. I agreed, however, in the committee to go along with the increase, because some increase is necessary and because we have said that the Corporation must make these loans, and they will only make them if they are required by law to make them. I do not think we are encouraging the Corporation to any extravagance by giving them somewhat more power than they actually require, but I think, if we are going to go on indefinitely increasing the capital, that the policy certainly will have to be reconsidered. We started with $100,000,000; we increased it in 1939 to $900,000,000; in 1940 we increased it to $1,400,000,000, and are now proposing to increase it to $2,650,000,000. The increase, however, involves no change in the entire policy, and, in view of the fact that the power expires on Monday night, I believe we should now extend the life of this Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 6.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in section 3 of this bill, as has just been stated, the amount of money available to the organization has been increased in the total sum of $1,250,000,000. In section 4 of the bill the other body provided——

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. Section 4 has been eliminated from the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I understand that. I said that the House provided in section 4, or undertook to provide, that the farmers should receive 85 percent of the parity price in the form of loans or advances. The Senate committee has stricken section 4 from the bill, which would seem to indicate that, so far as this legislation is concerned, the farmers are not to be considered.

Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Leon Henderson issued some sort of a statement, and the Journal of Commerce of today carries his statement somewhat at length. On the first page of this publication I find a statement under a heading, as follows:

Cottonseed oil ceiling is planned by Henderson "far below" levels now.

In another article I find a heading:

"Ceiling" to be set on cottonseed oil.

Then I find in the body of one of the articles commenting upon Mr. Henderson's statement these words:

The trade expects that the grains—

That means corn, wheat, oats, rye, and other commodities—

soybeans and yard futures markets which will be open today will decline because of this warning.

That is a warning alleged to have been given by Mr. Leon Henderson, who is operating, as I understand, upon a Presidential decree and not with any legal authority back of his acts.

Mr. President, Congress to my knowledge for 10 years has been laboring and appropriating money to get the farmers parity prices, at least, upon their basic agricultural commodities. We have tried to insure the farmers prices upon the basis of parity prices for corn, wheat, cotton, and some of the other commodities which the farmers produce. The Congress has enacted legislation, it has passed appropriations, and the Treasury has been drained of some billions of dollars to try to get farm prices up. Now, when we have a chance to get farm prices up we find an agency of the Government, presumed or otherwise, driving prices down.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the price of July wheat closed on the New York market at $1.06⅜. Today the price of wheat on the same market closed at $1.03⅛, a decline of 3¼ cents per bushel. So the statement of Mr. Henderson has driven down the price of wheat today over 3 cents a bushel. I wonder how the wheat farmers in the South and the Central West who are marketing wheat today will react when they drive into the elevator and offer their wheat for sale and find that the wheat price is down 3 or 4 cents a bushel.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Mr. Henderson of whom the Senator speaks an expert farmer or an expert economist on farming; or who is Mr. Henderson?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, he was before the Agricultural Committee a few days ago, and gave his background in some detail. As I remember, he stated that he had been a teacher, a professor, and an economist, and left the impression that he was a sort of a general specialist.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has he had any experience in farming or farm prices or farm economy of any kind?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question. However, as I remember, he stated that he was born on a farm. He made the statement that he had a staff of 250 men and women working in his organization. So here we have an organization set up by Presidential decree, embracing some 250 persons, assuming power that they admit they do not have to fix the prices on basic farm commodities.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator know whether Mr. Henderson has done anything to reduce the price of the products the farmer has to buy?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot answer that question authoritatively.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Am I to understand the Senator from Oklahoma as criticizing the use of the Presidential decree in any sort of defense matter, or anything that may be considered a defense matter?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I am not at all making that criticism.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If so, I should like to find out where the Senator begins to draw the line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not making such a criticism. If we decide to go into the price-fixing business, it is my contention that we must either begin at the top and go down to the bottom, or commence at the bottom and go up to the top. When such a bill comes before the Senate, if it does, and if it is given the consideration that it should be given, the task will be comparable to the enactment of a tariff bill in which every commodity and everything the people buy and consume must have consideration, and must have a price fixed, and each price must be fixed in relation to and in harmony with the prices to be fixed on all other commodities including the wages for labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The people of my State are somewhat interested in cotton. Did Mr. Henderson make any remarks on cotton?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; he is reported to have made a statement affecting cotton.

Mr. McKELLAR. If so, what effect did that have on the cotton market?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It broke the cotton market this morning, so I am advised, a dollar and a half a bale. That is the alleged effect his statement had upon the price of cotton. Of course, in the cotton South, this year's crop has not yet reached the market; but there is a vast amount of cotton in storage, owned by the cotton farmers and planters of the South.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The reason why Mr. Henderson's statement depressed the cotton market is that he broke the place where cotton is consumed. I have from the market this morning a statement of the price that this all-powerful gentleman fixed on cotton goods, if the Senator will allow me to refer to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The statement I have is as follows:

The Government today—

The Government! I wonder who is the Government. I have been trying to find out for several years, and I have not found out yet.

The Government today established maximum prices on six leading types of cotton cloth.

That is where cotton goes.

Thirty-nine cents a pound for print cloth, card broadcloth, and tobacco cloth; 30 cents, 32 cents, and 33½ cents a pound for three classes of sheets; 54 cents a pound for combed broadcloths.

That is, some time ago this Government fixed the price—Mr. Henderson did; we are under his government—he fixed the price of combed yarns, out of which these broadcloths are made; and the mills quit making them and shifted to the manufacture of other goods which, they thought, as American citizens, they might have a right to produce under the law of supply and demand.

I think we had better adjourn and let Mr. Henderson take charge. He seems to be doing a satisfactory job to himself. I do not know whether he knows a cotton stalk from a jimson weed, or a cornstalk from a fishing pole, but that does not enter into this equation. The question is, What does he want? Not what you want, or what I want, or what we, the supposed representatives of the sovereignty of the States and, with the other House, of the people, want. We hunt around to see just what he wants; and in the meantime, while the Parity Price Act is seeming to have a good effect, and those administering it say, "All right; we will put cotton up to 16 cents a pound," he says, "No! Who are these House Members and who is that bunch of so-called Senators?"

We have gotten ourselves into the most absurd, ridiculous, humiliating condition of any legislative body in the world, turning over all of our rights to those who never were elected. They could be, for matters have come to such a pass that almost anybody could be elected. But we are here and do not exercise any authority. We had a meeting this morning, and we served some notice on Brother Henderson, and he will tell us to go to—heaven. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have in our Government a bureau which has developed a formula for working out and determining parity prices. That bureau is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. On May 15 this Bureau worked out the parity price on wheat.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, since the Senator is taking up a new branch of the subject he is discussing, would he permit me to submit a conference report?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I intend to take only a moment more.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have stated that I have no objection to the bill pending before the Senate. The striking out of the 85-percent-parity section gave me a chance to make these few remarks.

I had just stated that we have a bureau which assumes to fix parity prices. On the 15th of May the parity price of wheat as determined by this Bureau was $1.149. In round figures, the parity price of wheat on the 15th of May was $1.15 a bushel. Yesterday wheat sold at $1.06 a bushel, and because of price-fixing statements the price broke this morning to $1.03 a bushel.

Mr. SMITH. What is the name of the individual? Is it Mr. Henderson?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Call his name.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. So the price of wheat today is 12 cents below parity. On the 15th of May the same Bureau fixed the parity price of corn at 83½ cents a bushel. Yesterday corn on the July market was selling for 74¾ cents a bushel, or almost 9 cents below the parity price. And today, because of the general break in the corn market—as in cotton, wheat, and other commodities—corn fell in price one and a half cents a bushel.

The parity price of cotton as fixed by the official Bureau is 16.12 cents. July cotton sold on the market yesterday at 14.97 cents, just less than 15 cents a pound, and I understand it broke this morning $1.50 a bale, which would be some 30 points down.

It occurs to me that we should not, if we can prevent it, permit any agency of the Government to do anything to lower the prices of these commodities so long as such prices are under parity. When prices reach parity, we might consider putting on the brakes in order to keep the prices from skyrocketing to the injury of consumers.

But until the prices of wheat, corn, cotton, and other basic commodities reach parity, the farmers who produce such commodities are not on a living basis, because parity prices are fixed so that the farmers will receive a certain sum for their wheat in order to be able to buy on an equality the things which they must buy. The same principle applies to the prices of cotton, corn, and of other basic commodities.

Recently the Senate adopted a resolution requesting the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to consider and to recommend to the Senate legislation under which and by which parity prices might be determined. At the request of the committee, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is now at work upon such a formula. In addition to this Bureau being at work upon the formula, private agencies are likewise at work upon the formula. So as soon as we have a report from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics we will take their report as a basis and compare it with the reports from private concerns. I might suggest that Colonel Westbrook, who has been employed by the Government for years, is working upon the proposition; and Mr. Ed Kennedy, who used to belong to the Farmers' Union, and now has an organization of his own, is likewise working upon the proposal. So very shortly, I hope, that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be able to report to the Senate the text of a measure suggesting a formula which, if enacted, will provide a plan for arriving at parity prices.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be read in my time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before that is read?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is the Senator familiar with section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, wherein parity prices are defined, and upon which Congress has acted from year to year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I am familiar with the section, which is the basis upon which the Bureau of Agricultural Economics operates. But I think that section is conceded by all not to be sufficiently broad and all-embracive to authorize and direct the proper formulation of parity prices.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1687) relating to price fixing, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pending the enactment of legislation establishing a definite formula for the determining of parity prices on basic agricultural products no agent of the Government, elected or appointed, shall fix or undertake to fix and establish a price or prices on any such basic agricultural product or products, or on the byproduct derived or manufactured from any such product below the parity price or prices fixed on such basic agricultural product or products by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics: *Provided*, That with respect to the byproduct of any such basic agricultural commodity, no attempt shall be made and no price shall be fixed and established on any such byproduct which will have the effect of fixing the price on any such agricultural product below such parity price or prices as is provided herein.

SEC. 2. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction, be removed from office and in addition shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000 under each order made and issued attempting to fix a price or prices on any such agricultural product or the byproduct of any such agricultural product as mentioned and provided in this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oklahoma indicate to which committee he desires to have the bill referred?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill is so referred.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the matter discussed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I have previously pointed out that Mr. Henderson has no shadow of legal authority to fix

prices. It may or may not be necessary to fix prices, but certainly if prices are fixed they should be fixed not by Mr. Henderson but by some board. Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture should be on such a board. Certainly the Secretary of the Interior, who has power to fix coal prices, should be on such a board. This power is sought for the purpose of controlling inflation, and therefore the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be represented on such a board. There should be at least 5 persons on it.

I have taken a good deal of trouble in preparing a brief, which I filed with the Senate Committee on Agriculture, to show that Mr. Henderson has no authority whatever today to fix prices, and I ask unanimous consent that this brief be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 20, 1941.

MEMORANDUM OPINION PREPARED BY SENATOR TAFT THAT MR. LEON HENDERSON, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVILIAN SUPPLY, IS WITHOUT AUTHORITY TO FIX PRICES

CONTENTS

I. Statement of facts.
II. Argument:
1. There is no statutory authority for price-fixing orders.
2. There is no constitutional authority for the President to fix prices.
3. War Industries Board action no precedent.
III. Conclusion.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Both in his capacity as head of the Division of Price Stabilization of the National Defense Advisory Commission and as Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, Mr. Leon Henderson has issued a number of orders purporting to fix prices. On February 17 he issued an order which stated:

"On and after March 1, 1941, prices for second-hand machine tools, exclusive of extras, shall not exceed the prices set forth in appendix A attached to this schedule. No person shall charge or demand for such tools prices higher than those set forth in appendix A; and no dealer, as agent for a person, shall buy or offer to buy such tools at higher prices."

On March 24, 1941, he issued an order on aluminum scrap, the terms of which read:

"On and after March 25, 1941, regardless of the terms of any commitment theretofore entered into, no maker of aluminum scrap shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer at a price, aluminum scrap made by him at prices higher than the prices set forth in column I of appendix A attached to this schedule, and no person shall buy, or offer to buy aluminum scrap from the maker of such aluminum scrap at higher prices."

On March 31 he issued a similar order relating to zinc scrap, and on April 3 relating to iron and steel scrap. On April 2 he proceeded to fix the price of bituminous coal in an order reading as follows:

"On or after April 3, 1941, no person selling bituminous coal, whether producer, distributor, retailer, or any other seller, shall sell or deliver bituminous coal at a price exceeding the ceiling price. The ceiling price shall be the price received by such seller for a similar sale or delivery made on March 28, 1941."

This order was subsequently amended and then revoked.

On April 16 he issued an order fixing the price of iron and steel product in similar sweeping terms. The order in which this committee is particularly interested is entitled "Price Schedule No. 7—Combed Cotton Yarns," the principal provision of which reads:

"On and after May 26, 1941, regardless of any existing commitment, no person shall for commercial use sell or deliver, or offer to sell or to deliver, any combed yarn, and no person shall for commercial use buy or accept delivery of, or offer to buy or to accept delivery of, any combed yarn at a price exceeding the maximum price set forth in appendix A."

Since that time numerous other orders have been issued, including a recent order on June 14 fixing the price of certain hides, kips, and calfskins. The essential paragraph of this order reads as follows:

"On and after June 16, 1941, regardless of the terms of any contract of sale or purchase or other commitment, no person shall sell or deliver, or offer to sell or deliver, any hides, whether for immediate or future delivery, and no person shall buy or accept for delivery any hides, whether for immediate or future delivery, at a price exceeding the maximum price set forth in appendix A."

The order also places a ceiling on the price of kips and calfskins by a section identical to the one just set forth.

The various orders to which I have referred contain a large amount of additional detail regarding practices and terms. The schedule fixing the price of hides, for example, requires that every purchaser of hides for immediate or future delivery shall file a sworn statement with the Price Administration that he has complied with the terms of the schedule. Detailed records of every purchase or sale must be kept for inspection. This schedule also prohibits a brokerage commission of more than 3 percent of the purchase price if added to the maximum price established thereunder. They are all drafted like statutes and purport to be issued under regular authority and have the effect of law. No specific penalty is prescribed, but in the coal and yarn orders there is a paragraph entitled "Enforcement," reading as follows:

"In the event of refusal or failure to abide by the price limitations, report requirements, and other provisions contained in this schedule, or in the event of any evasion or attempt to evade the price limitations or other provisions contained in this schedule, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply will make every effort to assure (1) that the Congress and the public are fully informed of any failure to abide by the provisions of this schedule; and (2) that the powers of the Government are fully exerted in order to protect the public interest and the interests of those persons who conform with this schedule in the observance of the maximum prices herein set forth. Persons who have evidence of the demand or receipt of prices above the limitations set forth, or any evasion of or effort to evade such prices, or of speculation, or of the hoarding or accumulation of unnecessary inventories thereof, are urged to communicate with the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply."

It should be noted that these are not orders relating to defense materials. They are not confined to articles required by the Government. They are general orders purporting to have the effect of law and to apply to all citizens of the United States buying or selling the articles named for wholly private purposes. In short, the orders have no direct relation to the war, but rather to an economic theory of Mr. Henderson, no doubt correct as an economic theory, that we should avoid inflation both before and after the war. The penalty prescribed appears to be a public smearing of those whom Mr. Henderson considers violators, plus the use of governmental powers having no relation to price fixing, which perhaps might make uncomfortable the life of the violator.

I am not considering in this brief the question whether the Government should have authority to fix prices. Personally I think there should be some such power, but I do contend that Mr. Henderson is acting wholly without authority, that his action represents the most complete usurpation of authority vested solely in Congress, and that if acquiesced in, it would enlarge executive authority to an extent dangerous to the future of the Republic.

II. ARGUMENT

1. There is no statutory authority for price-fixing orders

A careful study of the brief filed by the general counsel reveals that there is really no claim made for the extension of any statutory authority. In fact, it is admitted that there is no such specific authority. On page 2 the general counsel states:

"It is submitted that there is authority to assure the ceiling price schedules. Lest this be misunderstood, however, it may be appropriately stated here that the existence of power to enter upon a program of price stabilization in the absence of congressional authorization by no means suggests the impropriety of legislative action by Congress."

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that there is no statute granting to the Price Administration any power to fix prices. Nor is there any statute granting to the President any authority to fix prices. Section 2 (b) of the Executive order establishing the Price Administration refers to four statutes which might enable the Administration to carry out and secure compliance with the price schedule, but none of these makes any reference whatever to the fixing of prices.

Reference has been made to a letter which the Department of Justice wrote to Mr. Henderson with relation to assistance they were willing to render him in connection with price fixing. This letter sets out an arrangement by which the Department of Justice and Mr. Henderson will consult together regarding actions taken under the Sherman antitrust law, and implies that the Department will prosecute those who are holding up prices contrary to that law. Since 90 percent of the price increases of today are resulting from the natural law of supply and demand rather than from combinations in restraints of trade, this means that the Department of Justice is only interested in that small proportion of price increases which really violate the Sherman law. They do not need Mr. Henderson to deal with those.

An examination of the four statutes which are referred to in the Executive order illustrate the arbitrary character of the price-fixing procedure. These statutes include two which authorize the President to take over plants necessary for defense purposes where they refuse to take orders on reasonable terms. One of these is the Selective Service Act which the Senate recently amended to permit the Government to take over any plant where production of defense materials may be delayed by reason of a strike. The third statute is one authorizing the President to decree priorities and preference in transportation, which has been supplemented by a recent priority statute intended to promote the Government defense program. The fourth statute authorizes the commandeering of certain goods intended for export but needed for the defense program. The implication is very clear. If any man refuses to comply with Mr. Henderson's order on prices, which he has no right to issue, he threatens to commandeer his plant, if he is a manufacturer, or prevent his making shipments, or seize his property. The great bulk of the transactions which Mr. Henderson is prohibiting will not involve any manufacturing plant. It might well be a plant which had no relation to national defense. Transportation

facilities are still so adequate that no priorities have been ordered within the United States. The suggestion is that if any man refuses to obey an order issued by Mr. Henderson, which he has no right to make, the Government will use powers granted to it for other purposes to punish that disobedience. To state the proposal is to condemn it. It is purely and simply Government blackmail. If that procedure is justifiable, no rights remain to any individual in the United States against the arbitrary action of executive officials. The same procedure could be used to suspend every provision of the Bill of Rights.

Just what is Mr. Henderson's authority? A survey of the steps creating the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply is necessary in order to trace it effectively.

The origin of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply is found in two actions by the President on September 8, 1939: His proclamation of a limited national emergency; the issuance of an Executive order establishing six principal divisions within the Executive Office of the President, one of these divisions being:

"(6) In the event of a national emergency, or threat of a national emergency, such office for emergency management as the President shall determine."

This Executive order stated it was issued to effectuate the purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1939 by organizing the Executive Office of the President with functions and duties so prescribed and responsibilities so fixed that the President will have adequate machinery for the administrative management of the executive branch of the Government.

Since this Executive order was the forerunner of a series of orders enlarging and amplifying it, it is proper to determine at this time its true effect.

The Reorganization Act, as its title clearly indicates, grants to the President power to reorganize various existing agencies of the Government for the purpose of reducing expenditures and promoting efficiency. The act does not grant to the President any new powers. It provides specifically that—

"No reorganization * * * shall have the effect * * * (c) of authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law."

On May 25, 1940, the President issued an administrative order establishing the Office for Emergency Management within the Executive Office of the President and defining its duties. These duties were chiefly to maintain liaison between the President and various governmental agencies for the purpose of obtaining maximum utilization and coordination in meeting the threatened emergency.

On January 7, 1941, the President issued another administrative order further defining the duties and functions of the Office for Emergency Management. This order, while more elaborate than the one of May 25, 1940, still defined the duties of the Office for Emergency Management as primarily those of coordinating the activities of the various governmental agencies.

On April 11, 1941, the President issued an Executive order establishing within the Office for Emergency Management the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. This order, among other things, authorized the Administrator to:

"C. Determine and publish, after proper investigation, such maximum prices, commissions, margins, fees, charges, or other elements of cost or price of materials or commodities, as the Administrator may from time to time deem fair and reasonable; and take all lawful and appropriate steps to facilitate their observance."

It is significant that the order did not mention any particular statute on which it relied for authority, but merely said:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and in order to define further the functions and duties of the Office for Emergency Management."

A study of the several Executive orders reveals that the President had no more authority to fix prices at the time of the order establishing the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply than he did at the time of the issuance of the first order in 1939 creating the Office for Emergency Management. The Price Administration is merely an offspring of that office. It cannot possibly have greater powers than its parent. As shown above, the Office for Emergency Management was created under the Reorganization Act, which did not confer on the President any additional powers. Since there was no statute at that time authorizing the fixing of prices, and since no statute has been passed since that time, it is obvious that the Price Administration could not derive its authority from any powers possessed by the Office for Emergency Management.

Not only is there no statute authorizing the fixing of prices, but there is no statute which even remotely relates to the subject, so that there can be no authority to fix prices implied from any existing statute.

2. There is no constitutional authority for the President to fix prices

An examination of the Constitution shows without question that there is no express power vested in the President to fix prices or to do any similar act. The only possible provision under which anyone could claim such authority is the general provision of article 2, section 1, that "the executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States of America," and the provision in section 2 that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

It can hardly be contended that the President can fix prices throughout the length and breadth of the United States because he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Even in time of war the powers of the Commander in Chief must have some direct relation to the conduct of the war itself. Thus within the actual fighting area where civilian law is suspended, the President could no doubt fix prices under martial law. It might be contended that he could seize goods needed for the Army and Navy and fix the price of payment outside of the war area, although I believe he could only do this outside of a war area under authority from Congress, such as is proposed in the bill now pending in the Military Affairs Committee. Certainly he cannot, as Commander in Chief, even in time of war, fix prices between two private parties in sections remote from the war area. In time of peace his lack of authority is even more clear. Literally millions of sales and similar transactions take place every day without the slightest relation to the conduct of the war itself. In considering the claim that article II constitutes a grant of power over and above any powers granted by law, there are circumstances under which this may be true. On the other hand, article I states clearly that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States," and article III states that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." It is clear, therefore, that this general grant of executive power to the President does not infringe upon the legislative power of Congress, and cannot be construed to give the President power to deal with any questions of general public policy ordinarily dealt with by Congress.

Thus Congress alone authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix railroad rates; and neither railroad nor utility rates have ever been fixed in State or Nation except by legislative act. Congress, by statute, has authorized the fixing of the price of coal and given that power to the Bituminous Coal Commission. No one ever thought of claiming that the President could fix the price of coal without an act of Congress. Congress has passed an elaborate law giving the Secretary of Agriculture all kinds of power over agricultural products, many of which are designed to increase their price. In fact, there can be little doubt that Congress has occupied the entire field of price fixing in relation to agricultural products. If Congress were to give Mr. Henderson authority to fix prices, it would certainly not extend that authority to coal and agricultural products. The effect of Mr. Henderson's claim is to create a complete confusion and conflict of authority. He claims the right to fix the price of coal at one price when the Bituminous Coal Commission has the right to fix it at another. He may completely disagree with the Secretary of Agriculture and produce a situation destructive of the Secretary's policies. This power cannot be both legislative and executive. Surely it must be clear that price fixing is not a power conferred by the Constitution on the President.

There has always been a question whether the general grant of executive power confers on the President any powers other than those more specifically described in section 2. The general counsel quotes from Professor Corwin a statement that "pending action by Congress, the President may, if the emergency is sufficiently pressing as in 1861, adopt a temporary measure calculated to meet the emergency, which measure will be law until superseded by congressional action." This statement seems somewhat extreme, but can only be justified if the failure to act involves some real and immediate danger to the country. It certainly does not justify the fixing of prices to prevent a possible price rise in one or two relatively unimportant commodities, with the underlying purpose of preventing a general inflation many months from this time.

The general counsel misstates the views of President Taft, which are clearly set forth in his writings and in his decision in the Myers' case. His views are entirely consistent. He disputes completely the so-called stewardship theory of Theodore Roosevelt that the Executive power is limited only by specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by Congress. I know of no lawyer or constitutional writer who supports Mr. Roosevelt on that question; certainly not Mr. Corwin himself. On the other hand, President Taft took the view that the grant of executive powers does confer some powers of an executive nature not specifically mentioned in the Constitution. Thus the executive power includes the power to remove as well as the power to appoint, because it can only be exercised through agents, and those agents must be responsible to the President if he is to be an Executive at all. Various other powers are incident to the duties of any executive in the enforcement of law and the maintenance of order. But nowhere is there the slightest authority in any court decision or in the writings of any responsible authority for the claim that the executive power includes a general fixing of all prices throughout the United States.

It is contended that the declaration of an unlimited national emergency in some way enlarges the President's powers. Of course, the Constitution says nothing whatever about emergencies. There are a number of statutes which specifically confer upon the President additional powers in case he finds that an emergency of one kind or another exists, but price fixing is not one of these additional powers. If the President, by declaring an emergency, could give himself additional

powers not granted by Congress, there would be nothing left to the American Constitution. If an emergency can be declared today, it can be declared after the war is over. We can live in a state of perpetual emergency.

Those who wrote the Constitution were determined to make our form of government as permament as possible. They imposed the restrictions on power and the division of powers for the very purpose of preventing any one man or group of men from acquiring gradually all the powers of government. They knew that every democratic government in the history of the world had degenerated into an autocracy because those powers had been concentrated in the time of emergency in the hands of a single individual. They made no provision for setting aside the Consttitution in time of emergency such as we find in some of the South American countries. The Supreme Court has frequently said that no new powers are created even by war.

It is difficult to exaggerate the danger of the proposition advanced by Mr. Henderson. If the President has power to fix prices without legislative authority then he may fix wages. The two powers are of exactly the same nature. He could fix all the practices connected with prices, as in fact he does in some of these orders, for unless practices are fixed, it is possible to evade price regulations. He would necessarily have power to fix margins for wholesalers and retailers. He would have power to fix profits. Power to fix prices involves a fundamental control not only over all economic life, but over the life of every citizen, for there is no family in this country which does not buy or sell commodities or both. The power to fix prices implies the power to bankrupt men who are engaged in business. It implies the power to determine the economic status of millions of workers. The man who can fix the price of all transactions in his own arbitrary discretion can be as complete a dictator as exists today in Europe.

If this power to fix prices exists in the Executive without legislative authority, then it is unlimited and arbitrary. If Congress passes a law it can limit the power to specific articles or to special kinds of transactions. It could provide for an appeal from Mr. Henderson's arbitrary fiat to a board which would treat the citizens' rights in a judicial way. It could provide for compensation in cases that amount substantially to confiscation. But if Mr. Henderson's theory is right there is no limit to his power.

3. War Industries Board action no precedent

The general counsel's memorandum lays great stress on the fact that the War Industries Board fixed prices during the World War without express statutory authority. There were, however, a number of substantial differences. The War Industries Board did not attempt to fix prices except for those commodities which the Government was buying for war purposes. They were not interested in the general subject of inflation because a tremendous inflation had already occurred before the war. We had been at war a considerable length of time before they acted and their action was a direct relation to the conduct of the war.

Unless the War Industries Board had legal authority to fix prices it certainly cannot be now argued that the Price Administration has legal authority. It is admitted by the memorandum of the general counsel that the President during 1917 and 1918, had no specific authority to fix prices, saying (p. 4):

"The Executive authority to announce maximum prices was exercised by the President, and agencies designated by him during 1917 and 1918, in the absence of specific statutory authorization."

It is certainly strange reasoning to attempt to obtain authority for the fixing of prices today because prices were fixed without authority during World War I. Reliance on Presidential prestige and the enthusiasm of the people should only be sought when there is no other recourse. The greater the emergency the more important it becomes that Congress exercise its true function.

The general counsel's reliance on the fact that the War Industries Board also fixed prices is further weakened by a study of the methods used by the Board to fix prices. A reading of the orders discloses that the so-called fixed-price announcements were, in reality, agreements between the Board and the industry. For example, on September 24, 1917, a statement was issued by the Board announcing the fixing of iron and steel prices, which was the first instance in which the War Industries Board had fixed any price whatsoever. The first paragraph of that order read as follows:

"The President has approved an agreement between the War Industries Board and the steel men, fixing the following prices, which became effective immediately and are subject to revision January 1, 1918."

The last paragraph of that order read:

"A spirit of cooperation was manifested by the steel men, and no doubt is entertained that every effort will be made to bring the production as nearly as possible up to the extraordinary demands resulting from the war."

Further evidence that the fixed-price announcements were, in reality, agreements with the industry, is found in a statement by Dr. Taussig, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission and a member of the Price-Fixing Committee, as follows:

"The prices fixed were in all cases reached by agreement with the representatives of the several industries. In strictness they were agreed prices rather than fixed prices. The agreements were usually reached in cordial cooperation with the producers concerned, and thus were in reality voluntary. There were cases, however, in which they were agreements only in name. The representatives of some industries, though they accepted them, did so virtually under duress. In these cases the committee to all intents and purposes decreed prices and was enabled to impose them, under the form of agreement, by a more or less veiled threat of commandeering, and also by the certainty that public opinion would condemn those who failed to accede."

The method employed by Mr. Henderson and the Price Administration is quite different, as a reading of any price schedule will demonstrate. While it may be supposed that industry will cooperate more and more with Mr. Henderson and is already doing so, the price schedules already issued have not been agreements. In fact, the schedules themselves indicate a new and curious attitude on the part of the Federal Government. They openly announce that failure to comply will result in the Price Administration's making every effort to assure "that the Congress and the public are fully informed of any failure to abide by the provisions of this schedule."

The schedule then proceeds to solicit the support of the public in the role of stool pigeon, viz:

"Persons who have evidence of the demand or receipt of prices above the limitations set forth, or any evasion of or effort to evade such prices, or of speculation or of the hoarding or accumulation of unnecessary inventories, are urged to communicate with the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply."

It is manifest that the quotations from the above schedule are not conducive to cooperation, if, indeed, any was ever intended. The variance between the fixed-price announcements of the War Industries Board and later its price-fixing committee is such as to remove even any reliance on the fixed-price announcements by the Price Administration as a precedent, let alone as the basis for legal authority.

If any further proof is needed that the fixed-price announcements made in 1917–18 constitute neither precedent nor authority for the present practices of the Price Administration, it is found in the recent book by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, American Industry in the War. Mr. Baruch, who was chairman of the War Industries Board, devotes many pages to the argument that individual price fixing will not succeed. He points out that it is confiscating and wholly impracticable; it cannot eliminate inflation and it is fundamentally unsound. He goes ever further and urges the enactment of a statute giving the President broad powers over the fixing of prices. He says on page 441:

"We improvised in 1917 because we had to. I know of no benefit that came from our total lack of prevision and consequent necessity for improvisation of fundamental war measures."

On the basis of his experience with the War Industries Board, Mr. Baruch urges action by Congress. He desires to improve on the methods which were used then without legal authority. And by demonstrating that the methods of 1917–18 were those of improvisation, he removes all doubt as to whether those methods constitute sufficient precedent for the issuance of price schedules today.

III. CONCLUSION

In conclusion I respectfully submit that there is not even a respectable argument in behalf of Mr. Henderson's right to fix prices; that there is no statutory authority; that there is no constitutional authority and no authority in precedent. My own belief is that we should take every possible means to lessen inflation, which will inevitably be caused by the defense program, and that price fixing is one of the means which we might well decide to use. I would support a statute conferring upon proper authorities the power to fix certain commodity prices. In general, I would not apply it to agricultural prices because that power ought to be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. In the World War food prices were not controlled by the War Industries Board but by the Food Administration.

If such a statute is proposed, it should provide for the cooperation of industry, a full opportunity to be heard, and an appeal to a board before any order is made permanent. But if we acquiesce in the theory that the Executive has power to fix prices, we might as well abandon our function of legislation and adjourn for the duration of the war.

EXTENSION OF LIFE AND INCREASE OF CREDIT RESOURCES OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, may we have the first amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "1946" and insert "1945."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thought we might have disposed of the bill, and I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a routine matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri withhold his request?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I withhold the request.

AMENDMENT OF T. V. A. ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I conferred with the Senator from Michigan about yielding for the purpose of permitting me to call up a conference report, which I do not think will excite any debate.

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection "(k)" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement of the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"(k) Shall have power in the name of the United States—

"(a) to convey by deed, lease, or otherwise, any real property in the possession of or under the control of the Corporation to any person or persons, for the purpose of recreation or use as a summer residence, or for the operation on such premises of pleasure resorts for boating, fishing, bathing, or any similar purpose;

"(b) to convey by deed, lease, or otherwise, the possession and control of any such real property to any corporation, partnership, person, or persons for the purpose of erecting thereon docks and buildings for shipping purposes or the manufacture or storage thereon of products for the purpose of trading or shipping in transportation: *Provided*, That no transfer authorized herein in (b) shall be made without the approval of Congress.

"(c) to transfer any part of the possession and control of the real estate now in possession of and under the control of said Corporation to any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States: *Provided, however*, That no land shall be conveyed, leased, or transferred, upon which there is located any permanent dam, hydroelectric power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter built by or for the United States or for the Authority, except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer of Nitrate Plant No. 1, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., or to Waco Quarry: *And provided further*, That no transfer authorized herein in (a) or (c), except leases for terms of less than 20 years, shall be made without the approval of the President of the United States, if the property to be conveyed exceeds $500 in value; and

"(d) to convey by warranty deed, or otherwise, lands, easements, and rights-of-way to States, counties, municipalities, school districts, railroad companies, telephone, telegraph, water, and power companies, where any such conveyance is necessary in order to replace any such lands, easements, or rights-of-way to be flooded or destroyed as the result of the construction of any dam or reservoir now under construction by the Corporation, or subsequently authorized by Congress, and easements and rights-of-way upon which are located transmission or distribution lines. The Corporation shall also have power to convey or lease Nitrate Plant No. 1, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and Waco Quarry, with the approval of the War Department and the President."

And the Senate agree to the same.

E. D. SMITH,
ELMER THOMAS,
G. W. NORRIS,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the present consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DANAHER. Will not the Senator from Nebraska explain to us the effect of the changes?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, under the present law the Tennessee Valley Authority Board has no power whatever to lease or sell any of the land which it took while building the various dams. A vast amount of land was overflowed, and the Authority attempted to get, and did get, so far as I know, land extending a few rods beyond the shore line so as to prevent contamination.

It often happened, in acquiring land, that the Authority necessarily had to take the better part of a man's farm. It has acquired a good deal of land, so that it owns property all around the various lakes. In the vicinity of every one of the lakes there is developing now a desire to build cottages, summer homes, fishing cabins, boathouses, swimming facilities, and the like, for recreation purposes. Under the law the Authority had no right to permit such things. Others have contemplated the building of manufacturing establishments as well as storage houses around these lakes. Others propose to go into the transportation business in various ways in view of the development of navigation on the Tennessee River. Such persons would have to come to Congress every time they wanted to obtain any one of these small privileges.

There is another thing which I believe to be of great importance. In connection with the development work, lands have been overflowed. Often schoolhouse sites have been overflowed, and in other instances railroads have been overflowed, necessitating the removal of schoolhouses and railroads. In other places telephone lines have had to be removed. In most cases the removal could be a simple matter. The school authorities could agree with the T. V. A. to move the schoolhouses a short distance onto land that was not overflowed, land that was then owned by the Government, and under the control of the T. V. A., but often the school authorities would not agree to such removal unless they could get good title; and under the law they would have to come to Congress every time in order to obtain good title.

As I have said, in other cases railroads had to be moved as a result of the overflowing of ground. There is at present one pressing railroad situation. That is the reason I am anxious to get the matter settled as soon as possible. In the building of the dam which was suggested by the O. P. M. as a defense project, the construction of which is now going ahead with great expedition, a railroad will be overflowed, and I think some schoolhouses will also be overflowed, as well as some public roads. There will be no difficulty about adjusting the matter if those in charge of making the adjustments are permitted to give title to land outside the overflowed lands. However, under the law, the T. V. A. cannot do so, and unless we pass a special act, or unless the pending measure is agreed to, that cannot be done.

The bill under consideration is a House bill. It contains a provision providing for the leasing, or selling, or transferring of Waco Quarry, a limestone quarry about 30 miles from nitrate plant No. 2. Nitrate plant No. 1 was an experimental plant, which was never a success and never produced anything. In fact, the T. V. A. does not desire it. If any other department of the Government desires to obtain it, the T. V. A. is willing to transfer it to such department.

The House conferees insisted on another provision, and in order to obtain any agreement we agreed to that provision. The Senate bill provided that the T. V. A. could lease manufacturing establishments anywhere on land which the Government owned and controlled on any of the lakes or streams or on the Tennessee River. The House insisted that the power should not be granted to the Authority except with the consent of Congress, and the Senate conferees have been compelled to agree to that provision.

If there are any other questions about the report, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TERM OF ACTIVE SERVICE OF NATIONAL GUARD MEN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to fix the fact, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to me from Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, the Judge Advocate General, asserting his views that there is no legal authority to keep National Guard men in active service beyond the period of 12 consecutive months of service provided by the act of August 27, 1940.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, June 23, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Responsive to your inquiry by letter dated June 21, 1941, it is my view that no legal authority exists to keep National Guard men in active service beyond the period of 12 consecutive months of service provided by the act of August 27, 1940.

The enclosed War Department press release, dated June 21, 1941, appears to be a complete answer to the inquiry posed in your second paragraph.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
ALLEN W. GULLION,
Major General,
The Judge Advocate General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
June 21, 1941.

Memorandum to the press:

For some time the War Department has been flooded with queries from the field as to whether or not the National Guard is to be allowed to return home after 12 months of service. These queries are to be expected, because whatever the decision there are many adjustments which the citizen soldier must make in his affairs.

The War Department announced today that it had recommended to the President that steps be taken to obtain authority to retain in the service the National Guard of the United States and Reserve officers who are now on active duty. Legislation is, of course, required, and the final decision is a matter of public policy which must rest with the President and the Congress.

LIFE AND RESOURCES OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 6.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Missouri desires to suggest the absence of a quorum. I wonder if he will not be willing to withhold the suggestion in order that we may proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, for the present I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that it is my purpose to offer a substitute for the committee amendment, to strike out the numerals "1945" and to insert the numerals "1942." I do that for this reason, Mr. President: The measure came over to the Senate from the House only yesterday. It came to the Banking and Currency Committee this morning. The fact that we are now nearly at the end of the fiscal year, and the fact that the general activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation is undoubtedly a necessary and essential service to the commodity producers of the United States, makes a very difficult situation for the Senate. But the powers of the original act are so vast, and to my mind they have been so outrageously abused by the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly under the late administration of Dr. Robbins, whom I understand is now retired, that it seems to me it would be very desirable to have the Congress reconsider the whole question. But rather than have any interregnum, I should like to suggest this thought to the Senator from Michigan and to the committee and to the Senate, that under the circumstances a 4-year extension of power is a very long and, it seems to me, unnecessary and unreasonable extension of the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I was about to offer an amendment to extend the time only for 1 year, but my attention was called by the Senator from Georgia to the fact that certain of the commodity-loan provisions extend for only 2 years, and in the event the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended for only 1 year it would result in possibly very complicated issues arising at the end of 1 year. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he would not be willing on behalf of the committee to accept a substitute for the committee amendment extending the term of this authority for 2 years—that is, to June 30, 1943—instead of for 4 years, as provided in the committee amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I have given some consideration to that suggestion, and have discussed it with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who is the acting chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have also discussed it with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who has been interested in this legislation, and if we can dispose of this matter and get the bill through so that there will be no interregnum in the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to act, I am willing to accept an amendment to the committee amendment extending the expiration date of the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to July 1, 1943.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the committee amendment modified by substituting "1943" for "1945."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri would have it read "June 30, 1943"?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; June 30, 1943. I offer the amendment to the committee amendment to substitute "1943" for "1945." Simply change the numerals "1945" in the committee amendment to "1943."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 1, line 6, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Whenever * during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture encourages the expansion of production of any commodity, the Secretary shall so use the funds made available under this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the funds available for such purpose for all commodities, as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity of not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor, or, in the case of any nonbasic commodity the production or consumption of which has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities, a price comparable to not less than 85 percent of the parity price for other commodities. Any such commodity loan or purchase operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient notice to the producers of such commodity to permit them to make a readjustment in the production of such commodity. It is the policy of the Congress that other purchase, loan, or other operations of the Department, taking into account the funds available for such purposes for all commodities and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand, shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of such commodities to a fair parity relationship with other commodities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I do not intend to interpose any further objection to the passage of the bill, although I take such action with a good many mental reservations.

I believed in the Commodity Credit Act when it was passed. I believe it has accomplished a great deal of good. I also believe that the administration in the Agricultural Department, particularly under Dr. Robbins, has been one of the most arrogant performances in the history of the United States, showing a deliberate disposition and intention at times to flout the plain intention of Congress and to indicate that he did not care what the intention of Congress was. I regret to say that Dr. Robbins was supported in that position by the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. I am not acquainted with the gentleman who has succeeded Dr. Robbins. I am informed that he is a very fine and very able man; and I express the hope that during the period of this extension the Commodity Credit Corporation will not show the same disposition to flout the plain will and intention of Congress as it has shown in the past.

I hope that before this matter comes up for further extension the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, with its very able membership, will have the opportunity of considering the powers contained in this grant and the use that has been made of them, with a view to making whatever changes may be necessary on the basis of experience.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4972) was passed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HERRING, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

HAZEL MERKER OSBOURNE

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 132, Calendar No. 502.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 132), submitted by Mr. BARBOUR on June 27, instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Hazel Merker Osbourne, widow of John D. Osbourne, late clerk in the office of Senator BARBOUR, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HARRISON

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 133, Calendar No. 503.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 133), submitted by Mr. BYRNES on June 27, instant, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Pat Harrison, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF VIOLATIONS OF THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 135, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 135) submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE today, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, for the purpose of concluding the printing of hearings and reports, the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936, and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 154, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to August 12, 1937, and under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to May 18, 1938, and under Senate Resolution 126, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to August 4, 1939, to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively is hereby increased by $500.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5052, Calendar 494.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what bill is that?

Mr. OVERTON. It is a bill which has recently been reported. It is on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5052) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator to proceed to the consideration of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. OVERTON. It is. It is rather urgent, because it is necessary that the bill be enacted in order that the District of Columbia may come under the provisions of the Social Security Act. It should be enacted by June 30. It will take only a moment to explain it.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee report it favorably?

Mr. OVERTON. It did. It was passed by the House without any objection on the part of the House.

The purpose of the bill is to meet certain requirements of section 303 (a) (8) and (9) of the Social Security Act, by adding the paragraph contained in the bill. The necessity for adding that paragraph arises because section 303 of the Social Security Act provides that the Board shall make no certification for payment to any State unless it finds that the law of such State, approved by the Board under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, includes provision for the two paragraphs which I am about to read. The purpose of the bill is to have the District of Columbia law conform to those two paragraphs. Let me read paragraphs (8) and (9):

(8) Effective July 1, 1941, the expenditure of all moneys received pursuant to section 302 of this title solely for the purposes and in the amounts found necessary by the Board for the proper and efficient administration of such State law; and

(9) Effective July 1, 1941, the replacement, within a reasonable time, of any moneys received pursuant to section 302 of this title, which because of any action or contingency, have been lost or have been expended for purposes other than, or in amounts in excess of, those found necessary by the Board for the proper administration of such State law.

In order to permit the District of Columbia to comply with these provisions before July 1 it is necessary that the bill be enacted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Louisiana if the bill makes any change in the Social Security Act so far as it relates to the States?

Mr. OVERTON. It makes no change whatever.

Mr. GEORGE. It leaves the present Social Security Act as it now stands so far as the States are concerned?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. The purpose of the bill, as I understand, is to require the District of Columbia to comply with the provisions of the Social Security Act. It makes no alteration in the provisions of the Social Security Act.

Mr. GEORGE. The States are now required to set up a merit system with respect to certain funds which they receive under the Social Security Act for distribution within the States. I wish to know whether the bill in any wise affects that provision as it applies to the States.

Mr. OVERTON. It does not, as I interpret it. It will take me only a moment to read what the bill itself declares. I read from the committee report:

The proposed bill is to meet certain requirements of section 303 (a) (8) and (9) of the Social Security Act by adding the following paragraph:

"All moneys received by the Board pursuant to section 302 of the Social Security Act shall be expended solely for the purposes and in the amounts found necessary by the Social Security Board for the proper and efficient administration of this act. In lieu of incorporation in this act of the provision described in section 303 (a) (9) of the Social Security Act, the Board shall include in its annual report to the Congress, provided in section 14 (c) of this act, a report of any moneys received after July 1, 1941, from the Social Security Board under title III of the Social Security Act, and any unencumbered balances in the Unemployment Compensation Administration fund as of that date, which the Social Security Board finds have, because of any action or contingency, been lost or have been expended for purposes other than or in amounts in excess of, those found necessary by the Social Security Board for the proper administration of this act."

No other section of the act is affected by the proposed bill.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator if the Social Security Board or the Administration has approved the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that I am not in a position to advise the Senator whether that is the case. In the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I was requested to bring the bill before the Senate and to ask for its immediate passage as a very necessary measure. There was a very short discussion of it in the House. It was in charge of Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. Representative MARTIN, of Massachusetts, asked him this question, referring to the bill:

It comes with the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH replied:

Yes; and in a brief explanation, in which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], ranking minority Member joins, the purpose of the legislation is to meet certain requirements of the present Social Security Act. The Federal law requires that all States, by July 1, have a provision showing that money expended erroneously or lost must be replaced or restored. The measure which we present simply brings the District of Columbia in line with the States on this provision.

So it is my understanding that the bill relates only to the District of Columbia, and that its purpose is to bring the District of Columbia in line with the States in respect to the matter covered by the bill.

In further reply to the question propounded by the Senator from Georgia, let me say that the bill relates only to the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, and undertakes to amend it, and has no other purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I have observed that from the report since I made the inquiry of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5052) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECRETARY ICKES AND MR. LINDBERGH—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune entitled "Mr. Ickes Insults Mr. Lindbergh."

I read from the editorial:

The intemperate, vitriolic, and unfair personal abuse which Secretary Harold L. Ickes has so often heaped on those who do not see eye to eye with him reached a new low on Thursday in his attack on Mr. Charles A. Lindbergh.

The editorial proceeds:

On two grounds we object bitterly to this diatribe. The first is that the charge is patently as untrue as it is unfair; when Lindbergh met Hitler he had no political following in this country. The second is that by this sort of billingsgate Mr. Ickes arouses sympathies for Mr. Lindbergh and stiffens the hearts of the isolationists against an administration which has had the extraordinarily bad judgment to keep a man like Mr. Ickes so long in power and to insult and accept the resignation of Mr. Lindbergh as colonel in the Air Corps Reserve when it could perfectly well have spiked his guns by ordering him to active duty. * * *

Mr. Lindbergh, we repeat, is, in our opinion, everlastingly wrong. He has been badly advised, his views of world affairs are naive, and he has done much to help the cause of Hitlerism in America. But it is his right to express his opinions freely—just as it is the right of Mr. Ickes to do the same.

I wish to say that, while the New York Herald Tribune, as I read it, has been one of the outspoken newspapers of this country in favor not only of aid to England but of the United States going into the war, nevertheless it is fair enough to recognize the fact that those who disagree with it, and those who disagree with the administration, and those who disagree with others who want to get the United States into the war, have a perfect right to express their opinions without it being intimated that Lindbergh is, at least, a friend of Hitler and is dominated by Hitler.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ICKES INSULTS MR. LINDBERGH

The intemperate, vitriolic, and unfair personal abuse which Secretary Harold L. Ickes has so often heaped on those who do not see eye to eye with him reached a new low on Thursday in his attack on Mr. Charles A. Lindbergh. This newspaper has repeatedly deplored Mr. Lindbergh's misguided and often misinformed conclusions about the war. It has resented the manner in which he has been used and exploited by the forces of Hitlerism in this country. It believes, as strongly as does Mr. Ickes, that Mr. Lindbergh is doing America a great disservice. But it has done Mr. Lindbergh the credit of believing in his sincerity, his loyalty, and his patriotism, and it has heard of no word or act of his to warrant any reflection on his integrity—however much his words may reflect on his judgment and intelligence.

Not content with implying that Mr. Lindbergh is not a fool, but a knave, Mr. Ickes said in so many words that he regards him as a traitor. "If Lindbergh is for Hitler now," Mr. Ickes is quoted in his Hartford address, "as every act and word of his seems to indicate, it is because, through an understanding with Hitler, or as an expected favor from him, he glimpses a political future which a free people would not accord him voluntarily. Thus it was with Quisling, who betrayed Norway to Hitler, and with Laval, who is doing the same thing to France." And again, "The understanding between the dictator who bestowed the medal and him upon whose breast it was pinned, is not accidental." And finally, "They have a common objective."

On two grounds we object bitterly to this diatribe. The first is that the charge is patently as untrue as it is unfair; when Lindbergh met Hitler he had no political following in this country. The second is that by this sort of billingsgate Mr. Ickes arouses sympathies for Mr. Lindbergh and stiffens the hearts of the isolationists against an administration which has had the extraordinarily bad judgment to keep a man like Mr. Ickes so long in power and to insult and accept the resignation of Mr. Lindbergh as colonel in the Air Corps Reserve when it could perfectly well have spiked his guns by ordering him to active duty. In this instance it is Mr. Ickes who is earning Mr. Hitler's approbation, inasmuch as, at a time when what Mr. Hitler needs above all else in this country is disunity, this member of the President's Cabinet goes out of his way to abuse and insult the leader of an important minority group and to enrage and embitter his following.

Mr. Lindbergh, we repeat, is in our opinion everlastingly wrong. He has been badly advised, his views of world affairs are naive, and he has done much to help the cause of Hitlerism in America. But it is his right to express his opinions freely—just as it is the right of Mr. Ickes to do the same. Mr. Lindbergh has the grace to refrain from personal insult and reckless abuse. If Mr. Ickes were to do the same he would be doing the country—and the cause of defeating Hitler, in which we, like Mr. Ickes, believe so strongly—a favor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I desire to know from the Senator from Montana if the address to which the editorial in the Herald Tribune refers is the one delivered by Mr. Ickes in Hartford, Conn., last Thursday evening.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the address to which it refers.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

TRUTH IN FABRICS

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, during many previous Congresses efforts were made by producers and consumers to secure legislation requiring manufacturers to place upon their products informative labels, showing the fiber content of articles of wearing apparel, and some other textiles. These proposals were highly controversial. There were those who did not want the retailer or the ultimate consumer to know the content of articles they placed on the market. There was a large group of honorable manufacturers and dealers who had no objection to labeling as such, but who feared that the enforcement of the law would be difficult and in some instances would work unnecessary hardships.

Early in my service in the Senate I introduced a truth-in-fabrics bill, which passed the Senate, but was not reached by the House prior to its adjournment.

In the next Congress I introduced a second truth-in-fabrics bill, and a companion bill was introduced in the House by the late Representative Martin, of Colorado. The bill is often referred to as the Schwartz-Martin bill. Some amendments were made in the House and in the Senate, and finally the bill became law when signed by the President on October 14, 1940. By its terms it will go into effect on July 14 next.

Mr. President, although the act will not go into effect until July 14, manufacturers generally are of the opinion that it will not be difficult to comply with the provisions of the law and the regulations issued by the Federal Trade Commission. Goods now in process of manufacture are being labeled as required by the statute. It is also evident that the trade will assist in seeing that the act is not evaded by any who may object to labeling articles they offer the public.

The New York Times of June 27, 1941, published a very interesting article showing the clarification in labeling, as compared to previous practices, the law has brought about in certain lines of textile products. I recommend the reading of the New York Times article by retailers, consumers, and all others interested in labeling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 27, 1941]

FIRST WOOL LABELS STARTLE RETAILERS—MEN'S HOSE STAMPED ACCORDING TO NEW ACT SHOW BIG CHANGES FROM FORMER MARKING—50 PERCENT WOOL BECOMES 18 PERCENT—BUT PREVIOUS TAGS ARE HELD TO HAVE ERRED BY OMISSION MORE THAN COMMISSION

First shipments of men's wool and part-wool hose, stamped according to the requirements of the Wool Products Labeling Act, which becomes effective July 15, have startled retail-store executives because goods previously "assumed" to be 50 percent wool now turn out to have a content of only 18 percent, and the 25 percent wool content of some numbers has dwindled to a mere 6 percent.

This is the first instance in which the act has brought about a marked change in the descriptive terminology of a product. While previous designations were not actually untrue in most cases, they were misleading in that they left certain things unsaid. But the fact that even experienced retailers have been startled by the new fiber-content designations on wool and part-wool hose indicates the wide revisions that have taken place.

In fairness to mills, both jobbers and retailers said yesterday that only a few have been guilty in the past of branding half hose 100-percent or 50-percent wool, when the actual fiber content was much lower. But even the legitimate mills in making their goods only told the truth to a certain degree.

For instance, a pair of half hose which last year was stamped "100-percent virgin wool faced, lined with cotton," is now marked "64-percent cotton, 34-percent wool." A 50-percent virgin-wool faced number turns out to have 18-percent-wool content, and a 25-percent wool-faced number has a wool content of 6 percent.

One large out-of-town retailer, when he received his first shipment this week, was so angry he decided to cancel the balance of

his order. His buying representatives here are trying to get him to reconsider, because the goods may not be available later in the year, or might be higher in price.

Jobbers in the market who are experts on hosiery said they usually knew the actual wool content of hosiery, but admitted that in many cases the marking probably gave the public a wrong impression. One jobber expressed the opinion that the wool content might have been lowered this year in order to keep the goods within certain price ranges.

Some mills have kept advances down, while in other cases they have been sizable. For instance, the 100-percent wool-faced number sold at $2.75 a dozen in the early part of 1940, and was advanced to $2.85 later in the year. It opened at the same price this year, but has been moved up to $2.90. Cheaper numbers quoted by mills at $1.50 early last year are now $1.70. Some domestic 6 by 3 ribs have gone from $4 and $4.25 to $4.50.

Retailers face a problem on carryover stocks of wool hose where there is an obvious variation between the original stamping on the sole of the sock and the new tickets or seals which contain the data required under the Wool Labeling Act. Thus, a sock may have the "100 percent wool facing" stamp on the sole and ticket with the "64-percent cotton, 36-percent wool" information. Retailers are wondering how customers will react to this apparently conflicting information.

Wool hose is not the first product, labeled according to the act, which has been shipped to stores, some fall underwear having already been taken in. But in the case of the underwear the changes were minor. For instance, a union suit with 10- or 25-percent wool was so marked in recent years and the only change is the addition of information about the balance of the fiber content, such as 75-percent cotton or 60-percent cotton, 15-percent rayon, etc.

PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4700, Calendar No. 498, an act entitled, "to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment was in section 1, on page 1, line 4, to strike out "September 8, 1939", and insert "May 27, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be very happy to make an explanation. Mr. President, the bill is a drastic measure, and very far reaching. Under ordinary circumstances, I think it would have been the subject of considerable debate. Because of the emergency, it proposes, by a system of warrants to be issued by the Maritime Commission, to take under the control of that Commission for a period between May 27, 1941, and June 30, 1943, all ships carrying the American flag. Taking them under control by these warrants, the Commission will determine their priorities and their cargoes and, fairly and reasonably, the maximum rate of charter hire. The plan to be pursued is this: If a ship takes a warrant under the Maritime Commission, it shall be entitled to dockage, coaling, supply, and the other harbor privileges necessary to the carrying on of its business. If it does not take the warrant, it has no such privileges except as it may accidentally get them. So the warrant by way of giving privileges if a ship takes warrant and depriving it of privileges if it does not take the warrant thrusts the merchant marine under our flag under the absolute control of the Maritime Commission so far as cargoes, routes, and harbor privileges and priorities are concerned. That is the explanation of the bill.

There is an amendment of some importance which would prevent interference with colliers carrying coal from our eastern coast, particularly from the port of Norfolk, and probably also from Baltimore and other ports, to New England manufacturers and New England ports. Such vessels can proceed just as they have been proceeding, but otherwise, the whole intent and effect of the bill is to give the Maritime Commission full control of all the shipping facilities under the American flag. It goes a little further and provides that even a ship under foreign ownership might come involuntarily and take a warrant. That is the size of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Am I correct in my understanding that under the terms of the bill the existing arrangement regarding the shipment of fuel to the Northeastern States would not be disturbed?

Mr. BAILEY. It would not be disturbed. It is specifically provided that—

> Vessels that on January 1, 1941, were engaged primarily in the coastwise transportation of coal for national defense and domestic consumption shall be granted warrants only so long as they continue in the same service as of said date, except that in case any such vessel ceased, before June 15, 1941, to engage in such transportation of coal and before such date became principally engaged in the transportation of defense materials, the Commission may grant such vessel a warrant for such service as it deems suitable pursuant to section 2.

The latter part of that language relates only to one ship which had been in the coal service but has since gotten out of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Inviting the Senator's attention to the sentence ahead of the one he has just read, what is the significance, please, of the language:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the exaction of any sum from the holder of a warrant solely for the privilege of carrying cargo on any route.

Mr. BAILEY. Under our American system we have been allotting routes to certain vessels. I think that system is utterly upset by the bill. It may be recalled that in the recent discussion here in connection with the controversy about the proposed mail subsidy to the Export Lines it was brought out that the Export Lines had the route to Lisbon, but the demand for passenger service was so great, because of the unusual conditions, that it was necessary for the United States Lines to send some ships to Lisbon on the same route, whereupon the Export Lines demanded pay in the sum, as I recall, of about $400,000.

I do not intend to raise that question now; that is all settled and the adjustment may have been perfectly reasonable; I have heard no complaint about it from the United States Lines, for example, but this provision would eliminate any possibility of demanding compensation as between one line and another on account of the privilege of carrying cargo on any route.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. It does not eliminate necessarily the adjustment of compensation or license payment, if I may call it that?

Mr. BAILEY. The bill provides:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the exaction of any sum.

It takes out of the proposed act any authority for such an exaction, but I do not think it disturbs the existing situation.

Mr. DANAHER. It does not turn on the word "solely" in line 2?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the word "solely" is very important in the amendment. It reads:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the exaction of any sum from the holder of a warrant solely for the privilege of carrying cargo on any route.

To be sure, it means that no sum shall be exacted solely on that account. Therefore a sum might be exacted on some other account. The word "solely" is utterly exclusive.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 19, after the article "the", to insert "fair and reasonable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, page 3, line 1, after the word "maintaining", to insert "managing, operating, whenever practicable in the judgment of the Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 11, after the article "the", to insert "towing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to insert "in the United States, including the Philippine Islands and the Canal Zone."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 23, to strike out:

> SEC. 4. It shall be the policy of the Commission in issuing the warrants authorized by this act to give priority to the importation into the United States of strategic and critical materials and to collaborate closely with other defense agencies for the purpose of securing these and other materials so far as may be practicable in the quantities and at the times requested by them: *Provided*, That there shall be no unjust discrimination between ports of the United States. Nothing

in this act shall authorize the exaction of any sum from the holder of a warrant solely for the privilege of carrying cargo on any route. Vessels that on January 1, 1941, were engaged primarily in the coastwise transportation of coal for national defense and domestic consumption shall be granted warrants only so long as they continue in the same service as of said date.

And insert:

SEC. 4. In the administration of this act it shall be the policy of the Commission to make fair and reasonable provision for priorities with respect to (1) the importation of substantial quantities of strategic and critical materials, (2) the transportation of substantial quantities of materials when such transportation is requested by any defense agency, and (3) the transportation in the foreign or domestic commerce of the United States of substantial quantities of materials deemed by the Commission to be essential to the defense of the United States: *Provided*, That there shall be no unjust discrimination between ports of the United States. Nothing in this act shall authorize the exaction of any sum from the holder of a warrant solely for the privilege of carrying cargo on any route. Vessels that on January 1, 1941, were engaged primarily in the coastwise transportation of coal for national defense and domestic consumption shall be granted warrants only so long as they continue in the same service as of said date, except that in case any such vessel ceased, before June 15, 1941, to engage in such transportation of coal and before such date became principally engaged in the transportation of defense materials, the Commission may grant such vessel a warrant for such service as it deems suitble pursuant to section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 5, line 22, after the word "Zone", to insert "and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, page 6, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "and the Philippine Islands, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if this bill does not, in fact, put in the hands of the Maritime Commission the broad power to interrupt and to disrupt shipping facilities of much of our coastwise trade?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; absolutely; it takes the whole thing over, but it provides that there shall be no discrimination against any port. It is intended to equalize the matter and rather to distribute the service than to concentrate it. But it gives the full power to disrupt and disintegrate, with a view to reintegration and cooperation and expedition of service. That is up to the Maritime Commission; but the power is absolute.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to call attention to the fact that, for instance, at the port of Savannah one shipping company has usually employed seven vessels. Already the Maritime Commission has taken over three or four—I forget the exact number—of the vessels. That shipping company is a necessary link between one of the railroads serving the Southeast, particularly my State, and eastern ports; and it is exactly similar to the disruption of that much of the rail facilities of any common carrier. If the purpose of the bill is to let the Maritime Commission readjust and to reallocate shipping service to the ports of the country, I can see some value in it, but if it is to be used without regard to the replacement of ships which have been already taken away, and in such manner as to further interrupt shipping facilities into many of our ports in the Southeast, it seems to me it would be disastrous.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it could be made a very disastrous act by administration. I think, at this stage, the Senator would not expect me to go into a discussion of that matter.

Mr. GEORGE. No.

Mr. BAILEY. But I will make one more remark.

Mr. GEORGE. I am calling attention to it because this seems to me to be a bill of extraordinary importance.

Mr. BAILEY. I think it is. What we are doing in this country, not only in this respect but in many others, is centralizing as fully as if this were a tyranny instead of a republic the control of the activities of American industry, American transportation, and American shipping. I do not know how far we will go, but I make this remark:

In such an emergency as that in which we now stand, a republic must undertake to bring about total effort without becoming totalitarian. My conception of this republic at this time, and my course here, is this: Our Republic is like a beautiful and perfect rod of steel. Under pressure, one may take it and bend it out of its perpendicular, and into a circle which we might say is totalitarian; but we must undertake so to preserve its character, so to fix limitations, and so to indoctrinate our people with the essential conceptions of free government, that once the pressure shall be removed she will of her own power right herself, and become once more a perpendicular, full-fledged, and unimpaired Republic of free men. That is my hope.

If I stoop into a dark, tremendous sea of cloud
It is but for a time;
I shall emerge—in God's good time.

It was Mr. Browning who said that. It is the philosophy of life, of men, and of republics. We must bend, we must at times stoop into a dark, tremendous sea of cloud.

I leave it to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I share the same hope; but I think it were time that we were inquiring whether all such extraordinary powers as this really promote the national defense. I have very serious doubts about it; I have very serious misgivings. Bear in mind, I am not discussing a situation in which this country is already at war, because it is not at war, Mr. President, and I profoundly hope it will not become an active participant in the present war, or any other war. I have not yet accepted the fatalistic doctrine that our actual military or naval participation is inevitable. I am willing to go all the way to prepare this country; but, in my judgment, anything in the world that seriously and unnecessarily and avoidably interrupts the orderly course of life in the United States will not materially contribute to building up a defense for this Nation.

In the first place, Mr. President, if we destroy all the necessary, legitimate, and essential industry that must serve the civilian needs—the needs of our people as a civil community—we have not promoted the national defense. We may think we have done so, but we have not promoted the national defense. We have not strengthened the country for the duty upon us and for the task ahead of us. Without the slightest reflection upon the able Senator who has presented this measure, because he has presented it in the utmost frankness, or the able committee that has passed upon it, and without questioning for a moment that the vast powers it grants may be used in such a way as to restore the necessary shipping facilities to many of our ports, without which their industries will become stagnant and cannot continue, it is a bit discouraging to me that a great many of the things we are doing have not any proper connection, as I see it, with any legitimate defense program; indeed, I think they are interrupting the defense program.

Reference has already been made here to price fixing; and price fixing has already reached farm products. It has already proceeded to the regulation of the price of cottonseed, or the threatened regulation of the price of cottonseed, thereby interrupting and throwing further out of adjustment the agricultural position of the producers of cotton.

Properly or improperly—and I do not say which—a price has been put upon certain textile products—combed yarn at 40 cents; standard print cloths today, 39 cents; ordinary half-waste Osnaburgs, 22 cents—and yet Mr. Henderson, in all good faith, has declared that he is heartily in favor of maintaining prices of farm products, and that he has not thought that farm products were too high. The difficulty is that he is cutting the bottom out from under farm prices. Cotton has already gone down today, for instance, almost half a cent a pound; and it is impossible to regulate the price of oils and fats without affecting nearly all the whole line of food products. It cannot be done.

Does national defense call for that? Does national defense call for drastic action which will interrupt so large a part of our civil activities, particularly in fields in which there is no exploitation and in which there is not any danger of inflation?

I know there is an inflationary tendency in the country which must be held in check; but if we have reached the point where that situation must be taken in hand, it is far wiser to do it under a general law, which will permit all the commodities falling within the price range which must be regulated or controlled to have a hearing and to develop full information, with a right even to some review of decisions when made. Otherwise we are not promoting national defense. While this particular bill can very properly be used to promote national defense, for it does have a bearing upon it, while

it can be used so as not further to interrupt and disrupt the civilian activities of the country, activities on which most of our people must yet depend for their livelihood, for their ability to get along in the world; yet it might be used in such a way, coupled with other actions already taken, as virtually to take away from many of the ports the necessary bottoms to carry on the essential commerce of the community and of the section.

Literally, Mr. President, I speak the truth when I say that that is true of the chief port of the State of Georgia today. The present shipping facilities are not sufficient to carry on the usual and full normal activities of that port, which serves a large area.

Provision has been made in the bill before us to protect colliers. In the Southeast, at a long distance from the coal fields, much oil is used. Oil is the fuel which operates the manufacturing plants and industries. It is the fuel which furnishes the heat which sustains the life of the community in the winter. There is nothing in the bill, of course, which protects the oil tankers which are accustomed to come into port on regular runs and under regular charters. On the contrary, the number of oil tankers operating was reduced voluntarily by the great oil producers themselves by providing a pool of 80 sometime ago, and already additional tankers have been taken off their regular runs, and the question of supplying gasoline and oils in the Southeast is an acute problem, affecting industry, health, comfort, and the ordinary civil activities of a large population, only a negligible percentage of which is engaged in any direct defense activities.

Mr. President, I am not opposing the bill, but I am trying to call attention to the fact that unless the most careful analysis is made of all of the proposals which, in the name of national defense, make it possible to interrupt further the ordinary normal activities of life in the United States, we may be doing many things which will not actually promote the defense of the country; and it will not add to the solidarity or the unity of spirit in the United States, on which any real, ultimate, final effort for the defense of the Nation and the carrying out of any of the commitments to which we have become a party can properly be accomplished.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not differ from the statements made by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I am glad he made them. He paints the background for a little picture of the bill before us and painting that background he paints the background for the whole procedure in this emergency.

We are continually passing emergency measures; and have been doing so for some time. So far as I know, during the past 8 years every emergency measure enacted has been by way of delegating the powers of the Congress to the President or to some bureau under his appointment. Unquestionably we are in the process of intense centralization, and we were in that process before the emergency began in 1929. I shall take the trouble to say that prior to the first administration of the present President, I heard a President of the United States protest against the centralizing disposition of the people and their Republic. He said:

> I am being blamed for it. I wish you to know that it is all against my grain; all against my wishes. If you gentlemen have any way of inducing the American people themselves to cease their centralizing tendency, I will thank you to do your part, and also to call my attention to your way.

Mr. President, such a tendency is found in the history of all governments. No governments live and grow by distributing their powers. They all live and grow and get old by centralizing their powers. We are approaching the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, but in latter years we have been centralizing power at a terrific rate and on a most comprehensive scale. Since the totalitarian threat has been thrust upon civilization, the tendency has become as irresistible as an avalanche down a mountainside. It cannot be resisted. I say for my own part that I am not a centralizationist, but I know that this country cannot survive in this world under existing conditions, it cannot cope with totalitarianism, unless and until the Republic and its people show the capacity for total effort, in unity, under one leadership, and without looking backward. If there is any other way to meet the totalitarian tendency, I should be grateful to have someone to reveal it to me.

Other nations, by way of tyrannies and force, manage to combine all the energies of their people, and all their industries, and hurl them into the conflict by force, at the price of the life of the man who disobeys. We, representing the people, are undertaking, by acts of Congress, to avoid force, but voluntarily to place in the hands of men elected by the people and responsible to the people the same capacity for combining our energies, uniting our forces, and centralizing our power in order that we may resist the great centralized and total power which threatens all the world, and ourselves the most of all, because this Republic, these United States, are the grand prize, the great stake, for every aggressor, every greedy ruler, and every grasping nation on the face of the earth.

That is the philosophy of our present position, as I see it. It may be disagreeable. I shall be greatly comforted, and I shall be proud when I find that my Republic of free men is capable of the same union, the same unity, the same capacity for combined action, and the same total striking power that any other nation is capable of. Let us do it as free men, and let them do it as slaves. Let us do it with a view of return to ordered liberty. Let them do it with the view to remaining under the heels of the tyrants.

Mr. President, the following is a statement contained in the committee report which explains the reasons for this unusual situation and for this particular bill:

> The European war, the defense efforts of the United States necessitating the transportation of a vastly increased quantity of import defense materials, the transportation of supplies to newly acquired outlying bases, the acquisition of a considerable number of merchant vessels by the Navy and Army, and the withdrawal of foreign vessels from our commerce for foreign national purposes have created for the United States a serious shortage of merchant shipping. The tonnage of strategic and critical materials to be transported in 1941 exceeds the tonnage of the same commodities imported in 1938 to such extent that 150 to 175 large ships would be required during the entire year to carry the excess alone. The requirements for ship tonnage have progressively increased and the supply has been reduced to an extent which far exceeds the tonnage of the new vessels which have been constructed for our fleet. The President recently (April 30, 1941) has requested that the services of at least 2,000,000 tons of existing merchant shipping be secured and its operation planned in such manner as will make their cargo space immediately effective in accomplishing our objective of all-out aid to the democracies. Under such circumstances, it is essential in the national interest that available shipping be employed to the greatest possible advantage, and that priority be given to the transportation of commodities which are essential in the national interest over those which we could do without, notwithstanding the fact that higher rates may be secured for the transportation of many nonessential cargoes.
>
> It also is essential that transportation be performed on an equitable basis consistent with the costs involved to prevent a spiraling increase of transportation charges, thereby threatening the present system of tariffs and rate structures and adversely affecting our national-defense program as well as our domestic economy.

That is the case, Mr. President. As I see it, a great necessity exists. The House committee, after considerable hearings, reported the bill, and the House passed the bill. The Senate committee, after long consideration, finally called for hearings, and we had hearings, and after the hearings, and full consideration of the matter, the Senate Committee on Commerce unanimously reported the bill. So I ask for its passage.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the bill is acted upon let me say that, in my very humble opinion, the bill could have been rewritten in such way as to have avoided exactly what I have in mind. The specific purposes in the bill are said to be—

> (1) The importation of substantial quantities of strategic and critical materials; (2) the transportation of substantial quantities of materials when such transportation is requested by any defense agency; and (3) the transportation in the foreign or domestic commerce of the United States of substantial quantities of materials deemed by the Commission to be essential to the defense of the United States.

In my judgment, it would have been simple to have given the Commission outright authority to take over all vessels flying the American flag, whenever it became necessary to accomplish these purposes. But that is not what the bill does. The bill goes infinitely beyond that, and requires every American-flag vessel to obtain a warrant in order to earn profits so it can exist and compete. It thereby places in the hands of the Maritime Commission full authority over the ordinary daily commerce in and out of ports serving agriculture and the ordinary

commercial interests. In my very humble judgment, it is not necessary to grant such authority in order to accomplish the purposes which are intended to be accomplished by the bill.

Let us say directly—it seems to me we should do it—that for these purposes and to effectuate these ends full authority is given to take over, to control, to operate, to manage, to fix the prices of charter, carriage charges, and everything else on any American-flag ships when they are engaged for any of these purposes.

That is not the way we are approaching the matter, and that is not the way we are approaching our problem in many of the bills we have been considering, and that is what I tried to say was disturbing to me.

My friend the very able and distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, is leaning a little too far, I am afraid, toward the adoption of totalitarian methods in order to provide national defense. I hope he may revise his thoughts along that line. I do not think it necessary for our country to interrupt and break up and destroy all its internal and domestic life, its industries, and everything else in order to prepare the Nation effectively. Indeed, I do not think we shall ever prepare the Nation effectively by that sort of method. I do not think America, by being forced into the position of totalitarianism, can ever obtain the most effective defense.

Mr. President, what I am talking about is a philosophy which underlies almost everything we are trying to do at this time. I would be the last person to say that we do not have national unity on the three great commitments which this country has made. Why? Because those commitments have been made in the way that a self-governing people has been accustomed to make decisions of vast importance. This Nation is committed in the accustomed way, the way in which it has always made its great decisions, to an all-out defense of the United States; and that has been extended to an all-out defense of the whole of this hemisphere, and as a necessary corollary it has been extended to an all-out effort to furnish financial and material aid and assistance to England and all other countries resisting the aggressor group of nations now operating in the world. The reaffirmance of the Monroe Doctrine was but a redeclaration upon a point as to which the Nation has been committed throughout nearly all its national life. But I submit that the three great commitments to which I refer have been made in the manner and by the means by which self-governing people, as we are, have usually made important commitments.

What operates against those commitments? The hour is late, and I have no disposition to enter upon a long discussion. Without hesitation I dare say that it is the fear of a large portion of the American people that we will make decisions not in the way in which the American people have always been accustomed to decide matters that go to the very base of their society and their interest. To my way of looking at it, nothing would further promote the spirit of national unity in this country and give that spirit to our resolution than the assurance of the American people that no great decision, involving everything that our people hold dear, will be made save in the American way.

I may be mistaken. I do not raise the question of loyalty or of the desire of the American people to present a unified front in this great emergency. I do not minimize the emergency. I am profoundly concerned that decisions be made not because a large percentage of the American people accept something as necessarily inevitable but because the American people as a whole, with as nearly a unanimous accord as can be secured in a population as vast as ours, and with differences as varying as we find in the United States, may be ready to sustain the decisions when they are made. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I humbly submit that I do not believe that such a result can be accomplished unless the American people feel that the decision is being made in the way they are accustomed to make decisions.

What has that to do with this bill? It has just this to do with the bill, Mr. President: The bill is but an example, and may not be even the most notable example. I do not think it is the most striking example. The bill involves a grant of power that can be consistent only with an actual all-out state of war in which the United States is a full participant. Do not the American people know very well that if we continue on the same path and continue to take such steps, the result will be that the final decision will be made without going to the American people themselves and having their approval of the course which is taken?

With all due respect, I do not think we can have national unity until we do what I think the President has been trying to do all the time. He has been trying to make the big decisions in the usual way in which a self-governing people have been accustomed to make such decisions. The President came to us for his defense program. He came to us in the orderly, usual way for reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine as applicable to this hemisphere. He came to us for approval of the program for all-out defense of the whole Western Hemisphere. He came to us when he thought that, as a necessary corollary we had to extend all possible material aid to the countries that were resisting aggressors. I have confidence that the President wants to come back to Congress, and will come back to Congress, if we are called upon to make further final commitments, so that the American people themselves may have the opportunity of approving a decision so vital to themselves, their happiness, peace, and security.

I know, Mr. President, that the American people may sometimes think very little of the Congress. I know that they may speak as though they do not highly regard our activities, or even our purposes; but after all, the American people have more respect for Congress than we sometimes think. Furthermore, they are perfectly conscious that the individual Member of Congress, whether of the Senate or of the House, is finally accountable to them, and that if misrepresentation occurs here, under whatever pressure, under whatever conditions, they have the final decision, and may themselves retire the individual Member to private life.

Mr. President, the way to national unity in America is not through methods of totalitarianism. It is not through asking for powers for which there is no need, and which cannot be wisely exercised without disrupting the orderly processes of living and of making a living in the United States.

The way to national unity is to give our people the assurance that when we are called upon to move into the actual range of fire and send our men there, whether on board naval vessels or in the aircraft, the American people themselves will have some opportunity to pass upon that question; in other words, that they will have the ultimate decision, through the machinery to which they have become accustomed, and the only machinery which they have at hand; will be able to pass upon the question of whether an actual state of war shall be brought into being or a formal declaration of hostilities shall be made by the people of the United States. If they are given such assurance, and the hour comes when we are called upon to make further commitments, a little debate may take place here. A few days or even a week or so of debate may occur here; but when the decision is made the American people will say of the action of the Congress, the Executive, and the American Government, "My Government has spoken, and we will wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support that decision."

I am not quarreling with the pending bill. I have the greatest respect for Admiral Land. I feel that he will try to administer the law fairly. I know very well the pressure to which he will be subjected. The Navy will be after him one day, and the Army will be after him the next day, saying, "We want some more of these ships; we want to take some ships out of commerce," and he will be almost compelled to yield. Then some other department of Government will come to him and say, "We also are doing something for national defense, and we want some of these ships which are serving Wilmington, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans, and all the New England coast." Admiral Land will be almost obliged to yield. In so doing, he will not be promoting national defense, because when he interrupts the ordinary daily activities of the persons who have to be served, he will not be adding anything to the spirit and sentiment of the American people which is the basis of real national defense and real unity.

I have the utmost confidence in Admiral Land's business ability, in his judgment, in his high patriotism; indeed, I think him a rare example of a high and patriotic public official; I know he will do the best he can; but I know what pressure will be put upon him.

I am not opposing the bill. I am trying to say that we accept too easily a philosophy which, in my opinion, is not promotive of true national unity. Mr. President, that is true of price fixing.

If we must fix all prices in order to prevent destructive inflation, very well; let us proceed on that theory and along that line. That is true of various other things we are doing. If they must be done for other reasons, let us proceed along that line. But let us be careful that we do not grant many extraordinary powers which could not and would not be used even if an invader stood at our shores and was about to engulf us.

Let us not by the enactment of legislation carrying such extraordinary powers impress the American people with the further thought, the deeper conviction, or, may I say, the fear that because of something which may be done down here, that finally the point of decision will have passed, and they will not have any opportunity to make the decision which they are entitled to make. Not the individual Member of the Senate, not the individual Member of the House of Representatives, not the Chief Executive, much as I respect him and much as I have supported and will continue to support him, and not any other executive officer of the Government but the people themselves have the real right to make the decision.

How can they make it? They cannot make it except under the machinery which they have adopted for their use, and which we always have recognized their right to use; but they have the right to make the decision, and they entertain the fear that matters will be carried beyond the point of decision without the opportunity for them to express themselves, perhaps not as effectively as they would like to express themselves, but to express themselves at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment; but, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to finish this statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. I reaffirm, Mr. President, what I have said heretofore: That it is my belief—although, of course, I am the only one responsible for that belief, and I do not speak by authority—that the President of the United States, great Democrat that he is, is desirous of making further commitments of high import and of vital concern to the American people only in the way in which we have been accustomed to make our great decisions—in other words, only after the people themselves have had the opportunity of declaring themselves and of making their own decision certain.

I know there has been a tremendous amount of pressure, and there cannot be a right-thinking man or woman in these United States who must not be conscious of the fact that day after day, hour after hour, moment after moment, through all the months that lie back of us, a terrific and overwhelming pressure has been brought upon the President. The President has desired the decisions which have already been made. Congress has cooperated and fully concurred, and those who opposed fell squarely in line back of them the very moment they became the recognized voice of a majority of the lawmaking branches of the American Congress.

The President may be called upon to make other and more momentous decisions. He is entitled, I believe, to know what the American people think, because I know he is entitled to the fullest support, to the strongest spirit of national unity back of every effort he has made.

The President not only has made the decisions, but all America recognizes that he will not turn back; and, with respect to the commitments made, no real American wants him to turn back or would have him do so. He will make, or the American people will make, whatever decisions must be made under the force of circumstances and events which we cannot altogether control; but we can make the decisions in the way which will lead to the constant strengthening of the spirit of unity of our people, and we can make them in the way in which a self-governing people have been accustomed to make their decisions.

Does the Senator from Missouri wish to make a remark at this point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had desired to comment somewhat on a thought the Senator expressed some time ago in his remarks, but his remarks are so logical, so cogent, and so well rounded that any question I might now ask would be an anticlimax.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I repeat, I am not opposing this bill, but I do have occasion to regret that all of us have fallen somewhat into the habit—and no man is free of this mild criticism, if it be a criticism—of writing too much into these extraordinary measures which we feel impelled to pass at this time, when a more direct and more limited grant of power would serve all the possible purposes we have in mind as a people, and, moreover, would leave our people undisturbed by the fear that if Congress is not going to analyze or scrutinize or limit or restrict, the hour will come when the decision will have been made for us, and without regard to what we say.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his very eloquent and noble remarks puts me under the necessity of explaining one point. The committee did consider whether it would undertake legislation to authorize the acquisition of ships, and, having considered that question, it chose to pursue the method of control as provided in this bill rather than of acquisition and ownership. I think control as opposed to ownership is more in accord with the character of this democracy than ownership could possibly be. Suppose we acquired the ships, we would have to operate them as a Government; and I am very averse to Government ownership. Not only so, but suppose we acquired some of the ships, we would be under the necessity of operating those we acquired in competition with private ships, in which event the private ships would be at a hopeless disadvantage. So the committee, having considered precisely this matter, as between acquisition and control chose control.

Mr. President, I dislike to detain the Senate, but the distinguished Senator from Georgia moved me very greatly. I am glad he is not opposing the bill. I see what he is doing; he is using the bill as a rest while he trains the guns of his eloquence on larger game. That is all right; and I am going to make a remark about the larger aspect of the matter. If the Senator from Georgia and I differ at all in these matters, it is in our conception of modern war. If I had a remark to make, not by way of criticism but by way of distinguishing his views from mine, I would say that he is thinking in terms of war as it has been; I am trying to think in terms of war as it is. I make no distinction so far as preparation is concerned. We are not at war, but when we passed yesterday the bill carrying $11,000,000,000 for the War Department, if we were not preparing for war, I do not know what we are doing. We are preparing for defense under circumstances which inform us all. Whether we shall be in the war or not, is not a matter of our wishes or of our purpose. It is not a matter of our timing; it is not a matter of our will; it is a matter of events and of action far beyond our control now. We might determine the time by a declaration; we might postpone the event by patience; but we live day by day, not knowing in what hour the fact of war will be presented to us by others beyond our control. The fact that we are in war, however we may contrive and however desperately we may pray, may be presented to us at any critical hour. We are preparing with total effort for total war, when and if it shall come.

I wish to make this remark for its value as anyone may choose to find it. I must draw a distinction. There is a new sort of war in the world. It is total, mechanized warfare; it is tanks instead of cavalry; it is the submarine and the torpedo in place of the surface ship; and it is the bombing plane carrying artillery and hurling torpedos. It is not the war of fortresses; fortresses are gone. It is not the war of insularity; islands are islands no longer.

Crete and Thermopylæ—Thermopylæ the pass and Crete the island—fell alike with astonishing suddenness under the attack of modern warfare. The Maginot line amounted to nothing; the great fortresses of Belgium meant nothing. We are in the age of new war. It is total, mechanized warfare, and, if it means anything, it means that all the people, not soldiers only—we must have them—not sailors only—we must have them—not generals and captains and admirals only—we must have them—but total war requires the devotion and the sacrifices and the energies of all the people of the nations engaged, for all the people of the nations engaged are as much exposed in total war as are the soldiers who charge into "no-man's land."

What are the casualties in London, and what are the casualties today on the coast of France and the coast of Belgium, we do not know; but we do know that, just as the moat passed, just as the castle passed, and just as the wall that was the basis of the feudal system passed under the new force of the gun and gunpowder, so all recent means of defense have

melted away under the force of modern mechanized war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there not another factor, which is probably the most important factor from the point of view of those of us who believe that we are defending and cherishing the principles of democracy, namely, that, while all the old forms of war have passed so also have the old forms of determining the policy of the people. The wars which have been declared in Europe have not been formally announced in parliaments, but have been undertaken without warning by the decrees of totalitarian governments. I can see that it was that point which was at the basis of discussion of the Senator from Georgia with which I completely agree.

It seems to me there can be no doubt in the mind of any person who has observed what is going on in the world that the question which will be determined by this war is whether the democratic system of governing people and determining the policies of people is to be maintained. I believe it can be maintained. I have the utmost faith in the people.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not disagree with the Senator. I am undertaking to maintain it; and yet it appears from what he says, or it is about to be made to appear, that I am in favor of some sort of a scheme of things whereby I can be committed to war without a vote, notwithstanding the Constitution imposes the responsibility upon me. That has not occurred to me. That is very far afield, I may say to my honored friend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator knows me too well, and he knows that I know him too well, to believe that he would commit himself to any such point of view; but, as the Senator from Georgia has clearly pointed out, there has been a constant series of steps which have undermined the power and authority of the people's parliament, the people's congress, to make the decisions upon which the fate of all the people will depend. This bill is one step in that series, in that it conveys certain powers which, as the Senator from Georgia has indicated, are the powers which are exercised when war actually exists.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it is rather remarkable to me that the protest should come upon the thousandth step in the last mile. I was protesting here in 1933 and 1934. We must prepare in advance of actual war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There were some others who made the same protest.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not saying that others were not making it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, I have not had my lunch and I wish to get through.

I think it is well that we have had the discussion; but I wish to come to the point here, not on the bill, because we are now talking about the difference between the situation we are in and all other situations heretofore respecting war. I am saying that in our preparation—not war, but preparation for defense against totalitarian power—we must make no mistake about it; we must so contrive this Republic that the total effort of all the people, all their energies, all their industries, all that they are and all that they have, shall be united and made ready, in order that in the hour of need the sum of our power may be brought to bear. If we do not do that we invite the invader, we do not challenge him. If we do that we arrest his progress, we stand him back.

I do not say that that shall be the order forever, but I do say that every man in America and every woman in America who contemplates preparation for modern war must prepare for the total effort, the total unity, even though we do have a republic of freedom. It may be voluntary—these acts come voluntarily—but, whether voluntary or involuntary, it must be had. Otherwise, we cannot cope with the modern situation. Otherwise, we expose our people in their homes to the first invader who finds a convenient base from which he may send an airplane across the land and into our cities.

We may regret that, but that is the fact. Total war by the Axis Powers, if and when we defend against it, can be defended by nothing less than total effort. We cannot have total effort in a democracy without the centralization of the wills and the hearts and the powers and the businesses and the industries and all the energies of all the people. I am ready for that; and when we get through, when this threat is gone, then I am ready to fight another battle to return this country to the great doctrines and to the immortal principles which constituted it a republic, and from which it has drawn its life for 165 years, since the day of independence, by means of which only it can hope to live in the thousands of years to come.

It is for us, Mr. President, to win our title to the leadership of the world by showing all the nations of the earth that a democracy is capable of total effort and at the same time is capable of a return to all the principles and all the glories of its liberty.

Mr. President, I again ask for the passage of the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for a moment, if I may have it, please. I had hoped to be recognized earlier, so that my remarks would have more continuity with his own observations.

As I understood him, at one time in the course of his address he said—and I will paraphrase as best I can:

> When the American people are asked to send their fleets and their air forces they will want to have the decision made in the customary American way.

I believe I substantially paraphrase the thought of the Senator from Georgia. It cannot be, it would seem to me, that the position of the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is without significance in our minds as he speaks and in the minds of those who will perceive his words as reported in the daily press.

I noted in the remarks of Mr. Churchill, broadcast in this country on Sunday last—and I sent for an account of his speech while the thought was fresh in my mind—that Mr. Churchill pointed out what might happen to Britain if Hitler's attempt to overwhelm Britain should be made. Now I quote Mr. Churchill—

> before the fleets and air power of the United States might intervene.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is in his remarks some prediction that he presages to us an implication that we are to be called upon to send the fleets and the air power of the United States to aid in the defense of Britain? May we properly deduce such a conclusion, may I ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would not have anyone deduce any conclusion of that kind, and I expressly disclaimed any thought that I was speaking with any authority. I was speaking solely for myself when I was engaging in this general discussion, which I did not anticipate I would engage in at all when the pending bill came up and suggested to me a line of thought to which I felt I should give expression. I do not mean to say that that will occur; but what I tried to say was only this:

I recognize the necessity for all-out total preparation as strongly as anybody can, and I think a little more strongly, perhaps, than some of our friends, because to my mind all-out total preparation never can be made by the American people with the resolution which has characterized them in all their great undertakings unless and until they feel that they themselves are a part of the great decision which brings on that effort. So when I was thinking of total defense I was thinking primarily of the strong spirit of unity which, as I see it, will not exist if our people are possessed with the fear that great decisions and commitments may be made or will be made without any opportunity on their part to participate in making such decisions. I tried to make it perfectly clear, as I hope I did, that in my humble opinion, but without anything to base it upon save my own conclusion and deduction, the President of the United States himself had fully recognized what is in my mind, and that he did not want to arouse the fear of the American people that he would make great decisions without their having an opportunity to pass upon the questions involved.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator from Georgia how happy I am that he has clarified in my mind, and I hope for the RECORD, the inference which I at least had drawn from his previous remarks, coupled as they had been in such close continuity with the observation of Mr. Churchill on Sunday last. I very greatly appreciate this reaffirmation of his confidence in the Congress and in the attitude of the President toward the Congress, in this great crisis. It is most refreshing to know the views of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4700) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 20, 25, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 37; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and any advances made from this fund to meet emergency requirements to which any other military appropriation would be legally applicable may, with the approval of the Secretary of War, be reimbursed from such appropriations when sufficient funds are found to remain therein, such reimbursed amounts to be available for the purposes of this appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and at the end thereof add the following:

": *Provided further*, That the restrictions contained in this paragraph on the use of appropriations made in this Act shall not apply to pay, allowances, or traveling, or other expenses for or incident to services entered into pursuant to orders issued by competent authority"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 15, and 36.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
DAVID D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES
(with exceptions to action on sections 11 and 12),
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to sections 11 and 12),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will not the Senator from Oklahoma make a statement as to what the report contains?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The bill was not substantially changed in conference. The amounts of money inserted in the bill by the Senate were agreed to in conference. The Senate made some amendments to the bill, and the House conferees found it necessary to take those amendments back to the House and have separate votes on them. They did so, and the House added one or two provisions to our amendments.

For example, the Senate added $500,000,000 to the bill. To that amendment the House added a provision to the effect that in the future no money shall be expended by the War Department except by direct appropriation of the Congress. That was intended, obviously, to defeat and to retard and to prevent the War Department from negotiating with the R. F. C. or any other agency in an effort to borrow money with which to construct defense plants.

Amendment No. 2 relates also to section 2, as I recall, wherein the references to certain sections were stricken out in the Senate. The striking of those two provisions was held to render the whole section unworkable, so the House agreed to that amendment with a slight amendment to clarify it. Those two amendments are still in disagreement.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4965, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 28, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "War", insert ", with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes,";

And at the end of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "1942", insert ": *Provided further*, That no obligations shall be incurred for or on account of objects appropriated for under this head to the Military Establishment except in pursuance of specific appropriations"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, on page 23, line 24, of the House engrossed bill, strike out all after "Provided," over to and including "further," in line 1, page 24.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2 and 15.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CRYPT FOR REMAINS OF GUTZON AND MARY BORGLUM

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, some days ago, at the suggestion of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 3857 was passed by the Senate. I am in accord with the views of the Senator from South Dakota and I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the name "Gutzon", it is proposed to insert "and Mary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon and Mary Borglum."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 3, 4, 10, and 11 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2, and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to

the enrolled bill [H. R. 4646] to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, and it was signed by the Vice President.

INVESTIGATION OF AIRPLANE CRASHES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 119, submitted by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on May 23, 1941, increasing the limit on expenditures for the investigation of airplane crashes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 119) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby increased by $10,000.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it was our hope that we might consider today the deficiency appropriation bill. It is evident, however, that we cannot do so; and I ask that when the Senate concludes its business today, it recess to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPORTATION OF MEAT FROM ARGENTINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had occasion yesterday afternoon to discuss certain phases of the importation of meat from Argentina, and I spoke of having requested from the Secretary of Agriculture a copy of the letter which he had received from the Secretary of State, asking for an interpretation of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which prohibits the importation of livestock and certain livestock products from countries infested with the foot-and-mouth disease. The letter was not received by me until after the Senate had recessed last evening.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Secretary Wickard transmitting the letter from the Secretary of State, together with the letter of the Secretary of State, be printed in the body of the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1941.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Ordinarily the Department of Agriculture does not feel free to send communications from another Department to the Congress. In this case, however, the Department of State has informed us that it has no objection to the transmittal to you of a copy of the Secretary of State's letter of April 10 regarding Tierra del Fuego. It is a pleasure therefore to send you a copy of the letter.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1941.

The HONORABLE CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The enclosed memoranda, which were left at the Department by the Argentine Ambassador, raise the question whether Tierra del Fuego may be regarded as a country, separate from Argentina and Chile, within the meaning of section 306 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 which reads as follows:

"Cattle, sheep, swine, and meats—importation prohibited in certain cases: (a) Rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease: If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country, is prohibited."

As you know, the word "country" has no fixed meaning in law. Where it appears in any statute its meaning depends upon the object and intent thereof and the particular situation in respect of which the word is used. (*Commissioner of Int. Rev.* v. *Chicago Portrait Company*, 50 F. (2d) 683, 684). In some statutes the word "country" is used with reference to a political entity, while in others it evidently refers to a geographical entity. (*Burnet* v. *Chicago Portrait Co.*, 285 U. S. 1).

Considering the fact that Tierra del Fuego is separated by water from the mainland of Argentina and Chile, it would accordingly seem possible to determine that Tierra del Fuego is a country separate from Argentina and Chile within the meaning of section 306 (a). However, this is a matter on which you will doubtless wish to obtain the opinion of the appropriate legal officers of your Department. In the event that the action suggested by the Argentine Ambassador is regarded as possible from that standpoint, consideration can then be given to any other factors having a bearing on the desirability of taking such action.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the letter of the Secretary of State was dated April 10, 1941, that the letter of the Department of Justice giving the opinion which was sought was dated May 16, and that the request for the opinion and the rendering of the opinion did not become known until a newspaper dispatch was received in the United States from Argentina, despite the fact that it involved not only the construction of a law, but the construction of a treaty which had been sent to the Senate 5 or 6 years ago for its consideration, and upon which there had been no action.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess following today's session the committees of the Senate may be authorized to file reports with the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John H. Fahey, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 6 years from July 22, 1941 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations on today's Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 30, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 26), 1941:

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COMMANDERS

George E. McCabe	Donald C. McNeil
Lee H. Baker	Harley E. Grogan
Martin W. Rasmussen	Harold G. Belford

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Chester A. A. Anderson	Kenneth P. Maley
	Samuel P. Gray
Edward E. Hahn, Jr.	Earl K. Rhodes
Emanuel Desses	Leon H. Morine
Wilbur C. Hogan	Walter C. Capron

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Gilbert F. Schumacher	Ernest A. Cascini
Charles Tighe	Robert F. Shunk
Fred L. Westbrook	Justus P. White
Richard Baxter	William J. Lawrence
Oscar D. Weed, Jr.	Guy L. Ottinger
Ralph D. Dean	Clifford S. Gerde
Joseph R. Scullion	Edward C. Thompson, Jr.
William J. Conley, Jr.	
Richard L. Mellen	James P. Stow 3d
Glenn L. Rollins	Gerald T. Applegate

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

James L. Brown, Chebanse.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Peter J. Hickey, Portsmouth.

NEW YORK

Celestine Reynolds, Corfu.
Harry B. Hickey, Fredonia.
Lorrin Eggleston, Westport.
Raymond B. Cooper, Williamson.

PENNSYLVANIA

Raymond A. McHale, Archbald.
Joseph E. Burnside, Emporium.
Joseph R. Thurston, Factoryville.
Willa S. Saxon, Fredericktown.
Frederic W. Moser, Greenville.
Paul A. Saupp, Houtzdale.
John B. Cassidy, Shiremanstown.
Galen L. Brookmyer, Smoketown.
Charles S. Doyle, South Langhorne.
Burnett W. Weber, Sykesville.
May E. Reisinger, Wrightsville.

PUERTO RICO

Joaquin Fernandez, Rio Piedras.
Laura Molini Diaz, Yauco.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be captain

Harold J. Nelson

To be commanders

Lucian A. Moebus	Thomas B. Brittain
Roy C. Hudson	Robert W. Bockius
Oswald S. Colclough	Winfield S. Cunningham
Lyman A. Thackrey	
Thomas L. Wattles	Carroll T. Bonney
Carroll L. Tyler	George W. Mead, Jr.
Carleton C. Champion, Jr.	Neill B. Brantly
	Charles D. Murphey
Mark H. Crouter	Philip R. Kinney
Douglass P. Johnson	Jewett P. Moncure
Paul S. Slawson	Richard P. Glass
Joseph U. Lademan, Jr.	John V. McElduff
	Joseph J. Rochefort
Valentine M. Davis	Herbert C. Behner
John M. Thornton	Roland E. Krause
George D. Morrison	Campbell Keene
Charles F. Grisham	Nolan M. Kindell
William M. McDade	Edward E. Dolecek
Joseph H. Seyfried	Delbert L. Conley
Clarence F. Swanson	Nathan W. Bard
Chester L. Walton	Harold J. McNulty
James B. Donnelly	Francis A. Packer

To be lieutenant commanders

Barron G. Lowrey	Louis M. LeHardy
Kenneth Craig	Louis E. Gunther
Charles T. Singleton, Jr.	Walter B. Davidson
	Thompson F. Fowler
Laurence H. Frost	Clarence E. Gregerson
Malcolm A. Hufty	Edward D. Crowley
Paul B. Tuzo, Jr.	Henry E. Bernstein
George P. Biggs	Theodore W. Rimer
Ernest J. Davis	Earl K. Olsen
Frank L. Durnell	John K. Wells
Alfred J. Benz	Hubert E. Strange
William K. Rhodes	Daniel J. Sweeney
Winthrop E Terry	Orville K. O'Daniel
John C. Hammock	Morton K. Fleming, Jr.
Robert B. Goldman	
Walter J. Whipple	Erasmus W. Armentrout, Jr.
Herald F. Stout	
Wesley A. Wright	Diggs Logan
Frederick A. Davisson	Frederick C. Stelter, Jr.
Allen M. Kemper	
Harper D. Scrymgeour	Louis Shane, Jr.
Vilhelm K. Busck	Otho P. Smoot
Justus R. Armstrong	Thomas F. Conley, Jr.
Nathaniel C. Barker	
Algernon S. Joyner, Jr.	Thomas R. Langley
Royal Lovell	James N. Shofner
Ramond C. Ericson	Guy B. Helmick
Harold A. Fravel	Robert R. DeWolfe
Henry D. Rozendal	Wallace J. Miller
Doir C. Johnson	August W. Lentz
Edwin S. Schanze	Clifford T. Corbin
Douglas V. Gladding	

To be lieutenants

John Shannon	George D. Roullard
Benjamin B. Cheatham	William W. R. Macdonald
Thomas H. Ward	Thomas V. Peters
George O. Klinsmann	Carlton B. Jones
Bernard M. Strean	James J. Vaughan
Paul Masterton	John J. McCormack, Jr.
Laurence H. Marks	
Robert A. Macpherson	Edward F. Jackson
John A. Gamon, Jr.	Herbert S. Fulmer, Jr.
Clayton L. Miller	Fitzhugh McMaster
Francis J. Smedley	Robert S. Camera
Bertram J. Prueher	

To be medical director

Rolland R. Gasser

To be dental surgeon

Everett K. Patton

To be pay inspectors

Stephen E. Smith
Cornelius A. Brinkmann
Ellory F. Carr

To be paymaster

Mark W. Clay

To be assistant paymasters

Henry P. Adams	William H. Williams
Samuel J. Major	William H. Seed
George E. Moore 2d	Francis B. Grubb
John C. Pennell	Nathaniel W. James 3d
Thomas H. Bell	George W. Netts
Benhardt B. Fischer	Herman Spector
John M. Gore	Raphael A. Zoeller
Daniel J. Carrison	Frederic W. Corle
Robert C. Dexter, Jr.	Lawrence Lovig, Jr.
Jesse S. Claypoole, Jr.	John G. Beard, Jr.
Earl E. Carlsten	Rex W. Warner

To be chief pay clerk

Edward J. Hagen

To be chief carpenter

Carl J. Kalb

To be commanders

Raymond D. Tarbuck
Carlton R. Todd

To be ensigns

Victor A. Moitoret	David S. Moore
Joseph F. Zawacki, Jr.	Josiah B. Henneberger
William D. Owen, Jr.	

MARINE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

James W. Flett

To be majors

Lofton R. Henderson	Jack P. Juhan
Francis M. McAlister	

To be first lieutenants

Paul E. Becker, Jr.	John W. Howe
Cyril E. Emrich	Clarke J. Bennett
James J. Owens	

To be second lieutenants

Wallace G. Fleissner	Eugene V. Boro
Robert H. Gray	Frank T. Whiffen
Schuyler D. Ferris	Louie N. Casey

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art our everlasting portion, we devoutly pray for Thy wisdom that the Congress may discharge the duties and the responsibilities which it owes the state; a soul is rich toward Thee when it gives itself in unselfish service toward the public weal. There is no side of human life toward which it is not our privilege to exercise just consideration—for the little child, the grown man, the poor, the rich, the good, and the bad. We pray that in the noblest sense our attitude may be expressed in the livelong injunction: Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. We offer this humble prayer in the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill is ready it may be considered without filing the statement of the managers, and that such statement, when filed later, may be printed as a part of the report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this agreeable to the Republican members of the committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the gentleman that I have not had an opportunity to confer with the Republican members, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is present. It will take several hours to prepare the report.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this request has reference only to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and I think we can do that all right in this instance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service and to include therein some statements of my own concerning the Director.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the anniversary of the Taylor Grazing Act and the resources of the public range.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PREPARATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the Interior Department appropriation bill conference report was before the House I submitted a parliamentary inquiry, asking the Speaker for a ruling as to whether or not the present rules of the House would make it mandatory for conferees, not only on appropriation bills but on all legislative bills, to place in the conference report, where a majority of the conferees had already agreed to move to recede and concur with an amendment, the language of the amendment upon which the House would be asked to recede and concur.

The Speaker very kindly submitted his view, and it was to the effect that there was nothing mandatory in the rule to require the conferees to place anything in the report that they did not desire to include.

My purpose in rising today is to say that my suggestion has borne fruit, in that I see in several instances where the conferees have accepted the suggestion and in the preparation of the conference report the able clerks have included a copy of the amendment that the House will be asked to recede and concur in. This is reflected in the conference report on the appropriation for the Military Establishment and also for the appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, as well as the report submitted by the conferees on the amendment of the National Housing Act, H. R. 4693.

As a number of conference reports have been filed, there might be others, but so far the three I mention came to my attention this morning. I want to say that I know the membership of the House will be pleased that the conferees have taken this attitude, and I hope that others will continue to follow the same procedure, as it will be most beneficial to the Members of the House to know just exactly what we are going to be asked to vote on without waiting until the motion is read from the desk.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Frank J. Barry, prominent member of the Los Angeles bar, to Francis E. McMahon, professor of philosophy at Notre Dame University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE LEASE-LEND BILL AND COMMUNIST RUSSIA

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President, under the lease-lend bill, is now making the United States give military aid to Communist Russia, because he deems the defense of the Soviet Union vital to the defense of the United States.

In defending Russia the President is forcing our Nation to defend communism and everything that this hellish cult has done since it started in Russia 24 years ago—the starvation of ten or twenty million people, the continual confinement in concentration camps of millions more, the outright murder of everyone who still had enough instinct in him above the brute level to try to resist the work of this monster, the burning of the churches, the murder of the clergy, and the rape of nuns.

In defending communism in Russia we are defending communism in the United States. We cannot bless communism in Russia and at the same time curse it in America.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will consider the Sabath resolution to appoint a committee of three Senators, three Members of the House, and three members of the executive branch of the Government to investigate decentralization. I think this will not only promote efficiency but will bring relief from congestion in Washington and will give the taxpayers in other sections of the country a chance to share in the administrative expenditures of government.

A recent survey in Chicago shows that there are now five and a half million square feet of office space in 55 commercial office buildings downtown, valued at $75,000,000, on which the taxes have not been paid for 5 years. The bonds on these buildings are selling at from 15 to 20 cents on the dollar. By removing some of the nondefense agencies to other areas of the country we serve a twofold purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the resolution will pass by an overwhelming majority.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in and include a speech I delivered at Greenwood, S. C., June 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN] and I and one or two others have bills calling for universal daylight saving pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I hope the membership of the House will join with me in asking for a hearing and the speedy enactment of that legislation, which is vitally needed, I understand and firmly believe, for national defense. We ought not to lose one single hour of time in our efforts at preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a resolution adopted by the Southeastern Montana Counties Association in respect to defense highways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Also, Mr. Speaker, with reference to a resolution passed by the same association of counties with respect to cooperating in national defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Also, Mr. Speaker, a resolution from the same association with reference to payments to the several States on account of lands of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in respect to the late Senator Sheppard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an article from In Fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of two newspaper articles which appeared in the Turkey Enterprise and the Memphis Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALUMINUM PLANT IN ARKANSAS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD generally, and also I ask unanimous consent for another extension to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE TOWNSEND BILL

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Townsend's Washington Flash has just come to my attention, carrying the names of Members of Congress who have signed the petition to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of the so-called Townsend bill. My name appears on this list. I did not sign the petition and do not intend to do so.

REPORTS OF CONFEREES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry, if I may have the attention of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] a few moments ago, and I wish to propound this inquiry: When a bill is sent to conference, is it mandatory that the conferees meet or that they report the proposition back to the House to be passed on?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say that the conferees are agents of the House and are expected to perform or ask to be discharged.

The Chair would be pleased, if such a parliamentary inquiry is to be propounded, that the Chair be notified in order to give the Chair a chance to look into the matter.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Very well, Mr. Speaker. Rather than take up the time of the House now, I will confer with the Speaker.

TRANSFER OF AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT FROM WASHINGTON

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed thankful to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who called attention to the fact that the resolution which I introduced will be called up next Monday. The resolution aims to eliminate the overcrowded conditions here in Washington. However, I doubt that the resolution will come up Monday as he has stated.

My colleague directs attention to the ample office space available in Chicago to take care of many of the bureaus and agencies that could easily, in the interest of economy and efficiency, be transferred to Chicago. Naturally, I am interested in Chicago because it is the most logical city where the work of these bureaus and agencies could be carried on more economically and even more efficiently than here in the overcrowded city of Washington.

Chicago has suffered more than any other city or any other section due to the national-defense program, because most of the activities are in the East and on the west coast, which has caused thousands of mechanics and other skilled help to leave Chicago to take employment in those sections, thus leaving thousands of vacant homes and apartments which could readily absorb any number of Government employees in the event of the transfer of any bureaus or agencies to that city.

While I feel Chicago is the most logical city to which some of the bureaus or agencies could be moved, I do not wish to foreclose other cities where some branches of the Government could be moved if they are as advantageously located as is Chicago. One thing is certain, and no one can deny, conditions in Washington are unbearable and something must be done to relieve the overcrowded conditions. The lack of office facilities, living quarters, and the unjustifiable high rents and cost of necessities work a hardship to the 35,000 or 40,000 employees who have come here within the last 4 months and does not afford them a proper or decent living here. Therefore, I hope that when the resolution does come up, you gentlemen will support it and pass it without unnecessary delay.

I know that the investigation that the resolution calls for will show that the cost of living and rents here are from 33⅓ to 50 percent higher than in Chicago. It will also disclose that office space can be obtained from 25 to 50 percent less than is being paid by the Government for quarters in Washington. The investigation will also show that thousands of capable and well-qualified persons have refused to come to Washington to accept Government positions on account of these conditions and that there are thousands of Government employees who are pleading to be transferred out of Washington, because their salaries are inadequate for them to anywhere near approach the standard of living to which they were accustomed in their home towns.

I therefore believe it would be in the interest of the administration and the Government if some of the agencies were moved from Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have read this resolution and I find it contains a preamble. I always thought it was the policy of the House to leave preambles out of such resolutions. There is no necessity for this one. In this instance the preamble sets out in part some complimentary remarks relative to Chicago and, reading between the lines, one would feel it was for the benefit of Chicago. There are other cities in the Mid-West that have facilities to take care of Government agencies if they are to be moved. I wish to speak in behalf of St. Louis, more centrally located than Chicago. I will say now I am not going to vote for that resolution unless the preamble is stricken out, because it is nothing more than a little boost for Chicago. I might add a survey is now being made by Public Works Administrator Carmody and Director of the Budget Smith and it has been going on for several weeks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Missouri, I wish to say that the resolution was reported with the preamble merely for informational purposes. I assure the gentleman that when the resolution reaches the floor I shall submit an amendment to have the preamble stricken therefrom. I feel that if my colleague had closely scrutinized the resolution he would have noted that the resolution provided, and I quote: "(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to investigate—(1) the feasibility and desirability of transferring from the District of Columbia to central locations outside the District of Columbia of any of the bureaus or agencies of the Government of the United States." Under that provision the gentleman will agree that the investigation would not be restricted to any given location and that even St. Louis may be included in same.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] are figuring on moving the Capitol out to Chicago or moving it to St. Louis. We are going to have something to say about that. We think the Capitol will still remain in Washington when you get through with this resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the Capitol will stay here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4965), making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think someone should explain this, so that if there is anything here that the House does not agree to we may have an explanation of it.

Mr. SNYDER. I intend to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 20, 25, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 37 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and any advances made from this fund to meet emergency requirements to which any other military appropriation would be legally applicable may, with the approval of the Secretary of War, be reimbursed from such appropriations when sufficient funds are found to remain therein, such reimbursed amounts to be available for the purposes of this appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and at the end thereof add the following: ": *Provided further*, That the restrictions contained in this paragraph on the use of appropriations made in this Act shall not apply to pay, allowances, or traveling, or other expenses for or incident to services entered into pursuant to orders issued by competent authority"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 15, and 36.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
DAVID D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES
(with exceptions to action on sections 11 and 12),
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE
(except to sections 11 and 12),
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Makes the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" available for expenses of warrant officers and enlisted men of the Army on special duty in foreign countries, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Restores the provision making the Contingent Fund of the Chief of Staff a revolving fund, modified to narrow the bases for reimbursement.

Amendment No. 4: Corrects punctuation.

Amendment No. 5: Makes $4,000,000 of the appropriation "Travel of the Army" available for fiscal year 1941 obligations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of making a like amount immediately available, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Provides for movement of dependents and household effects of military and civil personnel on duty outside the continental limits of the United States and Alaska to new locations and subsequently to new stations wherever they may be situated, as proposed by the Senate, instead of merely to new locations and stations within the continental United States, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Strikes out of the appropriation "Clothing and equipage" the clause making $50,000,000 of the appropriation immediately available, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11, relating to the appropriation "Incidental expenses of the Army": Appropriate $231,201,383, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $228,751,383, as proposed by the House, the increase being for the liquidation of contracts heretofore authorized, and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the clause making $15,250,000 of the appropriation immediately available.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14, relating to the appropriation "Military posts": Modify House text in re the acquisition of land so as to conform with prior waivers of section 355, Revised Statutes, requiring determination of validity of title by the Attorney General prior to taking possession and commencing construction, and appropriates $332,140,556, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $276,378,424, as proposed by the House, $54,762,132 of the increase being for the liquidation of contracts heretofore authorized, and $1,000,000 for the acquisition of the Washington-Hoover Airport property.

Amendment No. 16: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the clause making $2,500,000 of the appropriation "Barracks and quarters" immediately available.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the appropriation "Medical and Hospital Department": Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision for giving financial assistance to civilian schools training nurses for duty in Army hospitals.

Amendment No. 18, relating to "Military construction, defense installations": Modifies House text in re the acquisition of land so as to conform with prior waivers of section 355, Revised Statutes, requiring determination of validity of title by the Attorney General prior to taking possession and commencing construction, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20: Restore House provision denying the use of Federal funds on account of National Guard personnel found to be not suitable for Federal service, with a clarifying amendment.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, relating to the Organized Reserves; Appropriate an additional $100,000 to enable the conduct of correspondence or extension courses, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out House provision denying the use of Federal funds on account of Reserve officer personnel found to be not suitable for the performance of active duty and the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate and strikes out the minor textual change proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to "Salaries, War Department": Provide specifically for the pay of the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, as proposed by the Senate; establishes a $50 per diem limit on the pay of persons employed temporarily by the Secretary of War, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the provision proposed by the House placing a $5,000 ceiling on salaries of new appointees in the absence of specific authorization.

Amendment No. 30: Broadens section 8 so as to permit of the employment of technicists as consultants or otherwise, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35: Strike out, as proposed by the Senate, the provisions directed against strikers who assist in the maintenance of picket lines and strikers or their employers who refuse to abide by the recommendations of the National Defense Mediation Board, because such provisions are considered to be administratively impracticable, and because they are not practicable of amendment so as to reach the situations at which they are directed without going beyond the jurisdiction of the managers.

Amendment No. 37: Changes a section number, as proposed by the Senate.

Disagreements pursuant to clause 2, rule XX

Amendment No. 2, relating to the appropriation "Expediting production":

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in the amendment of the Senate with the following amendments:

After the phrase, "To enable the Secretary of War", at the beginning of the paragraph, insert ", with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes,".

And at the end of the matter inserted by the Senate insert ": *Provided further*, That no obligations shall be incurred for or on account of objects appropriated for under this head to the Military Establishment except in pursuance of specific appropriations".

Amendment No. 15, relating to the appropriation "Military posts":

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, on page 23 of the bill, strike out the

matter commencing with the word "That" in line 24 and extending down through the comma following the word "further" in line 1 of page 24.

Amendment No. 36, making the appropriations and provisions of the bill effective from and including July 1, 1941:

The managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed that the managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
DAVID D. TERRY,
JOE STARNES
(with exceptions to action on sections 11 and 12),
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE
(except as to sections 11 and 12),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a statement, if I may, to my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], although little needs to be said in view of the statement that has just been read.

As reported and passed by the House, the bill carried appropriations totaling $9,826,509,492.

The Senate has added to the bill $558,312,132, and the conference committee has agreed to that addition, which, if approved by the House, will make a grand total of $10,384,821,624, or the largest amount carried by any single appropriation measure in all our history.

The additional amount added by the Senate is for the following purposes:

First. Acquisition of Washington-Hoover Airport property, $1,000,000. This item has Budget support (S. Doc. 67). In fact, it is the only item added by the Senate for which a regular Budget estimate has been presented.

Second. For liquidation of previously granted contractual authority under Army transportation, $2,450,000.

Third. For liquidation of previously granted contractual authority under military posts, $54,762,132.

Fourth. For the Organized Reserves, $100,000.

Fifth. For the provision of additional munitions plants and the completion of such plants now under way, $500,000,000.

With respect to the latter item I may say that approximately half of the amount has been provided to avoid the necessity of the Army turning to the Defense Plant Corporation of the R. F. C. for aid in proceeding with purely Army projects. We feel that the Army should get its funds directly for purely Army needs, and that is the view of the Senate, as evidenced by the amendment. With view to seeing that this course is followed in the future, we propose to add to the Senate amendment a proviso designed to keep the R. F. C. out of the picture so far as strictly Army projects are concerned.

Outside of money changes, Mr. Speaker, the other modifications are relatively unimportant save three or four. Briefly, in numerical order, these are—

Amendment No. 15, which applies to the provision fixing a 7-percent limitation on engineering and overhead expenses on construction projects. We have brought that item back in technical disagreement, and later I shall yield to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to explain the action which we shall propose.

Amendment No. 19, which relates to the House provision designed to keep the National Guard free of persons who are not available for Federal service. The Senate conferees have agreed to our provision, with the addition of a clarifying amendment, which is printed in the conference report.

A like proposition touching the Organized Reserves, Senate amendment No. 24, goes out under our agreement with the Senate conferees, and, also, the Senate's proposed restoration of current year language, amendment No. 25. The tenure of Reserve officers is unlike that of members of the National Guard. The Reserve officer must establish his qualifications every 5 years, and eliminations of officers who become unsuited for active service may be accomplished in that way.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, are the so-called Case and Pace amendments, amendments Nos. 31 and 32, respectively. These were stricken out by the Senate, and your conferees have agreed to the Senate's action, not because we are not in sympathy with the end sought to be accomplished but because we are convinced that what we are seeking to do is beyond the power of the managers effectively to reach.

These two provisions, it seems to me, self-evidently are administratively impracticable. That is borne out by Under Secretary of War Patterson's letter to Senator THOMAS, of June 12, 1941, printed on pages 28 and 29 of the Senate hearings. What Secretary Patterson says is corroborated by Mr. Knudsen in a letter I have from him dated the 26th instant, and which I shall read:

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1941.

The Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SNYDER: In response to your inquiry, I understand that the sections 11 and 12 of the Military Establishment appropriation bill of 1942, H. R. 4965, the so-called Case and Pace amendments, were eliminated upon the specific request of the Under Secretary of War, because the difficulties surrounding the enforcement of those sections would, in his opinion, result in retarding the national-defense program rather than accelerating it.

The Under Secretary pointed out to the committee that in certain cases it would be absolutely impossible to determine whether or not the law was complied with. In other cases, the information which the contracting officer would have to obtain would be so great, in order to comply with the law, as to make the law impractical of enforcement.

I concur in the opinion expressed by the Under Secretary.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN.

There is only one way to reach this matter and that is to legislate. This bill only touches the Army. There is the Maritime Commission, the Navy, the Coast Guard, lend-lease contracts, and possibly other agencies, and many of the plants manufacturing material for one are also engaged in producing material for others. It is a much involved matter, Mr. Speaker, and certainly one which cannot be properly handled on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Perhaps I did not understand the gentleman, but I understood him to make a statement about loans being granted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the building of plants that will be engaged in war work. I would like a little explanation of that.

Mr. SNYDER. I will be glad to give the gentleman an explanation of that.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POWERS. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] would like to have the subject of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation building munition plants clarified. Is that correct?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. POWERS. You will find that about a half billion dollars have been added to this bill by the Senate for this reason: There was a movement on foot for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its subsidiary, the Defense Plant Corporation, to take over certain War Department moneys and then supplement those moneys with Reconstruction Finance Corporation moneys, to set up a brand new construction organization, probably hire three or four hundred engineers and four or five hundred more accountants to do the work through the Defense Plant Corporation. The way the Senate has amended the bill it permits the organization of General Somervell, construction quartermaster, to do all this work. In other words, when the Appropriations Committee and the Congress appropriate for these plants, we appropriate for them to be done by a specified agency, the construction quartermaster. The language in the bill makes sure that these plants are going to be constructed by an existing organization and not by either a new organization or an expanded smaller organization.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman whether this will in any way interfere with the construction of these plants by private corporations?

Mr. POWERS. Certainly not; these plants are not in that category.

Mr. RICH. I was afraid from what the gentleman said that that might be the case.

Mr. POWERS. No.

Mr. RICH. For if private individuals want to invest their capital in projects that are going to be essential to the progress of national defense we certainly ought to encourage them.

Mr. POWERS. Undoubtedly we should; but let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that private capital will not invest in this type of plant. No. 1: We have a shell-loading plant. Of what use could a shell-loading plant be to private industry after the war? No. 2: We have a smokeless powder plant. Of what use could a smokeless powder plant be to private industry after the war? There are plants that no private

moneys could be obtained for. I feel that the Senate has done a good job in placing this amendment in the bill, and I feel that the conferees have done a good job in agreeing to it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The object of this appropriation is to keep this outfit in the hands of General Somervell and not permit the creation of a duplicate organization of governmental construction under the R. F. C.

Mr. POWERS. Exactly, and we all admit that General Somervell is doing a capable and efficient job. His organization is tops at the present time and will be bettered if possible.

Mr. RICH. I am not in sympathy with duplication of work by Government bureaus.

Mr. POWERS. Certainly not.

Mr. RICH. I was trying to make the point that we do not want to do anything to discourage private capital investing in national-defense undertakings.

Mr. POWERS. I hope the gentleman is satisfied with my explanation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. Gladly.

Mr. TABER. I notice the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] did not agree to the elimination of sections 11 and 12.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will permit an interruption I may say that each of these gentlemen later will make a statement on their position.

Mr. TABER. That will be all right.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in yielding me a few minutes' time, and I do not want unnecessarily to take the time of the House by shadow boxing or unduly emphasizing the importance of a newspaper article, but I believe the leading article in the Washington Post this morning in its implications is something I should call attention to. The article reads:

[From the Washington Post of June 28, 1941]

ARMY SEEKS TO PUT UNITED STATES ON VIRTUAL WAR FOOTING—DEPARTMENT EXPECTED TO ASK AUTHORITY TO SEND TROOPS ABROAD, KEEP GUARD ON DUTY

(By John G. Norris)

The War Department plans to ask Congress to make a formal declaration of a national emergency, a step that would put the Nation on a virtual war status and make it possible for troops to be sent anywhere in the world.

President Roosevelt, it was learned last night, has approved the Army's plan to keep the National Guard and Reserves in active service beyond their year of service, a step that requires action by Congress. Army chiefs want to accomplish this by a congressional declaration of national emergency.

Retention of the Guard and Reserves could be authorized by a simple resolution passed by Congress, it is said, but the declaration of an emergency would invoke other powers applicable in wartime. Selectees, for example, may be kept in active service beyond their year of service only when "Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled."

Such a declaration would also remove restrictions on the use of guardsmen and selectees outside the Western Hemisphere and American possessions. Practically all other war powers not applicable under a Presidential declaration of a national emergency would come into effect should Congress make the declaration.

PROTEST STORM FORECAST

The request, when made, is expected to raise a storm of protest among opponents of the administration's foreign policy, and War Department heads plan to confer with Senate and House leaders before formally presenting their proposal. Should the latter indicate that sentiment in Congress would be opposed to the move, it may be restricted, perhaps, to specifically authorize retention of the Guard, Reserves, and selectees, and cover other specified war powers.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not want unduly to emphasize the importance of this article. It is rather strange that the War Department would be coming to Congress asking Congress for some declaration of international policy. There may not be anything in it. I am inclined to think there is not anything in it, but in view of certain rather bombastic and jingoistic utterances of some Cabinet officers and other people in high places this may be put out as a trial balloon. The article states—

The request when made is expected to raise a storm of protest among opponents of the administration's foreign policy.

In order to keep the record straight I should like to say it would raise a little storm of protest by one Member of Congress who has gone 100 percent with the administration's foreign policy. I supported the President, Secretary Hull, and Sumner Welles because I thought they were doing a grand job on the whole. I believe in the philosophy which has so far underlain their actions. I believe there can be no security and no peace, and no prevention of war in America unless somebody somewhere stops Adolf Hitler. I believe the peace and security of America is directly tied up in this European conflict. I have therefore been ready to do everything in our power to strengthen the arm of Great Britain, send materials over there; in fact, I think we ought to be on a 24-hour, 7-day-week basis instead of fiddling around with 8-hour shifts and quibbling about overtime.

Not only that, but I think we should see that Great Britain gets the things we propose to send over there, and if anybody challenges the right of American ships to sail the seven seas, I think the American Navy is ready and it should be ready to take such action as may be necessary to protect the right of these ships upon these seas. The man today who stands before the American people and advocates a declaration of war either does not know anything about what he is talking or else he is utterly stupid, or both.

The idea of this country going off now and trying to settle the conflicting emotions and ideologies of Europe to me is ridiculous, even if we were prepared to do so, and we are not. There are many reasons why we should not go abroad. It is only necessary to state one, and that is we have not the troops nor the equipment.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody has a notion in his head, either in the War Department or in any other department that they can come up to this Congress and get any sort of declaration that will put us aggressively into the European war or that will send American expeditionary forces abroad, I think the sooner they get the idea out of their heads the better it will be.

I hope our distinguished Speaker and our distinguished minority leader if and when they are called into this conference, if such a conference is ever held—and may I say again it may all be a smoke screen—they will tell the friends who are inquiring about it, whether it be the War Department or anybody else, that the Members of Congress, like the American people, are with the President 100 percent in defense of the Western Hemisphere, we are ready to defend it to the last ditch, and we will go further than that, we will never let Hitler get even his toe in the front yard of the Western Hemisphere. When we go beyond that, then we are getting into difficulties far beyond anything that has been approximated so far.

There is nothing in the picture today which, by the slightest imagination, should cause Americans to consider seriously a declaration of war or a declaration of any sort of policy that will suggest that we are going to send an expeditionary force abroad.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the statement made by the very able gentleman from Virginia to the effect we are prepared as a Congress and as a people to spend any amount of money and to exert whatever effort is necessary for the defense of America and the Western Hemisphere, but there is neither cause nor reason at this hour for this Nation to become involved in the present World War No. 2, therefore we do not propose to become involved by congressional action and a formal declaration of war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] referred a moment ago to the statements that appeared in the papers this week to the effect that Secretary Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, was in favor of going into war now. I have always been curious about why the President, who must be familiar with the fact those statements are made around the country, does not discipline his Cabinet officers or at least impose some restraint upon them.

Those statements go around the country, people become exercised about them, and, after all, the President is the boss, he is in position to place some restraint upon the jingoistic statements that are made. I am wondering why he does not do it.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. So am I. My real purpose in taking the time of the House this morning is to give you a very short and concise report of a tour of inspection I made of Army cantonments and Army posts in the Southeast during the last 10 days. In this area, the Fourth Corps Area, approximately 33⅓ percent of all Americans in uniform are training today. Men from New England, from the Midwest, from the South are training in that area now.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the Army in training in this area at the present time is the best-housed, the best-clothed, and the best-fed Army in the history of the American Republic. The morale of the men is at an extremely high pitch. Never have we had less trouble, never has it been necessary to take such a small amount of disciplinary action in all of our history. This speaks volumes for the morale of the youth of America, about which we have wondered so many times.

Undoubtedly everything is being done that can be done to see that our men are properly cared for. Not only are they well fed, well clothed, and well housed, but every effort is being made to provide for their entertainment, amusement, and their welfare during this 12-month period of training.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have my serious doubts as to the wisdom of legislation which would keep the selective trainees and the National Guard in service longer than the period of 1 year for which they were ordered. I very seriously doubt the wisdom of so doing unless this Nation is actually involved in war. In a sense we would be breaking faith with them and breaking a contract with them, if we kept them in for a period of longer than a year at this time.

The construction program is practically completed in this area. The training grounds and training facilities are very good, indeed. The rate of progress in the training program is highly satisfactory. The southeastern air training center at Maxwell Field, in Montgomery, Ala., is a model. It is training America not only how to fly but to fly well. They are training British pilots in that area also.

At Fort Benning, the second largest post in the country in area and number of men in training, we find that the Fourth Division is completely equipped and that the mechanized division in that area is completely equipped. Roughly speaking, all of the divisions in this area have at least 60 to 70 percent of the motorized equipment they need. In some instances 80 to 90 percent of the light motorized equipment is available. There is a shortage at this time, however, in heavy motorized equipment, especially the 2½-ton trucks, but this shortage is rapidly being overcome. These needs are being met by industry.

There are some shortages, however, to which I wish to direct your attention. There is an extreme shortage in 60- and 81-millimeter mortars, which are part of the equipment of every infantry regiment. There is a shortage of 105-millimeter howitzers, the new artillery weapon of the Army. There is a shortage of the new 90-millimeter antiaircraft guns. There is a shortage yet in the modern 37-millimeter guns. These shortages will not be overcome for some 6 or 8 months, and in some instances almost a year; therefore it emphasizes the necessity of 24-hour, 7-day-a-week construction, uninterrupted by any strikes and stoppages and uninterrupted by any demands for further concessions by business and industry in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the gentleman refers to a shortage, would he mind giving us some idea of what percentage the shortage is? In other words, are we 20-percent equipped, or 15-percent equipped, or 40-percent equipped, or 90-percent equipped?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I would say, speaking broadly and generally, that about 80 percent of the light motor equipment is available to each combat division. The heavy motorized equipment will run from 15 percent up to 75 percent in each of the combat divisions. Each division is rapidly being equipped with all of the Garand rifles necessary, because at the present time Government arsenals plus private firms are providing a sufficient number of Garand rifles daily to equip an infantry regiment.

There is an acute shortage of ordnance in certain lines, but there is a sufficient amount of 60- and 81-millimeter mortars and the other ordnance of which I spoke, except the 90-millimeter antiaircraft guns and the 105-millimeter howitzers, for the training of the divisions. However, they are woefully inadequate for combat purposes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As far as small equipment is concerned, particularly rifles, may I say that we have nearly 3,500,000 rifles of the old type in addition to the others.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes; there is no shortage there.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is any of this shortage for our own defense caused by the fact that we are sending abroad under the Lease-Lend Act more of our equipment than we should send?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I did not hear that complaint raised. It may be true with reference to certain air centers which I was unable to visit. However, as you know, the big need thus far in the American Army for planes has been for training planes. That need is being met.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. We frequently read in the paper or hear the statement made that a lot of these boys are training with broomsticks, and a lot of other things of similar character. In view of what the gentleman said in answer to the inquiry by the gentleman from Kentucky about having on hand 3,500,000 rifles, does not the gentleman feel that that is a mistake, that if any such condition as that does prevail it may perhaps have been in some place where they have perhaps been a little slow in getting equipment of that kind to a particular post or cantonment, but that the material is available and is being used just as rapidly as it can be gotten to the troops?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Generally speaking, of light infantry weapons, the gentleman is eminently correct. I believe too much emphasis has been placed upon exaggerated reports in the press with reference to the shortages of ordnance. It is true that of certain types I mentioned a moment ago, since they are new types in some instances and will not reach mass production or appreciable production until September, there is naturally a great deal of simulation of these weapons in maneuvers; this gives rise, of course, to exaggerated reports which reach the public from the press.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. In my district there is a manufacturer for whom for months I have been trying to connect with the War Department for the production of approximately 1,400,000 shells, either 75-, 90-, or 105-millimeter shells. It does not involve any Government building or any housing. This manufacturer has domestic orders for his men but wants to take a part in the arming of our country; yet we are battered back and forth between the departments here and the coordinator in Ohio, and the men in my district who want to help arm the boys from my district seem unable even to get close to a contract. They talk about large prime contracts with large manufacturers, so why not break that down and use some of the potential possibilities of that great machine State from which I come? What is true of my district is true of every district in Ohio, yet a little State like Connecticut has gotten three times the war orders Ohio has gotten. They are not even touching the potentialities of the State of Ohio to produce armament.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I appreciate the contribution the gentleman has made and realize the necessity of breaking down these contracts so that we can reach out and touch and vitalize the entire productive capacity of America. I believe that has not been done as yet.

and that more prime contracts should be given to smaller contractors and that large prime contractors should be forced to give more contracts to subcontractors so that we may utilize the full industrial capacity of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand that some of these large concerns have contracts for producing shells 3 years ahead, with production stalled in their territory and in their factories, while other manufacturers who are just as able to go ahead and produce this equipment have nothing to do.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am afraid that is true in many instances, and I think the gentleman is doing the country and the public a service when he calls the attention of this country to this particular condition.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield for another question on something else, I notice that sections 11 and 12 are eliminated by the conference report. Will the gentleman give the House a little something about that?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be glad to.

Sections 11 and 12 were eliminated from the conference report because Under Secretary of War Patterson, General Somervell, and Mr. Knudsen testified before the Senate subcommittee or contacted the chairman of the respective subcommittees by letter or in person, stating that these two amendments were impossible of administration from a practical standpoint. While they had no criticism to make of the intent and purpose sought to be achieved by the proposed amendments, yet they felt that they were administratively impossible and that instead of helping they would hinder our defense program. With that view being so forcefully presented by the men charged with the responsibility on the part of the War Department and the Office of Production Management of obtaining necessary and essential items for defense, the conferees agreed to eliminate the sections.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I personally did not agree with the attitude taken because I felt it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to adopt a policy with reference to unwarranted and unnecessary strikes which have hampered and impeded the defense program. Undoubtedly, the shortages that we are faced with today and which threaten our security come from two sources: First, because of the adoption of new models of weapons and equipment for which we have not yet been able to provide plants so that we can have mass production; and, secondly, because of hundreds of stoppages by strikes involving millions of man-hours of work, led in many instances—not all—but in many instances by known Communists, by known exconvicts, and by known aliens, who up until the time that Hitler double-crossed his pal, Joey, were doing everything in their power to aid and assist the Axis powers in preventing this country from providing adequate security for itself and aid for England. Of course, since Adolf has double-crossed Joe, all the left-wing elements and all the communistic elements in this country will now find that a holy war is being engaged in by the fatherland and they will insist that America get actively and actually into this present conflict. I make this statement without any equivocation or reservation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Who will do this insisting and will they want us to get in bed now with Stalin and all these Communists? As I said the other day, we might just as well get in bed with a rattlesnake or a skunk as to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. From an ideological standpoint nobody in America, except Communists and fellow travelers, want to get in bed with the Soviet Union, because it is like getting in bed with a rattlesnake and a skunk, but from a practical standpoint I think every loyal American citizen is agreed that whatever obstruction we can place in the path of Adolf Hitler, in his march for world conquest, whatever practical assistance we can give to England or any other country that will dissipate his force and his power it is our duty to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, we hear with interest these reports on our Army camps and on the operation of the new Army equipment. What a great many of us would like is an opportunity at some camp near Washington to see these things with our own eyes. Why does not the Military Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department prevail upon the Chief of Staff to arrange for the benefit of Members of Congress a review of our military strength at some place near Washington? We would like to see these new arms and equipment in action. Once we see these things we can tell our anxious constituents what progress we are making.

I do not feel that I do a good job when I go home and tell inquiring people that somebody said we had this and that equipment. I would like to see these things with my own eyes.

Mr. SNYDER. I will invite the gentleman to join me one day and I will take him out to Camp Meade.

Mr. THOM. I think the preferable method would be to have a good-sized demonstration for the benefit of the whole House so we can all go at one time and do the job in 1 day or half a day. I think that would be very beneficial.

Mr. SNYDER. We might even do that.

Mr. THOM. I would like to have the gentleman join in such a request and I would like to have the Speaker of the House join with the gentleman in asking the War Department to give us such an opportunity.

Mr. SNYDER. We might do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RICH rose.

Mr. SNYDER. O Mr. Speaker, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] had talked himself out. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania says that he thought I had talked myself out. I hope for my own satisfaction that that is not the case. I heard the statement made awhile ago by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. He said that the President and Secretary Hull had done a grand job, on the whole. I think they have done a grand job of putting us in the hole; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point certain appropriations that have been made and the status of these appropriation bills at this time. It is a very small statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Present totals of appropriation bills, June 28, 1941

	Status	Total
BILLS		
Agriculture	Conference report filed.	$1,060,500,063.00
District of Columbia.	Passed Senate.	54,785,686.00
Independent offices.	Law	1,414,626,838.00
Interior Department.	Submitted to President.	188,325,923.00
Labor-Federal Security.	Passed Senate.	1,200,511,100.00
Legislative	do	25,087,486.00
Military	Conference report filed.	10,384,821,624.00
Navy Department	Law	3,415,521,750.00
State, Commerce, and Justice.	do	279,142,477.00
Treasury and Post Office.	do	1,147,624,384.00
War Department (civil).	do	228,601,828.00
Urgent deficiency	do	393,687,775.00
Fourth supplementary national defense.	do	1,376,464,602.00
First deficiency	do	191,478,544.88
Defense aid	do	7,000,000,000.00
Fifth supplementary national defense.	do	2,299,767,920.00
Additional urgent defense.	do	174,409,630.00
Emergency relief	Passed Senate.	936,390,000.00
Second deficiency	Passed House.	879,321,270.80
Grand total		32,651,068,901.68
JOINT RESOLUTIONS		
Clothing, Army		175,000,000.00
Merchant ships		313,500,000.00
Tennessee Valley Authority.		40,000,000.00
		33,179,568,901.68

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. In a moment. That will show to the Congress and to the country just how far in the hole we are. This hole is a deep one, but naturally, of

course, I am for national defense. I want to do what I can to protect and defend this country against any aggression, regardless of where that comes from—any individual or any country—and, as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], I would not let Hitler or any other foreign country come and get a toehold in America, and that means North and South America. If we want to defend the Monroe Doctrine or keep it in force, we will naturally have to do that; but while we are making these great expenditures for war, let us be very vigilant that we do not do something that will lead us into the European or Asiatic war itself. I am more interested in keeping this country at home where we belong, attending to our own business as best we can so that we do not wreck America. That is the most vital thing that should be in the mind of every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States. If Stalin wants to get at war with Hitler and Hitler at war with Stalin, that is up to them. Let them fight it out. We will not fight a war with either or against either in Europe or Asia. I hold no brief for either of them. I do not want to defend either of them. I want to see them take care of themselves, and if they are going to fight each other, and both are annihilated, I think for the benefit of the world each will have done a good job. I now yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. When the gentleman spoke about the President and Mr. Hull putting the country into a hole, I was wondering whether the gentleman had voted for the $7,000,000,000 aid-to-Great Britain bill.

Mr. RICH. Certainly I did not. I opposed that, and that is one of the best votes that I ever cast in the House of Representatives—against the lend-lease and against the $7,000,000,000; and if the gentleman voted for it, then he is giving away from the taxpayers in America, and his own taxpayers, $7,000,000,000. That is going to take the money of the gentleman's taxpayers for years and years. It will aid greatly in wrecking America instead of aiding the United States of America.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. No; I cannot yield now. I am answering the gentleman's question, and I do not yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But I thought the gentleman was asking me a question, and I tell him that I am proud that I voted to aid Great Britain in this.

Mr. RICH. That may be, but the gentleman has to answer to his own people down there for taxing them for the rest of their days, and their children and their children's children. He is going to compel them to carry a load that the squandering of this administration has placed upon them because of recklessness in expenditures and inefficiency in government. Who is responsible for that? The men who voted for it, and you fellows who are responsible for it will have to answer to your constituents and to the American people. Great Britain never did anything for the United States, and I say why wreck the United States for any European country? I want to aid them diplomatically but not by war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

CASE AND PACE AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about antistrike legislation in connection with national-defense projects. The only positive action that this House has taken has been in the form of two amendments that were first adopted, the Members will remember, during our passage of this War Department appropriation bill, and subsequently were incorporated in the second deficiency bill which passed the House a few days ago.

The first of the amendments was the one which I introduced, that sought to prevent interference with workers who tried to return to work after the National Defense Mediation Board had declared further stoppage of work would critically impede the defense program.

The second of the amendments was the one introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], which denied further access to funds from the bill to any person, firm, or corporation which failed to follow the recommendations of the National Defense Mediation Board within 10 days.

These amendments were adopted by large majorities. They were adopted because of the rising temper of the House against the mounting tide of strikes and the consequent delay in the production of essential items in the program.

They were adopted because the House, following the debate on the Starnes and Smith amendments, was determined that something should be done. Their adoption served notice on the administration, on the country, and on the employers and employees that if something was not done to change the situation, Congress would take drastic action, even though we had been repeatedly told the situation should and would be handled by administrative action.

The administration took action and troops took over a California airplane factory. Leaders in industry sat up and took notice and a healthier situation generally began to develop.

The amendments went to the Senate. There, according to press reports, testimony was given by the Under Secretary of War that it would be difficult to administer the amendments, inasmuch as the General Accounting Office would require proof in every claim that none of the persons who would receive any part of the money had violated the provisions of either amendment.

At the same time the Under Secretary, in his communication to the Senate Appropriations Committee, said:

> The War Department favors in principle any practicable means that will prevent delay by strikes, lock-outs, or otherwise in the performance of the national-defense program.

Admittedly it is difficult by a limitation in an appropriation bill to do the job that should be done by legislation that should come from one of the legislative committees of the House. Nevertheless, in any effort to meet the reported objections, I redrafted a combination of the two amendments and submitted it by wire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who was out of the city, and from him I received the following reply:

> Your suggested substitute entirely satisfactory.

I then prepared a memorandum giving the amendments and the substitute and submitted the same to the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, after discussing them with him by telephone. Under permission granted by the House, I include a copy of the memorandum and a reply received from him shortly afterward:

MEMORANDUM

Suggestion for compromise alternative for so-called Case and Pace amendment to War Department and deficiency appropriation bills to be proposed at conference with Senate:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation in connection with a contract for the production of defense articles or facilities who or which the National Defense Mediation Board certifies has failed to respect or abide by the recommendation of the Board, or has sought forcibly to prevent the return of workers, within a reasonable time after the Board has previously certified to the President that further stoppage of production under the contract will critically impede the national-defense program and has called upon the persons, firm, or corporation to resume production."

The original Case amendment reads:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Law 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Defense Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work."

The original Pace amendment reads:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation, who shall, for as long as 10 days, fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces."

It will be noted that the new text relieves the General Accounting Office and the War Department of determining who comes under the ban. The National Defense Mediation Board does not need to make the determination except in those cases where it desires to do so. The value of the amendment, however, is that it does give the Board a stick to use if and when it desires to do so.

Your comments or suggestions are welcome.

FRANCIS CASE, M. C.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1941.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: Reference is made to your memorandum containing a suggested compro-

mise alternative for sections 11 and 12 of H. R. 4965 as proposed by the House of Representatives in which you request my comments relative to the suggested alternative section.

While the compromise alternative does relieve the War Department of determining who comes under the ban, there are other objections to the original section which are not remedied by the suggested compromise. The principal ones from the viewpoint of the War Department being:

1. No provision is made with respect to payment for defense articles produced but not delivered previous to the date of certification by the National Defense Mediation Board. It is not clear whether the War Department could take delivery and make payment for such defense articles or would be prohibited therefrom.

2. In cases where the contractor is certified as the offender by the National Defense Mediation Board, no provision is made with respect to the unfinished portion of his contract. That is, would certification by the National Defense Mediation Board forfeit the contract or merely suspend its further execution until the contractor had complied with the recommendations of the Board.

3. There is no provision under which the contractor or employee involved could purge himself and receive compensation either for past or future work and services. As prepared, the proposed compromise alternative would seem to be a permanent bar to payment of applied funds to any contractor or employee guilty of violation thereof.

4. It is not clearly stated whether the prohibition applies to compensation earned but unpaid previous to the date of certification or only to compensation earned subsequent thereto.

In my opinion, the objections listed above render the incorporation of such provision very unadvisable at the present time. The problem involved would seem to be impossible of solution by a legislative provision in as few words as the one proposed.

I appreciate your courtesy in bringing the suggested compromise alternative to my attention and giving me an opportunity to comment relative thereto.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

The Under Secretary's letter was delivered to me by special messenger just before the conferees met. I thereupon drew the following provisos to add to the substitute combination to meet the additional objections raised:

Provided, That nothing in this section shall prevent payment in connection with articles or facilities produced in whole or in part prior to such certifications: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall prevent the National Defense Mediation Board from rescinding the certification of failure to comply or from rescinding the certification of interference with the return of workers.

The Secretary's aide took the additions to the War Department for examination while we continued the conference. Shortly the Under Secretary called me on the telephone and advised that, while he thought the provisos met a part of the problem, he was not sure that they fully covered the situation in which a contractor might breach his contract in an effort to renew the contract later at higher prices, or where the War Department might want a contractor to resume production under a contract once breached.

From attitudes expressed in the conference, it had become apparent that regardless of how the amendment might be drawn it would not be accepted by the conferees for the other body. Accordingly, over the protest of the gentleman from Alabama and myself and some other members of the conference, the majority of the conferees agreed to the Senate amendment striking out the so-called Case and Pace amendments. Reluctantly, then, we signed the report, making a note of our exceptions to the action on these amendments.

I have reported the situation in this detail to the House because of the wide interest shown by the Members in the subject. Debate on antistrike legislation for defense industries occupied the better part of 2 days in this body. The amendments were adopted by large majorities and a second test vote on the Face amendment showed an increasing and overwhelming majority.

It is my belief that the responsible legislative committees of the House should take note of this feeling and bring in comprehensive legislation dealing with the subject. It is difficult by a single limitation on an appropriation bill to deal with the situation. Obviously it is a negative approach while positive, affirmative legislation is needed. The leadership of the Congress and the administration cannot continue to excuse and alibi inaction to the country.

There will always appear to be something artificial and synthetic about calling our situation an unlimited emergency as long as you draft men to fight at $21 a month and permit employers or employees, getting guaranteed profits and high wages, to stop production of the guns and planes the drafted boys are to use. You can talk about emergencies and crises until you are black in the face but as long as you permit that situation to continue, you will not get national unity and you will not convince people that the emergency is what you say it is. They believe the emergency is to deal with the conditions that are delaying the production of defense articles and facilities.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 2: Page 2, beginning in line 14, strike out lines 14 and 15 and insert:

"Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense: To enable the Secretary of War to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national-defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the War Department during the fiscal year 1942, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of War are desirable in expediting production for military purposes and are approved by the President, $1,271,896,000, of which amount not to exceed $771,896,000 shall be for payments under contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941: *Provided*, That the appropriations and contract authorizations provided under this head in the appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941, and the appropriation provided by this act, are hereby consolidated and shall constitute one fund and one contract authorization, respectively, and remain available until June 30, 1942: *Provided further*, That an account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized under the several appropriations herein consolidated and reports thereon shall be submitted to Congress on or before July 1, 1942."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 2 with an amendment as follows: On page 2, line 17, after the word "War", insert ", with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes."

And on page 3, line 18, before the period, insert ": *Provided further*, That no obligations shall be incurred for or on account of objects appropriated for under this head to the Military Establishment except in pursuance of specific appropriations."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 25, line 12, after the word "engineering", strike out the words "and overhead."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, on page 23 of the bill, strike out the matter commencing with the word "That", in line 24 and extending down through the comma following the word "further", in line 1, of page 24.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain letters pertaining to the subject matter under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment pertains to the 7-percent limitation that was placed in the bill on my amendment, for Army overhead and engineering, in the construction of Army projects. On page 25, in lines 12 and 13, the

House placed a provision, on my motion, which reads as follows:

Provided, That engineering and overhead expense shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of any project.

The Senate committee rejected the entire amendment. The bill was amended on the floor of the Senate to read as follows:

Provided, That engineering expense shall not exceed 7 percent of any project.

Prior to the time the Senate committee had stricken the amendment from the bill the Engineer Corps of the Army sent out a letter pertaining to this amendment. General Somervell, construction quartermaster, sent a copy of that letter to my office, and I understand he sent a copy of the letter to each conferee and to each Member of the House and Senate subcommittees. I shall place these two letters into the RECORD at this point under my leave to extend, together with my reply thereto:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 12, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: I am enclosing for your information a copy of a letter from the Office of the Chief of Engineers to the Budget Officer for the War Department. I am sure you will be interested in the figures submitted, as they bear on the provisions of the appropriation act which I understand you were instrumental in formulating, which reduces the total overhead in engineering costs permissible on the projects to 7 percent.

Though our overhead costs are not so high as those cited in the letter, I am sure you will realize the impossibility of our being able to do business on the basis fixed in the act.

I hope you will keep this in mind if the matter is brought up before the House-Senate conferees.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Brigadier General, United States Army.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 10, 1941.

Subject: Comments on Proposed Amendment, Military Appropriations Bill, Fiscal Year 1942.

Memorandum to Budget Officer for the War Department:

1. It is understood the following amendment introduced on the floor of the House was accepted: H. R. 4965: On page 24, on line 4, after "1941", insert "*Provided*, That the engineering and overhead expenses shall not exceed 7 percent of the cost of project."

2. The amendment carrying the above limitation is not fully understood. If the amendment is intended to provide that all costs to the Government other than the contract cost shall not exceed 7 percent, the experience in this department shows that it will be impossible in performance. The following is a summary of Government costs in connection with cost-plus-a-fixed-fee construction contracts as of April 30, 1941. These figures are based on a study of 24 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee construction contracts with a total estimated reimbursement to the contractor of $76,428,598.

Cost to Apr. 30, 1941

	Amount	Percent of total reimbursements to contractor
Reimbursements to contractor	$13,679,941.10	
Government cost:		
Inspection and supervision	227,117.94	1.7
Surveys	34,549.92	.3
Auditing and general administration	291,599.65	2.1
Overhead (field)	78,982.61	.6
Overhead (district, division, and Office, Chief of Engineers)	676,553.89	4.0
Total Government cost	1,308,804.01	9.6
Engineering		4.0
		13.6
Estimated total reimbursement to contractor	76,428,598.07	
Estimated Government cost:		
Inspection and supervision	1,118,725.04	1.4
Surveys	152,825.00	.2
Auditing and general administration	1,446,942.22	1.9
Overhead (field)	232,825.69	.3
Overhead (district, division, and Office, Chief of Engineers)	2,721,066.53	3.6
Total estimated Government cost	5,672,384.48	7.4
Engineering		4.0
		11.4

Similar detail for each contract is available in this office.

3. From the above study it will be noted that engineering costs will average about 4 percent. All other items have cost 9.6 percent to date with an estimated cost on completion of project of 7.4 percent. It is not clear what the item overhead, as used in the bill, will cover. The above tabulation shows that the term overhead as used in this department to include deferred cost of field, district, division, and Chief of Engineers office expense was estimated to be 3.9 percent. This alone plus the 4 percent for engineers would exceed the 7 percent established in the bill.

4. It is recommended that the amendment be deleted from the bill.

For the Chief of Engineers:

E. E. GESLER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Chief, Finance Section.

JUNE 15, 1941.

Brig. Gen. BREHON SOMERVELL,
Construction Quartermaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Your letter of June 12 enclosing a copy of a statement made by the Office of the Chief of Engineers has been received.

This, of course, pertains to engineers' projects. I would like to have you give me a similar statement itemizing the expenditures of the 11 percent overhead on the following construction jobs: Camp Jackson, S. C.; Camp Dix, N. J.; Fort Bragg; Indiantown Gap; Camp Edwards.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

In his letter of June 12 General Somervell refers to the Chief Engineer's memorandum of June 10. The Chief Engineer's Office, in this memorandum, sets forth an itemized statement of what purports to be Army overhead on two projects, on which the Army engineering and overhead on those two projects ran as high as 13.6 percent.

I discussed this matter at the time I offered my amendment when the bill was under discussion on the floor of the House. I say here and now deliberately that if the Engineer Corps cannot operate on less than 11 or 13 percent for engineering and overhead they had better get out of the construction business and let somebody do it who can.

When I received that copy of the letter from the Engineer Corps I wrote General Somervell a personal letter. I called attention to the fact that the construction Quartermaster Corps had added 11 percent on every Army project. Of the $800,000,000 cantonment construction cost, $88,000,000 had been added on by the Army construction quartermaster for engineering and overhead. I selected five specific projects in my letter. I asked him specifically: "What I want to know is, what did you do with the 11 percent that you added onto the cost of Camp Dix, Camp Edwards, Fort Bragg, Fort Jackson, and Camp Devens?" Remember, the Engineer Corps had sent out a letter, and on the strength of that letter the Senate committee had stricken the amendment from the bill entirely. I received another letter, which I shall place in the RECORD at this point, in which General Somervell sets forth the actual engineering costs on those five projects:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 23, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: In reply to your letter of June 15, there is tabulated below the information you requested concerning the overhead at a group of our camps.

Project	Architect-engineer		Constructing quartermaster		Administration Washington		Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Percent
Fort Jackson	$1,200	0.007	$267,624	1.54	$350,846	2.02	3.567
Fort Dix	37,530	.23	349,576	2.17	346,100	2.15	4.55
Fort Bragg	500,000	1.29	700,000	1.81	671,408	1.74	4.84
Indiantown	280,000	1.66	191,931	1.14	335,351	1.99	4.79
Edwards	428,299	1.50	378,183	1.33	506,841	1.77	4.60

All of the above-listed projects about which you inquired are large projects and, as you are well aware, the overhead on a large project is proportionately less than it would be on a small project. It is anticipated that on future work there will be certain increases in the overhead of projects due to the fact that increased work of checking, auditing, and inspection will be added to the items covered in the overhead of the constructing

quartermaster. This work was formerly done by the contractor and was checked by the constructing quartermaster. It is now proposed to have the constructing quartermaster take over these functions from the contractor. This will eliminate some duplication and overlapping of functions and will result in a saving in the over-all cost of the project, but will cause an increase in the constructing quartermaster overhead.

However, it is not anticipated that the limitation of 7 percent for overhead and engineering will be exceeded for the program as a whole, but it will be impracticable to stay within this limitation on certain projects, particularly the smaller ones.

For the quartermaster general:

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Brigadier General, U. S. A.

It will be noted that the total cost of overhead and engineering on these projects did not exceed in any case 5 percent. The highest was 4.84 and the lowest was 3.56 percent.

I wrote General Somervell another letter, which I shall place in the RECORD, in which I then asked him to tell me what he did with the 11 percent. In other words, I wanted to know what he did with the difference between the actual overhead in these cases and the 11 percent that was allowed for engineering and overhead.

This letter reads as follows:

JUNE 24, 1941.

Brig. Gen. BREHON SOMERVELL,
Chief, Construction Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I am in receipt of your letter of June 23 giving me the engineering and overhead on the projects of five cantonments. I understood that the Army added 11 percent for engineering and overhead to each of these projects. If they did add 11 percent, please advise what they did with the difference between the total amount of engineering and overhead as set forth in each project and the actual amount deducted. For instance, the cost at Camp Edwards was $29,000,000; 11 percent of $29,000,000 would be $3,190,000, of which $1,313,123 was used for the architect-engineer, construction quartermaster, and administrative expenses at Washington, leaving $1,876,877 unaccounted for. Assuming that the total 11 percent was deducted, what I want to know is was the 11 percent deducted; if so, what became of this $1,876,877, and similar information on each project.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

Before he received that letter General Somervell came to the office and asked me to withdraw my amendment. I then asked him personally about the matter:

You charged $3,190,000 against Camp Edwards in engineering and overhead—

I said:

You have accounted for approximately $1,300,000 on that project. What did you do with the other $1,890,000 that you charged for engineering and overhead?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman referred to engineering overhead.

Mr. ENGEL. Engineering and overhead.

Mr. THOMASON. Engineering and overhead. Just what does the gentleman include other than fees to architect engineers?

Mr. ENGEL. I included the camp construction quartermaster's cost. His fee is in there, his inspection work is all included in this. It includes the architect engineer, including his fee and his expenses. In the case of the camp-construction quartermaster it included his expenses, his cost of inspection, and the administration office expenses in Washington, ranging from 1.74 to 2.22 percent. That is all included in it.

Mr. THOMASON. When an architect-engineer takes a contract on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis and receives therefor from 3 to 6 percent for himself, does not the gentleman feel that ought to cover all engineering expenses?

Mr. ENGEL. I made that statement on the floor of the House. The only reason that I thought it ought to be limited to 7 percent on these contracts was because I did not think I could get a 5-percent amendment through. Yes; I believe 5 percent is what it ought to be.

When General Somervell came to the office at that time I asked:

What did you do with the $1,890,000 difference? At Camp Edwards the total engineering and overhead was 4.60 percent—the difference between that and 11 percent.

He said:

It was used for contingencies.

I said:

What contingencies?
Well—

He said—

it was used on some project.

"What projects?" I asked him.

Finally he said to me that they were taking the difference between the actual engineering and overhead which at Camp Edwards was 4.6 percent and the 11 percent charged on one project and using it on another project.

I said:

Then you are taking engineering and overhead charged against project B and allowed for project B and using it on project C?

He said:

Yes.

It is upon such showing I base the statement that if the Army engineers cannot get along without from 11 to 13 percent overhead they ought to get out of the construction business and let somebody do it who can.

Mr. THOMASON. What is the average percentage that an architect-engineer would receive on a cantonment job that cost say $10,000,000?

Mr. ENGEL. I believe at Camp Edwards the expenses of the architect-engineer plus his fixed fee amounted to 1½ percent of the job. I am not talking about a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, but I am talking about the engineer's fixed fee plus his expenses. At Camp Edwards it was 1½ percent; at Indiantown Gap, 1.66 percent; at Fort Bragg, 1.29 percent. At Fort Dix, where it was a competitive bid job, it was .23 percent, and at Fort Jackson it was .007 percent.

Mr. THOMASON. Assuming that the cantonment cost $10,000,000—and that is a right modest assumption, what does the gentleman think a reasonable architect-engineer's fee should be?

Mr. ENGEL. Camp Edwards cost $29,000,000.

Mr. THOMASON. What would the architect-engineer on that job receive?

Mr. ENGEL. Approximately $450,000.

Mr. THOMASON. He would receive a fee of approximately $450,000.

Mr. ENGEL. That is not correct. The architect-engineer's fee plus all of his cost, his office expenses were all paid—his fee and office expenses amounted to 1½ percent.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true—and I again commend the gentleman for the fine work he has been doing because I happen to be chairman of a committee that has been investigating the same subject—is it not true that in practically every project that cost from $3,000,000 to $25,000,000 or more the fee of the architect-engineer ran from $25,000 to more than $100,000 and that the architect-engineer did not gamble anything?

Mr. ENGEL. He had everything paid for. Every man he hired was paid for, all his supplies were paid for, his inspectors were paid for, and in addition to that he got his fee.

Mr. THOMASON. May I interrupt to say that in the investigation now being made by the committee of which I am chairman, we had the case of an architect in Oklahoma who was a Reserve officer on a W. P. A. job. Thereafter he took a job building two camps in Louisiana where in 9 months he made $70,000. I undertake to say nobody can defend fees like that. I want to commend General Somervell in the highest terms. I have great confidence in both his ability and integrity. Now that he is in full charge of these contracts, I feel sure that we will not again hear of these excessive and unjust cost-plus fees to both contractors and engineers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on the splendid work his committee is doing. These investigations are having a tremendous effect upon construction costs.

Mr. THOMASON. There may be instances where because of lack of time a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract can be justified, but does not the gentleman believe that where a contract is large, say $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, there ought to be a sliding scale of fees so that regardless of the size of a job the architect-engineer or the contractor could not get a straight percentage of 5 percent, 3 percent, or whatever it might be of the total cost where the fee itself would run up into many thousands of dollars? Does not the gentleman think there could be a negotiated fee that would be fair and based on the size of the job and the amount of work to be done?

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman knows I am opposed to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. It is my observation that as soon as we put a defense tag on any measure that is brought in here that it brings about waste and extravagance. I want to commend the gentleman upon his efforts to see that every dollar that is put into defense work is a dollar well spent, and I want also to say that I support him in his endeavor to put these contracts on a competitive-bid basis. I think it is right.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I should like to make this observation, and make it in the form of a question, because the gentleman has made a very searching investigation of the subject: Does not the gentleman feel that in the construction of the ordinary cantonment, maybe the building of a hundred temporary buildings, such contract could be well executed by competitive bidding, and that the only excuse or justification ever to have a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract might be where the project is a technical one such as the construction of a powder plant or shell-loading plant or something like that, where time and speed are of the essence?

Mr. ENGEL. I am opposed to all cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, and particularly so in case of the construction of cantonments.

Mr. THOMASON. Should we not get away from that just as quickly as we can?

Mr. ENGEL. I agree with the gentleman's first premise.

In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the House will recall that at Camp Meade it cost $17,364 to build a 63-man barracks, while at Camp Dix, a competitive-bid job, it cost $9,800. Since that time I have received information that at Fort Sheridan it cost $8,350, and at Camp Custer, Mich., $8,200 to build the same barracks, in the same zone, with the same material, with a higher wage rate, than at Camp Meade, where it cost double the amount, or $17,364. At Fort Sheridan carpenters received $1.62½ per hour.

Mr. Speaker, when General Somervell was in the office he said, "We have some difficulty on small jobs in keeping within the 7 percent." I said, "I am willing to accept an amendment which would make my amendment apply only to jobs in excess of $200,000 or $300,000." Then he objected on the ground he would have to make a return in each case to the Comptroller General. I did not want to add any more Army red tape, so finally we agreed. My amendment applied only to this bill. We reached an agreement which would apply to all construction. We agreed first, in no case was the engineering and overhead on the over-all program to exceed 7 percent. Second, he agreed not to charge against any project any overhead and engineering except the overhead and engineering incurred on that particular project. Third, he was to give a report to any member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations at any time they asked for it at reasonable intervals.

The first letter was not satisfactory. I finally received a second letter from General Somervell which sets forth the agreement and with the understanding they are to keep within the terms of that letter I am placing in the RECORD at this point, I accepted the conference report which strikes out this engineering and overhead cost.

This letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 27, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: Supplementing our conversation in connection with the proposed limitation of 7 percent for engineering and overhead on construction projects, this office would find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to remain in that figure on the smaller and more complex projects. To require such a limitation would likewise introduce administrative complications on the larger projects which would be very objectionable.

This office can assure you:

(1) That a figure of 7 percent for engineering and overhead will not be exceeded on the over-all program;

(2) That no overhead or engineering costs will be charged against any project except the actual expenditures for these purposes on that project, and

(3) That any committee, subcommittee, Senator, or Congressman will be furnished a report on our actual expenditures for these purposes at any reasonable intervals.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Brigadier General, U. S. A.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to thank the members, not only of my committee, but of the House as a whole for their splendid cooperation with me and with my committee in bringing about the result contained in this bill that is about finally to pass the House. It has been a long, strenuous task, but the splendid cooperation that has prevailed generally has made the task much easier.

I wish to add this observation at this time, based upon my own philosophy of life; that is, if you have flowers to spread, you should spread them while there is life and not after death. If you have nice things to say about people you ought to say them while they are living.

It seems to me fitting to speak a word of praise today of our great airplane industry. Yesterday a wonderful feat was accomplished at Los Angeles when the largest airplane ever built made its initial and successful flight. It was my pleasure to stand there in the factory beside one of the wheels of that plane. The wheels are 8 feet tall, 30 inches in diameter, and weigh 26 pounds more when filled with air than when the tires are empty. The plane has a wing spread of 210 feet and weighs 87½ tons fully loaded. I saw it weighed. The airplane is capable of flying 8,700 miles without coming down.

We should feel proud of this feat and of the service of our engineers and the sturdiness and determination of those engaged in the aircraft industry.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36. Page 76, line 1, after section 12, insert:

"SEC. 13. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday one of the columnists whose column is syndicated all over the country carried an observation with respect to the fact that the busy men in the War Department who are looking after the defenses of the country lose much time because they have to give ear to congressional delegations and Members of Congress. It occurs to me the matter was set up in such a light as to be somewhat of a reflection on Congress and its lack of appreciation of its responsibility in the defense program.

I have called General Marshall's office once since he has been Chief of Staff. I have had occasion, however, to call the War Department many times every day on routine matters, and I have discovered, as you have discovered, that it is necessary to get at least five or six branches down there before you can find out what you want to know. So this morning I sent General Marshall a letter and suggested that he set up a congressional liaison office in the War Department, staffed with some real competent help; that Members of Congress route all their criticisms, complaints, and inquiries through that department; let them find out about it and call us back. I believe that would be in the interest of time and economy, both for busy Members of Congress and for busy members of the War Department.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman does not say that in criticism of the War Department, does he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4646. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the

stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1942

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 32, 54, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$606,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That irrespective of the total number of enrollees either authorized or actually enrolled, in no event shall there be expended more than $1,000 per actual enrollee per year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 48, line 16 of the bill after the first "and" appearing in said line insert the word "by"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 8 of said amendment after the word "agency" insert the following: ", nursing school"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$74,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$201,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, and 11.

M. C. TARVER,
BUTLER B. HARE,
ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $850,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, as proposed by the House instead of $490,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: [1]

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $606,000 for salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, instead of $595,000 as proposed by the House and $608,220 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, safety and health program (national defense), Bureau of Labor Standards, instead of $176,500 as proposed by the House and $276,500 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: [1]

Amendment No. 8: [1]

Amendment No. 9: Provides specifically for salaries of the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: [1]

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 13: [1]

Amendment No. 14: [1]

Amendment No. 15: Provides a limitation of $1,000 on the amount that may be expended on each enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps instead of $950 as provided by the House and $1,060 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Inserts language in the bill designed to make the limitation contained in amendment No. 14 applicable to each enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps regardless of the number of enrollees that may actually be recruited.

Amendment No. 17: Eliminates an appropriation of $10,000,000 at this point in the bill which by Senate action had been transferred from another section of the bill relating to national-defense items. The effect of the action is to restore the item to the point in the bill where provision had been made therefor by the House.

See footnote on page 5682.

Amendment No. 18: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 19: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 20: Eliminates a Senate provision proposing to make available specifically the funds provided for education and training of defense workers for certain national-defense purposes. The conferees consider that the general authority contained under this education and training item is sufficiently broad to encompass the objectives sought in the Senate amendment should the need for such training become manifest.

Amendment No. 21: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 22: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 23: Adopts Senate language proposing to include certain schools exempt from taxation under a certain provision of law in the general program of national-defense vocational training.

Amendment No. 24: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 25: Eliminates a Senate provision similar to amendment No. 19, and for the same reasons assigned.

Amendment No. 26: Restores language inserted by the House and deleted by the Senate proposing an appropriation of $10,000,000 for national-defense training of youths employed on work projects of the National Youth Administration. This amendment is a corollary of action taken on amendment No. 16.

Amendment No. 27: Eliminates a Senate provision similar to amendment No. 19, and for the same reasons assigned.

Amendment No. 28: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 29: Incorporates a Senate provision requiring the National Youth Administration to submit certain quarterly reports to Congress.

Amendment No. 30: Eliminates language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate proposing to require preference to nonyouth workers in the matter of vocational training for national defense. It is the thought of both the Senate and House conferees that the provision retained in the bill, requiring that no maximum age limit for trainees shall be established, is sufficient authority to insure against any discrimination against the older worker in the training program for national defense.

Amendment No. 31: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 32: Eliminates a Senate provision similar to amendment No. 19, and for the same reasons assigned.

Amendment No. 33: Incorporates in the bill a Senate provision designed to permit the Commissioner of Education to delegate to any officer in his office any of his powers or duties.

Amendment No. 34: [1]

Amendment No. 35: [1]

Amendment No. 36: Adopts language inserted by the Senate amending House language designed to require a contribution from the District of Columbia government to Freedmen's Hospital commensurate with services rendered by such hospital to residents of the District of Columbia. The Senate amendment more effectively accomplishes the purpose provided in the House language.

Amendment No. 37: [1]

Amendment No. 38: [1]

Amendment No. 39: [1]

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $1,665,000 as proposed by the Senate for disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, instead of $1,615,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Adopts Senate language designed to expand the scope of the agencies that may be beneficiaries of Federal funds for nurse training under the Public Health Service.

See footnote on page 5682.

Amendment No. 42: Adopts Senate language designed to clarify procedural phases of operating the nurse-training program under the Public Health Service.

Amendment No. 43: [1]

Amendment No. 44: Adopts Senate language proposing to make the appropriation for grants to States for unemployment-compensation administration under the Social Security Board available for operation of employment-office facilities and services essential to expedite the national-defense program.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $74,000,000 for grants to States for aid to dependent children, Social Security Board, instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House and $78,000,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: [1]

Amendment No. 47: Adopts Senate language, slightly modified, which has the effect of protecting the civil-service status of employees assigned to or on detail to the National Youth Administration.

Amendment No. 48: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 49: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 50: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 51: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 52: A clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 53: Adopts Senate language permitting items in the bill under the National Youth Administration to be cited as a separate act.

Amendment No. 54: Restores House language deleted by the Senate which makes the appropriation for St. Elizabeths Hospital available for purchase of newspapers.

National Labor Relations Board

Amendment No. 55: [1]

National Mediation Board

Amendment No. 56: [1]

National Railroad Adjustment Board

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $201,440 for salaries and expenses instead of $207,780 as proposed by the Senate and $200,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Limits the availability of the funds appropriated for salaries and expenses to $45,000 for the services of referees as proposed by the House instead of $50,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Limits the amount that may be expended for personal services, from the funds appropriated for salaries and expenses, to $111,380 as proposed by the Senate instead of $110,000 as provided by the House.

Amendment No. 60: [1]

Amendment No. 61: Eliminates language inserted by the House and deleted by the Senate proposing to require non-civil-service positions under certain agencies appropriated for in the bill to be allocated among the various States on the basis of population.

Amendment No. 62: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 63: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 64: Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 65: Corrects a section number.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 10, and 11 are reported as being in disagreement, and it is the present intention of the House managers to move in the House that the House further insist on its disagreement to these Senate amendments.

M. C. TARVER,
BUTLER B. HARE,
ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, quite a number of amendments were made in the Senate to the House bill. Most of these amendments were of a minor character. All of them are covered in the conference report with the exception of four which deal with the amounts of the appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

Insofar as major amendments are involved and are dealt with in the conference report, the position of the House in the greater portion of the cases involved was substantially sustained, so it appears that there is no need to consume the time of the House to discuss the amendments which are dealt with in the conference report, in the absence of the desire of some Members to direct attention to a particular amendment and the action had thereon. Unless some Member desires to ask a question of that type, it is my purpose at this time to move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, as I have stated, the amendments in disagreement relate in their entirety to the appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor and should appropriately be considered together. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the amendments in disagreement, Nos. 3, 4, 10, and 11, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments in disagreement:

No. 3: On page 3, line 10, strike out "$215,500" and insert "$219,000."

No. 4: On page 3, in line 17, strike out "$1,538,000" and insert "$1,749,500."

No. 10: On page 12, in line 9, strike out "$4,697,700" and insert "$5,406,800."

No. 11: On page 12, in line 10, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,035,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, and 11.

Mr. Speaker, while it is possible the Members of the House might agree without debate to the motion which has been made, it seems to me that the matter involved is one of sufficient importance to indicate the propriety of its being discussed, at least briefly, in order that there may be no question in the mind of anyone with regard to the issue which is involved.

As I have already stated, each of these amendments deals with one of the several appropriations made to the Wage and Hour Division in the Department of Labor. When this bill was considered in the House, I pointed out to the Members of the House in my presentation of the bill the issue which has arisen with reference to the carrying on of necessary investigations by the Wage and Hour Division in the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the desire of the Administrator, General Fleming, to have a sufficient investigatory force to enable him to investigate at periodic intervals the plant of every employer in the United States.

With that viewpoint our subcommittee took issue, feeling that investigation of the character which is carried on by the Division of Public Contracts, charged with the duty of enforing the Walsh-Healey Act, should be sufficient to insure efficient administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

We pointed out that in the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act the Division of Public Contracts is accustomed to make what are called spot inspections of 25 percent, approximately, of the number of employers who have contracts with the Government involving $10,000 or more, and whose contracts, therefore, come under the jurisdiction of that Division, and, in addition thereto, to make investigations in all cases in response to complaints. This procedure has apparently brought about an efficient administration of the work of the Division of Public Contracts in dealing with the Walsh-Healey law.

We pointed out that the same type of administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act would provide for the inspection of approximately 75,000 plants of employers out of 300,000 involved, and that the funds which we recommended for inclusion in the bill would be sufficient to enable the Wage and Hour Division to inspect that percentage of the plants of the employers involved and in addition to make such inspection as might be necessary in response to complaints that might be submitted.

I wish to go back a little further to the passage of the appropriation bill for the Labor Department for the fiscal year 1941. Budget estimates were submitted which were very largely in excess of the amount which was recommended by the subcommittee in the submission of the bill for this fiscal year. Some considerable controversy arose with regard to the reductions which the committee had undertaken to bring about. The Senate added to the bill sufficient amounts to bring the amounts appropriated up to the full Budget estimate. In conference an agreement was finally reached by which a reduction of substantially $400,000 below the Budget estimate was agreed to and was approved by both Houses.

The Wage and Hour Administration at that time was very much disturbed, feeling that its work for the fiscal year 1941 would be greatly hampered by reason of this reduction. What are the facts? As you will find from the hearings and from the committee report, the Wage and Hour Division will have at the end of this fiscal year of the moneys appropriated $750,000 as an unexpended balance; in other words, if it had secured the full amount of its Budget estimate it would have had for the present fiscal year $1,150,000 more than it has been able to expend.

[1] In each of these amendments the Senate has eliminated language making the appropriation available for the purchase of either newspapers, newspaper clippings, or both. In each case the House has receded from its position and the authority to so purchase will no longer exist.

Despite that fact, it procured the submission to Congress of Budget estimates which would have increased the amount available for the present fiscal year by approximately $563,000, so that for the next fiscal year, if those Budget estimates had been fulfilled, there would have been made available for the Wage and Hour Division approximately $1,300,000 more than it has had for the present fiscal year.

The committee felt that in view of the fact that the Division has been unable to expend $750,000 of the money that has been made available for this fiscal year, it ought to be able to get along for the next fiscal year on the same amount it has had for the present fiscal year, which will enable it to spend $750,000 more for the next fiscal year than it has spent during the present fiscal year.

The House concurred in the position of the committee. At the time we presented this bill to the House, in the committee report, and in the remarks which I offered in the presentation of the bill, we called attention to the fact that the matter involved is one of policy and that if the Congress feels that the Wage and Hour Administration should investigate the plant of every employer in the United States, instead of carrying on the character of inspection which is carried on by the Division of Public Contracts, then it should properly increase the amount of the appropriations to the full amount of the Budget estimate, and any Member of the House who might entertain the opinion that that should be done was invited by the committee and by myself in the presentation of the bill to offer an amendment providing for that increase in order that the sentiment and viewpoint of the House might be ascertained, and no single Member of the House offered on the floor, by amendment or by other expression, the suggestion that, in his judgment, it would be appropriate that the amount should be increased as desired by the Wage and Hour Administration.

We now come back to you with the same proposition we had when we originally presented this bill. The Senate has restored the full amount of the Budget estimate. If it is the desire of the Congress that the Wage and Hour Administration should undertake to inspect the plant of every employer in the United States, then it is probable that the full amount of the Budget estimates would be necessary for that purpose.

We conceive that in many industries, such as the automobile industry, where there is no question but that the minimum wage is being paid, and where, if there were any violations of the maximum-hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, those industries being highly organized, the attention of the authorities of the Wage and Hour Division would certainly be promptly called to the dereliction there is no neces y for periodic and repeated field investigations of those particular industries.

We also felt it was never contemplated by the Congress that this administration, going further than any other similar administrative organization of the Federal Government, should undertake to investigate the plant and books of every possible law violator, which would include every person, firm, or corporation in the United States employing persons engaged in the production of goods for interstate commerce.

We have moved here that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments. We repeat the statement which was made in the presentation of the bill originally that if the House feels that this wholesale investigation of the plant of every employer in the United States should be made, then you ought to vote down the motion which is now being offered, but if you feel that the committee has dealt fairly with this matter and that the same type of enforcement which is being carried on in the Division of Public Contracts in the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act should be sufficient for the enforcement of this law, and if you feel that with $750,000 more than it has expended for the present fiscal year, the Wage-Hour Administration ought to be able to satisfactorily discharge the duties which devolve upon it, then you should support the motion which is offered by the committee to further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. How widespread is the violation of the Wages and Hours Act?

Mr. TARVER. There seems to be very efficient enforcement at the present time with the funds presently available. The committee has not received, as it has in previous years, complaints as to inefficiency of administration. That is one reason we conceived there is no necessity for expending more than three-quarters of a million dollars next year in excess of what we have spent this year.

Mr. THOM. Of course, the gentleman realizes that it is unfair for a businessman to have a competitor violating the law and therefore putting him at a disadvantage.

Mr. TARVER. I wish to assure the gentleman that every member of the subcommittee is interested in the efficient enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the only question here involved is what provision of funds is necessary in order to achieve that objective.

There is one other thing to which I want to call the attention of the House, and I do so regretfully, because it is not a pleasure to say anything in criticism of an administrative officer of the incumbent administration, but while the conferees were considering this subject matter, Gen. Philip B. Fleming, the Wage and Hour Administrator, made a speech at Greeley, Colo. I am not particularly concerned with his having made a speech to an organization meeting at Greeley, Colo., but he issued a news release containing that speech and circularized all the regional offices of the Wage and Hour Administration and certain newspapers of the country with copies of that speech, which was quite evidently intended to influence propaganda to be used in an effort to bring pressure upon the conferees to get them to agree to the larger amount above the House bill which was desired by the Wage and Hour Administration. There are two objections to the procedure that he followed. One is that title XVIII, section 201, of the United States Code, forbids the use of any money appropriated by the Congress to any administrative organization of the Government in an effort to influence the action of the Congress on legislation of any type, and while the amount of money involved may have been, and probably was small, we conceive that in the action of General Fleming in using moneys appropriated to his Division in an effort of this type, calculated to influence the action of the conferees who were then presently considering the bill which is now before us, General Fleming was acting in violation of a Federal law.

There is just this further comment to be made in connection with the statements made by him in his Greeley speech, and that is that in certain particulars they were not only incorrect, but at the time that General Fleming made the statements, he must have known that they were not in accordance with the facts. For example, he stated that the subcommittee handling this bill and presenting it to the House indicated that they felt that he could properly discharge the duties devolving upon him merely by making inspections in response to complaints. The subcommittee has never made any such suggestion. The subcommitte report which accompanied the bill upon its presentation to the House expressly negatives any such idea, but on the contrary, as I have already said, indicated that we provided funds sufficient for the inspection of about 25 percent of the plants of the employers affected by the provisions of the act, and that in addition to that there shall be of course inspection in every case in response to a submission of complaint.

I have addressed to General Fleming on this subject a letter under recent date. I received from him a reply, and I submitted to him a reply to the letter which he had sent to me. These communications are too lengthy to warrant my undertaking to quote them in the presentation of this matter at this time, but with the consent of the House I insert them at this point:

JUNE 21, 1941.

Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Wage-Hour Administrator,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL FLEMING: My attention is called to a news release issued through your office under date of June 18, 1941, consisting of a copy of your address scheduled for delivery on that date before the forty-sixth annual convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor.

The address seems to consist mainly of propaganda intended to affect the action of the conferees on the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill in dealing with the amount of funds appropriated for your Division, a matter which, as of course you know, is now pending in conference.

The news release in question, if paid for with funds appropriated to your Division, is in apparent violation of Federal law contained in title 18, section 201, of United States Code, which reads as follows:

"Use of appropriations to pay for personal service to influence Members of Congress to

favor or oppose legislation: No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearings by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both" (July 11, 1919, ch. 6, par. 6, 41 Stat. 68).

It is, of course, rather remarkable that a law-enforcement official of the Federal Government should himself be violating one of the laws of the country which is of equal dignity with the laws it is his duty to enforce.

Aside from this consideration, it appears that in the news release in question misstatements of fact were made by you in an effort to influence the action of the conferees, which misstatements must have been known to you to have been untrue at the time they were made. For example, you say on page 6 of your release, referring to our House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department, "They feel that we can get universal and uniform compliance if we will do nothing more than make an inspection after someone has complained that the law has been violated." There are a number of other misstatements of fact in this news release, but a discussion of this particular one will show just how flagrantly you have ignored the truth in this propaganda effort.

Pages 13 and 14 of our committee report pointed out that the Director of the Division of Public Contracts is able to make approximately 25 percent inspection of the firms coming within the provisions of the act which he administers and indicates the feeling of the subcommittee that this percentage of inspection in addition to the investigation of complaints should be sufficient to bring about adequate enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The committee report not only does not state that it feels that nothing more should be done than inspection after complaints, but further states positively with reference to the sum now carried in the House bill for your Division:

"The sum will be sufficient to investigate all complaints of violation that might be registered with the Division and will permit, in addition thereto, inspector service to be available for spot checking industries throughout the United States. In the opinion of the committee this is as far as Congress ever intended the Bureau to go in the matter of enforcement. In 1940 the Wage and Hour Division made 5,127 inspections. In the first 9 months of 1941 they made 37,000 inspections, which total represents approximately 12 percent of the total firms covered by the act. If the Division is able to inspect 50,000 firms per year, the committee would regard this action as effective enforcement. With the funds provided—and such funds are approximately $750,000 in excess of the amount to be spent this year—it will be possible to inspect something in excess of 75,000 firms per annum and at the same time investigate all complaints that might be registered involving violations of the act."

On behalf of the House subcommittee, who are now serving as conferees on the bill in question, I wish to inquire as to the number of copies of the news release in question which have been circulated by your Division and as to the type of individuals or organizations to whom the news release has been sent throughout the United States, and to ask definite information regarding the amount of Federal funds appropriated to the use of your Division which have been used for this purpose.

I further wish to inquire whether or not your traveling expenses in attendance upon the convention at Greeley, Colo., on the occasion when the address discussed is supposed to have been delivered were paid by you personally or from funds of the appropriation made to your division, and, if from funds appropriated to the uses of your division, the exact amount thereof.

Of course, the subcommittee has been receiving communications from interested parties throughout the United States who in conection with these communications relied upon the misstatements of fact made by you in your news release.

Since your action in using funds appropriated to your division, if in fact you did, was in clear violation of the statute quoted, it would seem appropriate that you should make restitution to the appropriated fund of the amounts so misused without regard to whether the Secretary of Labor or the Attorney General may take action in accordance with the provision of section 201, title 18, or not.

I am transmitting a copy of this communication to each of these officials for such consideration as they may deem it proper to accord it.

Yours truly,

M. C. TARVER.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
Washington.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TARVER: This is in reply to your letter of June 21, not received by the Department until the morning of June 24, in which you take exception to certain statements made by me in an address delivered on June 18, 1941, before the Forty-sixth Annual Convention of the State Federation of Labor at Greeley, Colo.

This speech was substantially a reiteration of the statements made by me in a letter of June 3 addressed to the members of the Committee on Appropriations in which I protested the expression of policy carried in the report of the committee against the necessity of routine inspections for the fair and uniform enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In its report the committee expressed its opinion. In my letter to the members of the House Appropriations Committee and in my speech at Greeley, I expressed my opinion and I think that I can say it is an informed opinion based upon nearly 2 years of actual experience in the administration and enforcement of the act.

The report of the committee seeks to justify its position in opposition to routine inspection by citing experience in the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act. Let me again refer you to that portion of my Greeley speech, starting on page 7 of the mimeographed copy (copy of which is attached), in which I think I have shown conclusively that the enforcement problems arising under the two statutes are not analogous. I quote:

"It was argued that the Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor does not make routine inspections in the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act. That is the law, you will recall, which requires the payment of the prevailing rate of wages and time and a half for hours in excess of 8 a day or 40 a week on work done in the execution of supply contracts of over $10,000 for the Federal Government.

"But the situations are not comparable. For one thing, for every employer subject to the Walsh-Healey Act, a thousand are subject to the wages-and-hours law. Again, the employers who are subject to the Walsh-Healey law are well known. All you have to do is go over to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department and look at the contracts. There you will find their names and addresses carefully noted. Moreover, the determination of the prevailing wage which must be paid as a minimum has been made by the Secretary of Labor before the execution of the contract. Thus, the employer's bid has been based in part upon his knowledge that he will have to pay the prevailing wage rate. It is much less likely that violations of the terms of the contract will occur, but even so, the Administrator of the Walsh-Healey law has expressed his own conviction of the need for systematic inspections for compliance with its terms.

"In any event, the situation in regard to the wage-and-hour law is far different. Today well over 300,000 employers are subject to that law, and some 15,000,000 employees are covered. We do not know who all of them are. There are little shops and factories in back streets or up dark alleys employing 3 or 4 or a dozen people producing goods for interstate commerce. We do not know about them until our inspectors hunt them out. Moreover, an employer who is not subject to the law today may be subject to it tomorrow, merely by developing a new market for his product. Similarly a worker may not be entitled to the wage or overtime benefits today, but may be entitled to both tomorrow because of some slight change in the nature of his occupation.

"It may surprise you to know that there still are thousands of workers in the country who do not know that they are entitled to the benefits of the wage-and-hour law. In the course of our routine inspections we run across them constantly. We make an inspection, ascertain that the employees have not received the wage or the overtime to which they are entitled, and require the employer to make restitution. Sometimes when the employees are handed their restitution checks they break down and weep, not merely in gratitude but also in amazement. They didn't know they were entitled to not less than 30 cents an hour and time and a half for overtime beyond 40 hours a week. I recall the case of a colored mammy employed in the women's rest room of a railroad station in West Virginia. One day an official of the road walked in and handed her a check for $300. She almost fainted. She had never heard of the wage-and-hour law, didn't know she had not been paid all she was entitled to. She had never made a complaint. In all probability she never would have made a complaint.

"There are millions of such people who, for no fault of their own, simply are not able to protect themselves. They are not going to be protected unless the Government, through the Wage and Hour Division, does it.

"On the other side of the ledger are millions of people who think they are entitled to a good deal more than they actually are under the law. We get many complaints of law violation from people in retail and service establishments and from other people expressly excluded from the benefits of the law. Naturally all such complaints have to be investigated, though such inspections may end up as a waste of time and energy, since the workers are not under the law.

"What would happen if we were not permitted to make an inspection until a specific complaint of violation had been filed with us? One thing that would happen would be that we would probably get few complaints from many people who stand in the most desperate need of help. They are in the very lowest of the low-wage industries. They are ignorant of their rights, or they have been so thoroughly intimidated that they are afraid to complain. On the other hand we would probably find ourselves wasting much more time on complaints from people who are not covered, and for whom we can do nothing."

The necessity of making routine inspections under the Fair Labor Standards Act is amply proved by our experience over the last year. Again let me quote from that portion of my Greeley speech in which I cited the figures to prove the point. I quote from the bottom of page 10 and the top of page 11 of the mimeographed copy:

"I said a moment ago that some employers could be in very flagrant violation and we would not know it because the employees haven't had the courage, or the necessary knowledge of the law, to protest. I can prove that by the book. In the first 9 months of the present fiscal year—that is, from last July 1 to March 1 of this year—we reviewed 12,621 complaint cases in Washington. That is, these were cases based upon complaints of violation, usually filed by workers. Roughly, one-half of those cases involved violations serious enough to warrant the payment of restitution to employees. In the same 9 months 19,635 cases based upon routine inspections were reviewed. Of these, 5,359 involved violations serious enough to warrant the payment of restitution. Not only that, but more than half of all the cases involving violations so serious that we had to take them to court were unearthed in the routine inspections. In other words, if we had not made routine inspections, nearly half of the violators we found in 9 months would have gotten away with it and their wronged employees, who have recovered hundreds of thousands of dollars that has been spent for needed food and clothing and the other necessities of life, wouldn't have recovered a plugged nickel. Thus, the statistics suggest that if we do nothing more than act upon complaints, we shall be overlooking a good full third of the lawbreakers, and probably the most incorrigible and defiant."

For some months we have been conducting conferences with various trade associations for the purpose of enlisting their support in bringing about compliance with the law upon the part of their members We have been signally successful in this endeavor. But we have been able to enlist such assistance only upon assurances that after a short time we would institute routine inspections throughout the industry concerned. This is the only guarantee we can give to the complying employer that his unconscionable competitor will not be able to obtain a competitive advantage over him by paying illegally low wages. It is the cooperating employer, far more frequently than the employee, who insists upon routine inspections for his own protection, not only against violating competitors but also to avoid liability resulting from unwitting violations.

Labor, both organized and unorganized, has a very vital stake in this matter, since if violations in considerable areas of industry subject to the law are permitted to go undetected, wage-and-hour standards will deteriorate in one industry after another. That has been the teaching of history in relation to the enforcement of laws of this character, a teaching amply documented by the almost unanimous testimony of enforcement officials in the several States and in foreign countries.

I have considered the provisions of title 18, section 201, United States Code, which you quoted in your letter, with reference to the subject matter of my speech. It is my opinion that no one can seriously contend that the Greeley speech constitutes a violation of this section.

Moreover, I think that the statements which were made by me in the Greeley speech, when the text is considered in its entirety, are fully justified by the facts.

While the relevance of the cost information which you request regarding my Colorado trip and the mimeographing and distribution of the Greeley speech is not apparent, I am happy to furnish the information. The cost of my trip to Colorado and return, I am informed, was $162.45. During the course of the trip I also addressed the Denver Chamber of Commerce, at noon on Tuesday, June 17, broadcast 15 minutes over Station KOA, in Denver, at 10 p. m. that night, and addressed the Rotary Club of Greeley at noon on Wednesday, June 18. Three hundred and forty copies of the Greeley address were mimeographed. Of this number 25 were mailed to the Division branch office in Denver for distribution among Colorado newspapers. One copy was furnished to each of the following: The Washington Post, the Washington Times-Herald, the Washington Star, and the Washington News, and Washington offices of the Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service. A total of 265 copies were distributed among the regional field offices of the Wage and Hour Division, in line with usual procedure of providing the field with copies of regulations, bulletins, and administrative decisions for the continued information of a staff distributed widely throughout the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The remaining undistributed copies of the speech were placed in stock to satisfy individual requests.

The cost of mimeographing the speech, paid for with funds appropriated to this Division, was $15.51, which is itemized as follows:

Cost of paper	$3.66
Cost of ink	.50
Cost of stencil	2.25
14 man-hours of labor, at 65 cents an hour	9.10
	15.51

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator.

JUNE 26, 1941.

Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Wage and Hour Administrator,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL FLEMING: I have your undated letter in reply to my letter of June 21. In my letter to you of that date there were two substantial subject matters involved:

(1) That you had made a statement in your Greeley speech which was untrue regarding the attitude of the House subcommittee. The statement was quoted. The statement of the House subcommittee, as contained in the House report on the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, was also quoted, showing conclusively that this statement was untrue. Merely quoting a large part of the remainder of your speech does not in any way affect this issue, nor does your statement on page 5 of your letter, that the statements made by you in your Greeley speech are fully justified by the facts, constitute anything except a conclusion. You know, of course, that the portion of your Greeley speech which I quoted to you is not justified by the facts, for the committee has never expressed the attitude which you said it had expressed, that investigation should be made only in response to complaints.

(2) In my letter of June 21 I expressed the opinion that you had prepared and circulated this news release, and made the speech in question, at a time when the appropriation for your Division was under consideration for the purpose of influencing congressional action thereon, and that the use of Federal funds for such a purpose was in violation of quoted Federal law. It is noted that in your instant letter you do not deny having had such purpose. The question of amount of money involved is not material. The question of whether you were right or wrong in your insistence as to the amount of this appropriation is not material to this particular issue, and therefore the rehashing by you of the various arguments advanced in order to secure larger sums desired is surplusage.

So far as issues raised in my letter are concerned, you do not have the right to use any money appropriated to your Division in an effort to stir up individuals or organizations to propagandize Congress in favor of a larger appropriation for your Division. This is what you have done, and it is clearly in violation of quoted law.

I do not have in my file a copy of your letter of June 3, addressed to members of the Appropriation Committee, to which you make reference. I think you must have omitted sending me copy of this letter. Whether you sent it or not, it could have been nothing more than a reexpression of the views which you expressed in committee hearings, and nothing therein contained could have justified propagandization efforts intended to influence the action of the conferees in connection with the amount of your appropriation.

Yours truly,

M. C. TARVER.

Personally it is a matter of little moment to me what procedure the General may see fit to follow in the presentation to the country at large of his contentions regarding the amount of his appropriations, but I do conceive it to be inappropriate, when conferees of this House are undertaking to discharge their duties in connection with a pending appropriation bill that an administrative officer of the Government should take money appropriated by Congress for other purposes, and use it in an effort to bring pressure to bear on the conferees, to have them reach a contrary decision to that which they have reached theretofore in the consideration of appropriations to be made available to him or to his agency for the next fiscal year, and which certainly, if otherwise appropriate, would be a matter subject to severe criticism that in such an effort he should make statements that are patently not in accordance with the facts, and which he must have known at the time they were made were untrue.

I have nothing else to offer on the subject matter, unless some Member desires to ask a question. If any Member of the House desires to submit a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, in lieu of the motion that I have offered, I would have no objection to his doing so. I feel that the House ought to understand this matter thoroughly, and that its vote here today should indicate and will indicate whether it desires that this wholesale inspection of the plant of every employer in the United States should be carried out as contemplated by General Fleming, or whether

the House and the Congress will be satisfied with the type of inspection which is indicated in the committee report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider the motion by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in the discussion of the conference report on the Army appropriation bill and include therein certain letters and correspondence between myself and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and the Under Secretary of War, Hon. Robert Patterson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution from the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks the correspondence to which I just referred during the discussion on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM and Mr. BISHOP asked and were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 3 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House recessed until 3 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The House was called to order at 3 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the expiration of the recess.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4972. An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HERRING, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4700. An act to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k)."

AMENDING TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

Mr. MAY, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 2097), to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k), for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"(k) Shall have power in the name of the United States—

"(a) to convey by deed, lease, or otherwise, any real property in the possession of or under the control of the Corporation to any person or persons, for the purpose of recreation or use as a summer residence, or for the operation on such premises of pleasure resorts for boating, fishing, bathing, or any similar purpose;

"(b) to convey by deed, lease, or otherwise, the possession and control of any such real property to any corporation, partnership, person, or persons for the purpose of erecting thereon docks and buildings for shipping purposes or the manufacture or storage thereon of products for the purpose of trading or shipping in transportation: *Provided*, That no transfer authorized herein in (b) shall be made without the approval of Congress;

"(c) to transfer any part of the possession and control of the real estate now in possession of and under the control of said Corporation to any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States: *Provided, however*, That no land shall be conveyed, leased, or transferred, upon which there is located any permanent dam, hydroelectric power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter built by or for the United States or for the Authority, except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer of Nitrate Plant Numbered 1, at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, or to Waco Quarry: *And provided further*, That no transfer authorized herein in (a) or (c), except leases for terms of less than twenty years, shall be made without the approval of the President of United States, if the property to be conveyed exceeds $500 in value; and

"(d) to convey by warranty deed, or otherwise, lands, easements, and rights-of-way to States, counties, municipalities, school districts, railroad companies, telephone, telegraph, water, and power companies, where any such conveyance is necessary in order to replace any such lands, easements, or rights-of-way to be flooded or destroyed as the result of the construction of any dam or reservoir now under construction by the Corporation, or subsequently authorized by Congress, and easements and rights-of-way upon which are located transmission or distribution lines. The Corporation shall also have power to convey or lease Nitrate Plant Numbered 1, at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, and Waco Quarry, with the approval of the War Department and the President."

And the Senate agree to the same.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

E. D. SMITH,
ELMER THOMAS,
G. W. NORRIS,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 2097.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the conference report at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement with respect to this matter and say to the House that, due to a clerical error in the copying of the conflicting sections of the bill under consideration, the wrong section was included instead of what the conferees intended should be included in copying the report.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that the House reject the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment and re-

quest a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. CLASON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include statements by three persons on the same subject. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $101 to print it, but it would cost more to print them separately. Therefore, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTRASTING ATTITUDES OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET GOVERNMENTS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of last night carried a story with this caption, "Oumansky Assured United States Will Aid Soviet Wherever Possible," and a subhead read, "Welles Informs Envoy Requests Will Get Favorable Consideration." Let me continue with the three leading paragraphs of this story:

> Russia had formal assurance today that any request she may make for American material aid in her fight against Germany will receive immediate attention and as favorable consideration as possible.
>
> This assurance was given Constantine Oumansky, Soviet Ambassador, when he called on Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles late yesterday to inform him officially of the "predatory attack of Nazi Germany" against Russia.
>
> Emerging smiling from his conference with Mr. Welles, the Ambassador told newspapermen he had received a clear-cut statement of United States policy toward the conflict and a promise that "all questions deriving from the German attack will receive immediate and friendly attention."

While the Ambassador smiles and while our Government is giving him assurances of immediate and friendly attention to his every request as Russia fights for its life, there is an American mother in my district in New Jersey who is literally dying by inches because the Soviet Government will not give immediate and friendly attention to the requests of the American Government and Secretary of State Hull to grant her son, a native-born American citizen, an exit visa from the Soviet.

Herein lies one of the most tragic stories of this war, particularly as it directly affects the lives and welfare of the American citizens involved.

The mother I describe is Mrs. Sophie Putkowski, a naturalized American citizen domiciled in Passaic, N. J., and her son is Dr. Witold Putkowski, who was born in Jersey City in 1911. The son, a graduate of St. Johns College in Brooklyn, went to Poland in 1932 to complete his medical education. He married a Polish girl and in 1935 a daughter was born, the latter also being an American citizen under our laws.

Dr. Putkowski was practicing in the Warsaw Hospital when the German blitzkrieg hit the capital early in September 1939. Hastily he got his little family together and started on the jammed road leading in the direction of Lwow. The car broke down, and in the ever-increasing panic he and his wife and 4-year-old child were separated. Months later it was discovered that he had reached Baranowicze, in territory seized by the Soviets, while his wife and child had returned to Warsaw to live with Mrs. Putkowski's parents.

The Soviet-Nazi Polish frontier was closed and the doctor was not permitted to cross, and, of course, it was impossible for his family to join him. There then began the futile efforts of the mother here to assist her son to return to America, where he could proceed with his efforts to have his alien wife and citizen child join him. The mother sent her son funds through the American Embassy at Moscow, and occasionally she would receive a few lines from him. These, hastily scribbled, would tell her only that he was anxious to come home and local authorities were stalling in his case. He was, to all intents and purposes, a prisoner and, no doubt, his medical talents were being used.

For close on to 2 years now congressional offices have urged Secretary of State Hull to demand the assistance of the Soviet in the release of this American citizen, the possessor of a valid American passport. During all this period the Secretary has been writing and cabling Ambassador Steinhardt to make the necessary representations to the Soviet Foreign Office and to assist the doctor. Finally, on May 2, 1941, the Secretary, upon my insistance, cabled Ambassador Steinhardt to emphasize to the Soviet authorities the Government of the United States expected them to grant Dr. Putkowski an exit visa at once, adding that failure to do so would be regarded with concern by the American Government. Our Ambassador replied he had presented this message, but to date there has been no other response from this Government, whose every demand at this time we have promised to give immediate and friendly attention.

I hold in my hand a letter from Dr. Putkowski's mother. It was received in this morning's 10 o'clock mail. In it she points out that Baranowicze is now the scene of heavy fighting between the Soviet and Nazi Armies. For the second time in 2 years this young American citizen is being blitzkrieged. The mother writes me:

> Although you say you are still hopeful, I have lost hope. You are a father and you can realize how I have suffered these many months, pleading and hoping our Government would get results. I have been in touch with our State Department ever since September 1939, when the Germans first attacked Poland. I have gone to great expense. I have prayed and prayed. Please believe me, a mother's grief cannot be described.

It may now be too late for the Soviet Government to do something for Dr. Putkowski. I hope and pray this is not so. I cannot help but feel, however, that the Congress will agree it is high time our Government gets a little hard-boiled about this treatment of an American citizen and it is certainly high time the Soviet Ambassador, Mr. Oumansky, who smiles as America promises his country immediate and favorable attention to his requests for aid to rescue the Russian people in their plight, does something about these long-suffering Americans.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House how it is going to be possible for the Government of the United States to reconcile its position of giving aid to Communist Russia while at the same time trying to drive Russian Communists out of America?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not believe a mere Member of the House can do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from my home town newspaper, the Madison Daily Leader.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a list of names.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial address delivered at Festus, Mo., by the Honorable John J. Griffin, of St. Louis.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF BILL—GEORGE S. GEER

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Claims I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1075) for the relief of George S. Geer, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the call of the Private Calendar next Tuesday may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, 15 minutes' notice to be given.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The House was called to order at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m., pursuant to the recess.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4965) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 15 to said bill.

LEGISLATIVE BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'NEAL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year 1942, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, and 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

"Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law or Senate Resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, on or before the first day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify, in writing, such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

"Senate Folding Room: For repairs and improvements in the building now occupied by the Senate Folding Room, including labor, materials, and other necessary expenses, $3,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$76,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$130,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment numbered 1 increases the compensation of the financial clerk of the Senate from $5,000 to $6,000 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 2 increases the compensation of the principal clerk of the Senate from $3,780 to $4,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 3 increases the compensation of the printing clerk of the Senate from $3,540 to $4,000 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 4 strikes from the bill appropriation for the salary of the assistant Journal clerk of the Senate at $3,360 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 5 increases the compensation of one clerk from $3,180 to $3,360 and creates the position of clerk at the salary of $3,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 6 changes the title of two positions from "press relations officers" to "assistants at the press door" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 7 appropriates $146,640, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $144,540, as proposed by the House, for salaries in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

Amendment numbered 8 corrects a typographical error as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 9 provides additional clerical assistance, in the amount of $6,000, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman for the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 10 provides an additional assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 11 strikes from the bill the salaries, totaling $10,320, for the clerk and three assistant clerks of the Senate Committee on Revision of the Laws, which committee is no longer existent, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 12 provides an additional assistant clerk, at $2,000, to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 13 appropriates $506,940, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $507,260, as proposed by the House, for salaries of employees of Senate committees.

Amendments numbered 14 and 15 increase the salaries of 96 clerks to Senators from $1,500 to $1,800 per annum each at a total cost of $28,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 16 permits each Senator to rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in his office within the total sum appropriated for salaries of such employees as he may direct as proposed by the Senate except that the provision has been so amended by action of the conference to provide that no salary in excess of $4,500 may be fixed under such provision and that no salary now fixed by law in excess of $4,500 shall be reduced.

Amendment numbered 17 adjusts a total.

Amendment numbered 18 increases the salaries of two assistant secretaries in the office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper from $4,320 to $4,800 so long as the positions are held by the present incumbents as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 19 increases the salary of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and storekeeper from $4,800 to $5,800 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments numbered 20 and 21 increase the salary of one clerk in the office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper from $2,000 to $2,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 22 increases the salaries of two messengers from $1,440 to $1,560 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 23 appropriates $271,444, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $269,044, as proposed by the House, for salaries in the office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Amendments numbered 24 and 25 increase the salaries of 26 mail carriers from $1,620 to $1,740 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 26 appropriates $66,340, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,340, as proposed by the House, for reporting Senate proceedings.

Amendment numbered 27 appropriates $4,850 to furnish not to exceed $50 in airmail postage to each Senator and the President of the Senate as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 28 appropriates $26,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,500, as proposed by the House, for stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate and increases the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate from $125 to $200 per annum as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments numbered 29 and 30 appropriate $369,574, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $282,745, as proposed by the House, for maintenance of the Senate Office Building and makes $27,900 of such amount immediately available as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 31 reappropriates $4,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 for maintenance of the Senate Office Building and makes the same available for the purchase of rugs and carpets as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 32 appropriates $3,000 for renovation of the present quarters

of the Senate folding room instead of appropriating $83,000 for purchase of a site and construction of a new building for the Senate folding room as provided by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 33 appropriates $91,320 for salaries, mechanical and structural maintenance, Library buildings and grounds, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $89,520, as proposed by the House.

Amendment numbered 34 appropriates $76,840 for general repairs to the Library buildings and grounds in lieu of $74,840, as proposed by the House, and $77,840, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 35 appropriates $1,316,840 for salaries, Library of Congress, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,314,840, as proposed by the House.

Amendment numbered 36 appropriates $130,950 for salaries for the Legislative Reference Service, in lieu of $126,720, as proposed by the House, and $135,180, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 37 places a limitation of $7,500 on the amount which may be expended from the appropriation for increase of the Library of Congress for travel expenses in lieu of $5,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment numbered 38 places a limitation of $3,250 on the amount that may be expended for temporary services in the Library buildings, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $750, as proposed by the House.

Amendment numbered 39 eliminates the provision proposed by the Senate to permit the Library of Congress to accept funds from private sources for the employment of exiled or displaced foreign scholars.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year 1942, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in disagreement in this conference report. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE OF POWERS AND CREDIT RESOURCES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate and appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WILLIAMS, SPENCE, THOMAS F. FORD, WOLCOTT, and GIFFORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call up for consideration the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, at any time after it is filed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted the ranking Republican member of the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have not had the chance to do that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the differences?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The time on this particular bill will expire on Tuesday and we want to have it in order to consider the conference report immediately.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the differences between the two branches?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Section 4 of the bill, if the gentleman remembers that section, was stricken out by the Senate and the time during which operations of the Corporation may continue was reduced to 2 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

There was no objection.

PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4700, to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. BLAND, RAMSPECK, MANSFIELD, WELCH, and CULKIN.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on Ways and Means, I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 255):

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives as follows:

Post Office and Post Roads: JOHN H. FOLGER, North Carolina.

Civil Service: KATHARINE EDGAR BYRON, Maryland.

War Claims: KATHARINE EDGAR BYRON, Maryland.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 11, 12, 28, 36, 46, 67, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 93, 95, 111, 118, and 133.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 114, 116, 119, 120, 121, 127, 128, 134, and 138; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$126,880"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$121,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,405,105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to appoint one additional teacher, class 2-A, for instruction in

automobile driving at a beginning salary of $2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$281,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "purchase and installation (not exceeding $100) of dual-control equipment for use in driver-training courses,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,775"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,933,427"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,099,503"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$103,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$54,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$861,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$320,315"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *"Provided*, That on and after September 15, 1941, no part of the funds herein appropriated for the National Training School for Girls shall be used for white inmates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further*, That the street-railway company shall after construction maintain, mark and light the same at its expense"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$546,971"; and the Senate agree to the Same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", including the entire cost of paving the track area"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and the purchase of one additional motor vehicle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committe of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 35, 52, 53, 59, 96, 113, 123, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 139, 140, and 141.

GEO. H. MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Salaries and expenses

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2, relating to the Executive Office: Provides for salaries of additional personnel in the amount of $6,100 and $2,020 for reallocations.

Amendment No. 3, relating to the Department of Inspections: Provides $256,960 as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $254,660, proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4, relating to the office of poundmaster: Restores the House figure of $12,420, in lieu of the Senate proposal, $13,620.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to public convenience stations: With respect to the former, it is recommended to retain the Senate figure, of $16,000, an increase of $2,000 over the House figure, and to allow Sunday and holiday openings of these stations. With respect to Amendment No. 6, the Senate recedes from its amendment of $40,000 for the construction of three additional stations.

Amendment No. 7, relating to care of District buildings: Provides $254,004 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $247,284, the House figure. This will provide for four additional custodial personnel and an increase of $6,720.

Amendment No. 8, relating to the Auditor's office: Increases the House figure of $124,880 to $126,880, or an increase of $2,000 for one field examiner instead of three proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9, relating to the office of the Corporation Counsel: Recommends $121,625 in lieu of the Senate amount, $127,225. This compromise will provide for one attorney at $4,600 and one stenographer at $1,800.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, relating to the Public Utilities Commission and the Department of Insurance, restores the House figures.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16, relating to the Surveyor's office, provide $7,700 for ar additional temporary field party as recommended by the Senate, and increases the House figure from $85,820 to $93,520.

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18: Provide the Senate figure, $1,000, for books in the Corporation Counsel's office.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, 21, and 22, relating to the central garage: Increases the House figure of $65,530 to $66,620, the Senate proposal, which is for the purchase and maintenance of additional field wagon for use of the added field party referred to in surveyor's office.

Free Public Library

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, and 25: These amendments appropriate $445,480 for salaries, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $444,000 as proposed by the House; $30,000 for binding instead of $25,000 as recommended by the House and $35,000 as proposed by the Senate; and $30,000 for the acquisition of a site for a building for the Anacostia branch library in lieu of the House figure, $25,000.

Sewers

Amendment No. 26: The proposal is for $350,000, which is a compromise between the House figure of $200,000 and that of the Senate, $375,000.

Collection and disposal of refuse

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34: These amendments appropriate $494,800, the House figure, in lieu of the amount recommended by the Senate, $508,800, and inserts language to permit the purchase of additional equipment over and above replacements for street cleaning; $1,000,000 instead of $988,000, the House proposal, and $1,017,500, the Senate figure, and inserts language to permit the purchase of additional equipment over and above replacements for collection and disposal of garbage, etc.; $300,000 as recommended by the Senate in lieu of the House proposal to appropriate $150,000 and to authorize the Commissioners to enter into contracts for completion of an incinerator at a cost not to exceed $300,000; and allows $9,000 as proposed by the Senate for transfer to Municipal Architect's office for the preparation of plans, etc., for the proposed incinerator, instead of the House figure, $6,300.

Electrical Department

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: The amendments retain the House figure of $73,600 for extension of fire alarm system in lieu of $86,550, the Senate recommendation; and $794,900, the Senate proposal, for street lighting in lieu of the House figure of $789,900.

Public Schools

Amendments 38, 39 and 40: These amendments provide $201,200, the Senate proposal in lieu of $200,000 as recommended by the House; $7,405,105 for salaries of teachers and

librarians, which is a compromise between the House recommendation of $7,397,105 and the Senate figure, $7,409,105. This will provide $6,000 for teachers for physically handicapped children and $2,000 for one additional instructor in automobile driving instead of three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41, relating to night schools: This amendment provides $6,000, the Senate recommendation, in lieu of the House proposal of $5,000.

Amendment No. 42, relating to the Community Center Department: This amendment appropriates $281,320, instead of $280,320 as recommended by the House, and $282,320 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, relating to miscellaneous expenses: These amendments provide $100 for the installation and purchase of dual-control equipment for use in driver-training courses in lieu of the Senate proposal for the purchase of automobiles equipped with these controls and thereby recommend $70,775 in lieu of the Senate figure of $72,025; $323,600 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of $315,000, the House figure, for fuel; $200,000, the House recommendation for textbooks and other supplies, in lieu of $204,900 as proposed by the Senate; $4,800 as proposed by the Senate for school gardens in lieu of $3,600, the House figure; $510,000 as proposed by the Senate for repairs to school buildings and grounds, which is an increase over the House figure of $10,000 for replacement of boilers.

Amendments Nos. 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69, relating to buildings and grounds: These amendments represent increases over the House figures by the Senate both as to appropriations and limits of costs on the following construction: Syphax School, $152,500 instead of $135,000 in cash and $247,500 instead of $230,000 in limit of cost; junior high school near Seventeenth and Q Streets SE., $1,090,125 instead of $969,000 in limit of cost; senior high school at Twenty-fourth Street and Benning Road NE., $700,000 instead of $500,000 in cash and $1,158,750 instead of $1,030,000 in limit of cost; Abbott Vocational School, $562,500 instead of $500,000 in limit of cost; Powell Junior High School underpass, $18,000 instead of $16,000 in cash; Woodrow Wilson High School, $33,750 instead of $30,000 in cash; additions to Benning School, $130,625 instead of $100,000 in cash and $275,625 instead of $245,000 in limit of cost; additions to Van Ness School, $130,625 instead of $100,000 in cash and $275,625 instead of $245,000 in limit of cost; school building near Hillside Road and Alabama Avenue SE., $167,500 instead of $3,900 in cash for plans, etc. The Senate receded from its proposal to construct an elementary school building near Eleventh and G Streets SE. at a cost of $500,000, and an appropriation of $200,000. These compromises total $1,933,427 in lieu of $2,133,427, as proposed by the Senate and $1,485,417 as recommended by the House.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71, relating to purchase of school and playground sites: The House receded to the Senate proposal for the purchase of a site for an elementary school near New Jersey Avenue and P Street NW., bringing the total for these purposes to $280,000 instead of $190,000 as proposed by the House.

Metropolitan Police

Amendments Nos. 72, 73, and 74, relating to salaries: These amendments provide $3,099,503 for salaries of officers and members of the police force in lieu of $3,046,888 as proposed by the House and $3,123,728, as recommended by the Senate, which compromise is brought about by the allowance of 25 additional patrolmen instead of the 40 recommended by the Senate and the inclusion of an appropriation for the selection of no more than 4 detectives specialized in the detection of crimes; and the allowance of the Senate figure of $167,500 in lieu of $164,860, the House amount, for other personal services.

Amendments Nos. 75, 76, 77, and 78, relating to miscellaneous expenses: These amendments appropriate $103,300 for miscellaneous expenses in lieu of $94,720 as recommended by the House and $103,600 as proposed by the Senate; $76,885 as provided by the House instead of $78,965 provided by the Senate for ambulance-scout cars; $54,350 in lieu of the Senate figure of $55,475 to uniform the additional police provided in amendment No. 72.

Fire Department

Amendment No. 79, relating to salaries: Restores the House figure of $2,167,000 in lieu of the Senate amount of $2,203,940.

Amendments Nos. 80, 81, and 82, relating to miscellaneous: These amendments appropriate $21,625, the House figure, in lieu of the Senate amount of $22,975 for uniforms, conforming thereby to the reduction in personnel effected in amendment No. 79; $61,700, the House figure instead of the Senate amount of $79,200 for replacement of equipment; and $2,000 incorporated by the Senate for plans for new fire-engine house near North Capitol and Crittenden Streets NW., the limit of cost being set at $100,000.

Health Department

Amendment No. 83, relating to general administration: This amendment makes provision for the retention of the Senate figure of $88,740 instead of $87,300, the House amount.

Amendment No. 84, relating to medical services: This amendment provides the Senate figure of $462,382 in lieu of $459,782 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 85, relating to inspections: Appropriates $129,691, the Senate figure, in lieu of the House amount of $127,341.

Amendment Nos. 86, 87, and 88, relating to site and building for northwest health center: These amendments provide $14,750 for the purchase of a site and $120,000 for beginning the construction with a total limit of cost of $250,000.

Amendment No. 89, relating to Tuberculosis Sanatoria: Appropriates the Senate amount of $437,460 instead of the House figure of $432,420.

Amendments Nos. 90, 91, 92, and 93, relating to Gallinger Hospital: These amendments appropriate $861,820 for personal services instead of the House figure of $802,720 and the Senate amount of $878,020 to provide for an additional 33 nurses at $1,620 each; $375,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $350,000, the House figure, for maintenance; $78,750, the Senate amount instead of the House figure of $70,000 for repairs, etc.; and deletes the proposal of the Senate for the construction of interne and physicians quarters in the amount of $100,000.

Courts

Amendment No. 94, relating to Juvenile Court: This amendment provides the Senate figure of $103,630 instead of $101,630 proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 95, relating to police court: This amendment appropriates the House figure of $105,520 in lieu of $107,320, the Senate amount.

Public Welfare

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, and 116, relating to the Board of Public Welfare: Appropriates $166,200 for personal services, Board of Public Welfare, as proposed by the Senate, provides that after September 15, 1941, white girls committed to the National Training School for Girls may be quartered in homes similar to those provided for the board and care of other children and provides a total of $320,315 for the board and care of such children; provides $121,300 for construction of a new receiving home instead of $108,800, as proposed by the House; allows $108,440 for salaries, $83,200 for maintenance, and $30,375 for construction of a wall, such increases being provided for the District jail, as proposed by the Senate; provides $41,920 for operation and maintenance of the National Training School for Girls, of which $23,060 shall be for personal services, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, the House provision limiting the expense of operating the institution to an average per capita of $575, and amends the Senate provision relating to use of the institution after September 15, 1941, by providing that the appropriation shall not be used for white inmates; provides $2,600 for an assistant superintendent at the Industrial Home School, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates the proposal of the Senate to provide $15,000 for plans and specifications for buildings for the Home for Aged and Infirm; appropriates $1,025,000 for relief, instead of $950,000, as proposed by the House and $1,050,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $213,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Home care for dependent children; appropriates $620,000 for old age want, instead of $605,000, as proposed by the House and $630,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $50,000 for aid to the needy blind, as proposed by the Senate.

Militia

Amendments Nos. 117 and 118: Provides $650 for the purchase of a passenger-carrying motor vehicle, instead of $600, as proposed by the House and $1,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate authorizing the commanding general to receive compensation as State Director of Selective Service for the District of Columbia.

National Capital Parks

Amendments Nos. 119, 120, and 121: Provides $360,350, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $358,010, as proposed by the House, for personal services; allows $375,962 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $365,322, as proposed by the House for general expenses; and authorizes the park officials to arrange for activities in connection with the President's Cup Regatta, as proposed by the Senate.

Highway Department

Amendments Nos. 122, 124, 125, 127, 128, 133, and 134: Provides that streetcar loading platforms may be constructed from highway funds when approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic, as proposed by the Senate, with the modification that the street railway company shall maintain, mark and light such platforms; provides $546,971 for police traffic control, instead of $537,686, as proposed by the House and $551,246, as proposed by the Senate; requires that the Capital Transit Company bear the entire cost of paving the track area in connection with the repaving of Wisconsin Avenue, R Street to 37th Street, NW., instead of the provision of the Senate; provides $250,000 for construction drainage structures and storm-water sewers, as proposed by the Senate; and $200,000 for grading, paving and surfacing newly developed areas, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House providing that no part of the appropriations shall be used for the operation of a testing laboratory of the highways department; and provides $125,000 for contingent expenses, trees and parkings, as proposed by the Senate.

Water Service

Amendments Nos. 137, and 138: Allows one additional motor vehicle for the Water Department distribution service, instead of

two as proposed by the Senate; and provides $475,000 for extension of the Water Department distribution system, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments in disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendments Nos. 10, 35, 59, 126, 130, 135, and 136, relating to exception from Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, and Civil Service requirements.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53, relating to the payment of tuition in the public schools by nonresident pupils.

Amendment No. 96, relating to the employment of an assistant director of public welfare without civil service requirements.

Amendment No. 113, relating to the stamp tax plan.

Amendment No. 123, relating to receipts from parking meters.

Amendment No. 129, relating to payment for paving track areas by the Capital Transit Co.

Amendment No. 131, relating to construction of a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of South Capitol and P Streets.

Amendments Nos. 132 and 141, correct a total and a section number, respectively.

Amendment No. 139, relating to extension of time for payment of taxes not exceeding 60 days.

Amendment No. 140, making authority with respect to appropriations retroactive to July 1, 1941.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 5049, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. MAHON (interrupting reading of report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us the difference between the bill as it is now written and when it left the House?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1942 in the sum of about $54,300,000. Of course, this bill appropriates money that is made available to the District by reason of the taxes which are collected here and the Federal payment. The bill must be written in accordance with the availability of revenue.

We have cut this bill down to such an extent that there is a prospect of about a million dollars in revenue anticipated in 1942 in excess of the amount appropriated in this bill, so that the District of Columbia will be in excellent financial condition in 1942 so far as the estimates before us indicate. There is a cushion of at least a million dollars to take care of unexpected contingencies.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, the District heretofore has received six and one-half million dollars. What is the District going to receive from the Federal Government as the bill is now written?

Mr. MAHON. The Federal contribution is in accordance with the Revenue Act of 1939, which provides for $6,000,000. This is a legislative provision which we have gone along with in this bill.

Mr. RICH. This bill does not require the Government to make any additional contribution?

Mr. MAHON. No. We did not agree to any raising of the Federal payment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does this contemplate an increase of taxes and, if so, of what character?

Mr. MAHON. This bill does not contemplate any increase in taxes. We had no authority to raise or reduce taxes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this measure it is contemplated that no new taxes will be required to be levied in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAHON. In order to finance the amount provided in this bill, it will not be necessary to raise taxes.

The bill in its present form is about $1,800,000 in excess of the sum that was first agreed to in the House. There have been a number of additions to the House bill, most of them for capital improvements, such as schools. In some instances, where we had provided for a portion of the money for a construction project, we agreed to appropriate considerably more in order that the work might be carried on more rapidly.

We did agree to an increase in the police force of about 25 men and 4 special detectives. We agreed to additional nurses at Gallinger Hospital.

On the whole, we think that we have a good bill, and I do not believe you want me to take your time at this hour of the day to go into the various details. If you have no specific questions to ask, I shall not discuss the conference report further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I first wish to have the RECORD show that our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], was very much interested in an item for which, unfortunately, there was no Budget estimate, appropriating money for the One Hundred and Twenty-first Observation Squadron. Our colleague was very much interested in this particular item and he has done everything in his power to secure provision for it. If it were not so late in the fiscal year, and we had time to give it full consideration, we might have been able to go along with him on the proposal. He has indicated to me that he is in full accord with everything the committee has done with this bill with that exception. I want the RECORD to show that.

For the information of the House, you will recall that we brought you a bill which was the largest appropriation bill ever passed for the District of Columbia. We brought that bill to you after very careful consideration, and with information that there would be a surplus in the city treasury of around $6,200. Further information coming to us after the bill reached the Senate was that they had suddenly discovered that there would be a surplus of $400,000 additional in the treasury of the District for the fiscal year 1941, and that the estimated revenue for the fiscal year 1942 would be $500,000 in excess of the original estimates, thus making a surplus of $900,000 more than was anticipated when the bill was before the House. It was a great surprise to me. It was information the committee should have had previously in order to pass upon the justifications which were made to the committee. This is a very fine demonstration of the wonderful work that has been done in this city by the late Dan Donovan. Had Dan Donovan been alive at this time I believe the committee would have had that information.

I believe an investigation into the fiscal affairs of the District should be made in order that, hereafter, your committee may have absolutely accurate information at the time it is considering the appropriation bill as to how much revenue is to be available to the credit of the District of Columbia in order that we can act intelligently on the requests for appropriations which we are called upon to recommend. In fact, without this information the members of the committee and its staff are at a great disadvantage in reaching conclusions as to what amounts should be allowed for various items. As far as I am concerned, I am going to bend every effort toward securing this information when the 1943 bill is under consideration.

Regarding the police items, we were certainly influenced by the terrible amount of crime that exists in this city, crime that has not been solved. Your committee put into the bill practically everything the Police Department had asked for, and put the burden of the responsibility of solving this situation in Washington directly up to the Commissioners and the Police Department of the city of Washington.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. One thing that was omitted, regardless of whether or not the District of Columbia Commissioners asked for it, was more policemen. The city of Washington should have at least 300 more foot patrolmen, at least 120 more scout patrolmen, and at least 60 more motorcycle patrolmen, to do a proper job.

Mr. STEFAN. All we can do is give to the city what they ask for. They got everything they asked for, insofar as police equipment is concerned, scout cars,

two-way radio equipment, patrolmen, and detectives. They have the personnel in this bill, and I should like to have them really do something.

Mr. DINGELL. If and when the District of Columbia fails to ask for the proper number of patrolmen, it is primarily our responsibility to impose it on them even though they fail to ask for it.

Mr. STEFAN. Your committee has no way of going around and checking what the police are doing. We are here appropriating money as a result of justifications requested by the experts or alleged experts in Washington.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the District of Columbia have any bonded indebtedness?

Mr. STEFAN. No; it has a surplus.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This bill as it finally comes here carries 83 new patrolmen for the District; 54 were carried as the bill came out of the House, and 29 were added in the Senate, including 4 detectives. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That includes four detectives.

Mr. DONDERO. How many cities are there in the United States of size comparable to the city of Washington that do not have a bonded indebtedness?

Mr. STEFAN. Very, very few, of course; the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I notice in the press this morning a painting of a picture in the Municipal Center Building.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; of policemen slugging victims, and so forth. It is a very brutal picture.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All of it is devoted to policemen slugging people. It is said that they paid $12,000 for that painting. I do not know of anything that could go further to discredit the Police Department of this city than a painting of that sort. I want to know who paid that out of the city or out of the Government funds.

Mr. STEFAN. All I can say to the gentleman is that your committee knew nothing about that until the newspapers developed it. It is a very, very brutal picture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That picture ought to be taken off the wall of the building, or the policemen ought to be taken out.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made an amazing statement to the effect that you have suddenly discovered $900,000 in the treasury of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. May I say to my colleague that we did not discover it. The day after we went over to the Senate we were told there that there was a surplus of $900,000 in the treasury of the District, and for that reason we could increase all these expenditures.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Was that $900,000 money in the Treasury or was it anticipated revenue?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that $400,000 of this surplus is chargeable to the fiscal year 1941 and that additional receipts amounting to $500,000 are expected to be taken in during the fiscal year 1942, under a recent estimate made by District officials, making a total of $900,000.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. It would make quite a difference whether it was anticipated revenue or money in the Treasury.

Mr. STEFAN. They referred to it as a surplus.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it true that many of the policemen who should be out on patrol work have been required to do clerical and all sorts of other work?

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman that we discovered that that was the situation in some cases last year and the committee requested that the policemen who were doing clerical work be placed back upon police work and that a clerk be put on that job.

Mr. REED of New York. Are they doing that now?

Mr. STEFAN. They were endeavoring to do it and we understand it has been done.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 8, after line 9, insert "*Provided further*, That employment of personal services from this fund may be made during the fiscal year 1942 without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended and civil-service requirements."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Committee on Expenditures was organized by the House I have been a member and we have tried to make appropriation bills to conform to expenditures as provided in section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, which requires competitive bidding. At this session of the Congress it has been necessary, due to the large defense appropriations, to exempt those appropriations from the provision of section 3709 as speed was essential. No objection was offered in those cases, but now we are considering a regular appropriation bill for the District of Columbia, and as I pointed out when the bill was before the House, in numerous instances there were provisions exempting certain appropriations from the provisions of section 3709, and, further, they were permitted to employ certain consultants and engineers without regard to the Classification Act or civil-service law. During my remarks the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] said that he could expedite the matter because it was his purpose to make a point of order against such provisions. The gentleman did this, but when the bill went to the Senate, the provisions were restored.

I have secured a copy of the hearings in the Senate, and on page 61 Captain Whitehurst, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for many years, a most competent man, and for whom I have a high regard, Director of Highways, asked that the language be restored insofar as the provisions permitting them to engage consultants without regard to civil service and the Classification Act were concerned. They did not seem so much interested about section 3709 then, but as appears on page 155 of the hearings, Mr. Fowler, the Budget officer, again appeared before the Senate committee and reversed this stand by stating, "I would like to see those provisions restored just as they were originally written," meaning section 3709 as well as employing consultants, and so forth.

Now, what is the situation? One of the provisions is in connection with a highway-planning survey. Another concerns a grade-separation project at Fourteenth and Maine. Another is with respect to the South Capitol Street Bridge project; another, a big one, construction of a reservoir. What kind of engineering force have we in the District of Columbia if they cannot take care of such improvements as these without hiring consultants? If it is necessary to hire consultants, under the Classification Act they can pay a man $7,500. If there were two members of a firm they could pay them $15,000, or $7,500 apiece. The information that this provision was back in the bill came to me too late to learn how much they have been paying these consultants, but I do say that in the regular appropriation bills, and especially a bill such as this, we should not permit officials to spend money without getting competitive bids or pay salaries not in keeping with the Classification Act.

There are plenty of engineers who have done this work who were with P. W. A. and the Building Commission now available and many competent engineers on the civil-service register looking for work. Remember when you leave such exemptions in an appropriation bill you let them pay what they want to consultants and engineers and also, if they desire, pay a contractor whatever sum they want, as you take off restrictions. The hearings show it was asserted the Commissioners never let a contract without competition. If so, why exempt these

appropriations from the provisions of section 3709?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. In a moment. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of the day when this bill must be passed, or the District of Columbia cannot function. I am not going to force the issue now due to this situation, but I do say that if I am here when the next appropriation bill comes in for the District of Columbia, or any other regular appropriation, I am not going to permit, without a roll call, the insertion of such provisions as remain in this bill. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I can see a point in having a waiver of section 3709 with reference to small items of a few dollars.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have a general provision with respect to the District of Columbia on small purchases.

Mr. TABER. But when it comes to constructing a reservoir at a cost of $490,000, when there is no hurry about it, in the District of Columbia, without competitive bids, it is just ridiculous.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a general provision which enables the District of Columbia to secure supplies and make contracts without regard to section 3709, up to, I think, $100, but over that, they are required to get competitive bids and they are required to comply with the Classification Act. There is no reason in the world why this city government should not do it. If we were members of the legislative body of our own city we would insist that they get competitive bids, and that they pay salaries in keeping with the law, and not permit the officials to go out and give the contracts to whomever they please, and pay salaries to consultants without limit. As I say, this bill must be passed in order that the District of Columbia may function, and I shall not press it now, but I serve notice I shall, if I am here when the next appropriation bill comes in, if an attempt is made to insert language of this character. No one should object to complying with existing laws.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have several votes on some of these legislative provisions in the bill. Practically all of them deal with the language to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred. They refer to the language that is inserted in several places which I had put out on a point of order which reads—

> without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act, as amended, or the Civil Service.

There is one other legislative provision which may come up for a special vote, and that is the one known as amendment 113, which has reference to the stamp plan. That went out on a point of order, because it contains legislative language, and provides that $50,000 of this appropriation and $25,000 of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1940 may be used as a revolving fund to finance the food stamp plan. On the surface of it it would appear that $75,000 is the whole story but that is not correct. The fact is that $75,000 would set up a revolving fund which buys the stamps as they are sold, but the House should know that in addition, approximately an additional half million dollars will be required of the Surplus Marketing Administration funds to supply commodities that will be distributed under the stamp plan. I took this up with the Surplus Marketing Administration yesterday and asked for their figures on it. Last year, that is, during the present fiscal year, the distribution of surplus commodities will cost $480,000 worth of commodities, but under the stamp plan they would cost approximately $1,000,000, because of the additional clients and demands under the stamp plan. That is the situation we face in putting that provision in the bill. It is argued of course that Washington is the last large city in the country that does not have the stamp plan. I am not going into the arguments pro and con. I merely want the House to know what is involved in the proposition since it has not been authorized by previous legislation.

With reference to the advertising for bids, covered by the language in section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the instance that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] mentioned is probably the most glaring instance in this entire report. It is found in amendment No. 136, which deals with a 20,000,000-gallon reservoir, to be built for the waterworks system. The bill provides $400,000 in direct appropriations, and additional contract authority for $490,000. If we adopt this language which the Senate has reinserted, it means that this $890,000 reservoir project may be constructed without letting the bids through advertising, and without letting it on competitive bids.

The House may do it if it so pleases, but I say to you it is letting stuff like this go by in a slip-shod fashion that will produce the headaches and scandals that will attend the history of fiscal affairs during the current era. We have got so in the habit of thinking there is some emergency connected with national defense that we stick a cost-plus clause and a waiver of statutes in everything that comes along. Some of you may have noticed that there is one of these waivers or a cost-plus plan in the St. Lawrence seaway bill. We also find it here.

No one can maintain there is any emergency in connection with the water situation in the District of Columbia that calls for the letting of contracts on an $890,000 proposition without calling for competitive bids. It is that principle which led me to make the point of order against that provision in 9 or 10 places when this bill came before the House. Since they are legislative provisions they are coming back for a separate vote.

I will not object to putting in most of of these, but when this one comes up with reference to the water works I will offer an amendment to concur with an amendment to strike out the particular provision waiving competitive bids on the construction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that on account of the national-defense situation and the inability in many cases to get the right kind of technical skill we are advised that it is absolutely necessary that this provision be put into the bill, in order that the proper professional service can be secured. This amendment has nothing whatever to do with any kind of contract or competitive bid, insofar as construction is concerned. Under no circumstances would I favor ordinary construction work without competitive bidding.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly what the gentleman says refers solely to that part of the amendment that has to do with the employment of people without regard to the Classification Act. But in that same amendment you find an additional provision exempting that expenditure from section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, which does mean that they can let a contract to anybody they desire, without competitive bidding. They are two separate and distinct questions. The officials said in their testimony that as far as section 3709 was concerned they were not much worried, or words to that effect. Their plea was they could not get proper help, consultants, without this provision. However, they come back again to the Senate committee and change their opinion and say that they need both. Now they not only want to hire consultants without regard to the Classification Act, or civil-service law, but also desire to let contracts, without competitive bidding. That is what we are complaining about. These jobs are not classed as an emergency in any manner, shape, or form. There is the situation. They are two separate and distinct matters. If the conferees had moved to recede with an amendment, to allow them to hire consultants without regard to the Classification Act but require them to abide by section 3709 it would not have been so bad.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we provide for the employment of expert personnel. I may say that this is not an unusual provision in the bill. It is absolutely necessary if this important work is to be carried on, and I ask that you join with the committee in receding and concurring in the Senate amendment.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment No. 35: On page 23, at the end of line 7, insert a comma and the following: "including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 52 and 53 be considered together. They are related.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments Nos. 52 and 53, as follows:

On page 35, beginning in line 14, strike out all of lines 14 to 19, inclusive, and insert:

"The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 36, after line 24, insert a comma and the following: "including the employment of personal services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements;".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all of the amendments with the exception of the one numbered 136 may be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 96: Page 55, at the end of line 11 add the following: "to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements,".

Amendment No. 113: Page 66, line 9, after the word *"Provided"* insert the following: "That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation, together with $25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, may be used during the fiscal year 1942 as a revolving fund for the purchase of food stamps from the Department of Agriculture in accordance with the food-stamp plan of that Department for the distribution of surplus commodities, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, said revolving fund to be reimbursed from time to time from the proceeds of sale of such stamps: *Provided further,*".

Amendment No. 123: Page 79, line 22, after the word "expense", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That fees from parking meters shall be deposited to the credit of the highway fund of the District of Columbia."

Amendment No. 126: Page 87, line 12, after the word "services" insert the following: "by contract or otherwise, and without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and civil-service requirements,".

Amendment No. 129: Page 20, after line 20, insert the following:

"Hereafter when any Capital Transit Co. street railway operation shall have been ordered abandoned by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have ordered the removal of abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of removing such abandoned tracks and regrading the track area, and if the street or bridge in which the said tracks have been ordered abandoned is not being paved, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay the entire cost of paving the abandoned track areas, which cost, however, shall not exceed the cost of repaving such abandoned track areas with the type, character, and thickness of the paving of the adjacent roadway left in place, and, if the roadway of the street or bridge is being paved at the time of removal of said abandoned tracks, the Capital Transit Co. shall pay one-half of the actual cost of paving the abandoned track areas, irrespective of whether the paving is of the type, character, and thickness as that existing at the time of said removal. The Commissioners of the District are authorized to settle in conformity with the principles herein set forth any claims it now has, or in the future may have, for the paving of abandoned track areas, upon such terms and conditions as to time of payment or payments as the Commissioners may determined;".

Amendment No. 130: Page 92, line 24, after "161)" insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the Commissioners are authorized to employ necessary engineering and other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements;".

Amendment No. 131: Page 92, after line 4, insert the following:

"For all necessary expenses for studies, preparation of plans and specifications, surveys and estimates, and for the investigation of foundation conditions, and the acquisition of the necessary land for approach roadways and rights-of-way, by either purchase or condemnation, for a vehicular crossing of the Anacostia River between the general vicinity of South Capitol and P Streets and the proposed Anacostia Parkway at the northern end of the Naval Air Station ground (old Bolling Field), with connections to Firth Sterling Avenue and other District thoroughfares east of the Anacostia River, including the employment of engineering or other professional services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements, $100,000."

Amendment No. 132: Page 94, line 15, strike out "$4,605,000" and insert "$4,805,000."

Amendment No. 135: Page 99, line 9, after the word "otherwise" insert the following: "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements."

Amendment No. 139: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 11. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to extend for not to exceed 60 days the time for payment of any installment of taxes on real property, and tangible personal property, and other taxes, payable in September 1941."

Amendment No. 140: Page 110, after line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 12. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Amendment No. 141: Page 110, line 14, strike out "11" and insert "13."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 136: Page 100, line 2, after the words "Secretary of War", insert "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or the civil-service requirements."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede and concur is preferential.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for a division of the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot be recognized on that. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to concur with an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 136 with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words and figures "section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to which there really should be no objection. The language of this particular paragraph appropriates $400,000 in cash for the construction of a reservoir and $490,000 in contract authority. The language is possibly a little ambiguous, but reading it all together it would appear to be possible under the language of the bill with the Senate amendment to construct this reservoir and to not only secure the professional services but also to construct the reservoir without letting it to bids.

My amendment takes out section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and leaves in the waiver of the Classification Act and the waiver of the civil-service requirements with respect to personnel. It merely strikes out the waiver in reference to advertising and competitive bids, which would apply to the construction. I really believe the gentleman from Texas should have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this provision is in conformity with various other provisions of the bill. The House originally placed in the bill these provisions which were stricken out on a point or order when the bill was before the

House. These provisions were added to the bill when it went over to the Senate. I made the motion to recede and concur in order that this work may be carried on as has been the custom in projects of this type in the District of Columbia over a period of years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I may point out, almost all the instances to which the gentleman refers has to do with the development of plans or the securing of professional services. But this particular paragraph starts out not as a paragraph for continuing the development of a plan or for professional services, but starts off "for the construction of" and later contains the words "including engineering," and so forth. It seems to me this differs from the other provisions in that the waiver of advertising applies not merely to the employment of professional services for the securing of plans but also for the construction. That opens the gate for letting the whole construction contract without bids.

Mr. MAHON. I know that is certainly not the intention.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that is not the intention, what objection can there be to this amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Certainly, it is not my intention. We merely propose to waive section 3709 as to engineering and professional services, but we would not dream of waiving competition bidding on contracts for the building of this reservoir, which it is estimated will ultimately cost $890,000.

The gentleman might modify his amendment to provide that the waiver shall apply only to professional services; that it shall not apply to the contract of construction. I would have no objection to such an amendment, one which would set forth that in no case should the waiver of section 3709 apply to the contracts for the construction of the reservoir.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. I have just been looking at that provision. I am inclined to believe it would permit the letting of the whole contract without competitive bids. I see no objection to letting contracts for engineering services and things of that kind without regard to the provisions of section 3709, but I would not like to see the provisions of this section waived with regard to the whole $890,000 project.

Mr. MAHON. I would not like it either, and I would not approve it. If the gentleman from South Dakota will offer an amendment, modified as I have indicated, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Since we have got to go back to conference with reference to the amendment dealing with school tuition for nonresident students, could not this matter be straightened out in conference and agreed to when that matter is brought back into the House?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will offer his modified amendment to the effect that the waiver of section 3709 shall apply only to engineering services and not to contracts for the construction of the reservoir, I think we can take care of the situation here right now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Mr. CASE of South Dakota moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 136 with an amendment as follows: Page 100, line 3, after the word "requirements", insert *"Provided, however,* That the waiver of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the letting of contracts for construction in connection with this project."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the House that this subcommittee is not in favor of the letting of contracts for construction without competitive bidding.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement in regard to these various items which has been prepared for me by the Director of Highways of the District of Columbia, Capt. H. C. Whitehurst, which I think is ample refutation of the argument which has been presented here by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO THE OMISSION OF PROVISIONS APPEARING IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BILL CONCERNING THE EMPLOYMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH SPECIAL PROJECTS

H. R. 5049 as approved by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia contained in the highway portion of the bill provisions that would permit of employment of the necessary engineering and professional services in connection with special projects. This language was omitted on a point of order when the bill was under consideration on the House floor. It has been restored by the Senate, and appears on page 86, starting with line 4, covering the highway-planning survey; on page 90, starting with line 17, concerning the Fourteenth Street and Maine Avenue grade-separation project; and on page 91, starting with line 8, concerning the South Capitol Street bridge project. This language is essential to the carrying out of this work. It provides for two things—for direct engineering and professional employment by the District of Columbia without reference to the Classification Act or civil-service requirements, and it further makes provisions so that consultant services can be secured. Without these provisions the District would not be able to employ the necessary personnel to prepare plans and supervise these large projects, nor would it be possible to secure consultation or specialized service that is necessary in connection with large projects of a specialized nature.

The personnel appropriation for the Highway Department covering statutory employees is insufficient to permit of the employment above referred to. The provision, or one similar thereto, has appeared for the last 10 years in connection with all major engineering projects. The regular personnel of the bridge and special traffic design sections represents only a skeleton organization that must be increased from time to time to handle these larger projects. The employees in the main are of a temporary nature and are only retained for the duration of the project's life. As to consultant services many of these projects represent specialized problems, and the economical and efficient procedure is to employ professional or consultant-service men who are trained and experienced in the particular character of work presented by the problem.

The procedure has been in the past to secure offers from various consultants, at least three in number, and more often five. This procedure is to all intents and purposes competitive bidding. It is, however, limited to known efficient consultants. After acceptance of an offer a contract is entered into by the District with the person or firm to be engaged.

In connection with employing engineering personnel by direct employment by the District the majority of those employed during the last 2 fiscal years have civil-service status. Their rates of pay are fixed by the Commissioners consistent with rates of pay paid regular employees performing the same or similar character of work. It is frequently necessary to secure men without civil-service status for such work, which is usually of a temporary nature. Some of these men have been employed because of their specialized knowledge and training in the particular field whereby they are thoroughly familiar with the problem with which they are confronted, and this is true particularly in connection with the unit that handles the design and layout of our specialized highway traffic projects. At the present time the highway department has only seven employees that are not under civil service who are engaged with the bridge office and the unit handling highway traffic problems. The rates of pay of these men vary from $1,260 per annum to $1,800 per annum, with one at $2,600 per annum. There are in the highway planning survey eight men without civil-service status, varying in pay from $1,080 per annum to $1,620 per annum. The $1,080 men are traffic counters and are employed purely on a temporary basis for a short time. This information is furnished to show that this very necessary provision in connection with specialized highway projects has not been abused. We have men paid from the appropriations for these projects who are under civil service and are classified to the extent of eight in number. This latter force covers the resident engineers, designers, and one draftsman.

It should be noted that the wording used in the highway section of the bill covers only engineering and professional services. In other sections of the bill the provision is not worded exactly the same. However, it is as important to that work as the projects under the highway fund.

Attention is also called to the fact that the provision appears on page 96 starting with line 25 and page 97 starting with line 18 in connection with water plant design and construction, and I would say that it is equally as important to that activity that the provision be retained as it is to the highway department.

It appears in the bill on page 8, starting with line 11; on page 23, starting with line 6; and on page 36, starting with line 17—the latter three concern activities of the municipal architect's office, and I am informed by

that office that if the provision is not included it will be necessary to separate a number of expert designers and technical men, leaving that office without facilities for carrying on the large amount of construction work in the nature of buildings authorized in the bill.

The effect upon the highway department would be equally as serious, for we would be without authority to employ personnel for these major projects under any conditions. It is next to impossible to secure from civil service, specialists that are always needed in work of the character that has been described. It should be further stated that the rates of pay of any men employed under these provisions are fixed by the Commissioners and are always consistent with the classification of regular employees.

It is urged that all of the provisions be left as they appear in H. R. 5049 on the pages indicated above on the bill as presented to the Senate. The Commissioners advised the Senate committee that before the preparation of the next bill the matter would be carefully reviewed and the language of the various sections made consistent and proper, and they have already instructed the department heads to this effect. It should be said that if this language is omitted it would result in a very serious situation to the engineer department of the District. A discussion of this matter is contained in the Senate hearings on pages 61 and 155.

H. C. WHITEHURST,
Director of Highways, D. C.

On motion of Mr. MAHON, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4646. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; and

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 27, 1941:

H. R. 4545. An act to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program.

On June 28, 1941:

H. R. 4646. An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Wednesday, Jul. 2, 1941:

H. R. 4466. Relating to the manning of vessels.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings on H. R. 2472, entitled "A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who became disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes," and H. R. 3257, entitled "A bill to increase and equalize the pensions of those persons disabled as the result of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard." The hearings will be held Thursday, July 10, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting reports from the American Red Cross, Treasury Department, and the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

688. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill making applicable to all lands or premises subject to the partial, concurrent, or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, the law of the State within the exterior boundaries of which land or premises is situated, pertaining to the recovery of damages for injury or death by wrongful act or omission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

689. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in suits involving claims of Indian tribes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

690. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for pay and allowances and mileage or transportation for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and retired officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy; to suspend the provisions of section 1422 of the Revised Stautes (18 Stat. 484; 34 U. S. C. 201) when the Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 1606. A bill for the protection of walruses in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 883). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5146. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with the construction of certain public works in connection with the War Department in the District of Columbia", approved June 15, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1447. An act making provision for maintaining the Corps of Cadets of the United States Military Academy at authorized strength; with amendment (Rept. No. 885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houes. H. R. 2097. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 886). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H R. 3933. A bill to grant the city of Vancouver, Wash., road rights-of-way and a retrocession of jurisdiction thereover; with amendment (Rept. No. 887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4756. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 888). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5049. A bill making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 889). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (S. 1075) for the relief of George S. Geer, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5211. A bill to authorize an appropriation of an additional $300,000,000 for

defense housing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 5212. A bill for the purpose of granting full and complete civil rights to Indians who are members of any recognized tribe in the United States of America who have served in the armed services of the United States in any war in which the United States was a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 5213. A bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 5214. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law prescribing penalties upon producers of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Congress of the United States to declare that a state of war exists between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 254. Resolution creating a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the sinking of submarine *O–9;* to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Resolution No. 347, relative to the Texas community property law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1553. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, requesting Congress to instruct the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and other purchasing agencies of the Government to purchase milk and milk products that rate the standard of the California law in accordance with the milk-purchasing laws of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1554. By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER: Petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing passage of House bill 3582 and Senate bill 937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1555. By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota: Petition of the North Dakota American Legion, in State convention, urging congressional approval for the Missouri River diversion project; asking greater coordination between the various Federal agencies and those of the State in advancing the program of irrigation, water conservation, and shelterbelt planting; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1556 By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution adopted b the California State Federation of Federal Employees Union, endorsing House bill 3487, providing for option retirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1557. By the SPEAKER. Petition of the National Association of Tax Administrators, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal revenue measures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1558. Also, petition of the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, United States of North America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their Resolutions 5, 6, 20, and 22, with reference to immigration and naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1559. Also, petition of Colston E. Warne, for the committee of professors of economics and political science, Amherst, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1560. Also, petition of the Friends of Astrology, Inc., Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1561. Also, petition of the Thueringer Women Lodge, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1941

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 26, 1941)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who fashioneth the hearts of men and understandeth their works, and who, through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast revealed the Gospel of the Brotherhood of Man: Look, we beseech Thee, with the tender eyes of Thy mercy upon all Thy children who have strayed into the paths of hatred and violence. Kindle anew in their hearts such mutual love that the hatreds of this present time shall be forgotten and the world shall know Thy peace.

In particular we ask Thy blessing upon these Thy Servants now assembled to take counsel for our Nation, that their deliberations, inspired of Thee, shall reach decisions fraught with Thy wisdom, that shall lead our Nation into deepening paths of service for all mankind, such as Thou hast revealed to us through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Saturday, June 28, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k); that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. CLASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4700) to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CULKIN were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. THOMAS F. FORD, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4756) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 35, 59, 96, 113, 123, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 139, 140, and 141 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 136 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 52 and 53 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5052) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Norris
Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Barbour	Guffey	Pepper
Bilbo	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bone	Hatch	Reynolds
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Herring	Schwartz
Brown	Hill	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of the serious illness of his mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department for foreign air-mail transportation, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $613,486 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 87).

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1942, to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Tobacco Inspection Act of August 23, 1935 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 88).

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented by Senators and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NYE:

The petition of Mrs. Martin Reinholdt and sundry other citizens of Sawyer and vicinity, Ward County, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Palco and Natoma, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 983) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Chautauqua, Harvey, Mitchell, and Sedgwick Counties, and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Sumner County, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution of the City Council, of Peabody, Mass., protesting against abolishment of the nursing and household projects under the W P. A.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy; to the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS AND PREVENTION OF VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, a petition from a group of prohibitionists in my State who are interested in the passage of legislation affecting the sale of liquor near camps.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of Winchester, Franklin County, Tenn., do respectfully petition you to defend the United States of America by defending the health and morale of the youth called out by your action under the Selective Service Act, from what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money"—the trade in alcoholic beverages; and from the dangers of venereal disease incident to prostitution, by passing H. R. 2475 which takes the place of the Sheppard bill S. 860, a reenactment of the protective legislation of 1917.

W. M. ROBERTSON
And sundry other citizens.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 28th instant—

On June 28, 1941:

By Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5166. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 493).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1627. A bill to provide for a quinquennial census of industry and business and for the collection of current statistics by the Bureau of the Census; with amendments (Rept. No. 495).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 353. A bill to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy; to suspend the provisions of section 1422 of the Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 484; 34 U. S. C. 201) in time of war or national emergency; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 496); and

H. R. 4671. A bill to authorize a plant-protection force for naval shore establishments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 494).

S. R. BRACKIN—BILL REFERRED TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Claims, reported a resolution (S. Res. 136), as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1628) for the relief of S. R. Brackin, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1695. A bill for the relief of Reginald H. Carter, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1696. A bill for the relief of Bessie Walden; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1697. A bill to amend section 301 of the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the persons to be appointed as members of the board to investigate various modes of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1698. A bill to amend the act reorganizing the administration of Federal prisons; and

S. 1699. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1700. A bill granting a pension to James H. Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1701. A bill to provide for pay and allowances and mileage or transportation for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and retired officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1702. A bill to establish a Department of Defense, to consolidate therein the national-defense activities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1703. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a medal of honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES (for Mr. CLARK of Idaho):

S. 1704. A bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to accept title to the fish hatchery at Clark Fork, Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1705. A bill to provide for the payment of claims of certain manufacturers for extra costs of manufacturing resulting from the deepening of the Oswego and Erie Canals, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1706. A bill relating to the military record of William Lendrum Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL FARM BOARD—SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 137), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 42, agreed to April 11, 1932, to investigate the activities and operations of the Federal Farm Board, is hereby authorized to submit a report thereon supplementing the report (Rept. No. 1456, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) submitted to the Senate in connection with such investigation on August 23, 1935. The expenses of preparing and presenting such supplemental report, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BYRNES subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back without amendment Senate Resolution 137, which was submitted earlier today by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the foregoing resolution was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES OF CONVOYING AND DESTRUCTION OF GERMAN NAVAL VESSELS BY THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Whereas on June 2, 1941, Joseph W. Alsop was sworn in as a Naval Reserve officer by the Secretary of Navy Frank Knox; and

Whereas the said Alsop, as coauthor of a syndicated newspaper column—on June 9, 1941, 1 week after he had taken the oath as a Naval Reserve officer—stated in that column:

"In one case, rather more than a month ago, an encounter between German and American warcraft at sea very nearly terminated in an attack by the Germans. In another, slightly more recent, an attack on what was believed to be a German submarine was actually made by an American destroyer.

"No details of the first episode are available, but the basic facts of the second are known.

"The destroyer, the name of which cannot be ascertained, was picking up survivors from a British vessel sunk not far from the coast of Greenland. While the operation was in progress the destroyer's detecting device announced the approach of a submarine. The submarine could only have been German. It was virtually certain to use its torpedoes, as semidarkness concealed the nationality of the American ship. And the commander of the destroyer accordingly dropped three depth charges.

"Thus, although the President is waiting for the Germans to shoot first, the truth is that there has been shooting already;" and

Whereas on June 23, 1941, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in their syndicated newspaper column charged:

"A group of American naval vessels has just returned from its first experience at Atlantic patrol, or convoying, whatever it is called—they helped to get about 80 British merchantmen safely most of the way to the west coast of Africa. There the British took over.

"Three United States airplane carriers, six destroyers, and three cruisers accompanied the convoy across the Atlantic—but never within sight of the 80 British merchantmen.

"One airplane carrier steamed ahead of the merchantmen, another to the rear, another to the north. Each carrier was protected by two destroyers, zigzaging constantly. The carriers performed the most important part of the patrol, keeping their airplanes constantly scouring the sky.

"Once a plane sighted a German surface raider and radioed its position to British warships, which rushed up and sank her. The battle took place so close to American vessels that they could hear the fighting, though they never saw the ships. United States radio operators picked up the distress message sent to Berlin by the Nazi vessel saying that she was sinking.

"On another occasion, an airplane carrier detector picked up the vibrations of a submarine, and signaled it to come to the surface. When there was no answer, United States destroyers immediately dropped depth charges. After that the detector picked up no more vibrations.

"When the patrol reached its meeting place with the British, near Cape Verde Islands off the African coast, it turned north, and shortly after this, the 12 United States naval vessels headed home;" and

Whereas on June 23, 1941, Gen. Hugh S. Johnson in his syndicated column stated:

"To an experienced eye there can be small doubt, after reading innocent but censored letters from young naval officers, that we have already sunk Nazi submarines. A submerged sub isn't so hot with the radio. A depth bomb leaves no trace. If this is an incorrect conjecture—and it can be no more than conjecture—there is little doubt that our Navy spots German subs and guides British ships to them.

"It seems to be quite generally believed that the seizure of great passenger liners and recent shifts of the Navy from the Pacific (not through the Panama Canal, but around Cape Horn) are preparatory to an attack on Dakar in west Africa, or other key Atlantic positions.

"What's the difference between that and outright war?"

and

Whereas other reports circulate to the effect that some of our ships have sunk German ships; and that American sailors are in London servicing American planes; and: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make, and to report to the Senate the results of a thorough and complete investigation of the charges that American naval units are convoying or escorting ships or that American naval units have destroyed by shooting or by dropping depth bombs on German naval units; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, if it finds that our naval vessels are doing such acts as above described in violation of law that it ascertain at whose direction and upon what authority such acts were committed.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to obtain such facts as Government agencies may have, and to secure the assistance of other Government agencies in the investigation hereby authorized.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and subsequent Congresses, to employ such experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, including the Secretary of Navy and any American naval officer or sailor and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

PRINTING OF MONOGRAPHS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 139), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3, of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the special committee who are directed by Senate Resolution 298 (agreed to October 8, 1940) to study and survey by means of research all of the problems of American small business enterprises and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation be, and is hereby, empowered to procure the printing of not to exceed 10,000 additional copies of each monograph published by said committee.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR BARBOUR TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE JOHN D. OSBOURNE

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a most sincerely meant tribute, in the form of a short statement, to the memory of my devoted friend and associate, the late John D. Osbourne, who for many years has acted so faithfully and ably as my secretary and office manager.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have suffered an irreparable loss in the death of my devoted friend and secretary, John D. Osbourne, last Thursday, June 26, at Roosevelt Hospital, where he was brought 3 weeks ago after he was stricken with a heart attack at his home at Loch Arbour, N. J.

Mr. Osbourne was a native of Cranford, N. J., and he had served in the merchant marine during the World War. He spent 11 years in the newspaper field, beginning his journalistic career on the New York Morning World in 1920, later becoming a reporter for the Philadelphia Public Ledger. From there he went to the Daily Record, Long Branch, N. J., and the Asbury Park Evening Press, Asbury Park, N. J., where he served more than 6 years. Mr. Osbourne then bought the Red Bank Standard, Red Bank, N. J., a weekly newspaper, and 3 years later sold it.

He joined my staff in 1928, serving as my publicity director, and later became my assistant secretary, then my secretary. He also served as campaign manager when I was elected to my third unexpired term, and in 1940 when I was elected to a full term.

At one time Mr. Osbourne was publicity director of the city of Asbury Park.

Fourteen years ago Mr. Osbourne married Miss Hazel Merker of New York; also surviving are a brother, Thomas D. Osbourne of Asbury Park, N. J., and a stepbrother, Andrew MacConnell.

No one can ever take his place because he was more like a dearly loved son or younger brother than a secretary. We are all greatly saddened by his sudden passing. His memory will never fade, and we will miss him always.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD AT UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BANKHEAD at the Defense Day banquet at the University of Alabama on June 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on June 23, 1941, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR BURTON ON WAR CONDITIONS

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio interview given by him on June 28, with regard to war conditions, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER AT CHICAGO, ILL.

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by former President Herbert Hoover, delivered at Chicago, Ill., on June 29, 1941, on the topic A Call to American Reason.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY BY PETER EDSON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Peter Edson on Senator CONNALLY, printed in the Mobile Register of June 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY FELIX MORLEY ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Felix Morley, published in the Washington Star of June 29, 1941, on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN ON RUSSO-GERMAN WAR

[Mr. SCHWARTZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Star of yesterday, entitled "Threat to United States Seen if Soviet is Crushed," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM MITCHELL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell, published in the Washington Star of June 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESIGNATION OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONER RICHARD J. BEAMISH FROM PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Public Utility Commissioner Richard J. Beamish to William M. Hargest, president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT DEDICATION OF POST OFFICE AT CLYDE, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the dedication of the post office at Clyde, N. Y., on June 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH FROM HOLLYWOOD BOWL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh from Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif., on June 20, 1941.]

ARTICLE BY LARRY RUE ON PROSPECTIVE ENTRY OF UNITED STATES INTO EUROPEAN WAR

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Larry Rue, published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 30, 1941, entitled "London Forecasts United States Entry Into War Almost Any Day," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY ON LABOR AND THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Labor and the National Emergency, delivered by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, on June 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. FLYNN AT DENVER, COLO.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Denver, Colo., on June 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY DOROTHY ROSENMAN ON WAR AND THE HOUSING PROBLEM

[Mr. MEAD (for Mr. WAGNER) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Rosenman, published in Liberty Magazine for April 26, 1941, entitled "War and the Housing Problem," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY E. P. THOMAS BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by E. P. Thomas, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY MRS. HARRIS T. BALDWIN BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 23, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINE IS STILL MOTHER OF SHIPS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD MATTHEWS HALLET

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Richard Matthews Hallet, published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 28, 1941, entitled "Maine Is Still Mother of Ships," which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL ON SHORTAGE OF OIL AND GASOLINE IN THE EAST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Decatur Review of May 31, 1941, on the subject of the shortage of oil and gasoline in the East, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY WILLARD BUNCE COWLES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the 1941 prize-winning essay in the National Legal Competition of the American Bar Association, by Willard Bunce Cowles, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF ROBERT H. JACKSON TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this morning I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary in opposition to the confirmation of Attorney General Robert H. Jackson to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I wish to serve notice now that I desire to oppose confirmation on the floor of the Senate; and inasmuch as the testimony has not been reduced to writing, I ask that the nomination not be brought up until copy of the printed testimony is on the desk of every Senator, and I am present on the floor to have a chance to make my opposition clear. I serve this notice publicly because I desire to be heard before the Senate acts in confirmation of Mr. Jackson.

COTTON LOANS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on Saturday, when the question of loans made by cotton agencies was under discussion, we were promised a letter from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I have received today such a letter, and two other communications to which it is a reply. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

UNION PLANTERS NATIONAL BANK & TRUST CO.,
Memphis, Tenn., June 22, 1941.

Hon. K. D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Referring to our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon, enclosed you will find a memorandum pertaining to

the subject I discussed with you; that is, the plan for the new C. C. C. cotton loan, which is now under consideration and which I understand will be announced within the next day or so; therefore the essence of time is important, and if you can possibly do so. I would appreciate your giving the matter attention immediately upon receipt of this letter. I am sending a copy of this letter along with a copy of the memorandum to Senator STEWART, requesting his cooperation. This memorandum is being prepared by Mr. Lytle McKee and myself after consultation with representatives of the other Memphis banks, the banks in this territory, and after consultation with a number of representatives of local cotton factors.

If the plan as we understand it now is adopted, there is a strong likelihood that banks will not be able to make any of the loans, and it will also be difficult for cotton factors to make the loans.

For your information, when the cotton loan was first inaugurated by the C. C. C., our bank took a leading part in the purchase of these notes; in fact, the Memphis banks and the Atlanta banks were about the only banks in the larger centers that had anything to do with the plan at first, but as time went on all the banks, not only in this section but throughout the entire country, began to take a great deal of interest in the purchase of the loan; and at the present time, as we considered them from the beginning, they are a very desirable investment, and we want to be allowed to continue to participate and cooperate with our cotton grower, our correspondent banks, and with the cotton merchants.

Banks in the larger cities of the United States, with the exception of Memphis and Atlanta, for 2 years would not buy the notes, stating that they were advised by their attorneys that the notes were not a legal investment, using as one of their arguments the small capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation in comparison with the amount of loans outstanding.

Thanking you for your usual prompt and helpful consideration, and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
V. J. ALEXANDER, *President.*

[Enclosure.]

MEMORANDUM

The following Commodity Credit Corporation officials were present at the conference in Washington last Saturday which was attended by representatives from the Memphis banks:

Mr. Hutson, president Commodity Credit Corporation; Mr. Farrington, vice president; Mr. Rathell, director cotton division; Mr. E. D. White, assistant to the president; Mr. Stanley Andrews, assistant to the president; Mr. Frank Biggs, manager New Orleans office Commodity Credit Corporation.

We would suggest that you discuss this with either of these officials you know personally or those who can be readily contacted.

1. Our impression is that the A. A. A. has injected itself into the situation and is attempting to control the Commodity Credit Corporation and its operations.

Our further information is that considerable politics is being injected into the organization, which, as you know, will prove to be very harmful to cotton farmers, to the banks in this territory, and the situation as a whole.

Heretofore we have purchased Commodity Credit Corporation notes direct from the grower, banks, and from cotton merchants. Our understanding is that under the new plan, lending agencies, including banks, would be forced to qualify in each county in which they do business. This would bring about an endless amount of red tape, enmity, and favoritism.

We are already qualified to do business with the general public. Why should it be necessary for us to qualify through local county agents who are men of limited ability and whose minds do not run along financial lines? If they have any ability at all it is supposed to be in connection with the raising of crops and holding their jobs. A ridiculous requirement, which we would and could not meet. The same applies to every bank, cotton factor, and lending agency, who either directly or indirectly finances practically every farmer in this section of the country.

2. Heretofore country banks, lending agencies, and cotton factors have purchased these notes from their customers, thereby rendering a service to our section of the country. They have passed these notes on to their banks and the country banks in most instances have passed them along to the banks in the larger centers, such as the Memphis banks. Under the new arrangement our information is that these notes could not be passed on but the original holder of the note, in order to obtain money on same, would be forced to take his notes to the Federal Reserve bank direct, thereby eliminating entirely the banks with which they have been doing business for years. The Federal Reserve bank is not set up nor equipped to give the service that the banks in this county are giving to their customers at the present time. It is doubtful in our minds whether the cotton grower would ever do business with the Federal Reserve bank or know how to The Federal Reserve bank was not organized to deal directly with the public in this manner in competition with its member banks. These notes should be negotiable, as heretofore.

Our information is that the reason the A. A. A. is demanding these changes in the whole arrangement is to protect the grower against excessive charges that have been made in rare instances by small ginners in remote sections of the country; in fact, the only complaints that we have heard of have arisen in Oklahoma and Texas.

If the A. A. A. wants to protect the farmer they could supervise the loans in addition to the protection that is now being given them by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The records and books of all the lending agencies are open for investigation at any and all times.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 28, 1941.*

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Re telegram: banks in Memphis as far as I know have never been advised definitely as to Commodity Credit Corporation lending plan through banks. Therefore we have made no agreement whatsoever. Would much prefer to participate in the lending program along the lines as heretofore. Please keep me advised as to developments. Memorandum sent you June 22 covers our position.

Regards,
VANCE J. ALEXANDER,
Union Planters Bank.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1941.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: This is in reply to your letter of June 26 referring to telephone conversation with your office and enclosing letter from Mr. Vance J. Alexander, president of the Union Planters National Bank & Trust Co., Memphis, Tenn.

We fully appreciate the valuable service given by banks in connection with cotton-loan programs. The changes that are being considered in connection with the 1941 loan program will provide for banks making advances to farmers and retaining an interest in the loan.

The plan under consideration provides for the approval of lending agencies by the loan agencies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting as agents for Commodity Credit Corporation, in the same manner as in past loan programs. These lending agencies will advance funds directly to the farmers, and after such advance will tender notes directly to Commodity Credit Corporation. The notes so tendered will be held in a pool by the Federal Reserve banks as custodian for Commodity Credit Corporation and the tendering lending agency will be given a certificate of interest in the pool. These certificates will be transferable. This is a change from previous loan programs in that the notes formerly were transferable as between lending agencies. The change, however, does not prevent the larger banks from participating in the loan program since they may purchase an interest in the pool from the original lending agency making the advance to the producer.

This plan was discussed in the conference with a committee of southern bankers representing the American Bankers Association on June 17, 1941, and the plan was approved in principal by that committee. Mr. Thomas E. Noel, president, First National Bank, Memphis, Tenn., and Mr. W. A. Wooten, vice president, First National Bank, Memphis, Tenn., were members of the committee. This change in handling cotton producers' notes will enable Commodity Credit Corporation to give prompt service in releasing collateral to cotton merchants who purchase the equity of producers. This will eliminate the serious confusion and delays which occurred under the old plan.

In addition to the changes in the loan program outlined above, it is contemplated that the county agricultural conservation committees will approve agencies to complete loan documents for farmers. In the 1940 loan program loan documents were completed for farmers by bankers, warehousemen, cotton merchants, banks, and other agencies, and in many instances excessive charges were made for these services. This was true to some extent in all parts of the Cotton Belt. The county agricultural conservation committees will be in position to determine the agencies best suited to perform this service for farmers and to determine an appropriate service fee for the work performed.

The procedure in handling cotton loans, as outlined herein, will enable Commodity Credit Corporation to give better service to all parties interested in the cotton loans.

Although the plan outlined above has received the approval of the groups indicated, it is still in the discussion stage and no definite decision has been reached at this time.

Very truly yours,
G. E. RATHELL,
Director, Cotton Division.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 32, 54, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24.

28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$606,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That irrespective of the total number of enrollees either authorized or actually enrolled, in no event shall there be expended more than $1,000 per actual enrollee per year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 48, line 16 of the bill after the first "and" appearing in said line insert the word "by"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 8 of said amendment after the word "agency" insert the following: ", nursing school"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$74,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$201,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, and 11.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
BUTLER B. HARE,
ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia indicate what disposition has been made of the disagreement between the Senate and the House on the question of inspections under the Wages and Hours Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendments relating to that subject are still in disagreement. They are not involved in the conference report now being considered.

I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when the conference report shall have been disposed of, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate recede from its amendments. The House has had the matter before it twice and has voted the amendments down unanimously on both occasions, so I do not think it would serve any useful purpose to further insist on the Senate's position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are still in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, and 11, and I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives regarding those amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4926, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 28, 1941.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 3, 4, 10, and 11 to the bill (H. R. 4926) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, amendments 3, 4, 10, and 11 relate to an increased appropriation for the inspection division of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor; $349,100, covering the salaries of additional inspectors, and other items, for printing, travel expenses, and communications, is involved.

The Senate conferees earnestly insisted upon the Senate's position. Those representing the House were adamant in their refusal to accept the Senate amendments. Upon the insistence of the conferees on the part of the Senate, the House managers took these amendments back to the House, the question at issue was thoroughly explained to the House, and the House unanimously voted to sustain its position. In view of this fact, I do not think it would be worth while to go back to conference on these amendments. I, therefore, move that the Senate recede from its amendments 3, 4, 10, and 11. Inasmuch as all these amendments relate to the same item, I ask that they be considered as one item in the motion.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I can appreciate the position outlined by the Senator from Georgia in regard to this matter, and if the House has once again by unanimous vote taken the position it has heretofore taken, perhaps it is of no avail to go into the matter further.

This is an important item, and I think the position the Senate took was the correct one. If we are to have enforcement of the law, we should have very definite inspections, rather than inspections conducted in a haphazard manner. I do not know that there is any use prolonging the matter further, if it would result in a stalemate. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that that would be the result?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Hampshire was a member of the conference, and he knows the attitude of the House conferees. They were not only willing, but were anxious, to take the amendments back to the House in order to show the unanimity with which that body opposed them. I cannot see anything to be gained by the Senate insisting further on the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate recede from its amendments 3, 4, 10, and 11.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the deficiency bill, unless the Senator from South Carolina has something else he wishes to suggest.

Mr. BYRNES. I hope the Senator will move that the deficiency bill be now considered.

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5166, making appropriations for deficiencies.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General Appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert.

SENATE

For payment to Edwina Harrison, widow of Pat Harrison, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $4 per day each, for the period commencing July 1, 1941, and ending with

the last day of the month in which the Seventy-seventh Congress adjourns sine die at the first session thereof, so much as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1941, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for folding speeches and pamphlets at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, contingent fund of the Senate, for the fiscal year 1941, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, contingent fund of the Senate, for the fiscal year 1941, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Salaries, Office of Superintendent of Documents: For an additional amount for salaries, Office of Superintendent of Documents, fiscal year 1942, including the same objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1942, $47,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Salaries: For an additional amount for salaries, fiscal year 1942, including the same objects and subject to the same conditions specified under this head in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1942, $5,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Government Reports", on page 5, line 13, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,425,603: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of compensation to any State director hereafter appointed unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this item relates to the Office of Government Reports. Members of this body and Members of the House of Representatives have in times past discussed the work of this office. There have been extensive debates as to its value, its objectives, and the purpose for which it was set up. Under the bill as it passed the House an appropriation of $1,015,000 was provided. The Senate committee amendments represent an increase of $425,603 in one item and $3,730 in another.

A certain minority of the Committee on Appropriations submitted a minority report, which will be found on the last page of the report of the committee. We feel that the office is of questionable value. We feel that this has been manifested in the very great division in Congress on the question whether this office is worth having at all and we believe it would be unfortunate and unwarranted to increase the appropriation at this time by $425,603 in one item and $3,730 in another. We feel that $1,015,000 is fully adequate to do the necessary work of this office.

We have heard much talk around the country as to cutting nondefense expenditures. I have heard it from Members of this body, I have heard it from Members of the House of Representatives, I have heard it from members of the administration; but so far as I can see, no real effort has been made to cut nondefense expenditures. The majority of those on this side of the aisle and on the other are in favor of all warranted expenditures for national defense, because we want to prepare this country. But we cannot prepare the country in an adequate way unless we take some step in the direction of cutting nondefense expenditures and get our fiscal house in order. In my opinion this is one item on which we can curtail without any serious effect to the efficiency of the office, whose value as I have stated, is questionable at best. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee amendment restores the Budget estimate, and the Budget estimate is less than the amount authorized by law. What the Senator has said and what is contained in the minority report is a mere continuation of an argument which proceeded here for days when the authorizing legislation was under consideration, that is, that the office is of questionable value. That was questioned by the minority at the time, and the Senate passed the bill. It was questioned in the House, and the House passed the bill. It is the law, and the appropriation recommended is in accordance with law.

It seems to me that this is nothing but an attempt to sabotage an act of Congress which has already been enacted. It is an indirect way of attempting to accomplish the same result which the Senator sought to accomplish when the original legislation was under consideration. The issue was determined when the authorizing act was passed. Having enacted the law, we should carry it out.

The Senator states that the amount appropriated by the House is wholly adequate. The testimony before the committee, as he well knows, is that in 14 States there is no representation of the Office of Government Reports, and that this additional sum of money is necessary in order to give representation in every State in the Union. How can the minority report be justified by the statement that the amount is wholly adequate when there is not enough money to carry the law into active effect in all the States of the Union?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did not the House provide for $1,015,000? Did not the House assume that amount to be adequate?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from New Hampshire assumes, then, that the Senate has no judgment in the matter at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume that in this case the House was right and the Senate was wrong.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a matter we can take up with the House in conference, but the facts are that the Senate passed a bill authorizing one and one-half million dollars to be appropriated; that the Bureau of the Budget estimated that $1,440,000 was necessary; that we held a hearing, and it was shown that with the amount of money appropriated by the House this activity could not be carried on in all the States of the Union, and that therefore it was necessary to increase the amount. We did the sane and sensible thing, in my judgment, and we should adopt this amendment, and take it to conference, and then we will see what happens, so far as the House is concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe in cutting nondefense expenditures at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but I consider this a defense expenditure.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have the Senator explain how it is a defense expenditure.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think I can do any better in that regard than to take Mr. Mellett's own statement from the hearings, that the Army is asking for information from all over the country which this organization gathers; the Navy wants it; the Federal Bureau of Investigation wants it; the President himself wants it in order that he may be adequately advised; and that the service this agency is now rendering is very closely knitted to national defense.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator is sincere in what he has said, but I disagree with him entirely.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has well said that we threshed this matter out in the Senate a few weeks ago. We spent a whole day on the bill authorizing this appropriation. I do not care to take the time of the Senate to make a speech similar to that which I tried to make some weeks ago. I went into every phase of this question. I took up all the work which this office was doing, its value to the Government as a whole, its value to the defense program, and at that time it was emphasized that unless the bill was passed, unless the amount which the Bureau of the Budget recommended and the President asked for was authorized, and then afterward appropriated by the Senate, there would be 14 States which would not have an office under the Office of Government Reports.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was not present when this matter was first dis-

cussed today. I should like to call his attention to the fact that members of his own party stated in the committee hearings that they hoped there would never be such an office established in their States, and members of his own party stated that the offices then in existence in their respective States were of no value.

Mr. HILL. That may be true. I do not know what went on in the secret session of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, but I do know what went on here in the open session of the Senate of the United States, when, just a few weeks ago, the Senate, by a very substational majority, passed the bill giving a permanent status to this office, and authorizing the appropriation for this office which the Senate Appropriations Committee now brings in to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to name the States which will not have any offices unless this appropriation is provided as recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. They are the States of Delaware, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Unless this appropriation is provided, not one of these 14 States will be able to have an office functioning under the Office of Government Reports.

As I said in the beginning, I do not care to go back over the arguments made in favor of this office. The Senate passed the bill by a substantial majority. The Appropriations Committee now proposes in an appropriation to carry out the express will of the Senate. All I ask the Senate to do is to stand by the decision which it made after hearing all the facts, after having the matter debated pro and con for a full day. Certainly there has been no new evidence submitted, there has been nothing submitted here which affords any basis for or any reason why the Senate now should turn around and march down the hill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think the House turned around and marched down the hill?

Mr. HILL. I do not know exactly what took place in the House. I do not know whether all the facts were presented to the House. I do not know how much debate ensued. I know how things are sometimes done in this body. Many a time this body, under the compulsion of doing business, under the necessity of driving matters through, does not go fully into the merits or the demerits of a proposition. It does not always have the opportunity or the time to do so. But I know that in this case the Senate of the United States went into this matter fully and completely. If there was any argument which could be advanced against the passage of the authorization bill which was not advanced, it was due to the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire and those like unto him on the other side of the aisle simply could not conceive or think of such an argument. Every blast that could be made against the bill, every shot that could be fired against it, was duly sent against it. The Senator from New Hampshire brings in no new light here today. He adds nothing to the arguments which were made when the authorization bill was under consideration some 2 or 3 weeks ago.

As I have said, the Senate then, after fully considering the matter, after having all the facts presented to it, after hearing all the arguments pro and con, decided that this was a meritorious governmental agency, that its work should be carried on, and that the appropriation should be authorized and subsequently made, so that its work could be carried on.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that if this additional money is not appropriated, and the appropriation remains at $1,015,000, the country will suffer?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I think this work is necessary; that it contributes very much to the proper functioning of our Government, and is of service to the people throughout the country. Of course, the Senator can pick out any appropriation, in any of the many appropriation bills, and he knows as well as I do that the Government is not going to stand or fall on any one appropriation, but I think the Senate was wise when it authorized this appropriation and when it said that the Office of Government Reports performed a necessary function of government.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will ask the Senator one more question. Does the Senator agree with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that this is a defense expenditure?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I think this expenditure is important to national defense. I think the work which this office is doing is contributing materially to the defense of our country.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator thinks that propaganda is a matter of defense?

Mr. HILL. No; it is not a question of propaganda. The Senator, for want of any better argument, for want of ability to add anything to the debate, now uses a word out of harmony with the facts. It is not a matter of propaganda at all. The Senator does not understand what it is all about.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire probably understands as fully as the Senator from Alabama does what it is all about. He has read the testimony and the proceedings, and he cannot see any reason for this provision. If the Senator from Alabama can convince me that this is a defense measure, I will vote for it, as I will vote for any other reasonable defense measure, but I cannot see that it is, and I do not think the Senator from Alabama, with all his great wisdom and ability—and I admit he has a great deal of both—could convince me of it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's position has not changed. The Senator stands exactly where he did when the bill was under consideration a few weeks ago. The Senate at that time refused to follow the Senator from New Hampshire, and today the Senator from New Hampshire has not given the Senate one reason why it now should change its position and go along with him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 13. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 18, after the numerals "1942," to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$18,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office for Emergency Management," on page 7, line 2, after the name "United States" and the semicolon, to strike out "not to exceed $100,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the civil-service laws, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended" and insert "not to exceed $100,000 for temporary employment of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, for my information will the Senator from Colorado tell me what is the function of the Office for Emergency Management, and where it fits into the sprawling procurement machine we are building in Washington?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I do not know that I can give the Senator any authoritative information, but my understanding is that it is the supervising agency under which all the defense agencies cooperate. It is a coordinating agency. In the report from the House is set forth a series of offices which are connected under the Office for Emergency Management.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it superior to the Office of Production Management?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it superior to Mr. Hopkins' office?

Mr. ADAMS. What is Mr. Hopkins' office?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Czar, in charge of $7,000,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I think not, if that is a correct statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator thinks Harry is superior to the Office for Emergency Management?

Mr. ADAMS. That does not follow at all. I think the two agencies are probably independent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How much are we spending on this office, which the Senator is so clearly illuminating for me?

Mr. ADAMS. I am not able to tell the Senator offhand. I will obtain that information for the Senator if I can. I do not have it at hand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I realize that it is of very small importance—probably only eight or ten million dollars, or some such amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committe amendment on page 7, beginning in line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies—Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel", on page 10, line 21, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$235,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is another item on which I should like a little more light. We are spending money by the billions of dollars; various persons have made gestures to cut down nondefense expenditures, but the item for the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel represents an increase of $60,000. I think it is an item which could very well be dispensed with. I know that the amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I should like to have from him an explanation as to why it is necessary at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if I may I will intrude ahead of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The figure of $235,000, while it is an increase above the House figure, also represents a decrease of $60,000 below the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau. The Bituminous Coal Act has among its functions the fixing of minimum prices. That tends to be for the benefit of the producers and their employees. The office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel has been set up as an independent agency. It is not a part of the Bituminous Coal Commission or its functions. Its purpose is to protect the consumer of coal againt excessive prices. We are advised that the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel follows the various hearings in which minimum prices are set.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I can add nothing to what the Senator from Colorado has said, except that the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel asked for $295,000, and that figure was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Witnesses appeared before the committee. The House cut the item from $295,000 to $175,000, which is not sufficient to do the work contemplated when the act was recently extended for 2 years.

I think $235,000 is not sufficient properly to man the office, but if that is all the committee wishes to allow, the office will have to be satisfied with it, and hope for more at a later time. The office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel is very important as a protection to domestic and wholesale consumers of coal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the object of the office? Is it to keep prices down?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes. The object is to protect the consumer. It is the best part of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel done anything in that direction in the past?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes. The office is represented at every hearing on the matter of minimum prices.

The office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel does not cost the Government a cent. All the money paid by the Bituminous Coal Commission to the Consumers' Counsel is paid from a tax of 1 cent a ton levied on all coal produced. When we cut off $120,000 we are not saving the Government anything. We are saving something for the producers of coal. We are not protecting the consumers, because we do not give the Consumers' Counsel sufficient money with which to operate effectively.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think that if this appropriation should be provided, the consumers of coal in other sections of the country than the coal-producing sections which he represents would be benefited by price reductions?

Mr. GUFFEY. They would be protected with respect to prices.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can tell the Senator from New Hampshire about specific instances within my own knowledge, not under the present bituminous coal set-up, but under the previous act, which was declared unconstitutional. The Consumers' Counsel, with very little authority under the law, by entering vigorous protest and communicating with various Members of the Senate and House, did not bring about decreases in the price of coal, but prevented unconscionable and unjustifiable increases. I can tell the Senator about that of my own knowledge. One of such instances had to do with the section in which I live.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 5, to insert:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Emergency health and sanitation activities (national defense), Public Health Service: For an additional amount for emergency health and sanitation activities (national defense), fiscal year 1942, including the same objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, $1,940,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 13, to insert:

Not to exceed $31,580 of the amount appropriated for "Emergency health and sanitation activities (national defense), Public Health Service, 1942" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, may be transferred to the appropriation "Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth, Public Health Service," and the limitation on the number of regular active commissioned officers is hereby increased by 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 13, after line 21, to insert:

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Defense public works (community facilities): To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by, and in accordance with the provisions of, title II of the act of October 14, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," as amended, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith including the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; expenses, when authorized by the Administrator, of attendance at meetings or conventions relating to the work of said title II; printing and binding; the employment of persons at the seat of Government and elsewhere; to remain available until expended, $150,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the committe, I offer an amendment on page 14, line 11, providing for a limitation on the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment on page 13, beginning in line 22, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 11, in the committee amendment, after the figures "$150,000,000" it is proposed to insert: "*Provided*, That the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses shall not exceed $6,750,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration", on page 14, after line 18, to insert:

The appropriation to the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency for construction of temporary office buildings, contained in title III of the Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby amended by inserting the words "or on the Arlington Experimental Farm in Virginia" after the words "on Government-owned land in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

General administrative expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1942, for eleven commissioners, secretary, and for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce, including the purchase of newspapers and the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, $150,000, and the limitation of $2,338,040 upon the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to $2,460,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 10, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, fiscal year 1942, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, emergency: For all necessary expenses to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the purpose of promoting the national security and defense, to adopt measures for preventing shortages of railroad equipment and congestion of traf-

fic, and expediting the movement of cars by railroads through terminals, and related activities, fiscal year 1942, $110,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to insert:

MARITIME LABOR BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For three Board members and for all other authorized and necessary expenditures of the Maritime Labor Board in performing the duties imposed by law, including contract stenographic services; lawbooks and books of reference; rental of equipment, travel expenses, and not to exceed $200 for newspapers and periodicals, fiscal year 1942, $105,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics", on page 16, line 12, after the figures "$214,080", to strike out the comma and "$465,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 18, to insert:

UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $5,000 for the expenses of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, contained in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia—Public Schools," on page 20, after line 5, to insert:

Clerks and other employees: For an additional amount for personal services of clerks and other employees, fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 24, after line 19, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

Forest-fire control (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies or individuals, to intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures in critical areas on Federal, State, county, municipal, or private lands, including the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $12,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1941, to remain available until June 30, 1942, $1,100,000: *Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 3 of the "Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes" shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days by the Department for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by said section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to insert:

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1942, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 511–511q), including the objects specified under this heading in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, $131,000, of which not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 12, to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

No part of the appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior", on page 28, after line 17, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries: For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, $50,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this particular amendment, which increases the amount for personal services in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior by $50,000, is another typical instance of an increase in an appropriation which I think at this time is unwarranted.

In the report of the Appropriations Committee at the time we find the following statement:

This increase is requested to provide $75,000 for additional positions in the new Division of Power established by the Secretary of the Interior by departmental order of April 18, 1941, for supervising functions in connection with electrical power matters in the Department of the Interior, the study of power problems, and the coordination of power policies and activities within the Department with other agencies dealing with power.

I feel that there is sufficient personnel in the Department of the Interior at the present time so that the Secretary can easily detail persons from the present personnel to perform these services without increasing the appropriation by $50,000 and creating new jobs for deserving New Dealers.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, just one word.

The Secretary of the Interior appeared before the committee and requested an appropriation of $75,000 for this purpose. He stated there had been created in the Department of the Interior a Power Division, and that if this Division was to function properly it was essential that they have additional members on their staff.

The committee was impressed by the fact that there was nothing at this time of greater importance than the proper functioning of the power facilities of the country, and we thought that if the committee was to be criticized at all it would be for cutting the amount rather than for putting it in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 2, after line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," at the top of page 29, to insert:

Agriculture and stock raising among Indians: For an additional amount for the purpose of developing agriculture and stock raising among Indians, fiscal year 1942, to be used for the purchase of land and improvements thereon (with or without mineral rights) for the sheep-breeding station on the Navajo Reservation, $24,520.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am extremely sorry that I was unable to be at the committee hearing last Saturday, when, no doubt, this item was discussed. Let me ask if this is the one for the State of New Mexico which went out of the Interior Department appropriation bill some weeks ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, Mr. President. At the time this matter was under consideration in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill the amount of money proposed was larger, and the area of land was larger. The purchase price of the land under this setup is about $2.70 an acre for about 8,000 acres, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I was unable to be at the committee hearings, or at the time when the full committee met on Saturday. This item came up before the Appropriations Committee when the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration by the committee. At that time it was not agreed to by the committee.

The item arose out of the following circumstances: Years ago the Government of the United States had a fort at a place called Fort Wingate in my State. The fort was abandoned in the early 1900's, and thereafter the land was turned over to the Indian Office for the benefit of that Office and of the Indians. Lately, under the national emergency, the Federal Government has located an ordnance depot at Fort Wingate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The understanding in the committee was that this matter should follow the desires of the Senator from New Mexico. He was not at the committee meeting, and we included the item in the bill. If the Senator from New Mexico wishes it to go out, I, for one—and I assume that I may speak for the other members of the committee—will be very glad to join him in rejecting the committee amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason why I want it to go out is because the Indian Office has millions of acres that can be used for this purpose without getting any more. I wish the item to be omitted from the bill.

Mr. ADAMS. In view of the Senator's statement, Mr. President, I hope the amendment may be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment at the top of page 29.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 7, to insert:

Protection of project works: For all expenses necessary, fiscal year 1942, to provide protection against sabotage and other subversive depredations, of dams, powerhouses, or other structures of the irrigation systems of the Indian Service, including employment of civilian guards, floodlights, gates, barricades, firearms, and ammunition, $45,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment provides $45,000 for the protection of certain dams, powerhouses, and structures of the irrigation systems of the Indian Service against sabotage, including employment of civilian guards, and so forth.

I think the protection is needed and warranted; but there is some question in my mind whether we want to establish that principle and start this appropriation for civilian guards, or whether it would not be wise to detail soldiers or members of the military forces of the country to protect these dams and powerhouses, and so forth, because of the military as well as the economic importance of such structures. I raise that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to I should like an answer from the chairman of the subcommittee as to whether he thinks that by inserting in the bill this appropriation of $45,000 we shall be establishing the principle of including that sort of protection as a permanent thing, so that such civilian employees may become permanent employees of the Government, or whether this is to be understood to be entirely a temporary matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is my hope that the provision is temporary. I have had some experiences in the past which lead me to be apprehensive of temporary measures becoming permanent; but, be that as it may, I think where we have large power and irrigation developments it would be rather unwise to leave them unprotected at this time. I am afraid, therefore, we shall have to take the hazard that disturbs the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that these developments should not be unprotected; but does the Senator believe that adding civilian employees of the type we probably will get would be a better method of procedure than having certain military forces detailed to guard the developments?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me on that point, I desire to say that the testimony before the committee by representatives of the General Staff was that the Army is strictly opposed to detailing soldiers to do this kind of work. They said that we are putting men into the Army to train them to fight. If they should be taken a long way from their camps to some isolated section where the Government owns a power plant, they would get no military training at all.

The second point raised by the Senator from New Hampshire is with regard to the type of men who might be employed. Inquiry was made about that matter in the committee, and no one is to be selected for these positions except from the civil-service rolls. These men will not be political appointees.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the Senator from Arizona that the experience in modern warfare has been, as he well knows, that power plants and dams, and so forth, are among the more important objectives, and every other country that has felt this danger has probably used military forces for their defense.

My only purpose is to suggest that the adoption of the amendment may involve the creation of a new civilian force which will be a permanent weight on the country when it would be my opinion that soldiers could do it more effectively and intelligently.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, Congress did the same thing a few days ago in creating a civilian force to take care of what is called housekeeping in the Army camps; that is to say, plumbers and mechanics of one kind and another to look after what is tantamount to the public utilities of a city. Otherwise, if soldiers were detailed for that purpose, when the troops marched away those so detailed would have to be left to take care of those camps. Congress, therefore, appropriated money for civilians to do this work, so that the soldiers may pursue their training for fighting in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, probably in the consideration of this item we ought to be guided by experience in the last war. At that time when reservoirs were considered to be exposed to hazard they were guarded and taken care of. In the first instance, that was done by the military, but the military proved themselves to be not so good as civilian guards for the particular purpose. In the beginning of an emergency when the danger is from sabotage or from fire or from something other than a strictly military objective, it is very much better to have a civilian type of guard, because each guard can do more work per man than is done in the military way. That is merely a statement made from actual experience. In instances where the military were detailed it was merely a matter of time when they were relieved and civilians were put in their place. The spirit of this amendment reflects purposely what was the best opinion as it was arrived at from actual experience in 1917 and 1918.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that in discussing this item it should be noted that there is a still larger amount provided on page 31 for the protection of reclamation projects. The item under discussion is limited to Indian projects, while the one on page 31 provides an appropriation of $410,000 for a much wider field of activity. Whatever discussion applies to the one applies equally to the other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Reinforcing what the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has said, I should like to say, from my own experience and observation, that the type of guard duty which is taken care of in these items is not the type of guard duty for which the military forces are best fitted or even fairly suitable. Such work is usually required to be done at some distance from the base of the military organization. It interferes with training and ordinary discipline and routine of the men involved. It requires rationing and subsistence, usually from some distance, and it is not the kind of duty that a man who has enlisted to fight in the Army considers being along the line of his particular aptitude. I believe we will get very much better guard service, with very much less interference with the duties of the soldier, and at certainly less cost to the Government, by employing civilian guards than by taking men from military organizations and sending them some distance, interfering with the ordinary methods of supply and discipline and training to no purpose. I think that these items are very excellent ones.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the men who are to be employed to protect these various projects will come from the civil-service rolls?

Mr. ADAMS. I cannot answer that, but they would come from civilian life, and they would be civilians as distinguished from those belonging to the military service.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that, but it has been suggested that they would be taken from the civil-service rolls.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I made inquiry of the Commissioner of Reclamation as to how these guards would be obtained, and he said from the civil-service rolls.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it, then, that there will be required examination for the particular type of guard duty which is contemplated at each particular project?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know about that. A large number of guard positions are now under the civil service.

Mr. LUCAS. This item is "to provide protection against sabotage and other subversive depredations." That is in line with the proposal in the bill presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] some days ago in connection with an additional force of men to guard certain plants in the navy yards. The type of individual so employed in the navy yards has to have more than the ordinary soldier has in the way of performing this character of guard duty. He has to have a superior knowledge of human nature, a knowledge of plants, and so forth, before he can obtain the position as a guard or as a watchman or as an investigator or whatever his duty may be in connection with that work. I take it that this is somewhat along the same line. I do not know what the hearings show with respect to the pay these men will receive, but in the bill presented by the Senator from Massachusetts the lowest pay such a guard would receive would be $2,600 a year.

Mr. ADAMS. They would be under the Classification Act.

Mr. LUCAS. So they would receive much more pay, I take it, than the ordinary soldier is getting at the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are a number of construction camps in this country where short-term convicts are employed on road work under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads. All the guards are selected from the civil-service rolls. I know they have a list of that kind. It requires peculiar qualifications which can be specified and the men can be obtained.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I was making was that under this provision, as I see it, the type of men, as the Senator from Missouri said a moment ago, who would perform this duty, would probably be better fitted for the work than would be the ordinary soldier taken from the ranks.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has said would be true if specially trained men would be selected, but I do not know that we have any assurance they will be selected in that manner. They will be under the set-up proposed in the Navy; we have removed any doubt as to them, but I do not know in this instance if the guards are to be taken from the civil rolls or merely generally from amongst the civilian population, whether there is any assurance that they will be as efficient as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggests, though if the suggestion that trained men be selected were followed, of course, they would be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, beginning in line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 13, to insert:

Natives in Alaska: For an additional amount for natives in Alaska, fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until June 30, 1943, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 18, to insert:

Medical relief in Alaska: For an additional amount for medical relief in Alaska, fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until June 30, 1943, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 23, to insert:

Reindeer service: For an additional amount for reindeer service in Alaska, fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941, to remain available until June 30, 1943, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 3, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of attorney or attorneys for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin (tribal funds): For compensation and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys employed by the Menominee Indians under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with existing law, fiscal year 1942, $5,200, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 10, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys for the Indians of the Klamath Reservation, Oreg. (tribal funds): For compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Indians of the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., under a contract or contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of said Indians: *Provided*, That the amount herein appropriated shall be available for compensation earned and expenses incurred during the period covered by the said contract or contracts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of attorneys, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana (tribal funds): For compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior on May 9, 1941, fiscal year 1942, $7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of such tribes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Protection of project works: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1942, for protection of project works, to be used for the employment of civilian guards, and other necessary expenses, independently or in cooperation with other agencies, as specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, $410,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines", on page 32, after line 20, to insert:

Helium plants and investigations: Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to expenditures from the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines for helium plants and investigations in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, approved April 1, 1941; for helium plants and investigations and helium production and investigations in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942; and for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164), authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 3, to insert:

Government of the Virgin Islands, survey of public-works needs: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and the employment by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an engineer or firm of engineers, if necessary, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive and complete survey of the need for the replacement of hospitals, schools, and other institutional buildings, and the need for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of sewer, water, power, and other utility services, and other public works necessary for the welfare of the Virgin Islands of the United States, fiscal year 1942, $5,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be transmitted to the Congress covering the results of such survey, together with estimates of costs of all projects, not later than June 30, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Fiscal Year 1941", on page 40, after line 17, to insert:

REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Construction and machinery: On account of objects heretofore authorized under this heading (and appropriated for in part), for the acquisition, conversion, or construction of 550,000 tons of auxiliary vessels authorized by the act approved May 24, 1941 (Public Law 72, 77th Cong.), and for the acquisition and the conversion of merchant vessels for use by the War Department as transports to replace vessels transferred by the War Department to the Navy Department, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 4, to strike out the subhead "Hydrographic Office" and insert in lieu thereof the subhead "Naval Observatory", and in line 7, after the word "expenses", to strike out "Hydrographic Office" and insert "Naval Observatory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Fiscal Year 1942", on page 45, after line 22, to strike out:

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Construction and machinery: On account of objects heretofore authorized under this heading (and appropriated for in part), for the acquisition, conversion, or construction of 550,000 tons of auxiliary vessels authorized by the act approved May 24, 1941 (Public Law 72, 77th Cong.), and for the acquisition and the conversion of merchant vessels for use by the War Department as transports to replace vessels transferred by the War Department to the Navy Department, any vessels transferred from the War Department to the Navy Department to be considered as a part of the additional tonnage authorized by the above-mentioned act, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Navy Department—Salaries in the District of Columbia", on page 46, line 23, after the words "employment of", to strike out "one additional employee (a special attorney in the office of the Under Secretary of the Navy)" and insert "two additional employees (one special attorney in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy and one a special assistant in the Office of Budget and Reports appointed at a salary per annum not in excess of $5,600)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General", on page 49, line 14, after the numerals "1941", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 12, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$520,705", and insert "$1,134,191."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Contributions, quotas, and so forth", on page 56, after line 3, to insert:

International Monetary and Economic Conference, 1933–41: The unexpended balance of the appropriation "International Monetary and Economic Conference, 1933–41," contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, approved June 27, 1940, is continued available for the same purpose until June 30, 1942, including obligations chargeable against the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary", on page 56, after line 13, to insert:

Foreign-owned property control: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, foreign-owned property control," fiscal year 1941, including the same objects specified under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940, $38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard", on page 60, line 22, after the word "relief", to strike out "therefrom;" and", and insert "therefrom;",", and on page 61, in line 11, after the word "reimbursed" and the quotation marks, to insert "and, (3), increase the amount which may be expended for recreation, amusement, comfort, contentment, and health of enlisted men from $46,720 to $51,621."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 14, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 82, and", and in line 16, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$600" and insert "$619.49."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military Activities", on page 64, after line 19, to insert:

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

MILITARY POSTS

Construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts: For an additional amount for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified therein, fiscal year 1942, $6,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure unless and until the bill H. R. 3537, Seventy-seventh Congress, is enacted into law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. The next amendments have to do with judgments and audited claims. I ask that they be approved en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 84, after line 21, insert:

(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1938 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 78, Seventy-seventh Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Independent offices: For operations under Mineral Act of October 5, 1918, $4,058.94.

For wage records, Social Security Board, 11 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Social Security Board, $2.71.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $10.70.

Department of Agriculture: For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $499.78.

For retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, 1938–December 31, 1939, $41.62.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, Act June 28, 1937), $74.42.

For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, 53 cents.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, $5.59.

For elimination of diseased cattle, Department of Agriculture, $600.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture, $4.58.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, $352.02.

Department of the Interior: For National Park Service, $3.92.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, $16.96.

For Indian school support, $44.01.

For general expenses, Indian Service, $94.55.

For conservation of health among Indians, $76.69.

For Indian boarding schools, 49 cents.

For support of Indians and administration of Indian property, 59 cents.

For irrigation, Indian reservations (reimbursable), $2.26.

For expenses of organizing Indian corporations, $68.35.

For agriculture and stock raising among Indians, $65.63.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service, $27.22.

Navy Department: For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $47,869.48.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $929.62.

For payment to officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to appreciation of foreign currencies (Navy), $57.14.

For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $32,642.55.

For aviation, Navy, $1,780.20.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 32 cents.

Department of State: For contingent expenses, Foreign Service, $505.

For foreign-service pay adjustment appreciation of foreign currencies (State), $19.33.

For transportation of Foreign Service officers, $63.04.

Treasury Department: For collecting the internal revenue, $1.59.

For stationery, Treasury Department, $1.18.

War Department: For Organized Reserves, 15 cents.

For Army transportation, $85.90.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $286.19.

For pay of the Army, $39.11.

For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $2.38.

For clothing and equipage, $62.10.

For Air Corps, Army, $27.36.

For travel of the Army, $1.20.

For working fund, War, Chemical Warfare Service (Navy, construction repair), $984.98.

For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $22.22.

For Civilian Conservation Corps, $322.33.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act of June 22, 1936), $64.70.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act February 9, 1937), $72.50.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act March 31, 1933), $171.93.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act June 19, 1934), $28.55.

Emergency relief: For emergency relief, emergency conservation work, War, Civilian Conservation Corps, $436.17.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, administrative expenses, general, $55.70.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, Federal projects approved prior to June 30, 1937, $241.83.

For emergency relief, Resettlement Administration, sanitation, prevention of soil erosion, etc. (transfer to Agriculture), $3,229.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, National Youth Administration (Federal projects), $68.97.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, grants to States, etc., $86.46.

For emergency relief, Works Progress Administration, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, $7.50.

For emergency relief, Resettlement Administration, rural rehabilitation (transfer to Agriculture), $63.50.

For emergency relief, Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, public buildings, parks, utilities, flood control, etc., $19.58.

Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For clerks, first- and second-class post offices, $303.74.

For payment of rewards, $25.

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $96,630.37, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 205, page 90, line 3, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 79, and", and in line 4, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$254,685.36" and insert "$285,456.79", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 205. For the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office pursuant to the act entitled "An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain, and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899," approved May 2, 1940 (Public Act No. 505, 76th Cong.), which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), under the War Department, in Senate Document No. 79, and House Document No. 266 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, $285,456.79.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 14, after the word "violence", to insert: "*Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the various executive departments and

other governmental agencies as may be designated for the purpose by the heads of the various executive departments and other governmental agencies are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits referred to in this section and similar sections in other appropriation acts, and they shall charge no fee for so doing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 304, page 93, line 8, after the word "expended", to insert "(except as otherwise provided for herein)", and in line 11, after the words "United States", to insert "whose post of duty is in continental United States", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended (except as otherwise provided for herein) shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States, whose post of duty is in continental United States, unless such person is a citizen of the United States, or a person in the service of the United States on the date of the approval of this act who being eligible for citizenship had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 305. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person for services in a plant engaged in the manufacture or production of any defense article as defined in Public Law 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, who assists in maintaining a picket line or otherwise seeks forcibly to prevent the return of workmen after the National Defense Mediation Board shall have certified to the President that further stoppage of work in that plant will critically impede the national-defense program and has asked the employees to return to work.

SEC. 306. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of compensation to any person, firm, or corporation, who shall, for as long as 10 days, fail or refuse to respect and abide by the recommendation of the National Defense Mediation Board: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to individuals who may become members of the military or naval forces.

SEC. 307. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein for the fiscal year 1942 shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 305. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein for the fiscal year 1942 and the appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1942, the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, shall be available from and including July 1, 1941, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1941, and the respective dates of enactment of this act and such other appropriation acts in anticipation of such respective appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is also proposed to renumber the next section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the able chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill. My attention was diverted as we were going through the amendments, and I should like to ask the Senator concerning an amendment which I realize has already been agreed to. I refer to the committee amendment on page 26, line 14, which says:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

No part of the appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, under the heading "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation," shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

As I understand the situation, the effect of this amendment would be to prevent any of the employees of the Farm Security Administration from going under civil service; and I wanted to ask the Senator as to the reasons why the committee inserted the amendment. Although I have had very little time to go into the matter since it was called to my attention, it seems to me that this amendment will create a very bad personnel situation in the Department of Agriculture. Every other division, agency, and activity of the Department will go under civil service on the 1st of July, with the exception of this one agency, assuming, of course, that this amendment prevails in conference.

It strikes me that from an administrative standpoint that will create a serious situation. For the purposes of proper administration, a department naturally has one personnel office, as I understand. If this particular agency, now under the Department of Agriculture, does not have civil service, and all other agencies do, it means that they must have an entirely different procedure in order that their employees may be taken from under the civil-service requirements that will affect every other employee of the Department. If the Senator is willing, I should like to have him give some explanation as to why the committee recommended this special treatment for this particular activity of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to explain the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not the author of this amendment. It was proposed in the first instance by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I did, however, support the amendment in the committee. I did it for the reason that it developed that the salaries which are paid in the Farm Security Administration are somewhat lower than those that would be paid under civil-service rates, and I feared to make too drastic a change in the set-up of this agency without knowing all the consequences which might ensue.

It had developed in the hearings before the subcommittee on the Agriculture Department appropriations, as will be found on page 475 of the hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill, that Mr. Baldwin testified that it would take $8,000,000 a year additional to pay the same scale of salaries in the Farm Security Administration as required by the civil service. He further stated, by way of illustration, that the average salary of the clerks in the county offices is approximately $1,070 per annum.

There is no doubt but that the Classification Board—

And I quote from Mr. Baldwin's testimony—

if title II of the Ramspeck bill were in effect, would say those salaries should be from $1,260 to $1,620. The average supervisor's salary, which we have recently raised somewhat, at the present time is about $2,000.

Under his testimony it would be necessary to increase those salaries considerably—by $800 for each supervisor.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of difficulty with respect to the Farm Security Administration in explaining to those who are not familiar with every phase of the program why it is necessary to expend such a large part of their appropriation for administrative expenses. The administrative expenses of the Farm Security Administration have been a constant target of attack ever since this agency was created in the first instance—I believe by Executive order. It is true that this agency has a large personnel. It is necessary, of course, that it have at least one representative in every county where any considerable agricultural activities are found. It has something like 3,000, I believe, of these field agents or supervisors. All counties have one, and some them have two. In addition there is a woman supervisor who works with the clientele, and it is absolutely essential that the Farm Security Administration have those supervisors if the Government is ever to recapture its loans.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, if the Senator will pardon me at that point, it is because of this administrative supervision and activity that the program has been a success instead of the failure which some persons predicted when it was inaugurated.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is absolutely correct; but I fear that if there should be any drastic increase in the appropriation for salaries in this agency it might open up discussion and cause a curtailment of the appropriation at some future date; and I do not believe the Farm Security Administration can possibly get along with less personnel than they have at the present time. If this agency goes under civil service, and the compensation of those who are employed by it is increased, it will be necessary either to lay off a good many of these county supervisors or clerks to county supervisors or else to secure a deficiency

appropriation of some kind to compensate them at the civil-service rates. I do not wish to hazard a reduction in the personnel; and, having understood from Mr. Baldwin's testimony that he was not insisting that this agency go under civil service, I supported this amendment in the committee, and made practically the same statement there that I have made here today.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have grave doubt about the wisdom of this provision. I know the Senator from Georgia and other members of the subcommittee are as ardent believers in the program of the Farm Security Administration as I am, but I believe it will create a very serious administrative and personnel problem to have one agency of a department outside civil service while all other agencies and employees are under civil service.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote whereby the amendment now under discussion was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to detain the Senate, because I have already stated my reasons for opposition to the amendment, but I am sure that everyone familiar with administrative and personnel problems will immediately grasp the difficulties which will face the Farm Security Administration if it is excluded from civil service, while all other agencies and activities of the department to which the Administration is attached are included. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a further statement. The Farm Security Administration has never been under the civil service, so they have managed somehow to get along up until now without having been under the civil service. They have been in operation for several years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Other agencies also have not been under the civil service. It is only because of the Ramspeck bill, and the Executive order thereunder, that all these agencies are now going under the civil service. This particular agency, if the amendment prevails, will be treated in a different manner from that accorded to all the others, which will be under the civil service after the 1st of July. It will stick up like a sore thumb.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is quite true that the other agencies have been covered into the civil service. But I wish to point out that the Farm Security Administration has gotten along until now without being under the civil service, and if this amendment shall be rejected a condition will be brought about within the Farm Security Administration so that it will either be necessary to lay off a considerable number of personnel, or procure a deficiency appropriation immediately with which to compensate the employees who are now being employed in that agency.

I wish to point out that an average compensation of $1,070 per annum for a clerk in the Office of the Farm Security Administration in one of the rural counties, while it is not an overpayment of that person, is certainly the equivalent of the compensation of a clerk receiving $1,140, or $1,440, or $1,620 per annum working in a regional office in one of the larger cities.

We would bring criticism on the Farm Security Administration, in my judgment, in the rural sections, if we established the higher wage scale, which would be brought about by the civil-service administration. In my opinion, the safest thing to do is to adopt the amendment, and at least let it go to conference—let us have an opportunity to look into the matter and see what the effect of placing this agency under civil service would be.

According to the testimony of Mr. Baldwin before the committee in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill, it would mean an increase in the compensation of every person employed by the Farm Security Administration—and they have a large number of employees—amounting to from $150 to $600 per annum. That would be the effect of the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is not that due to the Classification Act rather than to the method of appointment?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have the same effect. The Classification Act does not take effect as to the Farm Security Administration, as I understand, until they are covered into the civil service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it seems to me the object at which the Senator is aiming could be accomplished if the amendment read "without regard to the Classification Act" instead of "appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws." Would it not then be in conference, if the conferees wanted to consider the proposition of letting them come in under civil service, personnel intact, so to speak, and yet not be under the Classification Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the matter would be in conference. I think the conferees could change the amendment. I do not know that it would be wise to do so. Some of those who are connected with the executive department of the Government in very high places have recommended this amendment, so that this matter could be given further study.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is speaking about the administrative difficulties which would result if this amendment were agreed to. As I follow the Senator from Georgia, there would be greater administrative difficulties if the language should be left just as it is.

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be almost insuperable administrative difficulties if this agency is required to pay this higher wage scale. In my opinion, they would have to lay off hundreds of employees all over the country, and I do not believe that they could administer this vast program with any smaller personnel than they have at the present time. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 26, lines 13 to 18.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to make clear that those who are in favor of the amendment will vote "aye."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2097) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k), and asking a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. NORRIS. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment, that the request of the House for a further conference be agreed to, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. BULOW, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5049) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 11, 12, 28, 36, 46, 67, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 93, 95, 111, 118, and 133.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 114, 116, 119, 120, 121, 127, 128, 134, and 138; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$126,880"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$121,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$7,405,105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to appoint one additional teacher, class 2-A, for instruction in automobile driving at a beginning salary of $2,000"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$281,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "purchase and installation (not exceeding $100) of dual-control equipment for use in driver-training courses,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$70,775"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,933,427"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$3,099,503"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$103,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$54,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$861,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$320,315"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That on and after September 15, 1941, no part of the funds herein appropriated for the National Training School for Girls shall be used for white inmates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$1,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$620,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further*, That the street-railway company shall after construction maintain, mark and light the same at its expense"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$546,971"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", including the entire cost of paving the track area"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and the purchase of one additional motor vehicle"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 35, 52, 53, 59, 96, 113, 123, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 139, 140, and 141.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
GEORGE H. MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5049, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 28, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 35, 59, 96, 113, 123, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 139, 140, and 141 to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 136 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert ": *Provided, however*, That the waiver of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the letting of contracts for construction in connection with this project,"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 52 and 53 to said bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 136.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 52 and 53, ask for a further conference with the House on the amendments in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4756) "making appropriations for the Legislative Branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, and 38; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert: "Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the

aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law or Senate resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, on or before the first day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert: "Senate Folding Room: For repairs and improvements in the building now occupied by the Senate Folding Room, including labor, materials, and other necessary expenses, $3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$76,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$130,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF MINES

INVESTIGATION OF RAW MATERIAL RESOURCES, WESTERN STEEL PRODUCTION

For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to investigate by subsurface exploration the amount and quality of certain iron ores, limestone, and coking coals essential to expanding steel production in the West, including all necessary laboratory research; preliminary examination and subsurface exploration of raw materials; supplies and equipment; traveling expenses; not to exceed $13,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, professional and scientific books and publications, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, computing, and addressing machines, and other labor-saving devices, accessories and repairs, including exchange and maintenance thereof, and purchase of such personal wearing apparel or equipment as may be required for the protection of employees while engaged in their work, fiscal year 1942, $350,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, and to carry out the projects in cooperation with other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, and State agencies, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, my amendment covers an item sent up from the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Mines. It has Budget approval, and comes directly from the President of the United States. I hope Senators will give me their attention for a few moments so that I may explain the situation.

The amendment provides for an appropriation of $350,000 for further exploration and investigation of iron, coal, and lime deposits in the State of Utah, and of iron deposits in southern California. For over 6 months I have been studying very closely and very earnestly the question of steel facilities and steel supplies on the Pacific coast. Over 6 months ago I went to the National Advisory Defense Council to confer with them about the situation on the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I find that seven Pacific-coast States—Oregon, Washington, California, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, and Nevada—consumed normally, before the expansion under the national-defense emergency, 2,276,000 tons of steel. Of the 2,276,000 tons of steel consumed in those 7 States, they produced only 600,000 tons, leaving a deficit in steel production on the west coast of 1,676,000 tons.

On the Pacific coast today the Government, under its national-defense program, has expanded its shipbuilding facilities probably five or six times. I was recently in conference with one of the big shipbuilding contractors of the west coast. He told me it was absolutely impossible to get any orders of steel through until next December, and that for one company it was impossible to get any through until next January. We find today that the shipping facilities through the Canal have been decreased materially. Scores and scores of ships which were formerly available to carry steel through the Panama Canal have now been taken out of that service and are being used on the Atlantic. We find today that there exists a greater menace to the country and to the Pacific coast than ever before existed, not only from Japan, but from Germany, for if Germany conquers Russia and goes into Siberia that will bring Hitler so much closer to the west coast of the United States.

I have talked with Mr. Hauck, of the Steel Division of the O. P. M., and I have talked to Mr. S. R. Fuller time and time again on this question. After our conferences Mr. Fuller wrote a personal letter to the President of the United States requesting that O. P. M. be furnished with information as to the iron-ore deposits and coal deposits in California and in other States on the Pacific coast.

In March 1940 an article appeared in the Iron Age pointing out the deficiency of steel production on the western coast. Some days ago, Senators, we read of a proposed expansion of steel-production facilities in the Middle West amounting to $85,000,000. An expansion in the West of over $100,000,000 in steel facilities and steel production is proposed. But one of the big questions facing us is, How about iron ore deposits; how about coal deposits; how about lime and coke? Where are they to be found? How can this Nation, how can O. P. M. intelligently provide for a $100,000,000 steel expansion on the Pacific coast without first deciding where the iron ore deposits are, what their character and quality are, and whether they are suitable for such an expansion?

Mr. President, I understand there is to be, in the State of Colorado, a $15,000,000 expansion of the Colorado fuel and iron plant. There is also proposed an expansion of the Columbia Steel facilities at Provo, Utah. There is also a proposal for additional facilities in California. But the question today confronting O. P. M. and the President is whether the iron in those States which is contemplated to be used in connection with this program, is of suitable quality.

This morning I talked to Dr. Sayers, head of the Bureau of Mines, with respect to my amendment. He is very much disappointed at the action of the committee, and said that it will interfere with the Bureau's ability to give to the O. P. M. the information and the knowledge which they should have before they go ahead with the expansion program. I talked to members of the subcommittee today with respect to this item, and from my talk with them I felt they were a little flustered at the thought of the amendment being adopted. I know the amendment is meritorious. Before it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Sayers and representatives of the O. P. M. appeared before the Bureau and showed the necessity for additional information concerning the steel facilities of the West and the raw materials of the West.

Mr. President, I can go through the bill from one end to the other and find no amendment in it which, in my opinion, is so important to the national-defense program as is this particular item, which was left out of the bill.

In the State of Utah we have vast iron ore deposits, we have vast coal deposits, but there are two questions to be decided. One is whether those vast coal deposits are of coking quality. If they are not, what happens? They are discarded and the expansion goes to some other part of the United States.

Then there is another question. Although these iron-ore deposits crop out on the surface for probably a mile or two, the question is whether they are of sufficient quality to justify the expenditure of several million dollars before it is known what will be disclosed at depth.

What is the only system by which this matter can be gone into and an ascertainment made of the quality of that iron and coal, not only in Utah but in California? There is a way, an economical way, an efficient way, and that is by diamond drilling. With the expenditure of $350,000 the necessary depth can be drilled, and we can know conclusively whether the ores or the coal are suitable for the expansion of steel facilities on the west coast.

Mr. President, the question is whether it is economy to go ahead with the expansion and then after we have built a plant costing several million dollars find that the iron-ore deposits are not of a sufficiently good quality to be used. Is it not the economical thing, is it not the intelligent thing, first to do the diamond drilling and then build the plant? That is the purpose of the amendment.

In my talks with Mr. Fuller, when he was at the head of the Raw Materials Division of O. P. M., he said to me, "Senator, we do not have sufficient information yet to go ahead with an expansion on the Pacific coast." He said, "We must have enough money to go out there and diamond drill deposits from one end to the other, and know what the quality of a deposit is, before Government money is expended for expansion."

As I understand, there is going to be expansion in Colorado, in the State of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, involving $15,000,000. There should be expansion in Utah, there should be expansion in California, so that when the crucial time comes, if it ever comes, by way of Japan, we shall not be dependent on steel from the East for shipbuilding on the Pacific coast, or dependent on keeping the Panama Canal open.

Mr. President, it is time that the people of the United States and the Senate of the United States began to consider the Pacific coast as a part of the United States rather than merely as a colony. I do not know any satisfactory answer, and I have been unable to get any from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], or from any other member of the subcommittee, to the question as to why it is uneconomical to give the Bureau of Mines the money with which intelligently to explore and investigate these deposits.

Mr. President, this is not a time for sectionalism. This is not a time to be worrying about what effect some development in one State may have on some other State. This is a time when every Senator and every Member of the other House should be looking at the resources of the whole United States, with the idea of efficiently defending the Pacific coast and the Atlantic coast.

I call the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is present, to the fact that notwithstanding that at Provo, Utah, we produce pig iron as cheaply as it is produced anywhere else in the United States, yet by reason of a lack of facilities on the Pacific coast manufacturers there are paying the highest prices in the United States for steel. Why? For the simple reason that in normal times 1,606,000 tons must come around through the Panama Canal from Birmingham and Sparrows Point. Is that economy? Is it patriotic to say to the O. P. M., "You are not entitled to this information."

I know they have found that one of the most serious bottlenecks—in my opinion next in importance to the bottleneck in aluminum production—is the bottleneck in steel production. Are we going to wait? Are we going to delay? Are we going to put off until it is too late finding where we can obtain additional iron ore and coking coal? Or are we going to do the economical and statesmanlike thing today, and tell the Office of Production Management "Through the technical service we have established, the Bureau of Mines, we are going to ascertain what the Western States have in the way of iron ore, coking coal, and limestone; and if we find iron ore, coal, and limestone in sufficient quantities and of a quality to justify expansion, then we will go ahead, but not until then."

As I said in the beginning, this is a request coming from the President of the United States. Why? Because he was advised by Mr. Fuller, of the Office of Production Management, that there was a lack of information as to the type and quality of iron ore in southern California and in the State of Utah.

I do not like to detain the Senate; but I think that this question is of sufficient importance to demand our sincere consideration. We know what has happened in connection with aluminum production. We know that by reason of certain selfish interests in the United States we are today confronted with a bottleneck that is puzzling every man that has anything to do with it, to find out how we can remove that bottleneck. The same thing is true with respect to steel. We have just as much of a bottleneck with respect to steel. Why should the west coast be dependent on shipments from Sparrows Point and Birmingham if we have the natural resources in the Western States to produce our own steel? Is it any argument against an item of this kind to say that it may be competitive with some other State or some other section of the United States? Is our outlook so narrow, and our interest in the whole United States so selfish, that simply because the development of one State or one section may be competitive with another, we are willing to say "No" to an item of this kind?

It may be argued that in the general appropriation bill for the Interior Department sufficient funds were appropriated; but that is not true. If it were true the Bureau of the Budget would not have approved this supplemental estimate for the Bureau of Mines. This morning I talked to Dr. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, and he told me:

> We simply do not have the money to ascertain these facts. Thirty thousand feet of diamond drilling would be required to ascertain what we must know before we can efficiently and economically expand steel production in the West.

Are we going ahead in the efficient way? Are we going ahead by diamond drilling before expansion, or are we going to wait until the plants are built and then find out that the iron ore and coal are not of the right quality to do the job?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Utah happened to notice an article in one of the Washington newspapers yesterday to the effect that during the past 6 months Germany has had engineers in the Ukraine and in the Caucasus making a survey in Russia of its limestone, iron, oil, and other mineral resources? How strange it is that Germany, straining every effort at war, should have the energy, the money, and the ability to make a survey of mineral resources in an alien country, while we, wealthy, powerful, and at peace, apparently lack the financial ability to find $350,000 to survey great resources in our western area, resources which may become vital to our national defense within the next year or two.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I desire to say further that the iron-ore deposits of Utah have been investigated and explored by private interests. Many reports are available from private engineers. But the Federal Government does not go ahead on the basis of private reports. We have our own agencies on which we depend. In this case the agency is the Bureau of Mines, which tells us that because of a lack of funds it has not the necessary information on iron and coal in California and Utah, but that if we will make the proposed appropriation it will take only a few weeks—at the most, a few months—to go out there and drill, and it can then tell the Government exactly what exists in that area in the way of such resources.

Mr. President, I do not know that I can say anything further. I know that it is especially difficult for a new Member of this body to find himself in opposition to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill and the majority members of the committee. But, Mr. President, I consider this item of sufficient importance that the Senate of the United States should not say "No" to it. Why should the Pacific coast, which is just as important to this Nation as is the Atlantic coast, be dependent for its coal supply on the Panama Canal, if we have the coal there? If we have the coal, then why in the name of heaven do we not ascertain that fact and be ready, whenever an attack is made on that coast, to supply a large percentage of our steel from that section of the country?

If there is any substantial answer to this amendment, I do not know what it is. If we can afford to spend billions and billions of dollars for defense; if we can afford to spend $7,000,000,000 of our treasure to help England, then in the name of economy let us spend $350,000

to ascertain what we have in the West in the way of iron ore and coal.

I hope the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill will see his way clear to go ahead with us on this amendment and let the Bureau of Mines ascertain, first, whether we have the right materials out there to proceed with steel expansion.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has an erroneous view as to the relative situation of himself and the chairman of the subcommittee. We are not in opposition to the Senator from Utah. The Appropriations Committee endeavors to take up the problems that come before it. If an amendment is not adopted, that does not mean that the Appropriations Committee or any member of it is necessarily in opposition to an individual Senator or to his project. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] did not appear before the Appropriations Committee, where both of them would have been welcome. Had a very small part of the energy and enthusiasm which they have displayed on the floor been exhibited before the committee, perhaps, a different result would have followed.

We are told that there is no reason for the failure of the Appropriations Committee to put this item in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In my opinion, the answer to the Senator is that the question involved is very technical. It is one which can be answered only by the technical service of the Government.

On Saturday I conferred with the distinguished Senator from Colorado and talked with every member of the committee I could find on the floor, and expressed the hope that this item would be included. I had read the statement of Dr. Sayers, of the Bureau of Mines. I had talked to the Bureau of the Budget about the item, and they told me that they felt it was a meritorius item of appropriation and should be adopted.

I will say to the Senator that in my appearances before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and of the House I often find that it is an imposition for Senators to come there and take up the time of the Appropriations Committee when the members of the committee already have the technical information on an item which involves technical matters. That is why I did not come; and I thought that the item was so meritorious that there was little need of my coming to say anything in addition to what Dr. Sayers said.

But Dr. Sayers, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, tells me that he was cut off at the hearing, and was asked merely to furnish a statement. That is the information I received this morning.

Mr. ADAMS. I did not happen to be in the committee when Dr. Sayers testified. I know nothing as to that.

Mr. MURDOCK. He said he was anxious and willing to testify, but that he was told to furnish a statement.

Mr. ADAMS. I can assure the Senator from Utah that any time he requests a hearing before a committee of which I am a member his persuasive and effective voice will be heard to the limit of his desires.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. ADAMS. If the committee has been in error, perhaps he presumed too much upon the intelligence of the committee, as perhaps at times he has upon that of the courts, by not arguing his case.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that is impossible.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. I merely wish to state to the Senator from Colorado that I did not want by my remarks to imply any criticism against any member of the committee. Of course, on all the issues that come before the Senate there are two sides, and I was endeavoring merely to present to the Senate the side in which I believe. I did not want to imply any criticism at all.

However, in the meantime I do desire to endeavor to exculpate myself from blame. I may say that I endeavor to appear before all committees considering bills which involve the Pacific coast and California if I have time to do so. I did not have any time or opportunity to pay any attention to this matter until after it had been acted upon, and I hope the Senator will clear me of all blame.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me say to the Senator that I know he is busy. Some of the rest of us have been rather busy. Let me give an illustration. Ordinarily we do not like to work in the Senate or in committees on Saturday. On Saturday, at the time this bill was before the Appropriations Committee, it so happened there was a session of the Senate, and the Senator from Colorado had six committee meetings. He attended five of them. If some matter did not receive full consideration, perhaps some allowance is to be made for those of us who are putting in hours almost as long as those the Senator from California is putting in.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say to the Senate that I have a full realization of the very heavy burden being borne here by the senior Senators in the work they are doing. I know the work they are endeavoring to carry on is almost beyond the energies of any set of men, and I am deeply sympathetic to everything the Senator from Colorado has said. Again I want to say to the Senator from Colorado that in anything I said there was not the slightest implication of criticism directed to any member of his committee.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not want the Senator to withhold any deserved criticism. I merely want to have criticism made if it is justified. It might correct the error of our ways in the future.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am trying to state as clearly as possible that I do not intend the slightest implication of criticism directed to any committee member by anything I have said.

I believe that this appropriation should be made. If the eloquence of the Senator from Utah has converted the Senator from Colorado to that viewpoint, the question becomes moot, and all of us will be very happy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, I want to endorse all that has been said by my colleague and by the Senator from California. I want also to endorse in the strongest terms possible the words which have been uttered by the Senator from Colorado in relation to the work which has fallen upon the Appropriations Committee, especially at this time. It is because I appreciate the fact that the committee has been overworked, because I realize that this recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget and from the President of the United States came up to the committee rather late, that I should like to ask if the committee gave the recommendation in regard to this survey the study to which under all the circumstances it is entitled.

Mr. ADAMS. I can only say that there were no full hearings on the matter. Practically all that we had before us was a very brief statement. We did have, as the junior Senator from Utah says, his statement of his very great interest. We knew that naturally the Senators from Utah and California would be heartily interested in an appropriation which, upon its face, was in the interests of the States of Utah and California.

Here is the Budget estimate. I desire to read it into the RECORD so that Senators may know the many things included in it. It says:

> For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to investigate by subsurface exploration the amount and quality of certain iron ores, limestone, and coking coals essential to expanding steel production in the West, including all necessary laboratory research; preliminary examination and subsurface exploration of raw materials; supplies and equipment; traveling expenses; not to exceed $13,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, professional and scientific books and publications, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, computing, and addressing machines, and other labor-saving devices, accessories and repairs, including exchange and maintenance thereof, and purchase of such personal wearing apparel or equipment as may be required for the protection of employees while engaged in their work, fiscal year 1942, $350,000;

Then this followed:

> *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, and to carry out the projects in cooperation with other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, and State agencies, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

Then the Bureau of the Budget added this brief word in support of the estimate I have read:

The purpose of this estimate is to provide funds for the Bureau of Mines to carry on exploratory work in the States of Utah and California for the purpose of determining the quality and quantity of coal, coke, lime, and iron-ore deposits in those States. This investigation is necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to advise on the commercial feasibility of establishing new steel plants in the West. It is now apparent that steel production will have to be increased to meet a possible deficiency in this metal for defense purposes.

That represents what was before the committee.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Utah will permit me to ask a question of the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. I have the floor, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I will ask the question of both Senators from Utah. The question I desire to ask is this: The amendment says this work may go on in the West, but that word is not descriptive. Then, in the course of his remarks, I think the Senator mentioned certain far Western States. What I should like to know is whether this amendment is intended by its terms and whether it is intended by what has been said on the floor and from what has been read from the statement of the Bureau of Mines, that States other than those mentioned are to be excluded although they are in the West?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to answer the question, I think the statement of the Bureau of the Budget is to be considered a limitation on this item. In other words, they make a specific statement as to two States in which the investigations are to be conducted, and I think the Bureau of Mines would feel bound by the Budget estimate and the explanation of the Budget Director.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now, that I may answer the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. ADAMS. I will yield, if the other Senator from Utah will permit me.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question was asked of me, I think.

Mr. ADAMS. Very well.

Mr. MURDOCK. My answer is that my opinion has been, during my entire contact with the O. P. M. and the Department of the Interior, that there is an absolute lack of information with respect to the Eagle Mountain deposit in southern California, which is one of the largest, and an utter lack of information as to the Bull Valley iron-ore deposits in Utah and the Mount Pleasant coal deposits. It seems as to most of the other deposits in that section they have full and complete information, but as to the one in California, the one in Utah, and the coal in Utah they have not such information.

I do not think that the amendment at all excludes any other Western States, but, as stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, Dr. Sayers before the committee indicated that the primary purpose at least of the appropriation was for investigations and explorations in California and Utah.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The reason I was concerned is that, in addition to a very large development of iron ore in Wyoming, we have two other deposits which have had the benefit of investigations by private engineers, but not by the Bureau of Mines, and they certainly are entitled to be considered in any investigation which may be conducted.

Mr. ADAMS. Absolutely.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. We should not adopt an amendment which will authorize the Bureau of Mines to spend a certain amount of money and be put in the position that we will not get any of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will never take the position in the Senate that any other State, or any other section of the country, should not have to the fullest degree complete information as to its natural resources, and I deplore the fact that we find ourselves in that position today.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. And participation in the $350,000 appropriation.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is very agreeable to me, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I do not want the junior Senator from Wyoming to have any misunderstanding about it, because he may be reasonably assured that no part of the $350,000 will be spent in the State of Wyoming.

If the Senator will refer to pages 70 and 71 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, he will find that Dr. Sayers specifically restricts his exploratory work to Utah and California, and I do not imagine that the amount of money provided is any too much for that purpose.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, under those circumstances, it is probably not necessary for me to say at this time that I will be unable to support this amendment. There are bills on the calendar providing for substantial sums to investigate the particular coal deposits referred to. It seems to me we should have a general bill that would cover this whole subject, and not do it piecemeal in this way.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I agree with what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has said, that this refers to a specific item.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for reading the reference and recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in regard to this particular language. Since this matter was not given great consideration by the committee, I should like to call his attention, if he does not object to my doing so at this time, and in this particular way, to the fact that this recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget is completely consistent with the national policy; it is in harmony with the strategic-materials bill; and every person who wants to be thoughtful about the industrial expansion of our country at the present time should consider the primary and fundamental information.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator had a leading, if not the leading, part in reference to legislation as to strategic minerals. Does the Senator have in mind a rough approximation of the money already appropriated for the purposes of that legislation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The bill calls for an appropriation of a million and a half dollars for the Geological Survey and $350,000 for the Bureau of Mines for these particular items.

Mr. ADAMS. I mean in previous years we have appropriated very large sums, have we not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. Therefore this is fairly consistent with the scheme and with the situation in which the country finds itself with regard to these materials and with regard to the type of investigation which has been carried on.

The Senator knows that the great iron deposits in Utah, Colorado, and California and the great coal deposits have all been looked upon by the Bureau of Mines as deposits which should be kept in reserve for emergencies, for conservation purposes, and that, so far as the ordinary expansion of the steel industry in our country is concerned, it is better to go forward in the way in which the country has heretofore proceeded.

The Senator is also familiar with the fact that the Bureau of Mines in the intermountain country has, for the most part, spent its time and energy on nonferrous investigations. The Senator is also familiar with the fact that the surveys of the Geological Survey have indicated that deposits of iron and coal are abundant, and it has been generally known that they would not be touched unless the industrial expansion and emergency expansion of the country demanded that type of investigation. So the request which comes from the Bureau of the Budget is most logical and most consistent.

The emergency is such that those in charge of our industrial expansion have set aside sites and have made recommendations in regard to steel and coal expansion throughout the West; but they are not satisfied with the information the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines can give at this time in regard to these great deposits in Utah and California. It is to take care of the practical need of the great southwestern part of the United States and its defense program that this recommendation has been made. It comes supported by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget; it is in harmony with the national policy; and it comes in a proper economic way. So a small sum of money will be spent in investigations to discover whether that which is thought to be there is really there, and whether the Government could justify the expenditure of, say, a million dollars for the construction of a plant which probably might turn out to be unprofitable if the deposits are not so great as they are thought to be.

In the light of the fact that all this has been in accord with Government arrangement, that it has been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget and by the various defense organizations, and the

President and the Bureau have recommended that the work go forward, is it not in accordance with national policy, is it not in accordance with good economics, is it not in accordance with the best wisdom the Senate can display at this time in the light of the long study which has been made in regard to strategic and necessary critical materials for it to put the Bureau of Mines to work upon this job?

The Senator from Colorado called attention to the great number of items included here. He is familiar with the law of the land, and he knows that it is necessary to state explicitly what might be done, because this is a research job; it is an investigatory job; and such jobs should not be interfered with by some interpretation of the law wherein it might be said there is not a sufficient all-inclusive grant in the appropriation which was made. The wording, of course, is the wording of the Bureau of the Budget, in order that the law may be explicit, and in order that the instructions of the Congress will be perfectly understood.

In the light of all these recommendations, I am wondering if the Senator from Colorado will not accept this amendment. It will have to go to conference, because, as was said in the beginning, the recommendation of the Bureau came directly to the Senate. It has not been considered by the House, and the recommendation probably was not ready when the House considered the deficiency bill.

Will not the chairman of the subcommittee accept the amendment and take it to conference?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wanted an opportunity to explain at least to the junior Senator from Utah what were the reasons, sound or unsound, which led to the absence of the amendment from the bill.

In the report, in the first place, it was pointed out that there was only a limited presentation before the committee. In the next place, there was no presentation of the matter before the House committee; the amendment came too late. In the next place, when we looked into the substance of the amendment it was not, without presentation on its behalf, sufficiently persuasive to lead the committee to put it into a deficiency bill on this short hearing.

It is urged as a need for national defense. There is no doubt as to the need for certain types of steel. There is no doubt as to the need for certain types of rolled steel on the Pacific coast for shipbuilding. There is a shortage of wide rolled steel sheeting. There are only a few mills which make the extra-wide sheeting which is now being used. There are many mills making a narrower and a customary brand of sheeting. It is a very expensive thing to start. The cost of establishing a plant runs into many, many millions.

An investigation has been made of the possibilities of establishing steel industries on the Pacific coast from a commercial standpoint as distinguished from the defense standpoint. The establishment of steel works must take into consideration both the ultimate commercial capacity and the immediate capacity.

The information originally given out was that there was no shortage of furnace capacity in the United States; that the shortage was in the capacity of the mills to roll the particular kind of sheets needed for shipbuilding.

I talked to Mr. Gano Dunn, who was the chief engineer of the defense operations, in reference to that matter. There were, I think, two investigations made. Of course, there is the need, and the question is, how to meet it? Can it be met?

Some members of the Appropriations Committee wondered if we should be progressing very rapidly toward meeting an instant need on the Pacific coast for steel sheets if we should go now to drill in Utah to ascertain what amount of ore might be there. In other words, we have first the process of disclosing the ore through diamond-drilling, which involves, according to Dr. Sayers, from twenty to thirty thousand dollars of core-drilling in two different areas. That takes time. There is not an unlimited number of drills; there is not an unlimited number of men competent to do the work; so that takes time. Then, when the core-drilling has made a discovery, if it is satisfactory, it takes time to develop a mine. A mine is not brought into existence merely by having located the ore. An iron-ore mine, to be adequate, is a large-scale operation. It cannot be done on a small scale. It is not like a rich vein of quartz which can be followed with a single shaft or tunnel.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should not be here today, asking for this——

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, what I am trying to do is simply to state what was before the committee. I am trying, as far as I can to justify the action of the committee. We were a group of men trying to do a job under some harassment; and we were not utterly without any notion of what we were doing, as the Senator from Utah seemed to think. The Senator said there had been no reason of any kind behind the action of the committee. I was merely trying to indicate some of the things that were in the minds of the committee, however inadequate they might be.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should not be here today, asking for this item, if I had not gone into the matter as thoroughly as I possibly could from the reports available from the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines.

Instead of the situation being as the Senator from Colorado would have us believe, that we had to go in and develop a mine, that is not true. What the reports of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines indicate is that there are vast deposits of iron ore in the vicinity we are talking about. The only question before the Senate today is, Should we, before we take it for granted that those vast deposits are of a proper quality, go ahead with the expenditure of several million dollars; or should we not first diamond drill at the cost of a few hundred thousand dollars?

It is not a question of the development of a mine. If diamond drilling indicates that the iron ore is of the right quality, then it is a steam-shovel operation, just as the mining today in Iron Springs is a steam-shovel, open-pit operation. But the Bureau of Mines says we have not yet sufficient information to know what the quality of the ore is. We know that there is a vast quantity outcropping, but we should know what the quality is. That is the situation.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator is experienced with mines; but when he tells me that it is necessary to have core drilling to find out what is there and then says that no development is necessary in order that a steam-shovel operation may be conducted, I have difficulty in following him.

[At this point Mr. HATCH submitted a report from the Committee on the Judiciary, which appears under its appropriate heading.]

Mr. ADAMS. While the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is present I simply want to say that another reason which influenced some members of the committee in refusing temporarily, at least, approval to this amendment is that it provided for exploratory work in two States only, entirely ignoring the iron mines in New Mexico, in Wyoming, and perhaps in other western States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It occurs to me to remark that sometimes we are led astray, perhaps, by the feeling that an appropriation to enable a Government agency to make an investigation will develop results. The result which is desired here is one as to which I completely agree with the Senators from Utah and California, namely, to bring about the development of the vast, almost unlimited, resources of the West for the national defense, and after that, for the promotion of industrial prosperity in this country, but I am impressed with the thought that it is not lack of knowledge with respect to the existence of resources that has been holding back the development of the West. That development is held back by the fact that industrial organization in this country is such that those who have the directing power over industry have not chosen to use the resources the existence of which is well known.

In my State of Wyoming we have very close to the capital what is known as Iron Mountain, 80,000,000 tons of iron ore, within the vision of anyone who desires to look at it. It has not been developed because the United States Steel Corporation, which has had complete control of the iron and steel industry in the United States heretofore, has not seen fit to develop the West.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Pardon me, I was just about to get to Utah. It is my information that the development which is now being undertaken at Provo by the United States Steel Corporation, in cooperation with the Government, has been the result of the fact that an independent entrepreneur by the name of Kaiser, who had established large shipyards upon the Pacific coast for the purpose of building the ships which the country needs above all things, steel ships, had been unable to obtain steel plates from the United States Steel Corporation, and in order to supply himself with steel he then was undertaking to develop known deposits. When the United States Steel Corporation saw that an independent enterprise was about to be started, it suddenly waked up and began the plant at Provo.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I happen to know a good deal about Henry J. Kaiser and his proposal. But what the Senator is now saying, that the United States Steel Corporation and other big corporations have in a way held the West in the palms of their hands and stopped development, leads me to say that those very people are saying today, "We do not yet know what those iron and coal deposits are."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is only an excuse.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is an excuse, yes; and if we turn down the proposed item of appropriation today, we simply add to that excuse and further the obstruction by those people of the development of the West.

Coming back to Kaiser, he himself included in his proposal an item of several hundred thousand dollars to do the very thing which is suggested by the Bureau of Mines today. He would not have gone ahead, he would not have asked the Defense Plant Corporation for money to go ahead with this until he first did the very thing we are asking the Bureau of Mines to do by this amendment.

If there is any question in the Senator's mind, or in the mind of the Senator from Colorado, about exploration in Wyoming or in Colorado——

Mr. ADAMS. I did not mention Colorado.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know the Senator did not, but if he wants something there, is not the intelligent thing and the fair thing and the economical thing to do, if the people there think that California and Utah are getting something which they are not entitled to——

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to commend Utah and California for their energy and perspicacity and ability to get ahead while perhaps the rest of them were slumbering.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Colorado has intimated a time or two here today that that is the reason why he does not want to go along, because New Mexico and Wyoming and other Western States are left out.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, no——

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is bothering the Senator, why not add those States, and increase the appropriation, so that we will know what there is in all the States?

Mr. ADAMS. There would be one very definite reason—it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to add that there are other known deposits in the State of Wyoming. There is a very well-known deposit at or near the town of Guernsey, which has been under development for a number of years. But the development there has been held back because, curiously enough, the corporation which uses this ore, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., which operates at Pueblo, in the State of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, in charge of the bill, though primarily owned by the Rockefeller family, has nevertheless been under the same type of suppression under which other enterprises in the West have been.

The famous device of which we have heard, lo, these many years, the device by which freight rates have been handled, namely, the "Pittsburgh plus" plan, was instituted for the express purpose, among others, of concentrating iron and steel in the area in and around Pittsburgh.

I am glad the Senator from Utah has made the suggestion that this amendment should be broadened. I was about to make that suggestion myself. From the information which is available to me from the Bureau of Mines, and the information which has been available to me from observation, I think we all know that the resources are in existence, and can be developed, provided we undertake to free industry in this country from the throttling control of monopolistic practice. It is monopolistic practice, and not lack of information, which has been holding back the development of the West.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where do we go when we want this information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We go to the Bureau of Mines, for which the Congress of the United States has been appropriating thousands of dollars over a generation or two.

Mr. MURDOCK. But still we do not have the information, and the Senator, notwithstanding the great work he has done on the Monopoly Committee, in my opinion, by taking a position against the amendment—if he does so—furthers the monopolistic tendency in this country. The Bureau of Mines have said in their statement before the Committee, of which the Senator is a member, that they have not the information they should have before this expansion goes ahead. How the Senator, with his great knowledge of monopoly, can refuse that information is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is getting just a little bit ahead of the story, and I think that is quite clear. I am not refusing information, I am pointing out that we do now have knowledge of the existence of tremendous bodies of ore. I myself have seen them in my own State, the Senator from Utah has seen them in his State, the Senator from Colorado has seen them, I have no doubt, in some of the States he has visited. We know these resources are available. We know they exist, and I am pointing out to the Senator from Utah and to others who are assembled here that our trouble is not lack of knowledge, but lack of the will to release this country from the throttling effects of monopoly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think it is pertinent to remark that we have had another kind of monopoly in our country; that is, a monopoly of a certain kind of information. The Senator is familiar with that, because he comes from the West. I have been told that our iron ores are supposed to be of low grade, and that high-grade steel cannot be obtained from them. How are we ever going to overcome a monopoly of information if we do not get the United States Government on our side to prove our point in regard to this question? It is all very well to say that there are monopolies. We know there are monopolies, and such monopolies have not been willing to expand probably for economic reasons. But when they hold in their hands the scientific knowledge which they claim to have, and make a monopoly of scientific knowledge, the only way the Government of the United States and the people of the United States can break that down is by the kind of investigation here proposed. For that reason quite as much as because of the fact that we need the steel I am in favor of this type of amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not altogether certain that the adoption of this amendment would break the monopoly of information of which the Senator speaks. Just a moment ago in his original remarks upon the question he said that the policy of the Bureau of Mines had been to regard these resources as a reserve to be withheld from development. I think the Senator was quite right. May I say to the Senator that in the investigation of the oil industry, which was conducted by the T. N. E. C., the charge was made to us that the estimates made by the Bureau of Mines with respect to oil consumption and oil requirements were not the scientific view of the Government as to the facts but were the view of those who are in control of the oil industry with respect to what the supply should be in order that prices might be maintained for those who were in control of the industry. I feel confident the charge was probably unfounded, but it was made.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I simply wish to add one or two paragraphs to what I have previously said, and then I will sit down and yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no intention of making a speech, but I do want——

Mr. ADAMS. I hoped the Senator would make a speech.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to get the amendment in the proper form, if it is to be considered.

Mr. President, the amendment provides:

For all expenses necessary to enable the Bureau of Mines to investigate, by subsurface exploration, the amount and quality of certain iron ores, limestone, and coking coals essential to expanding steel production in the West.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, from the testimony which has been presented to us, the action upon the part of the Bureau of the Budget will confine that investigation to two States. The Senator from Utah has been good enough to indicate, which we all know, that it was not his intention to restrict this investigation to any two States. So, Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment, to strike out the word "West" and to insert in lieu thereof "States of California, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and all other States in which such deposits may exist."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wanted to add one or two words to the rather fragmentary statement I have made, and try to reinstate the committee in the reasonably good graces of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I said anything that was offensive at all to the chairman——

Mr. ADAMS. Not at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. Or to any member of the subcommittee, I now very humbly apologize, and I am perfectly willing to withdraw any such statement.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I am simply trying to build up our standing a little in the eyes of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator knows what I think of his committee. I think it has done a great job. I simply could not understand how such a great committee could turn down such an amendment as mine.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it was suggested by some member of the committee that rather large appropriations were available to the Bureua of Mines with which to make investigation, and we were not at that time impressed with the imminence or the necessity for adding to those appropriations when we did not know how far they had gone. In other words, there was not an absolute shortage of funds because the Senate had passed a very large appropriation for the Bureau of Mines which would enable it to do this very thing.

Another question suggested by a member of the committee was the propriety of having the United States Government undertake to do something which was not the uncovering or development of strategic minerals, I believed as some other members of the committee did, that the shortage was not in iron ore; that there was adequate iron ore in the country, and that the problem was to handle the existing iron ore and get it to the mills. The question raised was whether the United States should undertake an extensive operation to develop iron ores for the benefit perhaps of some private group, that is when the iron ore was to be used for the establishment of a privately owned corporation, thus separating the matter from the national-defense angle.

Of course, when we go into the manganese field and the tungsten field, and into the field of metals of which we are short, a different situation is presented. For instance, if someone should say that there was a possible field for tin in Utah, there would not be the slightest hesitation on anyone's part to have it investigated. On the other hand, iron ore is very plentiful in the country. I am merely illustrating some of the things that occurred in connection with a discussion as to whether the United States Government should undertake an exploratory development which would be not in furtherance of immediate national defense but would be for the purpose of advising private individuals whether they could profitably undertake the establishment of a steel plant. That, Mr. President, covers in a scattered and fragmentary way the points I wish to add to my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], as amended.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I offer another amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, to strike out "$350,000" and to insert "$500,000." From my knowledge of the mining industry, I know that it will not be possible to make very extensive and constructive subsurface investigations on four or five different properties with the amount of money provided by the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am confronted with the very disagreeable duty of raising a point of order against the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS. The point of order is that it is not authorized by statute; that it has no Budget estimate back of it; and that it provides for an increase in an appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4965) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to further amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to the amendment which I am about to offer. On May 15 of this year the Senate passed an act for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees. The amount carried in the authorization is $432.28. This action of the Senate makes it in order for me to offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 90, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 209. Eastern and Western Cherokees: For the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees, as authorized and directed by the Senate act (1113) entitled "An act for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokees," Seventy-seventh Congress, fiscal year 1941, $432.28, with interest at 5 percent per annum from January 1, 1874, to the date of approval of this act, in full settlement of item 3 of the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States (202 U. S. 101).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. I have noticed the interest item. Some of us have a distaste for long-range interest accumulations. This goes back to 1874, which I suppose would multiply the principal sum mentioned in the bill three times.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not quite that much, but approximately.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, that is in the authorizing act.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not certain what action, if any, has been taken by the House. The fact that the Senate has acted on the authorization bill makes it in order to offer the amendment at this time. If it goes in this bill, and if the House shall not have acted affirmatively on the authorization bill, it will be for the conferees to act as they see fit in the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

It will be recalled that some time ago the Committee on Military Affairs reported a bill proposing to amend the Selective Service Act with relation to the deferment of men over 27 years of

age, and that the Senate amended the bill in several particulars. The House received the bill, but it has been lying in committee, and nothing has been done toward passing it in the House.

Tomorrow, July 1, is the date when those men will be drafted unless the measure becomes a law. So I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Colorado that I may propound a unanimous consent request that the rule be suspended in order that I may offer it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, is there not some other way?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I know of no other way. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and a number of Members of the House have been conferring, and they have determined that this is the only opportunity to enact this provision into law so that it will become effective tomorrow. Otherwise men over 27 years of age may possibly be drafted, and their service will not be deferred.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator knows that we really ought not to put legislation in appropriation bills.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is very true. That is the reason I am asking unanimous consent to suspend the rule.

Mr. ADAMS. There is another reason. The measure is now pending in the other body, and if we tie it to an appropriation bill we pass it the second time. We have already passed it. The proposed amendment would be merely a repassage of the measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. ADAMS. If the other body is not in favor of it, we should simply run into difficulties in conference. There are a multitude of items in the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize the attitude of the Senator from Colorado, and I do not want to impose upon his usual good nature, urbanity, and cordiality, but this is an unusual situation, in that tomorrow is the effective date of the proposed measure. We have been pressing appropriation measures through the Senate. I do not understand that the duty of the Senator to his committee requires that he object to the suspension of the rule. As I understand, his duty requires him to make points of order, but after the rule is suspended he can still make his point of order if he so desires, and remain true to his committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to inform the Senator from Colorado and other Senators that there has been some indication that there are Members of the majority in the House who look with favor on having this amendment added to the appropriation bill, so I think they have notice that there is a possibility that the Senate may act in this manner.

I may say that, because of my interest in the deferment of those above the age of 27, I have received letters and editorials from all over the country. Those who are interested are not only the men above 27 years of age, but also the board members of some 65 selective service local boards. They have to do an immense amount of work in classifying these men, which will be useless unless this measure is enacted into law. The decision should be made by Congress, so that they may know whether they will have to go through all the questionnaires and classify men who may at any time be deferred en bloc. I think it is very important that we not only let the boys know, but also let the draft boards throughout the country know the situation. I hope there will be no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is a question of fact which is disturbing me. The measure which the Senate has passed provides that the draft age shall be reduced by 10 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, it simply authorizes the President to defer those over the age of 27. That does not mean that they are exempted. They might be called later.

Mr. HAYDEN. Tomorrow the registration of men who became of age since last October will take place. That is the only new thing that is going to happen.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from South Dakota can answer that, probably better than I can.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the only new factor which will enter into the picture. Young men who were not 21 years of age last October, but who become 21 before the 1st of July, will be included in the draft.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. All the local boards have to do is to classify them.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that the bill which the Senate passed on June 12 deferred, at the discretion of the President, those above 27 years of age, or those who are above 27 years of age on July 1, 1941. So the Senator can see the immense amount of work which the local boards would have to do for nothing if this measure should fail of passage.

Mr. HAYDEN. I really cannot see that they would have much to do. Their immediate job now is to register and classify some three-quarters of a million men who will become of age before July 1.

Mr. GURNEY. That factor does not enter into the consideration of the proposed amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the immediate job they have to do. After those men shall have been classified they will be placed in the group heretofore listed.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question of making selections from that group will then arise. If the bill which the Senator from Texas has in his hand should become law 10 days, 2 weeks, or a month from now, nobody would be drafted in the meantime.

Mr. GURNEY. Those above 27 years of age are being drafted right along. I could name many men above the age of 27 who have been ordered to report in the past few days or in the next 10 days. They do not know where they stand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Discussion is taking place upon a unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the rule be suspended in order that he may offer a certain amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the circumstances, in view of the fact that the Senate has already once passed the bill, and that it is now pending before the appropriate committees in the House, and in view of the fact that the amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill, I object to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems I have already yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will hold that the Senator from Wyoming may not take the Senator from Texas from the floor by interposing a parliamentary inquiry and subsequently interposing an objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if the Senator from Wyoming is going to object, I surrender the floor. I do not wish to take up any of the time of the Senate in speaking about something to no purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossing of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5166) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO WILLIAM L. MITCHELL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce a short bill, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The bill (S. 1703) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a medal of honor to William Mitchell, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to the late William Lendrum Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, in recognition of his outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation. The President may present such medal of honor to Mrs. Martin Fladoes, of Milwaukee, Wis., sister of the said William Lendrum Mitchell.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in reference to the bill which has just been read, authorizing the President to award to the late Col. William L. Mitchell, or General Mitchell, the Congressional Medal of Honor, I wish to take approximately 5 minutes of the Senate's time to explain the reason for the introduction of the bill. The bill is designed to acknowledge and to reward belatedly an act of heroism and self-sacrifice in the service of his country with few parallels in history. It is a bill authorizing the President to award posthumously the Medal of Honor to the late William Lendrum Mitchell, colonel and brevet brigadier general, United States Army.

Gen. "Billy" Mitchell was a prophet who lived ahead of his age. What he saw over the horizon was no mirage. It was a panorama of the future, a living picture of today. His prophetic vision has been justified by events, his prophesies have been fulfilled in detail. All of us have seen these things come to pass. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate I have become particularly aware of them.

General Mitchell was a passionate advocate of military air power. He staked his reputation and his official life on his understanding of air power and his belief in the critical importance of the air arm in war and in the defense of the Nation. His conception of the striking power and the tactical uses of the air arm is being demonstrated daily in the present war.

I shall not include in my brief remarks today a recitation of William Mitchell's record of service to his country. The recital would be long but never dull. He was a soldier and a man. He enlisted for the Spanish-American War and he came up the hard way. He commanded our air force in France during the 1918 war. He won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal. He was decorated by the leading allied governments. He returned to peacetime service full of honors but not of years. He was still a young man with an extraordinary record of service and the promise of a brilliant future.

The details of General Mitchell's services, in war and in peace, and his tireless effort to make his associates and the Nation share his understanding of the great, new weapon which was being evolved, may more properly be recorded later when this matter comes before the Senate for passage, or in hearings before the committee.

The Medal of Honor bears the simple legend "For valor." I invite the Members of the Senate to think of that: "For valor." There is the valor of heroic deeds, risking injury, disfigurement, or death, in the heat of conflict, with the moral support of comrades and the example of others. And there is the lonely valor of deliberate sacrifice for a belief, for a high purpose, without moral support, without heat, without passion, facing bitter criticism, slander, and public disgrace—the lonely valor of grim determination and devotion to a high duty; a moral valor, an intellectual valor, if you will; a valor that faces, undismayed, not the quick, hot death of conflict and then blessed oblivion, but the slow, cold death of disgrace and calumny, which must be died anew every day. We in the Senate know something of this kind of valor. We know the strength it takes.

William Mitchell deliberately, and with full knowledge of the probable consequences, sacrificed his career and his reputation as a desperate recourse to bring to the attention of his associates and his Nation the things the world is learning now by bitter experience. The fact that we failed to heed him then does not reduce our debt to him.

Mr. President and my esteemed colleagues, I am not proposing that we honor "Billy" Mitchell by this act. "Billy" Mitchell's record and the vindication of his prophetic vision are his honor. I am proposing that we honor ourselves by doing a measure of justice to a brave soldier and a far-seeing man who dared to do his duty, and in so doing deliberately sacrificed himself for his country. That is the height of true valor.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as part of my remarks an editorial from the Liberty magazine entitled "To a Prophet Without Honor in His Own Country," a resolution of the Northwest Aviation Planning Council, a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, a resolution adopted at the twenty-second annual convention of the Yankee Division Veterans' Association, and an article summarizing General Mitchell's record, which was written at the time of his passing a few years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New Hampshire will be granted, and the various matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From Liberty Magazine of June 28, 1941]

TO A PROPHET WITHOUT HONOR IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

To General WILLIAM MITCHELL,
Wherever his spirit may be.

DEAR BILLY: Today British airplanes sank one of the greatest battleships of modern times—Germany's *Bismarck*.

But it was more than the *Bismarck* that went to the bottom of the sea. The steel mastodon carried with her to a watery grave the myth of the superiority of sea power over air power.

That would be no news to you, Billy.

Back in 1921 your aviators flew over a ship and dropped bombs on it and sank it. With what result? The Army let you go. You had the courage to sound a stern warning to the American people that the Army was woefully backward in aviation, and so they kicked you out.

As I read the news dispatches, I thought of our first meeting in Washington, early in 1926. You were already in disgrace. You told me then that the peace of Versailles was no peace at all but only a breathing space between rounds. You were certain that another war was coming, and that its decisive battles would be fought in the air. You predicted that the United States would ultimately be the richest prize in that war. You argued that the Atlantic and the Pacific were no longer barriers of protection but merely space over which swarms of flying fortresses could come at us.

In the years that followed you wrote bravely and with vision in the pages of this magazine. Here are some of the things you said in Liberty:

"Our effort to build an adequate air service has been arrested principally by the Army and Navy." January 16, 1926.

"Our national defense has been modernized in no essential particular since the Civil War. * * * It is immersed in a sea of bunk and politics." June 27, 1931.

Why didn't we believe you?

"This is no time to listen to pacifist vaporings or the impotent communications of the League of Nations." January 30, 1932.

"We now find ourselves unprepared for modern war, either actually or theoretically. * * * It is high time we coordinated our defense and modernized it to * * * provide for our security." June 25, 1932.

"The future preservation of the independence of this country depends on air power." May 12, 1934.

Why didn't we take heed of what you said?

I remember, too, our last talk together, sitting at an open window and looking out at the sea. That was when you said that nothing could stem the tide of blood that was rising everywhere in the world, and you went on:

"We need tanks; we need a completely mechanized army; we need whole schools of submarines, and we need thousands upon thousands and more thousands of airplanes. Only then can we feel safe."

They called you a fanatic. Yet if you had had your way, the United States of America would now have an air force greater than any other in the world. We could have given England bombers and pursuit planes in such legions that they could long since have gone forward, driven back the Germans, carried the battle on to Europe, and won the war.

Wherever you are now, Billy, in whatever American Valhalla there may be where heroes and prophets and patriots foregather, you would not say, "I told you so." Rather you would say:

"It is late, but not too late. There is yet time to do what must be done."

There is still time for us to forget greed, selfishness, and indifference; to unite our vast resources and powers in one mighty American effort to meet the peril that you foresaw so long ago.

Meanwhile, Billy, America remembers—and misses you.

FULTON OURSLER.

RESOLUTION OF NORTHWEST AVIATION PLANNING COUNCIL

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the Northwest Aviation Planning Council in annual meeting assembled at Billings, Mont., this 20th day of June 1941, that a bill is being introduced in the United States Senate by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, to secure the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor for Gen. William Mitchell, deceased; and

Whereas delegates to the council from the Territory of Alaska and the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana unanimously favor the enactment of such legislation by the Congress of the United States, recognizing befittingly the just debt of gratitude of the United States of America to a renowned former commander of the Air Service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Northwest Aviation Planning Council, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to enact immediately appropriate legislation awarding posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. William Mitchell, deceased; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Northwest Aviation Planning Council be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and to each member of the congressional delegations from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and the Territory of Alaska.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF STATE OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the late Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell enlisted in 1898 at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War as a private in the First Wisconsin Infantry and saw active service in Cuba and the Philippine Islands; then served on the Mexican border in 1912; and was repeatedly decorated during the World War by Congress and by several of our Allies for repeated gallantry and giving exceptional example to his fellow soldiers; and

Whereas he rose from the ranks during 28 years of spectacular achievement, having been the first American officer to fly over the trenches during the World War, the first American to scout troop movements by plane, commanded the largest concentration of airplanes in the then history of aviation; and

Whereas he continued to pioneer aviation progress by proving the feasibility of transcontinental flight, as a result of which our air-mail system was instituted; and

Whereas from 1920 to 1924 he served as Assistant to the Chief of the Army Air Service, in charge of operations and technical development, in which position he contributed invaluably to the development of military and civil aeronautics; and

Whereas he strove to impress his superior officers with the shortcomings and deficiencies in the Army and Navy flying units, only to be rebuffed and demoted; and thereafter the crash of the dirigible *Shenandoah* and failure of Navy's flight by plane to Hawaii prompted him to charge incompetency on the part of his superiors and criminal neglect of national defense; and

Whereas, although a separate inquiry substantiated the truth of his accusations, he was tried by a court martial for violating the ninety-sixth article of war, found guilty of a breach of discipline, and suspended from the service for 5 years without pay, but still subject to call; and

Whereas the practical effect of this decision was that the pride and dignity of military officials must be protected at all costs, even at the risk of jeopardizing the effectiveness of national defense; and

Whereas General Mitchell's fearless adherence to principle resulted in his sacrificing his personal ambitions in an effort to arouse the Nation to a knowledge of its military helplessness; and

Whereas developments arising from the present European conflict demonstrate incontrovertibly that General Mitchell was possessed of prescience which placed him many years ahead of his colleagues; and

Whereas the stigma upon his memory should be officially eradicated: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such official action as may be necessary to clear the name of this soldier and patriot to the end that he who stood his ground, though persecuted, may be completely and forever cleared; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, YANKEE DIVISION VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1941

We hereby resolve that the Yankee Division Veterans' Association go on record with the suggestion that Congress posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell for his patriotic service and foresight in recommending an adequate air force to function as a separate unit of the armed force of the United States.

GENERAL MITCHELL DIES—AIR LEADER IN WAR—FLYING HERO QUIT ARMY IN 1926 AFTER COURT MARTIAL FOR HIS CRITICISM OF SUPERIORS—BEGAN AS PRIVATE IN 1898—ROSE TO ASSISTANT CORPS CHIEF—A PIONEER IN SERVICE, HE PREDICTED OCEAN FEATS

Brig. Gen. William Lendrum (Billy) Mitchell, commander of the United States air forces in France during the World War and afterward Director of Military Aviation, died at 4:45 o'clock yesterday afternoon in Doctors Hospital, where he had been confined with a heart ailment since January 28. He was 56 years old.

At his bedside when he died was Mrs. Mitchell, the former Elizabeth Trumbull Miller, whom he married in 1923. The cause of death was recorded as coronary occlusion.

Funeral services will be held at 10 a. m. Saturday in St. Paul's Cathedral, Milwaukee.

Advancement through all grades from that of private, which he became by regular enlistment at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, up to that of brigadier general, which he achieved as commander of the air forces in France during the World War, had come to General Mitchell when the headline name "Gen. Billy Mitchell" flamed into the news consciousness of the American people in the fall of 1925.

It achieved that status because a demoted corps area air officer in Texas had asserted that the high command of both the Army and Navy were guilty of "incompetency, criminal negligence, and almost treasonable administration of the national defense."

A BITTER CRITIC OF AVIATION

But backward from that date, back to the close of the World War, and forward from that date through his trial by court martial for violation of the ninety-sixth article of war, through his avoidance of a 5-year suspension from the Army lists by his voluntary resignation, and on into his retirement as a wealthy stock raiser and gentleman farmer, Billy Mitchell was known as the stormy petrel of American aviation. At times it seemed as if nothing that was done in the development of American aviation, either military or civilian, was right or adequate in his opinion.

General Mitchell, as he was always known as a result of his war rating, was a prophetic and vitriolic critic.

When in the summer of 1921 he and fellow officers successfully demonstrated the possibility of destroying a battleship with aerial bombs by sinking from the air the former German dreadnaught *Ostfriedland* and the former German cruiser *Frankfort*, all battleships became in General Mitchell's words subservient to the airplane and all navies became obsolete.

Many of his other aviation prophecies came true in time. In 1922 he predicted a day when airplanes would fly at the unheard-of speed of 250 miles an hour. Within 10 years of that warning prediction airplanes had flown nearly 500 miles an hour. In 1923, to focus attention upon the dangers of an aerial attack on America from across the Pacific, General Mitchell painted a seemingly fanciful picture of a day when airplanes would fly regularly from China to San Francisco. That was 4 years before anyone had demonstrated that the Atlantic, let alone the Pacific, could be crossed by air.

Long before he uttered the charges which brought him his court martial Mitchell was baiting his superiors and twitting those in authority for their incompetence in handling the instruments, usually the airplane, which had been placed in their care for use and development. As early as 1910 he was saying that America would be helpless in an air war and that an air fleet could wipe out all of New York City; and in 1921 he was saying that the airplane made the battleship practically useless.

He repeated the latter charge so often that finally the naval authorities looked over their war prizes and selected the *Ostfriedland* and the *Frankfort* upon which they offered to permit the army fliers to test their chief's extravagant claims. On July 18, 1921, a squadron of army bombers from Langley Field sank the *Frankfort* 60 miles east of the Virginia Capes. Two days later they dealt the same fate to the *Ostfriedland*.

The man who fought for his belief and faith in the airplane for more than a decade was born in Nice, France, December 29, 1879, while his parents, the former United States Senator John Lendrum and Harriet Danforth (Becker) Mitchell, were sojourning abroad. Mitchell's father had served as a Union soldier in the Civil War and from him he inherited a tradition and instinct for the military. Much of his home education was in the military tradition, and his extra-curricular interest was so largely wrapped up with military history that the boy was exceptionally well-grounded in this field.

STUDIED AT WASHINGTON

Returning to the United States with his parents, the boy entered Racine College in Wisconsin, and later was graduated from George Washington University. He was with his family in Washington when the United States declared war on Spain. Although he had just reached 18, he returned to Racine immediately and enlisted as a private in Company M of the First Wisconsin Infantry. This was on May 14, 1898. He had achieved the rank of lieutenant when his company reached Cuba, and he served there on the staff of Gen. Fitzhugh Lee. He was in the Philippines during the insurrection, one of the youngest officers on the staff of General MacArthur, whose son, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, was later Chief of Staff of the Army and a member of the military court that convicted Mitchell in 1925.

Mitchell early in his military career began specializing in communications, which was the primary concern of the Signal Corps. It was through the accident of the fact that when the Wright brothers and Glenn H. Curtiss developed the first military planes in this country and the Army, being in a quandary as to what to do with this new instrument, consigned it to the Signal Corps, that Mitchell first became interested in aviation.

Returning from the Philippines to Washington, young Mitchell was commissioned to lay telegraph lines from Eagle City down the Yukon and across the Tanama country to Prince William Sound, a distance of 3,000 miles. Although the feat had been attempted twice before and had failed, Mitchell, despite many hardships and handicaps, finally completed the task.

SAW PLANE DEMONSTRATION

At 24, with the rank of captain in the Signal Corps, Mitchell was one of that select historic company that witnessed the first demonstration of a military plane by the Wright brothers at Fort Myer in September 1908. He met the Wright brothers for the first time on that occasion, and it was from Orville Wright, 6 years later, after Congress had appropriated $13,000,000 for the organization of the First Aero Squadron, that Mitchell learned to fly. He was soloed by Wright after 2 hours of instruction.

In March 1917, upon completion of a tour of duty as a member of the General Staff, Mitchell, then a major, was in Spain on leave. On April 6, when the United States entered the war, he was in Toledo. He proceeded at once to Paris, and through special arrangements he was attached to the staff of General Pétain, and was one of the first American Army officers to participate in an attack with the French. With the fuller organization of the American Expeditionary Force in France, Mitchell was assigned to assist General Mason M. Patrick in building

up of the Air Service force on the front. He later succeeded to the command of this service, with the rank of brigadier general. He served as Chief of Air Service, Zone of Advance; Chief of Air Service, First Corps; Chief of Air Service, First Army; and Chief of Air Service, Group of Armies.

DECORATED FOR BRAVERY

His official war record states that he received the Distinguished Service Cross for "repeated acts of extraordinary heroism in action at Noyon, France, in March 1918"; and in July of the same year he "displayed bravery beyond that required by his position as Chief of Air Service" by piloting his plane over the battle lines and gaining information as to the disposition of air and ground forces which led to a change in the tactical methods of the air wing. For his World War service he received, in addition to the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, Croix de Guerre with five palms, Commander of the Legion of Honor (French), Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George (British), Commendatore S. S. Maurizio é Lazzaro, Medal for Merit in War, and Grand Officer of Italy.

Returning to the United States after the armistice, General Mitchell was immediately made Assistant Chief of the Army Air Service and put in direct charge of the training of the aviation force of the Army. A brilliant war career behind him and filled with enthusiasm for the new instrument which had proved itself in that war, he immediately became an outspoken and tireless critic of what America was doing with her opportunity of becoming a leading air power of the world.

At the end of his regular 4-year tour of duty as Assistant Chief of the Air Corps, as it was now called, he was not reappointed to that post. He was reduced to his regular Army grade of colonel and sent to Texas as air officer of the Eighth Corps Area. He had been at this new station only a short time when he made his famous statement about the high command "inefficiency, incompetency, criminal negligence, and almost treasonable administration."

Mitchell was tried for violation of the ninety-sixth article of war, was found guilty on all counts, and the verdict of the court martial was suspension for 5 years without pay or allowances. President Coolidge later reviewed the sentence, and, while he upheld the suspension, he restored the allowances and one-half of his monthly base pay. Less than 2 weeks after this Presidential review and commutation of his sentence General Mitchell, on February 1, 1926, resigned from the Army.

As a private citizen, however, he remained a bitter critic of the conduct of American aviation.

On October 11, 1923, General Mitchell was married to Miss Elizabeth Trumbull Miller at Detroit, Mich. There are two children, Lucy Trumbull and William Mitchell, Jr. General Mitchell was a member of the Metropolitan, the Chevy Chase, and the Army and Navy Clubs of Washington. Among his writings which have appeared in book form are Our Air Force, Winged Defense, and Skyways.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the Military Affairs Committee. In the trying times through which we are passing, when the fate of the world is at stake, when the new weapon which has come into force is air power, I believe it is time for the people of this country to pay some attention, to give some recognition long past due, to a man who had the vision to foresee, and to prophesy and to sacrifice himself for a cause and for a belief which have since been justified. The least this country can do is to pay homage to this man who lived before his time and who prophesied all that has come to pass. If, instead of condemning him, the people of this country had followed his leadership, perhaps the great war in which we are today engaged might have been averted. Certainly it would have been averted if some of the other countries had followed his leadership. It is now time, and high time, that we in America pay this delayed tribute and recognition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator remember a vote in the Senate in 1939 on the matter of the number of airplanes we would have, whether we would have 5,000 or 5,500 or 6,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. CONNALLY. How did the Senator from New Hampshire vote?

Mr. BRIDGES. I voted for it, as I have voted for all national-defense measures.

Mr. CONNALLY. The vote to which I refer was before the present war.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize that. I say I voted for it, as I always have voted for all national-defense measures.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question was whether we would increase the number of airplanes. If the Senator voted to increase the number of airplanes he left his party alinement, because the majority of Senators on his side of the Chamber voted against the proposed increase.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was one of the few Members, I may say, who did vote that way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have disagreed with the Senator from Texas on many domestic policies, but I may say that I probably voted side by side with him on national-defense measures; and I trust that we have both been right.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of uncontested measures on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the calendar for consideration of unobjected-to measures.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1290) to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over under objection.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over, under objection.

The bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and Navy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that that bill also go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4293) to further amend the act of February 9, 1927, entitled "An act relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A similar bill having been previously objected to, the bill, the title of which has just been stated, will be passed over.

RELIEF FUNDS FOR REHABILITATION OF PUERTO RICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1358) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the name "Puerto Rico" to strike out "The fund thus established shall continue available for expenditure until June 30, 1941", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936 (49 Stat. 1135), is amended to read as follows:

"That all sums which the President has segregated or allotted or shall segregate or allot for projects in Puerto Rico out of the money appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 shall constitute a special fund to provide relief and work relief and to increase employment in Puerto Rico. All income derived from operations financed out of this fund and the proceeds of the disposition of property acquired therewith, and all income derived from operations financed with funds which have been made available

or which may hereafter be made available to the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration under any act approved before July 1, 1941, as well as the proceeds of the disposition of property acquired therewith, shall constitute a revolving fund, which shall remain available for expenditure for the purposes and in manner authorized herein and in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 until Congress shall provide otherwise, notwithstanding any limitation of time contained in the said acts. All income and proceeds derived or obtained from operations financed, or property acquired, out of the aforesaid revolving fund shall be paid into that fund and shall remain available for expenditure in the same manner. Any agency or agencies lawfully designated or established to administer funds allotted hereunder or the revolving fund herein authorized may be continued so long as the said funds or any of them remain available for expenditure.

"Projects for rural rehabilitation in Puerto Rico may include the acquisition, development, maintenance, and operation of agricultural enterprises. A reasonable charge may be made for materials and services produced or made available by any project: *Provided*, That such materials and services may also be supplied as compensation, in whole or in part, for services rendered by persons employed upon any project."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I observe the presence of the able Senator from Maryland, chairman of the committee. I should like to have a brief statement from him concerning the objectives of this bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the administration sent the bill to the Senator from Maryland as chairman of the committee. The Senator from Oregon and other Senators will remember that a great deal of money was appropriated for relief in Puerto Rico, and, in the nature of the circumstances there, it seemed to be advisable that some of the relief money be expended on projects which would be profit-making, or at least intended to be operated so as to make a profit. A great deal of money was spent in undertakings of that kind. The purpose of the bill is to perpetuate that situation so as to allow the money to become a sort of revolving fund.

I may say to Senators that the population of Puerto Rico is the densest population on the Western Hemisphere. They have a population, as I recall, of about 350 persons for every square mile. One is never out of the sound of a voice or out of the sight of a person in Puerto Rico. Therefore, when the depression struck Puerto Rico, coupled with a cyclone which also hit the island, the whole process of living there was thrown out of gear, and Congress appropriated very large sums of money for relief purposes. In the investment and expenditure of that sum many projects which would carry themselves along were set in motion to provide work for the people. This bill is to give the Puerto Rico Emergency Relief Commission the authority to continue that work. The committee in recommending the bill thought that would be the cheaper way to continue to aid Puerto Rico than the outright expenditure of funds at every session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 357) to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PREVENTION OF PHOTOGRAPHS OF NAVAL VESSELS AND PROPERTY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 799) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval property, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That whoever, except in performance of duty or employment in connection with the national defense, (a) shall knowingly make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation (1) of any navy yard, naval station, or other naval reservation, or place used for national-defense purposes by the Navy Department; (2) of any naval vessel or naval aircraft, wherever located; (3) of any vessel, aircraft, installation, equipment, or other property whatsoever, located within any such yard, station, reservation, or place, or in any defensive sea area established in accordance with law; or (4) of any foreign naval vessel, foreign armed merchant vessel, or foreign naval aircraft, within the territorial waters or jurisdiction of the United States; or (b) shall knowingly make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation of any vessel or aircraft, or any installation, equipment, or other property relating to the national defense, being manufactured or under construction or repair for or awaiting delivery to or in transit for (1) the Navy Department under any contract or agreement with the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or (2) the government of any country whose defense the President declares to be vital to the defense of the United States; shall be punished as provided herein.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to permit photographs, sketches, or other representations to be made when, in his opinion, the interests of national defense will not be adversely affected thereby.

SEC. 3. Any person found guilty of a violation of this act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall apply in the Philippine Islands and in all other places within the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 5. This act shall expire on July 1, 1943, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1568) for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the calendar was called a few days ago the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objected to the bill. I note his absence. Therefore I shall object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over under objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago I understood the senior Senator from Oregon to offer an objection to the consideration of Senate bill 1568 on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. The Senator from Massachusetts is present at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I inquire what bill is referred to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado refers to Senate bill 1568, which was passed over on the objection of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I made the objection, and stated that I did so on account of the absence of the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when the calendar of business was last before the Senate I discussed this bill in connection with a similar bill which was pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs, when there was a request for increased compensation to the band leaders of at least three bands of the Naval Establishment. I suggested that before action was taken I understood that passage of the Army bill would lead to similar action being urged in the case of the Navy bill, and that in my opinion the bill ought to go over for uniform consideration by both the Military and Naval Committees. Since this bill was under consideration I have been in correspondence with the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, calling his attention to some information I have; and I therefore request that the bill may go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is perfectly agreeable to me. The object of this bill is to hold the Army Band leaders in the same category and at the same rate of pay as the band leaders of the Navy and the Marines. The Senator's explanation is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. WALSH. I understood that this bill was introduced with the expectation that an increased wage would be given to the Navy bands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. There is a disposition in the Committee on Naval Affairs not to do it. There is a feeling that this is no time to increase the pay of band leaders, when we are asking large numbers of young men for $21 a month to render active fighting service to our country, and we thought it would be a bad precedent. As I said before, I have called the whole matter to the attention of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, with the expectation that whatever action is finally taken will be taken jointly.

ORGANIZATION OF MILITARY UNITS IN HAWAII, ALASKA, PUERTO RICO, AND THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (S. 173) to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of

extending to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone the permission to organize military units not a part of the National Guard, which was granted to the States by the amendment made to such section by the act of October 21, 1940, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 61. No State or Territory shall maintain troops in time of peace other than as authorized in accordance with the organization prescribed under this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting the rights of the States and Territories in the use of the National Guard within their respective borders in time of peace: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall prevent the organization and maintenance of State or Territorial police or constabulary: *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe for discipline in training, the organization by and maintenance within any State or Territory of such military forces other than National Guard as may be provided by the laws of such State or Territory is hereby authorized while any part of the National Guard of the State or Territory concerned is in active Federal service: *Provided further*, That such forces shall not be called, ordered, or in any manner drafted, as such, into the military services of the United States; however, no person shall, by reason of his membership in any such unit, be exempted from military service under any Federal law: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War, in his discretion and under regulations determined by him, is authorized to issue, from time to time, for the use of such military units, to any State or Territory, upon requisition of the Governor thereof, such arms and equipment as may be in possession of and can be spared by the War Department."

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS FROM MILITARY SERVICE

The bill (S. 1397) to provide for the exemption from military service of certain aliens residing in the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (Public Law 783, 76th Cong.) is amended by adding at the end of section 3 (a) thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That any male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States who is registered or who is or may become liable to registration under the provisions of this act shall be relieved from liability to training and service thereunder if he makes a declaration prior to becoming a member of the land or naval forces or within a time fixed by the President if he is already a member of the land or naval forces, in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, withdrawing his intention to become a citizen of the United States which shall be held to cancel his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States and to forever bar him from becoming such a citizen."

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The bill (S. 1602) to amend section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 14), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 333 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is further amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the words "at the commencement of its session."

GIFTS AND BEQUESTS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (S. 1586) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept for the United States Naval Academy such gifts and bequests as he may see fit was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept, receive, hold, administer, and expend gifts and bequests of personal property, from individuals or others for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the United States Naval Academy.

SEC. 2. Gifts or bequests of money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as trust funds under the title "United States Naval Academy General Gift Fund," which funds will be subject to disbursement by the Secretary of the Navy for the purposes herein specified.

SEC. 3. Gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this act shall be exempt from all Federal taxes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasurer is authorized, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to invest, reinvest, or retain investments of the money or securities composing the United States Naval Academy General Gift Fund, or any part thereof deposited in the Treasury pursuant to section 2 of this act, in securities of the United States Government or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States Government. The interest and profits accruing from such securities may be deposited to the credit of the United States Naval Academy General Gift Fund and will be available to disbursements as provided in section 2 of this act.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4839) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1585) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 2, at the end of the bill to add section 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "and five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and fifteen for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than four during the year 1942, four during the year 1943, and two during the year 1944.

SEC. 3. Midshipmen appointed to the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia must have been, on June 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the academy, actual and bona fide residents of the District for a period of not less than 3 years immediately preceding: *Provided*, That residence of parents or guardians, if any, shall govern; and section 1517, Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBSISTENCE AND RENTAL ALLOWANCES TO RETIRED OFFICERS OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1589) to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 1, after line 6, to add section 2, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter money allowances for subsistence and rental shall not accrue to any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps on the retired list for any period during which any such officer is not employed on active duty.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws, insofar as they are in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RANK OF OFFICERS ON SPECIAL OR UNUSUAL DUTY

The bill (H. R. 4823) providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I cannot tell from the reading of the title of this bill what its purpose is. A week or two ago there was a bill on the calendar providing for an investigation force for the Secretary of the Navy, to which at that time the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] objected. I am trying to identify this bill, which I have been unable to do from a hasty reading. If this is the bill that was objected to at that time, I want to interpose my objection at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after "sec. 212)", to strike out ", any naval officer designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command a naval unit afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission may, within the discretion of the President, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving" and insert "naval officers, not to exceed a total of nine at any one time, designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command naval units afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission

may, within the discretion of the President, have the rank, pay, and all allowances of a vice admiral while so serving."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I can give the Senator from Oregon a brief explanation of the bill, in the absence of the chairman of the committee.

Naval officers, as well as the Secretary of the Navy, as I recall, appeared in behalf of the bill. There are certain missions which have to be performed by the Navy in countries where we have bases which are being built and there is other naval work which has to be carried out or planned. It would be a mistake to send to a foreign country where he has to meet with the officials of such country an officer of lower rank than those with whom he has to deal. It is a reflection upon the prestige of the United States primarily. Out of that situation came this bill, so that our representatives will meet on equal terms as to rank with those of other countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in my temporary absence from the chamber, calendar No. 463, House bill 4823, was called, and the bill was explained by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS.] I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 448) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4823) providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and with the recommendation that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

After the comma, on page 1, line 6, strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "naval officers not to exceed a total of nine at any one time, designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command naval units afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission may, within the discretion of the President, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving."

The purpose of the bill is to permit naval officers designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command a naval unit afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission, to have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving.

Under existing law, which has remained unchanged for 24 years, seven officers in the Navy may hold ranks higher than rear admiral. These are the Chief of Naval Operations, who has the rank of admiral; and six flag officers afloat in command of fleets or subdivisions thereof. Of these six, not more than three may be admirals. The others may be vice admirals. In all cases the rank is held only while the officer is serving in a designated billet. Upon completion of that duty he reverts to his permanent rank. In other words, the rank goes with the billet, not the individual.

For a number of years (although the law permits of other distributions, such as one admiral and five vice admirals, or two and four, respectively) the six officers afloat have been equally distributed in the grade of admiral and vice admiral, and at the present time the officers holding the following commands hold temporary advanced rank as indicated:

Commander in chief, U. S. Pacific Fleet	Admiral.
Commander in chief, U. S. Atlantic Fleet	Do.
Commander in chief, U. S. Asiatic Fleet	Do.
Commander, Scouting Force	Vice admiral.
Commander, Battle Force	Do.
Commander aircraft, Battle Force	Do.

During the World War, when existing law was enacted, the organization of the Navy and the distribution of forces was such that the higher ranks authorized by the act of May 22, 1917, were sufficient to meet the needs of the Navy; and for that matter the need for more high-ranking officers did not manifest itself until comparatively recently. Within the last year, however, it has become apparent that it would be advantageous to have a few more here and there, depending on the circumstances. The Navy Department foresees the desirability of being able to detail officers of sufficient rank to represent this country effectively from the standpoint of relative rank with officers of other navies, and also the desirability of giving increased rank to an officer commanding a special unit afloat if the importance of that command should warrant.

Under existing law, in time of peace, officers in command of fleets and subdivisions designated as admirals and vice admirals must be designated from among rear admirals on the active list of the Navy, and in time of war they may be designated from the grades of rear admirals or captain on the active list of the Navy.

An officer of the Navy serving temporarily as a vice admiral receives an allowance of $500 per year, in addition to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half which amounts to $9,700 per year.

The bill was amended by the House of Representatives to make it conform to existing law regarding grades from which appointments could be made and to provide for situations which may arise during a national emergency by the addition of the following language:

"In time of war or national emergency the provisions of this act shall be applicable only to officers on the active list of the rank or grade of captain and above. At all other times the said provisions shall apply only to officers of the rank or grade of rear admiral."

The Senate committee has amended the bill to provide that not more than nine officers of the Navy, exclusive of the number previously authorized, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and meets with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives sets forth the views and recommendation of the Navy Department on this bill:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "Providing for the rank of officers ordered to perform special or unusual duty, and of commanders of special naval units afloat."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to permit any naval officer designated by the President to perform special or unusual duty, or to command a naval unit afloat organized for the purpose of performing a special or unusual mission, to have the rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while so serving. The exercise of this authority would be left to the discretion of the President. This latitude is considered highly desirable from the standpoint of relative rank with officers of foreign navies, and because the importance of such duty might, for other reasons, warrant increased rank.

The Navy Department recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

The President has indicated that this proposed legislation meets with his approval, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised the Navy Department that there would be no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH A. BARD, *Acting.*

CONSTRUCTION OF COAST GUARD CUTTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4887) to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for the performance of Coast Guard duties, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and empowered, in the interest of the national defense, through the Commandant of the Coast Guard, to purchase, charter, requisition the use of, or the possession of, for the use of the Coast Guard in the training of Coast Guard cadets and merchant marine personnel, any foreign vessel designed as a merchant marine training ship, which is lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1941 (Public, No. 101, 77th Cong.), except the third and fourth provisos of section 1 thereof, applicable to foreign merchant vessels, shall be applicable to any foreign vessel acquired under this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 13, to change the section number from 2 to 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of Coast Guard cutters necessary in the interest of national defense and for performance of Coast Guard duties, and for other purposes."

LANDS AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 531) to amend the act of April 6, 1938 (52 Stat. 201), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Miami Beach, Dade County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 4658) to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF COASTWISE LOAD LINE ACT OF 1935, AS AMENDED

The bill (S. 1632) to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House bill 4988, which is similar to this bill, will be taken up for consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4988) to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is this a bill of the same title as Senate bill 1632?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LODGE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. LODGE. I ask that it go over until we can have an explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both bills will go over under objection.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: Mr. President, having just received an explanation of the purport of Senate bill 1632, I desire to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will recur to the consideration of House bill 4988, which was taken up in place of Senate bill 1632.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4988) to amend section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1632 will be indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

The bill (H. R. 2074) to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MANNING OF CERTAIN VESSELS OF 500 GROSS TONS AND LESS

The bill (H. R. 4224) relating to the manning of certain vessels of 500 gross tons and less was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MANNING OF CERTAIN SAIL VESSELS

The bill (H. R. 4225) relating to the manning of certain sail vessels was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF NARCOTICS ON AMERICAN VESSELS ON THE HIGH SEAS

The bill (H. R. 4258) to supplement the navigation laws and facilitate the maintenance of discipline on board vessels of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROVISION OF SUITABLE VESSELS FOR STATE NAUTICAL SCHOOLS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) to provide suitable vessels for the use of certain State nautical schools, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments.

The first amendment was in section 2, page 2, line 13, after the word "of" where it occurs for the second time, to strike out "not more than four," and in line 16, after the word "Act," to strike out "at the time of enactment of this joint resolution," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. The Maritime Commission is authorized, from any moneys hereafter appropriated or made available to the Commission, to provide for the construction, by contract or otherwise, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of the Navy, of suitable vessels with modern equipment and instruments to replace vessels otherwise furnished to States which are maintaining schools under such act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 16, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. The Maritime Commission is authorized to extend the benefits of this joint resolution to a State nautical school, established and maintained by any State in accordance with the applicable provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911, as amended, at such port as may be designated by the State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF ARAPAHOE AND CHEYENNE INDIANS

The bill (S. 271) authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statute of limitations, to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render final judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims of whatsoever nature against the United States arising under or growing out of any treaty, act of Congress, agreement, or Executive order, relating to the lands or other rights claimed by the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Tribes of Indians or any band thereof, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States: *Provided*, That if the said tribes or any band thereof claim any interest in the lands, moneys, or other property involved in any proceedings now pending in the Court of Claims, such tribes or any band thereof may file an intervening petition therein and be made parties thereto under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That the claim or claims of the said tribes or bands of Indians shall be presented separately or jointly by petition, setting forth the treaties, agreements, acts of Congress, or Executive orders upon which the same are based, wherein said petitioners shall be parties plaintiff and the United States party defendant, and if filed separately shall be subject to consolidation by the court in proper cases, and the said court may order any nation, tribe, or band of Indians deemed necessary as parties to a final determination of such suit or suits to be joined therein, it being the intent of this act to give the Court of Claims full jurisdiction to determine any and all legal and equitable claims of every nature of said Indians asserted hereunder: *Provided*, That the petition or petitions of the said Indians shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims, under contract with such Indians, approved in accordance with existing law, upon information and belief as to the facts therein alleged, and no further verification shall be necessary: *And provided further*, That any and all claims against the United States under this act shall be forever barred unless suit or suits be instituted or petition, subject to amendment, be filed in the Court of Claims within 5 years of the date of this act.

That in the event any claim or claims are asserted against the United States for minerals mined and removed by white persons without authority of law and in trespass from lands reserved and set aside for said tribes of Indians or any band thereof prior to the time such lands were ceded to the United States, and said Indians have not been compensated therefor, the Court of Claims is hereby authorized and empowered to base any judgment for such minerals at one-eighth of the value of the amount shown to the satisfaction of the court to have been so mined and removed in trespass: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall not be construed as creating any rights but shall authorize said Indians to present such claims to the Court of Claims for adjudication as such claims may exist under treaties or agreements or acts of Congress relating to said Indians.

That official letters, papers, documents, maps, or other public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys for the said tribes or bands of Indians to such records.

SEC. 3. That upon final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable fee or fees, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered, for services rendered said Indians under duly approved contracts, to be paid to said attorney or attorneys for the said tribe or bands of Indians, together with all necessary and proper expenses incurred in the prosecution and preparation of the suit or suits, the same to be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due said Indians under such suit or suits.

SEC. 4. That the proceeds of all amounts, if any, recovered for said Indians, less the fees and expenses of attorneys, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of such Indians as decreed by the court, and such sum or sums shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the original judgment or decree, and thereafter shall be subject to appropriation by the Congress for the benefit and uses of the said Indians.

CLAIMS OF ASSINIBOINE INDIANS

The bill (S. 753) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, notwithstanding anything in the Judicial Code of the United States to the contrary, and without regard to the lapse of time, former adjudication, or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims arising under or growing out of the Treaty of Fort Laramie of September 17, 1851 (11 Stat. L. 749), between the Government of the

United States and the Assiniboine Indian Nation and other Indian nations therein specified, or any subsequent act of Congress, treaty, agreement, or Executive order or treaty with any other Indian tribe, or any nation that violates any of the rights of the Assiniboine Indian Nation, arising under or growing out of the said treaty, which said Assiniboine Nation or Tribe may have against the United States; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the said court to determine whether or not any provision on such treaty has been violated or breached by the Government of the United States, by acts of Congress or otherwise, and, if so, to render judgment for the damages resulting therefrom.

SEC. 2. Any and all claims against the United States within the purview of this act shall be forever barred unless suit be instituted or petition filed as herein provided in the Court of Claims within 5 years from the date of the approval of this act. Such suit shall make the Assiniboine Nation or Tribe party plaintiff and the United States party defendant. The petition shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims under contract with the Assiniboines, approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior.

Official papers, letters, documents, and records, including records of evidence heretofore taken before the Court of Claims pertaining to the subject matter of the suits herein authorized or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of such Indian nation to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nation.

SEC. 3. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said court it shall determine the rights of the parties thereto, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation or former adjudication and any payment which may have been made by the United States upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel but may be pleaded as a set-off in any suit, and the United States shall be allowed credit subsequent to the date of any Executive order, law, treaty, or agreement under which the claims arise for any sum or sums paid or expended for the benefit of said Indians prior to March 2, 1927, including gratuities: *Provided, however,* That there shall not be set off or credited any such sum or sums of money paid by the United States to or for the benefit of the Assiniboine Indian Nation for lands lying north of the Missouri River; nor any sum or sums of money received by the Assiniboine Nation or members thereof for surplus lands in the Fort Peck or Fort Belknap Reservations; nor any lands, nor the value thereof, allotted to the Assiniboine Nation, or members thereof, in the Fort Peck or Fort Belknap Reservations; nor any land, nor the value thereof, still held undisposed of in those reservations; nor shall there be set off or credited disbursements for agency building and repairs, miscellaneous agency expenses, pay of miscellaneous employees, pay of superintendents and agents, expenses of delegations, or pay of interpreters or Indian police.

SEC. 4. That if it be determined by the court that the United States, in violation of the terms and provisions of any Executive order, law, treaty, or agreement set forth and referred to in section 1, has unlawfully appropriated or disposed of any money or other property belonging to the Indians, damages therefor shall be confined to the value of the money or other property at the time of such appropriation or disposal, with a minimum value of lands at 93 cents per acre. With reference to all claims which may be the subject matter of the suits herein authorized, the decree of the court shall be in full settlement of all damages, if any, committed by the Government of the United States and shall annul and cancel all claim, right, and title of the said Assiniboine Indians in and to such money or other property.

SEC. 5. Upon final determination of such suit or suits, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable fee for services heretofore or hereafter rendered the Assiniboine Nation not to exceed 10 percent of the recovery, together with all necessary and proper expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred in preparation and prosecution of the claims and suits, to be paid to the attorneys employed by said tribe or nation of Indians, who have heretofore prosecuted and shall hereafter prosecute said claims and suits and the same shall be included in the decree, and shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due said tribe.

SEC. 6. A copy of the petition shall, in such case, be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he, or some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case.

SEC. 7. The proceeds of all amounts, if any, recovered from said Indians shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians decreed by said court to be entitled thereto, and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the judgment or decree, and shall be thereafter subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of said Indians, including the purchase of land and building of homes, and no part of said judgment shall be paid out in per capita payments to said Indians. The costs incurred in any suit hereunder shall be taxed against the losing party; if against the United States such costs shall be included in the amount of the judgment or decree, and if against said Indians shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States: *Provided,* That actual costs necessary to be incurred by the Assiniboine Indians as required by the rules of court in the prosecution of this suit shall be paid out of the funds of the Assiniboine Tribe in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 8. All laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

LIZZIE SMITH

The bill (H. R. 4359) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Lizzie Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF CROW INDIANS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) to amend the act of July), 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807), be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows: "That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with right of appeal (not by writ of certiorari) to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitations, to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment on the merits in any and all claims arising under or growing out of the treaty of Fort Laramie, dated September 17, 1851 (Fourth Kappler, p. 1065), between the United States and the Crow Indian Nation, and the treaty dated May 7, 1868 (15 Stat. 649), between the United States and the Crow Indians of Montana, or arising under or growing out of the agreement between the River Crow Tribe of Indians and the United States, dated July 15, 1868 (Third Kappler, p. 714); the Executive order dated July 2, 1873 (First Kappler, p. 855), or any subsequent Executive order; the act of Congress approved April 15, 1874 (18 Stat. 28), or any subsequent act of Congress or agreement with said Crow Indian Nation, including claims growing out of any cessions of land by said Indians to the United States for an inadequate consideration under mistake of fact, irrespective of any treaty stipulation entered into under such mistake of fact, which said Crow Indian Nation or any branch thereof may have against the United States. Jurisdiction also is hereby conferred upon the said courts to determine whether or not any provision in any such treaty, agreement, Executive order, or act of Congress above set forth has been violated or breached by any act or acts of Congress or by any treaty made by the United States with any other Indian tribe or nation, and to render judgment for the damages resulting therefrom: *Provided,* That for complying with the terms of this joint resolution case No. H-248, in the Court of Claims, entitled 'The Crow Nation or Tribe of Indians of Montana against the United States,' decided on March 4, 1935, is hereby reinstated."

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 294) to authorize an appropriation for payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of construction costs assessed against certain lands within such district acquired by the United States for the benefit of certain Indians in the State of New Mexico, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$35,075.29" and insert "$22,415.43"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "against", to strike out "803.94" and insert "483.29"; in line 4, after the word "lands", to insert "in addition to the lands covered by the contract of December 14, 1928, between the district and the Secretary of the Interior, executed pursuant to the act of March 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 312),"; and on page 2, after line 13, to insert:

SEC. 2. The unexpended balance of the amount appropriated by the act of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685-701), for final payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District on account of Pueblo Indian lands benefited by the works constructed by the district is hereby made available for payment to the district to liquidate liens against 320.65 acres in addition to lands covered by the contract of December 14, 1928, supra, representing unpaid construction assessments at the time the lands were purchased for the Indians.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $22,415.43, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of paying to the Middle Rio

Grande Conservancy District, a corporate political subdivision of the State of New Mexico, that part of the cost of works constructed by such district which was assessed against 483.29 acres, more or less, of lands, in addition to the lands covered by the contract of December 14, 1928, between the district and the Secretary of the Interior, executed pursuant to the act of March 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 312), in Sandoval County within such district as its proportionate share of the cost of construction of such works; such lands having been acquired by the United States for and on behalf of the Pueblo Indians of Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, and Santa Ana subsequent to their assessment for construction costs but without the payment of the assessments thereon.

SEC. 2. The unexpended balance of the amount appropriated by the act of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685-701), for final payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District on account of Pueblo Indian lands benefited by the works constructed by the district is hereby made available for payment to the district to liquidate liens against 320.65 acres in addition to lands covered by the contract of December 14, 1928, supra, representing unpaid construction assessments at the time the lands were purchased for the Indians.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSION INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2308) to ratify a lease entered into by certain Mission Indians of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, page 7, line 13, after the word "reservation", to insert "and distributed in per capita payments as authorized by section 2 of the act of August 25, 1937, Public, No. 375, Seventy-fifth Congress," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. No assignment of the foregoing lease shall become effective until approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, and all revenues payable to the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Band of Mission Indians under the terms of said lease or any assignment thereof shall be remitted to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the Agua Caliente or Palm Springs Reservation, and distributed in per capita payments as authorized by section 2 of the act of August 25, 1937 (Public, No. 375, 75th Cong.).

The construction, maintenance, and operation of any airport on the land covered by said lease shall conform to such requirements as may be prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

RINCON BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

The bill (S. 1626) to reserve a certain part of the public land in California for the benefit of the Rincon Band of Mission Indians was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to all valid existing rights and claims, the following-described lands of the United States be, and the same are hereby, withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition and set aside as an addition to the Rincon Indian Reservation in California: The north half, excepting that portion included in the Pauma Rancho, southeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 25, northwest quarter southwest quarter, south half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 27, west half, northwest quarter northeast quarter, south half northeast quarter, section 34, township 10 south, range 1 west, San Bernardino meridian: *Provided*, That until otherwise directed by Congress none of said lands shall be allotted in severalty or shall be subject to taxation.

ROADS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The bill (S. 1625) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"That appropriations are hereby authorized, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for material, equipment, supervision, including engineering, and the employment of Indian labor in the survey, improvement, construction, and maintenance of roads on Indian reservations or other land areas in the continental United States administered by the Office of Indian Affairs, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field; for the acquisition of rights-of-way, including payment of damages where necessary; and for cooperative work with other Federal or local governmental agencies in the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of roads furnishing access to Indian reservations and lands under the jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder on roads eligible to Government aid under the Federal Highway Act."

PRAIRIE BAND OR TRIBE OF POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS OF KANSAS AND WISCONSIN

The bill (S. 1154) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians residing in the States of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States, arising out of treaties between the Pottawatomie Nation of Indians and the United States. The jurisdiction conferred by this section shall include the claims of said Indians arising out of the agreement of March 16, 1909, for the commutation of the perpetual treaty annuities of said Indians, entered into pursuant to the Act of April 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 70, 73), irrespective of any waiver, release, or settlement effected by the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. 269, 289), ratifying and confirming said agreement.

SEC. 2. Such claims may be instituted in one suit at any time within 6 months after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from any judgment thereon, shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended. The attorney or attorneys of such Indians shall have access to any documents, correspondence, or records in the possession of any department, bureau, or agency of the Government which may be needed in the preparation or prosecution of such claims.

SEC. 3. Should the Court of Claims find from the evidence presented to it that the agreement of March 16, 1909, ratified and confirmed by the act of April 4, 1910, for commutation of the perpetual treaty annuities of these Indians was not signed, either in person or by persons duly authorized to sign for them, by a majority of the adult members of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians, then in that event the Court of Claims may treat any and all acts of Congress based upon the purported agreement as having been enacted under mistake of fact, and the court shall render a judgment restoring the annuities perpetually: *Provided*, That gratuity expenditures made by the United States for the benefit of these Indians, as referred to in section 4 hereof, and any payment heretofore made to them by the United States in fulfillment of the agreement of March 16, 1909, shall be charged as an offset but shall not be treated as an estoppel.

SEC. 4. There shall be set off against any recovery obtained hereunder such gratuity expenditures made by the United States for the benefit of these Indians as are directed to be set off by the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 596).

SEC. 5. Upon final determination of such claims, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine (1) a reasonable fee, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered by such Indians, to be paid to the attorney or attorneys who prosecute such claims under contract with such Indians approved in accordance with existing law; and (2) the amount of all necessary and proper expenses incurred by such attorney or attorneys in the preparation and prosecution of such claim, and such sums shall be included in the decree and be paid out of any sums appropriated for the payment of such sums as may be adjudged by the court to be due such Indians.

WISCONSIN BAND OF POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS

The bill (S. 1117) authorizing a suit in the Court of Claims of the United States against the United States by certain members of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment for the amount, if any, that legally or equitably may be fairly due on account of claims against the United States, of whatever nature, legal or equitable, arising out of treaties between the Pottawatomie Nation of Indians and the United States, of members of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomie Indians who were not paid from appropriations made by the act of Congress of June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 102), and subsequent acts, and the Court of Claims shall deduct from the amount found due the amount of money, if any, expended by the United States gratuitously for the benefit of said Indians, as required by section 2 of title 1 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 596), and render

judgment for the balance, if any: *Provided*, That on any claim heard under the provisions of this act, for the appropriation, taking, acquisition, or deprivation of land or any interest therein, the jurisdiction conferred by this act to hear any such claim and to render judgment thereon, is limited to the ascertainment of the value of said land, or interest therein, at the time of the appropriation, expropriation, taking, acquisition, or deprivation, and no judgment shall be rendered by the Court of Claims which includes any increment, interest, or the equivalent thereof, from the date of the taking to the date of said judgment as an element of just compensation or otherwise, and either party shall have the right to have the judgment reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States by appeal.

Such claims may be filed and presented by a majority group of said Indians within 2 years from the enactment of this act, and plaintiffs therein, at any time before the final judgment is rendered in said suit or suits, shall have the right to amend their petition or petitions, and the proceedings shall be as provided in the Judicial Code.

The rights of such Indians shall not be prejudiced by laches, lapse of time, or any statutes of limitations, nor by the fact that some of them or some of their ancestors may have fled from the United States to territory now a part of the Dominion of Canada, and may have become Canadian nationals.

The attorney for such Indians shall have access to all records, documents, and correspondence in the possession of any branch or agency of the Government, or may use the same, or copies thereof, as evidence in the hearing of their claims.

The Court of Claims shall have the jurisdiction to fix a reasonable attorney's fee for services rendered, and to be rendered, in the prosecution of said claims, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount, if any, found due to such Indians, and to fix the reasonable expenses incurred by such attorney, and the same shall be paid out of any funds Congress may appropriate to pay the claims of such Indians.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (S. 1116) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $776,742.03, being the net amount received by the United States from the sale of land of the Osage Tribe of Indians in the State of Kansas under article I of the treaty of September 29, 1865 (14 Stat. L. 687), credited to the "Civilization Fund" on the books of the Treasury of the United States and used for the benefit of Indian tribes other than the Osage Tribe, now residing in the State of Oklahoma, as found by the Court of Claims in its opinion of May 28, 1928 (66 Ct. Cl. 64), in a case known as B-38 entitled "Osage Nation of Indians against the United States" instituted under act of February 6, 1921 (41 Stat. L. 1097).

SEC. 2. That said amount when appropriated shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Osage Tribe of Indians and be distributed in accordance with the rules and regulations governing payment of moneys accruing to members of the Osage Tribe of Indians; and that said sum so authorized shall be paid in five equal annual installments, beginning with the fiscal year July 1, 1941.

SEC. 3. That said appropriation shall be in full, complete, and final settlement of the claims of the Osage Tribe of Indians against the United States arising under said treaty of 1865, above cited; and the said tribe of Indians waive all claims to interest on account of delayed payment and the United States waives all claims which might be asserted as offsets.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the said appropriation when made, the fees and expenses of the attorneys of record, in accordance with the provisions and percentages in their contract as approved by the Secretary of the Interior May 5, 1931.

CLAIMS OF CHOCTAW INDIANS OF MISSISSIPPI

The bill (S. 485) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims be, and it is hereby, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claims, legal or equitable, of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi against the United States for losses claimed to have been caused by the failure of the United States, its officers, agents, or representatives, to comply with, perform, and execute the provisions of treaties, agreements, or statutes of the United States relating to the reservations, lands, funds, and citizenship rights of said Indians, in regard to the following matters:

(a) The claims of the Choctaw Indians of Mississippi and of other reservees arising under the treaty of September 27, 1830, known as the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek (7 Stat. L. 333), for compensation for the failure to grant to them the lands to which they were entitled under said treaty, and for the value of scrip or indemnity for the same to which said Indians and reservees were entitled under the acts of Congress approved August 23, 1842 (5 Stat. L. 513), and March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. L. 777), including interest at 5 percent per annum for a period not to exceed 6 years.

(b) The claims of said Choctaw Indians of Mississippi for compensation for the loss of their interest, vested or contingent, in the assets or property of the Choctaw Nation to which they were entitled under the provisions of the several treaties and agreements between the United States and the Choctaw Nation and statutes of the United States relating thereto (1) by representation to said Indians that the United States would provide for their removal; (2) by advising against their accepting the aid of private persons to effect their removal; (3) by failure to give reasonable notice or aid in their removal; (4) by the disapproval of a roll of identification containing the names of a large number of said Choctaws, which roll had been held without action by the Secretary of the Interior for a long period of time and was disapproved without consideration of its merits by said Secretary upon representation to him by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that if approved the time for removal of those identified would extend beyond the date fixed for the final closing of the rolls of citizenship of the Choctaw Nation; or (5) by the action of the United States in allotting lands and distributing the property of the Choctaw Nation in disregard of the provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Choctaw Nation of April 28, 1866, with respect to the citizenship rights of the Choctaws of Mississippi: *Provided*, That if the said court shall find the said Choctaws of Mississippi had a vested or contingent right of which they were deprived by any of the foregoing causes, each person whose rights were lost thereby shall be entitled to an award of the average value of the interest so lost by him, including his proportionate share in the funds, and proceeds of the property of said nation as distributed to the enrolled members thereof, and the average value as of the time of loss of the individual allotments made to citizens of the Choctaw Nation: *Provided, however*, That the jurisdiction conferred by this act shall not extend to or embrace any claim or claims of any nature against the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, but solely to claims against the United States asserted by those Indians hereby authorized to sue, and no sum or sums recovered in any action hereby authorized or sums appropriated in payment or settlement thereof shall ever be the subject of a charge against or claim for reimbursement out of any of the property or funds of the said Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, directly or indirectly, or as a set-off or counterclaim against any claim or demand of said nation against the United States now or hereafter asserted, whether said claim or demand be of a legal or equitable nature, or for a gratuity.

SEC. 2. That this action shall be brought in said Court of Claims as a class action by a representative number of said Choctaws of Mississippi in their own behalf and in behalf of others similarly situated, and the petition or petitions filed under the provisions of this act may be executed and verified by J. A. Riddell as the representative of said petitioners and of all those in whose behalf said petition or petitions are filed and signed by William E. Richardson and Thomas E. Rhodes as attorneys for said Indians, and said representative and said attorneys are hereby authorized to prosecute said claims to the final conclusion of any action brought hereunder.

SEC. 3. That any petition or petitions filed in the said Court of Claims under the provisions of this act shall be submitted to said court within 2 years from the date of this act, and said cause or causes shall thereupon be proceeded with in accordance with the law and practice of said court, and any claims not so presented within the said period of 2 years shall be thereafter forever barred.

SEC. 4. That the hearing and adjudication of said claims shall be governed by equitable principles and shall fairly and finally determine the merits of the claims of said Indians and the obligations of the United States to them in administering the affairs of Indians subject to the guardianship and authority of the United States, in accordance with the customary action and precedents in the conduct of the estates of incompetent Indians, if the court shall find that said Mississippi Choctaw Indians were in fact as a group incompetent to manage their own affairs.

SEC. 5. That the amount of any judgment rendered in said cause when appropriated shall be set aside as a special fund to be paid or disbursed to the persons legally entitled to receive the same only upon such terms and conditions as Congress may by its subsequent legislation direct: *Provided, however*, That in entering its final judgment in said cause the Court of Claims shall hear and determine the amount, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of any final award, which on a quantum meruit basis it shall find to be a reasonable compensation for the respective services and expenses of J. A. Riddell as the representative and of William E. Richardson and Thomas E. Rhodes as attorneys for said Indians as a class, heretofore rendered, or which may hereafter be rendered in the suit authorized by the provisions of this act, and shall as a part of said judgment award so much thereof as may be necessary to pay said compensation and reimbursement upon the basis herein directed to such person or persons, respectively, as the said court may find entitled thereto.

SEC. 6. That said court shall have further jurisdiction to hear and determine any counterclaims or counterdemands on the part of the United States against the said Choctaw Indians of Mississippi upon the said basis of equity and justice as directed in respect to

the adjudication of all matters under the authority of this act.

SEC. 7. That either party aggrieved by any final decision of the said Court of Claims in said cause shall have the right to appeal such final decision to the Supreme Court of the United States as provided by law in respect to appeals from the Court of Claims to said Supreme Court: *Provided*, That on the question of the validity of the claim or claims of said Choctaw Indians against the United States, or any counterclaims or demands of the United States against said Indians, the appellate jurisdiction of said Supreme Court of the United States is hereby expressly extended to the hearing and determination of an appeal by or on behalf of said Choctaw Indians or the United States.

SEC. 8. That for the purpose of this act the term "Choctaws of the State of Mississippi" shall include only reservees under the treaty of September 27, 1830, and their descendants; those persons who on July 1, 1902, were residents in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, having not less than one-eighth Choctaw Indian blood, and their descendants, and such persons as were thereafter identified on any approved roll of Mississippi Choctaws and their descendants, and shall not include any persons who were enrolled on the final citizenship rolls of the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma.

LEASING OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR USE AS PUBLIC AVIATION FIELDS

The bill (S. 1480) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of public lands for use as public aviation fields," approved May 24, 1928, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of public lands for use as public aviation fields", approved May 24, 1928, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "not to exceed 640 acres in area" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "not to exceed 2,560 acres in area."

BELL GROCERY CO.

The bill (S. 1619) for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $427.50 to the Bell Grocery Co., of Pineville, Ky., to pay 28 months' rent on a warehouse which was used by the Works Progress Administration, and which sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the Bell Grocery Co. growing out of such transaction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

POSTAGE RATE ON BOOKS

The bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the postage rate on books consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof, irrespective of the postal zone of destination thereof.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The bill (S. 1605) to amend the act approved March 5, 1940, entitled "An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense," approved March 5, 1940 (Public, No. 426, 76th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1941" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1943."

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4473) authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 3, page 2, line 23, after the words "eligible for", to insert "consideration for"; and on page 3, line 2, after the word "President", to strike out "*Provided*, That no temporary promotions shall be made in any staff corps of the Navy until the authorized number of permanent officers in each grade or rank has been filled", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Officers on the active list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps in commissioned ranks, including those appointed under the authority of section 2 of this act, may be temporarily appointed to higher ranks or grades in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and the provisions of paragraph 9 of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 626; U. S. C., title 37, sec. 2), shall be applicable to all officers eligible for consideration for appointment or advancement pursuant to the provisions of this act, not only during the existence of a state of war formally recognized by Congress, but also during a national emergency determined by the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 8, line 19, after the word "apply", to insert the word "to"; and in line 24, after the word "Navy", to insert "and Marine Corps", so as to read:

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto shall apply to—

(a) Personnel of the Naval Reserve (except the Fleet Reserve) and the Marine Corps Reserve (except the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve) in like manner and to the same extent and with the same relative conditions in all respects as are provided for personnel of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, but this shall not be construed to authorize the temporary appointment of the personnel thereof to ranks or grades in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, and so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

The bill (H. R. 4841) to establish a National Archives Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST GUARD LIGHT STATION RESERVATION, AU SABLE, MICH.

The bill (S. 1601) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich., was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, House bill 4903 is a companion bill to the one just reached on the calendar. I therefore move that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and that the House bill be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4903) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange certain land owned by the United States for a site for a road right-of-way needed for access to the Coast Guard Light Station Reservation, Au Sable, Mich., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1601 will be indefinitely postponed.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3537) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendment, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after the word "land", to strike out "and to construct or acquire under contracts entered into as the result of competitive bidding buildings and accessories"; on page 2, after line 5, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

The provisions of section 8 (a) of the act approved June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), shall be applicable to the foregoing projects.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO WEST VIRGINIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey certain lands to the State of West Virginia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS

The bill (H. R. 3191) to amend the act entitled "An act to make unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL HIGHWAYS

The bill (S. 599) to amend section 17 of the Federal Highway Act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 17 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "for the right-of-way of any highway or forest road" a comma and the following: "for the storage of equipment or materials used or to be used in the construction or maintenance of any such highway or forest road."

DESCHUTES NATIONAL FOREST

The bill (S. 852) to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for and the addition thereof to the Deschutes National Forest, in the State of Oregon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase when purchasable at prices deemed by him reasonable, or by condemnation under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888, on behalf of the United States with any fund or moneys available for such purpose, any of the following-described lands in the State of Oregon which are within the existing boundaries of the Deschutes National Forest, and now in private ownership, to wit: Township 10 south, range 10 east, sections 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34; township 11 south, range 9 east, sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, 35, 36; all of township 11 south, range 10 east; township 11 south, range 11 east, sections 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33; township 12 south, range 9 east, sections 9, 10, 11, 27, 28, 34; all of township 12 south, range 10 east; township 12 south, range 11 east, sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31; township 13 south, range 8 east, sections 13, 15, 17, 19, 25, 27, 33, 35; township 13 south, range 9 east, sections 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 25, 29, 31, 33; all of township 13 south, range 10 east, except the south half of section 6 and the north half of section 7; township 13 south, range 11 east, sections 6, 7, 18, 19, 30, 31; township 14 south, range 8 east, sections 1, 11, 13, 15, 25; township 14 south, range 9 east, sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 31, 33, 35, 36; all of township 14 south, range 10 east, township 15 south, range 8 east, section 1; township 15 south, range 9 east, sections 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17; all of township 15 south, range 10 east; and township 16 south, range 10 east; township 16 south, range 11 east, sections 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33; township 17 south, range 10 east, sections 1 to 16, inclusive, sections 20 to 27, inclusive, and sections 34, 35, 36; township 17 south, range 11 east, sections 4 to 10, inclusive, sections 15 to 22, inclusive, and sections 27 to 34, inclusive, all Willamette meridian.

SEC. 2. When title to any of the aforesaid privately owned lands has been vested in the United States, such lands described in section 1 hereof shall be added to and become a part of the Deschutes National Forest and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to affect any valid existing rights.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $445,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This concludes the calendar.

THE PRICE-FIXING PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, Saturday last I made some remarks about the present price-fixing program. Following those remarks I introduced a bill on the subject. Since the introduction of the bill I have received a number of telegrams relative to the program now in process of operation and some suggestions relative to the program. I submit at this point, and in connection with my remarks, the telegrams I have received, and ask that they be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPLE, OKLA., *June 29, 1941.*

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
CARE SENATOR ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

We unanimously endorse Senator THOMAS' resolution regarding farm products price fixing. How can the administration expect citizens in the agriculture States to buy national-defense bonds so long as the commodities of the farm are at their present low values? We request full support of Senator THOMAS in his effort to curb price fixing of farm products.

JEROME MOONEY,
Secretary.

DURANT, OKLA., *June 30, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Just when farmers and the millions depending on them for our living thought we would get a break Leon Henderson pops off throwing monkey wrench into machinery. Such outbursts are unwarranted, unfair, impractical, and plain dumb; don't they recall what happened in '37? Gag him if possible.

Dr. O. J. COLWICK.

SUMMIT, N. J., *June 30, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Three cheers for spanking little Hitler price fixers. Congress must govern. As farm owner urge dropping subsidy, used by New Deal to coerce Congress, before even congressional price fixing.

H. DUDLEY SWIM.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 29, 1941.*

Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.:

Your friends in the South admire and appreciate your stand to control Leon Henderson rather than to permit him to issue vicious statements relative to price control of farm products against interest of farmers. This man's actions should be repudiated at once.

SCOTT FITZHUGH.

GRANGER, TEX., *June 30, 1941.*

ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton farmers are greatly alarmed over the unwarranted activities of Mr. Leon Henderson. Hope you will immediately use your influence to see that he does not use the power of his office to further peon cotton farmers by freezing price of cotton and cottonseed. Texas farmers appreciate interest you have shown in them and are looking to you for assistance.

RALPH W. MOORE,
Member Executive Committee,
Texas State Grange.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 29, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Many cotton growers who patronize our warehouse have complained bitterly the last 2 days against Henderson's price-fixing edicts on cotton textiles and cottonseed oil. These cotton growers contend that since the costs and prices of all agricultural products consist largely of labor costs, no fixation of prices can be rightfully or successfully made on products of labor until and unless the price of labor itself is also fixed. Furthermore these men contend that since the administration plans to produce enough to act as food storehouse and arsenal for world democracies in present conflict, no such program can be successfully prosecuted without sufficiently rewarding producers of necessary products. In spite of present surplus of commodities, many predict that if we are to feed and clothe England, China, and Russia in addition to our own people, we will be rationing food and clothing in this country within 2 years, especially if Henderson's price-fixing program continues. Please do your utmost to safeguard interests of your agricultural constituents.

VALLEY COMPRESS CO.,
By CECIL F. WHITE, *President.*

TAFT, TEX., *June 29, 1941.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I vigorously protest Leon Henderson's dictatorial and un-American activities without statutory authority meddling with prices of basic commodities, indirectly fixing price of cotton by naming ceiling for cotton yarns, and especially his very recent utterance regarding prevailing price of cottonseed oil being too high. Forty-two-cent yarn price means cotton farmers will not receive more than 85 percent of so-called parity, which is far below production cost. Farmers are entitled to cost plus a profit, regardless of Henderson's apparent desire to make them paupers. Fixing of price of cottonseed oil serious and far reaching. It would mean relatively low prices for all competing commodities such as peanuts, soybeans, lard, hogs, corn, oleomargarine, butter, etc. It would fix price of all fats and oils which is source of 10 percent of all farmers' cash income. How can we pay taxes and exist with our basic industry, agriculture, in poverty and on Government relief? I am sure you will do everything in your power to stop any such un-American program that will impoverish and destroy American agriculture.

W. L. WEBER.

AUSTIN, TEX, *June 30, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

Fight with all your might Henderson's proposal to fix price ceiling on cotton and cottonseed oil. Without Government handicap supply and demand coupled with short crop, cotton price will reach parity levels and enable cotton farmers to pay some of their debts and mortgages. Average price ⅞ middling cotton 1920 to 1929, the 10-year period was 20¼ cents a pound The price per pound a farmer receives for his cotton equals the wage per hour he receives in growing cotton and surely 25 cents an hour is far less than the wage the Federal Labor Relations Board fixes for industrial workers. Henderson has no constitutional right to place price ceiling on cotton and cottonseed oil. It must not be done.

Regards, J. E. MCDONALD,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

JASPER, ALA., *June 30, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS:

Please wire me the result of the meeting today on the subject of price fixing. I am with you in this fight.

High regards.

J. H. BANKHEAD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 30, 1941.*

ELMER THOMAS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In reference to uneconomic and un-American price-fixing proposal on agricultural commodities, cotton, cloth, and cottonseed oil. As we know agriculture is our basic and greatest industry upon which the life and prosperity of our Nation depends. For the past 10 years Congress has been trying to raise prices of commodities and increase agricultural income. Recently there has been an advance in commodity prices, yet present prices are far below actual cost of production to our farmers. The proposal now to fix price on cotton yarn and cotton cloths is but an indirect way of fixing price on raw cotton. The proposal to fix price on cottonseed oil will naturally fix the price on cottonseed, which is a substantial part of the cotton farmers' income; also to fix price on cottonseed oil will have most depressing effect on prices of lard, hogs, corn, soybeans, peanuts, and many other commodities which are raised by our farmers throughout the Nation. Furthermore cost of raw commodity is on an average of but about 10 percent of the cost of manufactured goods to the consumer. Therefore, even if commodity prices were doubled it should not materially affect cost to the consumer. To fix prices on commodities and semimanufactured commodities around present levels is most unfair to our farmers. Also it is contrary to what Congress has been working for during past 10 years, that is to increase commodity prices. Also it means that our farmers will continue to be in an impoverished and desperate financial condition which will make sound recovery impossible and thus retard program for adequate national defense. Therefore, hope you will make every effort to defeat any dictatorial price fixing of commodities or semimanufactured commodities and in no event permit them to be fixed below cost of production plus a fair profit to our farmers at prices determined by the Congress.

ROBERT HARRISS.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PREVENTION OF PROSTITUTION NEAR MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, Order of Business No. 340 is House bill 2475, relating to protection of the health of the young men assembled in the various camps. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was amended was entered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], now presiding in the Senate. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to explain the two measures which are now under consideration, as well as the parliamentary situation.

The House of Representatives passed H. R. 2475, which is entitled "An act to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy."

When the measure came up on a unanimous-consent call of the calendar, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] offered as an amendment Senate bill 860, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs without recommendation. Senate bill 860 seeks to go a great deal further than H. R. 2475. House bill 2475 was aimed at a purpose to which no one could have any objection—namely, to give control to the heads of the Army and Navy of the areas surrounding concentrations of men in the uniform of the United States and to stamp out therein vice and prostitution. But Senate bill 860, introduced by the late Senator from Texas, Mr. Sheppard, sought to go a great deal further. It proposed to confer upon the heads of the Army and Navy not only the power to attempt to deal with vice in the areas surrounding the camps but also to provide for prohibition of alcoholic beverages, including beer, ale, and wine, not only in the military establishments themselves but in the areas surrounding them; and it is my interpretation, as the bill is drawn, that it would even give them power to establish rules and regulations in communities, cities, towns, and villages in the areas surrounding such camps.

I was in the chair when the Senator from Colorado offered S. 860 as a substitute for the House bill, and, of course, I was in no position to debate the matter. I had to put the question, the question was put, and the Senate agreed to substitute S. 860, a very sweeping bill, conferring upon the heads of the Army and Navy the power to establish prohibition again in areas around the camps. I subsequently entered a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate adopted S. 860 as a substitute for H. R. 2475.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that originally all the power sought for the Army or the Navy was to deal with the question of vice. Senators and Representatives, of course, disagree on the question of prohibition, and I believe that the wise and the sound course for the Senate to follow is to reconsider the vote whereby Senate bill 860, this prohibition bill, was agreed to as an amendment to House bill 2475, then to reject the amendment and to pass House bill 2475, let it go to the President, and grant this power, which everyone knows is necessary in order that the heads of the armed forces may deal with the problem of vice. Then, if Senators are sufficiently interested, let us take up the question whether we wish to reestablish prohibition through the ipsi dixit of the heads of the Army and Navy, in the areas contiguous to and surrounding military camps. If that is done, it is my understanding that it will conform to the wishes of the author of Senate bill 860. I believe I was reliably informed that the late Senator Sheppard was in agreement that the two measures should be considered separately, and upon their merits.

Mr. President, with that brief statement of the parliamentary situation——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not question the general statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I do question his statement that the late Senator from Texas, Mr. Sheppard, thought these two subjects should be dealt with separately. I question that statement because the late Senator from Texas introduced the two proposals in one bill. If he had believed that the two should be dealt with separately, certainly he would not have combined them in one bill. So I question that particular statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that is neither here nor there. The Senator from Colorado was much closer to the late Senator from Texas than I on the question of prohibition, but I think I was reliably informed that the purpose of the late Senator was to report these bills separately, and that when they were reported separately the then senior Senator from Texas was agreeable to having them considered separately. But I withdraw my statement in that regard.

The issue is clear before the Senate. It is, Do we want to enter into a long controversy over the question whether the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the power to establish prohibition of all alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, and wine, in the areas surrounding military camps, and whether we want to have that issue confused with the issue of giving power to the heads of these Departments to control vice, and thereby delay the exercise of a power which is very much needed, according to the information which has been submitted to me by those connected with the armed services of the United States, as well as with the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the War Department submitted a report on S. 860, and did not object to section 4 of that bill, which undertakes to establish a ban against vice in the neighborhood of armed camps, and so forth, but the War Department submitted an adverse report against sections 1, 2, and 3 of Senate bill 860, which seek to establish prohibition areas.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, there is considerable opposition to vesting authority in the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to undertake to establish prohibition zones, but there is no opposition, at least so far as I am informed, to House bill 2475, as reported, which deals solely with the question of vice, and undertakes to protect the soldiers stationed in the camps.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct. I may say again to the Senate that the simple way out of this matter is to reconsider the vote whereby Senate bill 860, the sweeping prohibition measure, was adopted as an amendment to House bill 2475, then reject that amendment, and then pass House bill 2475, to which there is not one scintilla of objection. It has already passed the House, and if passed in its present form it can go on to the President and be signed and become law within a few hours.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I thoroughly agree with him. House bill 2475, as originally reported, which undertakes to establish zones with respect to vice, is being held up because of this very controversial issue.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is no question about that. If the Senate should reaffirm its action taken previously, then the measure would have to go to the House of Representatives; there would have to be a conference, and there would be a protracted fight on it, and in the meantime vice would be thriving in the areas surrounding the camps. I certainly hope reconsideration of the vote will be had.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that these two entirely separate issues, one of which has no opposition of any character whatever, and which has the support of the War Department and of the Navy Department as being immediately necessary as an emergency measure, and the other of which is a highly controversial question, and upon which we are advised by both the War Department and the Navy Department that it confers upon them an authority which they do not need and do not want, have been deliberately confused for the purpose of sending the bill to conference so that a group of conferees may write any sort of bill they please, and bring it back to the Senate and House under the requirements of the rules of both bodies that it must be voted up or down by both bodies? It seems to me it is unfair for the Senate and the House deliberately to abdicate their functions, and put the matter into the hands of a little group of conferees to write any sort of bill they please, so that in order to get a very essentially necessary measure of reform the Senate must take what it does not want and the Navy and War Departments do not want.

I have been advised by members of the Military Affairs Committee that the purpose in mixing up these issues is deliberately to send the bill to conference so that a bill may be written in conference which the Senate will either have to vote up or vote down.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any further time. I think it is easy to understand what is involved in this question. But I desire to repeat that if we can get a reconsideration of the vote, and eliminate the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is in fact the language of Senate bill 860, we can pass House bill 2475, containing this very important and very necessary power permitting the Army and the Navy to deal with vice in the areas surrounding concentrations of men in camps, and it can be on its way to the White House in a few hours. But if we have to fight over again the issue of prohibition, if the matters are to be snarled up and snagged up and wound up together, the result will be that those who profit by this vicious traffic will go on waxing fat, and the health and sanitation of our camps will be in danger.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not wish to take up very much time of the Senate on this question. I will be very glad to see House bill 2475 disposed of. It could have been disposed of on the 23d of May had not objection been raised to the action of the Senate in amending House bill 2475 by changing the language to that of Senate bill 860. Since that time it has been objected to by certain Senators and therefore has been delayed to this time.

I do not feel, as the Senator from Wisconsin does, that the two issues are entirely separate and distinct. I think they are very closely related one to the other, and that in order to take care of the boys in the Army the Army officers themselves should have some power of control over the men insofar as the two vices which are covered by the two bills are concerned. I think the two matters should be held together. I think perhaps the original language in Senate bill 860 may have been too sweeping. It probably requires some amendment. So I do not object to the motion which has now been made by the Senator from Wisconsin to reconsider the vote by which the language of Senate bill 860 was placed in House bill 2475. If that motion prevails, however, I think the Senate should consider certain amendments to House bill 2475, which will be presented.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What amendment relating to the sale of liquor does the Senator propose to offer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is proposed that Senate bill 860 be amended by striking out section 1, and that section 2 be amended so that the authority of the Army and Navy would not extend into incorporated cities and towns. The control the Army and Navy would have over camps would simply apply to the zones outside the camps, between the camps and the incorporated cities or towns.

Mr. WALSH. Does any amendment relate to the sale of any class of intoxicating liquors in camps or naval reservations or Army reservations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Section 1 of Senate bill 860 pertains to liquor within the camps.

Mr. WALSH. But, as I understand, the Senator does not now intend to go into that field by any amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I should be satisfied if the Senate would amend House bill 2475 to strike out section 1.

Mr. WALSH. And give to the military authorities control over the sale of liquor in the vicinity of camps and cantonments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Outside incorporated towns and cities. That is the amendment which I have in mind.

Mr. WALSH. In my section of the country there is no area intervening between the camps and the cities or towns. We have either a Government reservation or an incorporated town or city.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are areas surrounding certain of the camps between the camps and the incorporated towns or cities. The object of the proposed legislation is to take care of situations with regard to vice outside the incorporated towns and cities, and outside the military reservations.

Mr. WALSH. So far as the Senator contemplates offering amendments, he would not interfere in any way with the sale of liquor in Army or Navy establishments, and would not interfere in any way with the sale of liquor in incorporated cities and towns in the vicinity of the camps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would not give the military authorities any control over incorporated cities or towns.

Mr. WALSH. Would the Senator prohibit the sale of liquor in incorporated cities and towns?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. The amendment would not apply to cities or towns.

Mr. WALSH. Then, the Senator has in mind only the situation with respect to public lands, for example, where there is no Army or naval reservation, and where liquor may be sold in the vicinity of camps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not necessarily public lands, but areas outside the military reservations, where bootleggers may operate, or where trailer camps, roadhouses, or places of that nature are located, which are not under the control of any local agency, but which do prey upon the military camps.

Mr. WALSH. I think the bill ought to be reconsidered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to go over old ground, but it is a fact that the House passed a bill dealing only with

prostitution, and the Senate has a bill dealing with prostitution and prohibition. The Senator from Wisconsin has just pointed out—I think very properly—that the matter will have to go to conference because there is bound to be a fight over whether prohibition shall be incorporated into the bill. For the purposes of my own statement, I do not wish to take sides on that question. I am suggesting to the Senator that it would really make for progress and speed if he would accede to the reconsideration of the matter so that we may vote on each question separately.

I know the Senator is actuated by a desire to aid the troops. I am not questioning his motives or the worth of the proposed legislation, but it does not seem to me to be within the parliamentary practice, strictly speaking, for us to substitute a Senate bill for a House bill when the Senate bill is not a similar bill but brings in an entirely new subject. That is what we really did a while ago. We substituted for a House bill which was limited to one subject a Senate bill which dealt with two subjects. I think most Members of the Senate were under the impression that the subject matter was practically identical, but that the wording perhaps was different. I, myself, was of that opinion.

I do not mean to oppose either of the Senator's proposals, but I am appealing to him, in the interest of the very men he wants to serve, to consent to a reconsideration. Of course, the question will be put to a vote; but if he would consent, as the sponsor of the measure, to a reconsideration of this matter, we could immediately pass the House bill with reference to prostitution, and there would not be any question about it becoming the law of the land, for there would not be anything in disagreement between the Senate and the House. On the other hand, if the bill is passed as it is now written, it will have to go to conference, and the Senator knows that such a course would bring on a very acrimonious and prolonged debate. The result might well be that we should not get either piece of legislation, certainly not for a long time.

Without questioning the Senator's motives, I suggest to him that the procedure which is proposed would only defeat the very purposes he has in mind. I therefore hope the matter will be reconsidered, so that we may vote on each proposal separately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to have the statement of the Senator from Maryland. So far as I am concerned, if the Senate would take up Senate bill 860 and vote on it this afternoon, I should be glad to see House bill 2475 passed now; but I think that we ought to dispose of Senate bill 860 this afternoon.

Mr. WALSH. Or have it assigned to a definite date. Would the Senator agree to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know. I understand we are about to take a vacation for the next few days. But if we can dispose of it I shall promise not to make any statement about it. I do not know whether there will be any debate on it. I do not know whether all Senators are familiar with the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to reconsider the vote by which the language of Senate bill 860 was substituted for the language of House bill 2475. If the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin shall prevail, then the question will be on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who originally made such a motion last week, for the substitution of the language of Senate bill 860 for the language of House bill 2475. The Senator will then be in a position, if he cares to do so, to modify his amendment or withdraw it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand the parliamentary situation. I now ask unanimous consent that, upon the disposition of House bill 2475, Senate bill 860 be made the next order of business and disposed of.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that request. It has been understood that during the remainder of this week there will be very little, if any, further consideration of bills on the calendar. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent. I wish to confer with him about the program for the future, in order that some agreement may be had for a recess every 3 days during a period of time which would take us into August. With that uncertainty and with the desire that there be a full attendance of the Senate when the matter comes up for consideration, I object to the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Norris
Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Barbour	Guffey	Pepper
Bilbo	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bone	Hatch	Reynolds
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Herring	Schwartz
Brown	Hill	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request with reference to the bill which has been discussed, namely, Senate bill 860. I ask unanimous consent that if, upon the call of the calendar at any session of the Senate after July 15, Senate bill 860 should be objected to, then, at the conclusion of the calendar, that bill shall be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think that is a very clear statement of the result of the conference. If we are in session, of course, on July 15, and thereafter the calendar should be called, and there should be objection, then the bill would become the unfinished business. No definite time is fixed, but the request, if agreed to, would give a status which I think is satisfactory to the proponents of the bill. Personally, I have no objection to the request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have the request stated again? I was in the cloakroom for a moment.

Mr. BYRNES. I may say that I do not ask that the bill be made the order of business on any specific day, because of the uncertainty whether the Senate would be in session on such particular day, but I have asked that after July 15, whenever the calendar is called, if Senate bill 860 is objected to, then, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, Senate bill 860 shall be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request for this reason: It has been my understanding that no business was to be transacted today except certain measures which were necessary because of the fact today is the last day of the fiscal year. Many Senators are absent under that understanding. Everyone is in agreement that the provisions of the House bill should be immediately enacted into law, and I believe I am perfectly safe in saying that that bill can be passed by unanimous consent without any further debate; that it can be passed in 5 minutes, and be on its way to the President for his signature in a matter of an hour or two. The Senator from Colorado, however, insists on tacking onto that bill an entirely different matter, an entirely extraneous measure, which will require very careful consideration, and probably prolonged debate.

That measure, of course, like any other bill, could be taken up on motion and made the unfinished business at any time the Senate should see fit to do so; but it does not seem to me to be fair, in the absence of a large number of Senators, who were not advised that this matter was coming up today, to have the Senator request that at some indefinite date in the future this bill be made the unfinished business. Therefore, although I will be glad to consider the provisions of the so-called Sheppard bill at any time, and to debate them at length, I do not think it is fair to make this bill the unfinished business at some indefinite day in the future. Therefore, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that the vote by which

the language of Senate bill 860 was substituted for the language of House bill 2475 be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire if there has been any business transacted since the last quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is quite right. No business has been transacted, and the request for a quorum is not in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order. Unanimous consent was asked and was denied. Is not that the transaction of business? A unanimous-consent request was made and denied. If that is not business, then I do not understand of what parliamentary business consists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Norris
Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Barbour	Guffey	Pepper
Bilbo	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bone	Hatch	Reynolds
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Herring	Schwartz
Brown	Hill	Smathers
Bunker	Hughes	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Walsh
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to reconsider the vote by which the language of Senate bill 860 was substituted for the language of House bill 3475.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to substitute the language of Senate bill 860 for the language of House bill 3475.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burton	Downey
Aiken	Butler	Ellender
Andrews	Byrd	George
Bailey	Byrnes	Glass
Barbour	Capper	Green
Bilbo	Caraway	Guffey
Bone	Chavez	Gurney
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Hatch
Bridges	Connally	Hayden
Brown	Danaher	Herring
Bunker	Davis	Hill
Hughes	Murdock	Stewart
Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Johnson, Colo.	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
La Follette	Overton	Tunnell
Lodge	Pepper	Tydings
Lucas	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McFarland	Reynolds	Van Nuys
McKellar	Russell	Walsh
McNary	Schwartz	Wheeler
Maloney	Smathers	White
Mead	Smith	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to inquire as to the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that the motion of the junior Senator from Colorado to substitute the language of Senate bill 860 for the language of House bill 2475 is the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to amend the wording of Senate bill 860 by a series of amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may modify his own amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to strike out all of section 1 of Senate bill 860. That provision pertains to the regulation of the control of liquor upon military reservations, posts, and camps of every kind of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Is it desired to have these amendments presented and voted upon one at a time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is the judge of the procedure to be taken. The Senator from Colorado is now offering amendments to the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In section 2, on line 13, page 2, after the word "place", I propose to insert the following language:

but not within any incorporated city or town.

It then would read:

That in the interest of the common defense it shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place, but not within any incorporated city or town, as the Secretary of War shall determine—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the perfecting amendment just offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have some further perfecting amendments of a technical nature which have been suggested by the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado will suspend, the Chair was about to submit his amendments as he presents them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, the matter before the Senate at the present moment is an amendment to House bill 2475 offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand, the Senator from Colorado now is moving to modify his own amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is proposing amendments to his amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A further parliamentary inquiry: Is it necessary for the Senator from Colorado to offer an amendment to an amendment which he himself is offering? Can he not, in his own right, modify any amendment which he offers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is necessary for the Senator to offer the amendments in this manner because the Senate has already passed upon his original amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the Senate has reconsidered its action in passing upon his original amendment. Does not this situation recur as though the Senator from Colorado had never offered his amendment in the first place?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule under which the Chair has ruled reads as follows. It is the second paragraph of rule XXI:

Any motion or resolution may be withdrawn or modified by the mover at any time before a decision, amendment, or ordering of the yeas and nays except a motion to reconsider, which shall not be withdrawn without leave.

The Senate having agreed to the motion originally, the rule therefore applies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no particular interest in the matter except for the sake of clarity. I have always been under the impression that the rule which the Chair has just read simply meant that a motion to reconsider could not be withdrawn, but did not mean that the Senator who had offered an amendment could not modify it in any way he saw fit.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I thought what the Senator from Colorado was doing was using the text of Senate bill 860 simply as the basis of an amendment. That is, he is not affecting Senate bill 860, but he is using it as the text for an amendment which he wishes to offer; and in that case he may offer any amendment he pleases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the motion which the Senate has just adopted was to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Colorado was adopted a month ago. That motion having been carried, the question now before the Senate is the original amendment of the Senator from Colorado. He may withdraw that amendment if he desires, and may offer a new amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is offering a new amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Chair understands that the Senator from Colorado desires to withdraw his original amendment and offer a new one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the original amendment of the Senator from Colorado is withdrawn. The Senator from Colorado may now present his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The new amendment will be the language of Senate bill 860, except that section 1 will be entirely stricken out; and section 2 will be amended by adding, after the word "place" in line 13, page 2, the words "but not within any incorporated city or town."

The section 1 which is eliminated pertains to military camps, naval reservations, and military reservations. Section 2 restricts the Army officers insofar as local units of government are concerned, incorporated cities or towns. Now I desire to offer two other amendments which were suggested by the Secretary of War.

On page 4, line 1, after the word "building," I move to add this language:

or to lease or rent, or contract to lease or rent, any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or building, or part thereof, knowing or with good reasons to know, that it is intended to be used for any of the purposes herein prohibited.

The amendment will make the bill conform to House bill 2475 as passed by the House.

The next amendment, which has the same purpose in view, is on page 4, line 12, where I move to add the words "and the Federal Security Administrator" after the word "Navy."

The third and last amendment is on page 4, line 17, after the word "act," to add this language:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on the personnel of the War or Navy Department or the Federal Security Agency any authority to make criminal investigations, searches, or arrest of civilians charged with violations of this act.

Mr. President, that completes the amendments of the Senator from Colorado to the language of Senate bill 860. I shall be very glad to explain any of the amendments further if any Senator desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the amendment now offered by the Senator from Colorado, it is that all of House bill 2475 after the enacting clause be stricken out, and that there shall be substituted in place thereof the language which the Senator from Colorado has just now read.

Mr. JOHNSON of COLORADO. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to hear the bill read as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is requested that the Senator from Colorado restate his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator has a copy of Senate bill 860, he will find that the first section is entirely stricken. In the second section, on page 2, line 13, after the word "place", this language is added: "but not within any incorporated city or town."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I interject a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN. What does the Senator mean by "incorporated town"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thought that was a pretty well understood term.

Mr. GREEN. In some cases I think the whole State consists of incorporated towns and cities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not an attorney, and I am not familiar with such States. In my State certain cities are incorporated and certain towns are incorporated, and some villages are incorporated, and some are not. The intention was not to give commanding officers of military reservations any authority over such units of government as incorporated cities or towns; that is all.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill read as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been amended. The Senator from Colorado is endeavoring to present an amendment and the amendment which the Senator from Colorado is endeavoring to present and has presented is a modification of the original Senate bill 860.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. May the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado as modified now be read for the information of the Senate? It has never been stated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the junior Senator from Colorado to one matter. I have just been conferring with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and he states that in Ohio they do not have towns, but they do have villages, and that the word "villages" should be added to the amendment in order to cover the situation in Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to add that. After the word "towns" I would add the words "and villages", so that it would read "cities and towns and villages."

Mr. GUFFEY. Does that include incorporated townships? We have several of them in Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My amendment does not say anything about incorporated townships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. The Chair will state that inasmuch as the amendment is being presented now to the pending bill, if it should be adopted, no other amendment would be in order. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

That in the interest of the common defense it shall be unlawful within any reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place, but not within any incorporated city, town, or village, as the Secretary of War shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy and shall designate in general orders or bulletins for any person, corporation, partnership, or association to sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this section or any orders, rules, or regulations made by proper authority thereunder, shall unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 and/or imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months.

SEC. 2. In construing the foregoing sections of this act the word "Army" shall extend to and include "Navy", the word "military" shall include "naval", "Articles of War" shall include "Articles for the government of the Navy", the words "military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place" shall include such places under naval jurisdiction as may correspond to the aforenamed places under military jurisdiction. The powers conferred under this act upon the Secretary of War are hereby conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy with regard to the naval service. The words "Navy" and "naval" shall include the Marine Corps. The aviation units of both the military and naval service shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That in the interest of the common defense it shall be unlawful within any reasonable distance of any military or naval camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy, and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins to engage in prostitution or to aid or abet prostitution, or to procure or solicit for purposes of prostitution, or to keep or set up a house of ill fame, brothel, or bawdy house, or to receive any person for purposes of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution in any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or building, or to lease, or contract to lease or rent, any vehicle, conveyance, place, structure, or buildings, or part thereof, knowing or with good reason to know that it is intended to be used for any of the purposes herein prohibited; and any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating the provisions of this section shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War or the Articles for the government of the Navy be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months and any person subject to military or naval law violating the provisions of this act shall be punished as provided by the Articles of War or the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, and the Federal Security Administrator, are hereby authorized and directed to do everything by them deemed necessary to suppress and prevent the violation of such provisions and to accept the cooperation of the authorities of States and counties, districts, and other political subdivisions in carrying out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on the personnel of the War or Navy Department or the Federal Security Agency any authority to make criminal investigations, searches, seizures, or arrests of civilians charged with violations of this act.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31, 35, 36, 46, 48, 49, 54, 57, 64, 72, and 79.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 43, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 71, 77, 83, 89, 91, 95, and 96, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and also including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, twenty thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which fifteen thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand for the use of the Senate, $20,000, and including printing and binding in cloth, with illustrations, thirty-five thousand copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which twenty-six thousand two hundred shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and eight thousand eight hundred for the use of the Senate, $30,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$48,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$304,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,241,455"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$11,050,411, of which $14,411 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$99,558, of which $1,558 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$782,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$249,337, of which $2,337 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$14,051,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$870,651"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$2,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$7,790 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics', and not to exceed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$1,797,348, of which $9,348 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$18,589,609"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$9,990,165, of which $34,665 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$314,469"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$877,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$182,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$690,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,329,978"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,284,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$685,668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$483,332"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$749,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,133,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$533,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$6,421,308"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,633,362"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$23,516,775, of which $58,425 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$25,602,109"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$499,388,671, of which $467,451 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$100,150,000, of which $116,850 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$47,962,910, of which $38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$5,559,827, of which $59,827 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$2,488,912, of which $38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$747,453, of which $8,764 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$2,752,412, of which $574,173 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$5,988,777"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$64,000,000, of which $115,171 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$120,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted and restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "$3,887,900, of which $77,900 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, 80, 93, 94, 97, 98, and 100.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
R. A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3735, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 20, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 11, 93, and 94 to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$7,170,943";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$14,158,918";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$14,948,918";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$27,313,976";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Omit the matter stricken out and the matter inserted by said amendment and insert:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, $212,000,000, of which $97,375 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics,' to remain available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1942 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment. The Secretary may also provide by regulations for similar deductions for planting in excess of the acreage allotment for the commodity on other farms or for planting in excess of the acreage allotment or limit for any other commodity for which allotments or limits are established under the agricultural conservation program on the same or any other farm.

"If the sum of the prevailing basic-loan rate for the crop year 1942 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

"The proviso contained in the paragraph headed 'Parity payments' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm in full amount only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1941 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program, and, if such allotment has been exceeded, the parity payment with respect to the commodity shall be reduced by not more than 10 percent for each 1 percent, or fraction thereof, by which the acreage planted to the commodity is in excess of such allotment': *Provided*, That the item entitled 'Parity payments' contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1941, is amended by inserting, immediately following the figures '$212,000,000' and before the colon, a comma and the following: 'together with the unobligated balances of the appropriation made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1940, approved June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 939)'."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 97 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "$3,962,375, of which $38,950 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics' ";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 98 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$3,962,375"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 100 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the first proviso in said amendment, after the colon, insert "*Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: "

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House

to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 9, 13, 17, 21, 97, 98, and 100.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 80 with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the second paragraph of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment and insert in lieu of such paragraph the following:

"If the sum of the prevailing basic-loan rate or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1941 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price."

The motion was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF PROSTITUTION NEAR MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2475) to prohibit prostitution within such reasonable distance of military and/or naval establishments as the Secretaries of War and/or Navy shall determine to be needful to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the Army and/or Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate for a few moments further to state the situation which now presents itself. The House has passed a bill containing the language of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Colorado, namely, section 4, which deals with the control of vice. The Senator has modified his previous amendment by striking out the first section of Senate bill 860, which was an ironclad prohibition against alcoholic liquors in any Army cantonment or any other place.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Secretary of War is on record against the amendments now offered by the Senator, and I wish to read from the statement of the Secretary of War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct in his statement that the Secretary of War was opposed to all of Senate bill 860 with the exception of the last section. However, after the Secretary of War had made his statement, this matter was posed to his representatives who came to Congress, and they said they saw no objections to section 2 or to the amendment which I now propose. They said there could be no objection on the part of the War Department to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not know who were the representatives of the Secretary with whom the Senator talked, but the Secretary of War is on record against every section of the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado with the exception of section 4, which is identical in language with the House bill to which he offers the amendment.

I do not think it is any breach of confidence for me to say that I also have conferred with the various agencies and departments which would be charged with the enforcement of this proposed legislation, and I do not believe I disclose any confidence when I say that they would undertake with great reluctance the enforcement of all the sections of the Senator's amendment with the exception of section 4, namely, that dealing with vice.

Let me now read what the Secretary of War had to say the last time he is on record in connection with this matter. After endorsing section 4 of Senate bill 860, which has to do with vice, he said:

The other sections of this legislation, however, provide measures which in the opinion of the War Department have proven ineffective in the matter of control over excessive use of intoxicating liquor by members of the armed forces and it is felt that, in the interest of temperance, such sections should not be enacted into law.

The War Department fully realizes that from the viewpoint of efficiency and moral standards an Army in which drunkenness is nonexisting is highly desirable. However, knowing the frailties of human nature and realizing that habits of temperance or intemperance are developed long before the individual becomes a soldier, the War Department is convinced that temperance cannot be attained by prohibition applied to its personnel any more than it can be attained by prohibition applied to the Nation at large, and experience has proven that the problem can only be solved by the application of practicable and tolerant measures applied in a logical manner. Fortunately—

Now listen, Senators—

Fortunately our presently existing laws provide an ideal framework for such control. Briefly stated, these laws forbid the sale of or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations, but permit the sale of beer and light wine of not more than 3.2 percent alcohol content by weight. Under these laws, announced War Department policy and regulations prohibit the sale or dealing in intoxicating liquor on military reservations but permit the sale of soft drinks, including beer and light wines containing not more than 3.2 percent alcohol by weight on those reservations located in States whose laws permit such sales at such places. Such sales are not permitted, however, on reservations located within any State, Territory, or District whose laws do not permit such sales within its borders. This policy has caused a degree of temperance among Army personnel which is not approachable in civil communities now, nor was as high a degree of temperance attained either in or out of the Army during the days of national prohibition. Under this policy, military personnel are encouraged to remain on the reservation (their home) and enjoy refreshment under conditions conducive of temperance.

I now come to the statement dealing with the other sections of Senate bill 860:

As the matter now stands members of the military forces not on military reservations are subject to the same laws, both Federal and State, that govern the conduct of other citizens. They are also subject to the ever-present restriction that they must at no time do anything that will bring discredit upon the service. The War Department believes that it would be harmful to the men in the service, as well as unnecessary to direct a prohibition against them that did not apply to other citizens.

Experience has proven that the present policy of the Department is the most effective way to insure temperance and it would be regrettable indeed should the Congress, in its effort to assist in the matter of attaining temperance among military personnel, enact legislation which would destroy the advancements made and return to the Department the difficult problem of combatting bootleg operations.

The War Department is firmly of the opinion that the armed forces need no such prohibition as provided in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I digress long enough to say that in the amendment he now presents, the Senator from Colorado has deleted section 1, but he has only slightly modified section 2, so that it would not apply in incorporated cities, towns, and villages. So the official record of the Secretary of War is as much directed against his amendment now as it was then.

I read further from the statement of the Secretary of War:

The War Department is firmly of the opinion that the armed forces need no such prohibition as provided in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this proposed legislation.

That is, Senate bill 860, the basis of the Senator's amendment.

It has its own and more effective methods of attaining temperance and of dealing with those who, through intemperance, bring discredit upon the service. It is firmly convinced that such legislation would not be in the interest of temperance in respect to the armed forces but would be used as a stepping stone for a movement leading to Nation-wide prohibition, a method of control once tried and later repealed by majority vote of the electorate of the Nation.

For the above reasons the War Department is opposed to the enactment of S. 860 in its present form, but would favor its enactment if it be amended by deleting therefrom lines 3, page 1, to line 14, page 3, both inclusive.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Let me once again state the situation to the Senate. Regardless of how most men feel about the question of prohibition, there is unanimity of opinion that we should extend to department heads charged with the control of the armed forces of the United States the power to deal with vice. Those with whom I have conferred about this situation inform me that in certain communities conditions are such as to demand action quickly in order that they may deal with the problem of vice.

But if this amendment is attached to the bill, every Senator knows that it will have to go to conference. The House of Representatives will never accept the amendment. It will be in conference for several weeks, if not for a month or longer, especially if 3-day recesses should be taken by either or both branches of the Congress until, say, the 1st of August.

So I make the appeal now that I made in support of my motion to reconsider the Senator's original amendment. Vote this amendment down. Pass House bill 2475, and within a relatively short space of time—a few days—rules and regulations can be promulgated to deal with the

problem of vice. Then, if we want to take up Senate bill 860, if we want to fight over again the question whether we shall give power to some department head to establish prohibition in certain areas in the United States, let us take it up and debate it on its merits. But in the meantime let us not delay this needed measure for the control of vice. Let us not play into the hands of those who pander and grow rich at the expense of the young men of the United States who have been inducted into its service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, House bill 2475 would have been enacted into law on May 23 had not an objection been raised by the Senator from Wisconsin to its passage.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sure he does not want to make what seems to me to be an entirely unfair statement. That is not true. It would have gone to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would have passed the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know what would have happened in conference, but it would have passed the Senate, and we should have finished our work upon it.

That happened on May 23. It is now the last day of June. So, when the Senator makes his strong plea that there be no delay in this matter I simply cannot accept it in the way in which he has stated it, because he himself has been largely responsible for the delay.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The RECORD will show that since the 24th of May the Senator himself has objected to taking up the bill for consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado has not objected to taking up the bill at any time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can show the Senator a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which shows that he objected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so states, it is in error.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I am under the impression that House bill 2475 would have passed without any objection had not the Senator from Colorado offered the amendment represented by Senate bill 860. In other words, if it had been an antivice measure, there would have been no trouble about its passage and there would be no trouble now. However, the trouble was that the Senator from Colorado offered a prohibition amendment to a bill designed to prevent vice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, let me state the present situation with respect to the bill. As it has been sought to be amended, it is not a prohibition bill at all. If my amendment should prevail, section 2 of the late Senator Sheppard's bill, Senate bill 860, would simply give the War Department and the commanding officers of military reservations, camps, and posts the right to control certain zones outside military reservations. The commanding officer would be authorized to do so. He would not be compelled or instructed to do so. He would do so of his own volition. If he should desire to control roadhouses, trailer camps, bootleggers, and other forms of vending liquors outside the military reservation, in a no man's land between the military reservation and the incorporated city or town, he would have authority to do so. If he did not wish to do so he would not have to. So it is entirely erroneous to bring in the question of prohibition. This bill, as amended by the Senator from Colorado, is in nowise a prohibition bill. It simply would give the War Department itself an opportunity to regulate the drinking of liquor in a no man's land.

Now, the Secretary of War says he does not want that authority. The Secretary of War knows that if Congress gives him that authority it gives him that responsibility, and he does not want the responsibility. That fact perhaps explains why the Secretary of War does not desire section 2 passed, if the Senator from Wisconsin is correct; but I have been informed by the Secretary of War's representatives that the War Department has no objection whatever to section 2 as it has now been perfected by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator consider to be no man's land?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I consider no man's land to be that area outside a military reservation and outside an incorporated city or town, surrounding a military reservation, in which there is no local authority, an area having no peace officer to regulate it, an area in which bootlegging may be carried on, and where there may be trailer camps, houses and other places in which liquor is sold and disposed of by bootleggers.

Mr. LUCAS. That would be regardless of local responsibility for the enforcement of any local laws the communities might have along that line?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This provision simply would give to the commanding officer at a post or reservation the right, if he should want to exercise it—he would not be compelled to exercise it—to set up such a zone. If he desired to exercise that right, if liquor is being sold indiscriminately in a no man's land, if there is a no man's land, he could establish a zone in which he could control or stop the sale of liquor.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me give the Senator an example, if I may do so, in order to make my meaning clear. There is in Illinois a camp known as Camp Grant, and within a mile and a half of that camp is the city of Rockford. Any kind of spirituous liquors may be purchased in the city of Rockford. Am I to understand that if this bill should pass, the commandant of that camp would have power to stop the sale of spirituous liquors in the city of Rockford, a mile and a half away from the camp?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is exactly what the power would not have if my amendment should be adopted. My amendment would not give the military authorities any control whatsoever in any incorporated city or town. It would give them control outside the incorporated city or town if they wanted to exercise it, but not within any incorporated city, town, or village.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. If, in the area between Camp Grant and the city of Rockford, outside the corporation limits, there are, we will say, three roadhouses or three taverns, those three roadhouses or taverns would come within the jurisdiction of the bill; would they?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They would come within the jurisdiction of the bill if the commanding officer of that camp chose to include them in such a zone.

Mr. LUCAS. That would seem to me to be rather rank discrimination against the tavern located on the edge of the city; because, under such circumstances the commanding officer would be taking charge of the tavern located just 100 feet beyond the corporation limits, and yet the tavern located within the city limits, 100 feet beyond the zone, could continue to sell liquor to the soldiers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Are there taverns which are located as the Senator indicates?

Mr. LUCAS. I am merely giving an example. I am not sure that is the case, but it could very easily be the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the commanding officer interfered with any taverns, they naturally would have to be close to the military post or reservation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON The Senator's bill makes no reference at all to the commanding officer. As I read the bill it vests no authority in any commanding officer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will read the language of the bill, it says, in line 13, page 2:

as the Secretary of War shall determine to be needful.

Mr. OVERTON. That is not the commanding officer of the camp. If the bill should pass, such power to establish local prohibition would be vested here in Washington, in the Secretary of War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Naturally, we would not place such power in the hands of some petty officer. Such power would be given to the first officer, and that is the Secretary of War. He would be authorized to prescribe the size of the zone, and he could make it 1 mile wide or 10 miles wide, except that he could not have it include an incorporated town.

Mr. OVERTON. Or he could make the zone 100 miles wide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He could not do that if it included any incorporated city or town.

Mr. OVERTON. No; but he could make it 100 miles wide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Louisiana has just heard the statement of the Secretary of War. Does he think the Secretary of War would make a zone 100 miles wide?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know; and I do not know how long the present Secretary of War will continue to be Secretary of War. We are talking about the power that is vested by this bill in a Secretary of War.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana hopes the present Secretary of War will not be Secretary of War very long.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not now desire to express any opinion on that matter. The Senator undertakes to vest in the Secretary of War power to establish a dry zone of such magnitude as he deems reasonable, not only around a military camp but around any station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training or mobilization place, military or naval. In my own State of Louisiana there are enough such military and naval reservations to make the whole State dry, except for incorporated towns and cities, under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado; and I believe that is true as to every State of the Union. The bill would give the Secretary of War such power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Provided the Secretary of War thinks such control should be had for the good of the defense of the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment proposed by the Senator would give the Secretary of War such power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under the language of the bill, the Secretary of War would have power to protect the soldiers in the camps in Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Not only to protect the soldiers, but he could make the whole State dry, except for incorporated towns and cities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would have that power which would benefit national defense, according to section 2.

Mr. OVERTON. The bill also would aid prohibition. It could make practically every area in the United States a dry area, except for military and naval places; could it not? The bill would vest in the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy power to make practically the entire area of the United States a prohibition area, except for incorporated towns, villages, and cities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would give the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, in the interest of common defense, an opportunity to protect the men in the cantonments, camps, and so forth.

Mr. OVERTON. That is all right. I think all of us want to protect the men in the camps. The Secretary of War says they are better protected now than they would be if the amendment offered by the Senator were adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is the same Secretary of War who is to administer the act. What is the Senator worried about?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator refers to the present Secretary of War. I do not know how long the present incumbent will be Secretary of War. We have to deal with the authority we would be granting a department of the Government and not an individual. The Senator's amendment does not read "as long as the present incumbent is Secretary of War." If the Senator would amend his amendment to read that way he would have an argument to present along the lines he has just suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I scarcely think it reasonable for the Senator to suggest that, against the will of the people of the United States, a Secretary of War would attempt to adopt such a policy as the Senator from Louisiana outlines. It is not conceivable that any man would be appointed Secretary of War who would attempt to act in so arbitrary a manner.

Mr. OVERTON. Just one other question, and then I will stop. Has the Senator from Colorado considered the constitutionality of this amendment, in view of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado is not competent to consider questions of constitutionality. We have a great many lawyers in this body, but the Senator from Colorado does not happen to be a lawyer; so he has not examined this question with reference to the Constitution. The Senator from Colorado has examined it with reference to the welfare of the men in the camps, and that is the thing in which he is interested.

Mr. OVERTON. Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate and of the House adopted a joint resolution denying to the Congress of the United States power to prohibit the sale, and so forth, of liquor. That joint resolution was submitted in the form of an amendment to be ratified by three-fourths of the States, and it was ratified by three-fourths of the States. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States have withheld from the Congress of the United States the authority to enact prohibition legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado will say that he is not attempting to overthrow that action by the people. He is making no effort to do that. The simple amendment under consideration by the Senate is merely for the protection of the soldiers in our camps. That is its only purpose. It is not at all a prohibition movement, as the Senator from Louisiana has insinuated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Louisiana has raised the same question I was about to raise, which is that by the repeal of the eighteenth amendment the basic law of the land, which is the Constitution, has been restored to its original vigor in regard to giving the States control of matters such as prohibition or the enforcement of police laws within their own areas.

Where does the Senator find any authority whatever in the Constitution for the proposition that the Congress of the United States has any possible authority to regulate the sale of liquor or beer or anything else outside of military reservations or other Government property? There is no matter of public health involved in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is a matter of public welfare.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The provision concerning prostitution can be sustained under the public-health statute, but there is no question of public health involved in this matter. Where does the Senator find any authority in the Constitution of the United States for the Congress of the United States to pass police regulations in regard to property within a State outside military reservations on Government property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Missouri has put his finger on exactly the answer to his own question. He says the provision with reference to prostitution is in the interest of the health of the soldiers. The two go together.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is mistaken from the legal standpoint. There is a distinction with regard to epidemics and public health. It has been held many times by the courts that the question of liquor regulation is not a public-health matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The two go together, and they should be kept together in this bill insofar as these subjects are concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be so in the opinion of the Senator from Colorado but not under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I understand the purpose of the Senator from Colorado in offering his amendment and assure him that I have no quarrel with his purpose; but I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the wording of this amendment. Under it incorporated towns are specifically exempted from the provisions of the proposed law. I believe in most of the States the county or township is a subdivision of the State government. Unless I am mistaken, there are several States where an incorporated town is a subdivision of the State, particularly in New England. Under the wording of his proposed amendment, if it should be adopted, I do not see how it would then apply to those States at all except as to unorganized towns or plantations or unincorporated towns, of which there are only a few. In other words, in some of the New England States the Army would not have any authority under this proposal to apply its provisions in those sections where they would most likely want to apply them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the Senator is more familiar with the State of Vermont than is the Senator from Colorado; I do not know how such a law would apply in that State.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is true of most of New England that the incorporated town is a subdivision of the State. In New York, for instance, they have incorporated townships, and I believe they have incorporated towns within a township. We do not have any such thing as that in New England.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We have incorporated towns, cities, and villages.

While I am on that point, let me say that the clerk in reading the amendment a moment ago read "incorporated cities, towns, or villages." He should have read "incorporated cities, towns, and villages." I ask that that correction be made.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. May I ask the reason why in his amendment the Senator excepts incorporated towns and cities? There are a great many more saloons in cities and towns than there are in the surrounding country which is less thickly populated. Why are they not a greater menace to these young men whom the Senator is seeking to protect?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Incorporated towns, cities, and villages have police protection, whereas localities outside cities and town, in many instances, do not have police protection, in fact, frequently there is no one to protect that no-man's land. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. It is not because there are more votes in the cities and towns is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. It has nothing to do with votes in the cities or towns, either outside or inside.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I do not want to speak in the time of any other Senator. I was merely going to suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that, in addition to the reasons given by the Senator from Colorado as to why cities and towns should be exempted, the general experience is that the authorities in cities and town are willing to cooperate with the Army officers to see that abuses shall not happen.

Mr. GREEN. May I ask the Senator whether that is not also true of the State police in most of the States?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I do not know how many State police there are in some of the States, but in many outlying districts of cities and towns they have no police protection; and that is where the evil houses exist and where illicit liquor is sold; that is where young men who have never been brought in contact with liquor—and I am not talking, one way or the other, about prohibition—come in contact with vice in its most serious form. Because there is not normal and proper regulation outside incorporated cities and towns, this bill is intended to reach points where there is usually not much police protection and a willingness to cooperate with the Army officers in preventing abuses arising from wrong indulgence in liquor by young men who have not heretofore had the experience which some of them from the larger cities have had.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like once more to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that the amendment merely authorizes the Secretary of War to act; it does not direct him to do so. If a bad condition exists around some camp, he may set up a zone of whatever size is necessary and may control that particular zone. It seems to me the Secretary should be given such authority and should accept the responsibility and use his discretion in exercising it insofar as the protection of the men within military reservations and camps is concerned.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, does not this go a great deal further than the protection of the young men? Within one of the zones within a reasonable distance of a camp, which the Senator says would be 10 miles, there may live a great many private citizens, many of whom have beer in their houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do they sell beer?

Mr. GREEN. No; but this proposal would not only prohibit their selling beer, which might be justifiable, but it would prevent their having beer. If the commandant of an Army post decides that 10 miles is a reasonable limit for a camp, immediately every citizen within that 10-mile zone outside the cities, if he has a bottle of beer in his house becomes guilty of a violation of the law and he must pay a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, and he may be imprisoned for not less than 30 days or for more than 12 months, because the commandant of that Army post decides that he will enforce this provision of the law. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to offer a further amendment. On line 17, page 2, I move to strike out "or have in his or its possession." Then that portion of the amendment would read in this way, beginning in line 17, "or association to sell, supply, give, any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado modifies his amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he has not yet reached the objection of the Senator from Rhode Island. I can give the Senator an illustration:

Jefferson Barracks is located in St. Louis County, Mo. It is not a part of St. Louis City; but the population is so closely settled that while there are a great many incorporated villages or towns in St. Louis County, there are many thousands of persons within 10 miles of Jefferson Barracks who do not live in any incorporated city or town. Even the last amendment of the Senator from Colorado would prohibit A from having some beer in his house and giving it to his friend B, who had nothing to do with the military service but just dropped in to have a bottle of beer with his friend.

It seems to me the objections of the Senator from Rhode Island very admirably illustrate the crudeness and carelessness with which this measure was originally drawn.

Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under rule XVIII there is a general provision as to the divisibility of amendments. My parliamentary inquiry is whether the general provisions of rule XVIII apply to the right of divisibility of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the portion of rule XVIII to which the Senator refers does apply to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The rule reads:

> If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is a motion to strike out and insert, and, therefore, under this language may not be divided; but the Chair calls to the attention of the Senator from Missouri the fact that it would be altogether in order for any Senator to move to strike out any portion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was precisely the question which I intended next to address to the Chair. Therefore, Mr. President, I move to strike out the portions of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado having to do with sections 2 and 3; that is to say, from line 10 on page 2 down to and including line 14 on page 3, with the modifications thereof heretofore made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood that this amendment could not be further amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has not been adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. According to my understanding, it has to be voted either up or down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator misunderstood the ruling of the Chair. The amendment could not be modified if it were adopted. The amendment is now in the state of being subject to perfection by the Senate, and therefore any amendment by any Senator is in order.

The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire now to appeal for the rejection of what is left of the amendment, because it would simply require the measure to go back to the House of Representatives and to have the same ground covered again. I think perhaps the Senator from Colorado would be willing to withdraw the amendment now, because its adoption would only delay the feature of the bill upon which we are all agreed; namely, conferring upon the Secretaries of War and Navy the power to deal with the problem of vice. If the substitute should be adopted it would have to go back to the House; and all the amendments which the Senator from Colorado has in section 3 of the pending amendment are incorporated in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of information: Will the Chair state the amendment which was just adopted, offered by the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri struck out all the language beginning in line 10 on page 2, down to and including line 14 on page 3; namely, sections 2 and 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As modified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, modified as the amendment is, I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that the whole amendment had better be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado withdraw his amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is withdrawn. The question now recurs on the third reading and passage of House bill 2475.

The bill (H. R. 2475) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am advised that the House is now considering the conference report on the relief bill, and that it will be impossible to report upon the deficiency bill for an hour. Because of the status of those two bills and the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 5:15 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., when it reassembled.

SENATOR FROM MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO presented a telegram addressed to the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., *June 30, 1941.*

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have today commissioned JAMES OLIVER EASTLAND United States Senator, to succeed the late Pat Harrison until an election can be held. Commission sent by air mail this morning addressed to President of the Senate.

PAUL B. JOHNSON,
Governor.

Mr. BILBO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator-designate be permitted to take the oath of office at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and if the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered.

Mr. EASTLAND, escorted by Mr. BILBO, advanced to the desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Vice President, he took his seat in the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, on being called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. CRAWFORD had been appointed a conferee on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, in place of Mr. GIFFORD, excused.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 80 to the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 52 and 53 to the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 10. (a) Section 15 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, is hereby continued in effect for the month of July, 1941. Effective on August 1, 1941, in employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be given to veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection), and unmarried widows of any such veterans, and the wives of any such veterans who are unemployable, who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify: *Provided*, That if the total monthly income from all sources of any such veteran or of the unmarried widow of any such veteran, or if the total combined monthly income from all sources of any such unemployable veteran and his wife, as determined by the Commissioner (whose determination shall be final and conclusive), is less than the monthly earnings the veteran, unmarried widow, or wife would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran, unmarried widow, or wife, as the case may be, shall be certified as in need of such employment, and when assigned to such employment he or she shall be employed for such period as will permit the total monthly income of such veteran or unmarried widow, or the total combined monthly income of such unemployable veteran and his wife, to be approximately equal to the amount which would be obtainable by full time employment on any such project. Thereafter preference in such employment shall be given on the basis of relative needs, as far as practicable, to other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert:

"(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting blind persons, veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans as are unemployable, who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than eighteen months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (1) the expiration of twenty days after the date of his removal, and (2) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects: *Provided*, That such workers shall be removed only in the numbers necessary to provide employment for employable persons with the same or similar job qualifications who have been certified for a period of three months or more as in need of Work Projects Administration project employment and who have not in such period been given employment on work projects."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "; except that this limitation shall not apply in the case of any person who is employed by any agency of the Government (other than the Work Projects Administration) on the date of enactment of this joint resolution."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 33. The Work Projects Administration shall continue to maintain in each State an Office of State Administrator for such State."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, and 24.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House Joint Resolution 193, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 30, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "35" and insert "34"; and

In line 3 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000";

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 to said joint resolution.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, two separate matters remain in disagreement. The item which is first mentioned in the report is the Surplus Commodity Corporation item. The Senate inserted an appropriation of $50,000,000. The conferees were unable to agree on that item. We have been conferring over it at numerous meetings. The Senate conferees declined to make any concession other than what we have indicated, that is, that if the House would agree to a reduction to $35,000,000, which was the amount in the agricultural bill, we might agree to that figure and recommend it to the Senate. The House conferees declined to do so, and the matter went back to the House for a vote.

The House refused to agree with the Senate provision of $50,000,000, and voted for an amendment appropriating $25,000,000. The first matter which is before the Senate is whether we shall concur in the House reduction from $50,000,000 to $25,000,000 in this item, or whether we shall stand fast and allow the matter to go on further.

In view of the fact that today is the last day of the fiscal year, in view of the possibilities of deficiency appropriations if the emergency should require them, and in view of the fact that there is already a very substantial sum in the agricultural bill, the conference committee recommends concurrence by the Senate in the House amendment. We do so reluctantly.

The members of the Senate conference committee were most staunch and firm in this matter. I will add that I have had many previous conferences at which the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was present, and this is the first time I have found him unwilling to make any concession. Usually he is a very adept compromiser and conciliator.

This time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], although he was not a member of the conference, aided us. I should like to have him give us his views as to what we should do with respect to the reduction from $50,000,000 to $25,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am considerably distressed at the action of the House with respect to this amendment. I think the Senate should be informed as to all the circumstances. When the agricultural appropriation bill was pending before the committee, the committee recommended and the Senate adopted an amendment which increased by $35,000,000 the item for the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the operation of the so-called stamp plan, as well as for the other activities of that organization. It required $35,000,000 to bring the appropriation for the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation up to the same amount as that which was available for the present year.

The so-called stamp plan of disposing of surplus commodities has been an unusual success. I may say it succeeded far beyond the expectations of the originators of the plan. It has, however, been as much of a relief program for the benefit of those who are on the direct relief rolls, and who are unable to secure employment on W. P. A., as it has been an agricultural program. Those of us who have labored with this matter have insisted all along that some of the funds for these activities should be contained in the relief bill, as well as in the agricultural appropriation bill.

When the bill was in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate were assured that if the Senate receded on the $35,000,000 which was contained in the agricultural bill the House committee which then had under consideration the relief bill would add $50,000,000 to the relief bill. It was not made clear whether they proposed to add an additional amount of $50,000,000 or whether they proposed to earmark some of the funds contained in the relief appropriation bill. It was my assumption—and I think it was the assumption of the other members of the conference, however—that there would be an additional and supplemental appropriation of $50,000,000.

The Appropriations Committee of the House reported the relief appropriation bill to the House, undertaking to earmark the relief appropriation in the sum of $50,000,000 for the stamp program rather than increasing the appropriation by $50,000,000. The House overturned that recommendation. The Senate therefore added the $50,000,000 to the bill.

The matter has been a bone of contention between the House and the Senate and the subject of discussion in two conference committees for the past 3 or 4 days. The Senate insisted upon its appropriation of $50,000,000 until the bitter end; and it is a bitter end to have to accept the $25,000,000 which we find provided for in this bill.

The House conferees at first refused to carry this amendment back to the House for a vote, but after long negotiations they did take it back to the House for a vote; and on the floor of the House a motion was made that the House recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount from $50,000,000 to $25,000,000.

I earnestly and sincerely believe that the appropriation should be $35,000,000. I know that if steps are taken to close down the stamp program in any of the cities in which that program is now in operation, the Senators and Representatives from the State in which the program is curtailed will have complaints; and not only that, but persons on direct relief will suffer. We have passed a W. P. A. bill carrying an appropriation far below that for the current year; and the States, counties, and cities of the Nation are ill prepared to enlarge their direct relief appropriations at this time.

I have endeavored, to the best of my ability, to keep faith with all Members of the Senate who have discussed this

matter with me. I did assure some of them that, in my opinion, we would have as much as $35,000,000 in one or the other of these bills. This amendment provides $10,000,000 less than that amount.

However, Mr. President, we are faced with a situation of this kind on the last day of the fiscal year, after this matter has been in negotiation between the conference committees on two of these bills for weeks, precluding the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill until today. I feel that the report now presented is the very best that can be done under the circumstances, and that the Senate should, as gracefully as it can, accept the House amendment providing for $25,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, one word should be added. The situation with reference to the W. P. A. is somewhat different from that with respect to the ordinary departments of the Government. If we were dealing with the War Department, or the Department of Agriculture, they would continue their existence even though the appropriation were not passed. If we do not pass this bill the W. P. A. will go out of existence at midnight tonight. We have this tremendous relief problem, and there is a little different type of emergency in connection with a relief bill than in connection with some other bills.

As I gather from the clerk, all these matters come to us in one statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to recede as to amendment numbered 24 and concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, with reference to amendments 7, 8, 9, and 10, which appear on page 8 of the bill, they are the ones concerning which we had a very active discussion on the floor of the Senate. The Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote, as I recollect, increased the amounts which were in the bill as it came from the House. The committee had reported these items, one of which is the item of administrative expense for the Division of Disbursements, which was increased on the floor of the Senate, upon motion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, from $1,100,000 to $1,250,000.

Amendment No. 8, carrying the appropriation for the Bureau of Accounts, was increased from $2,025,000 to $2,360,000.

The next amendment, which is No. 9, is simply a total of these items, showing the increases in total from $6,005,000 to $6,490,000,

Amendment No. 10, which follows that, contains this language:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to defray the expense of transferring or maintaining the performance of any of the functions appropriated for—

In the several sections which were increased—

at points other than in the States where any of such functions are now performed.

In the vote on this matter the House was almost unanimous—it was 119 against our position to 1 for it, so there was rather a strong vote against us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] will recall, in the Appropriations Committee I was one of those who sustained the position the Senator took. It seems to me it is of sufficient importance that I should now state the reasons why I took that position.

Obviously, there will be a saving of money if the action of the House is sustained. There can be no question that it will cost less to administer the W. P. A. disbursement offices through regional offices than through the separate organizations of the States.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that we could withdraw all our Federal officials from the several capitals and save not only half a million dollars but many times a million dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to make that remark. The issue here is not whether we are going to save several thousand dollars. The issue here is whether we shall continue to regionalize the Government of the United States and abandon the State administration of functions.

Necessarily, the people of the United States have had to turn to the Federal Government at Washington for relief in the depression. We had to establish the W. P. A. and provide national relief for those who were unable to find employment, but we shall make a mistake if we do not realize that the reason it became necessary to turn to the Federal Government for relief against unemployment was that the concentration of economic power had proceeded to such a degree that the States had lost their economic independence. If we continue to regionalize Federal activities and substitute Federal activities for the spontaneous activities of the people of the several States it will not be long before someone will rise and say, "Why should we have the States at all?" The fundamental theory of our Government, of course, is that we should have local self-government. Local self-government has been undermined because we have been building up concentrated control over the economic life of the people.

I was opposed to regionalization because I saw in the progress of regionalization the eventual destruction of the States. I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma only for that reason, and, with him, I feel that the Members of the House did not have this issue presented to them as it is. If we now agree to the action of the House merely because this is the 30th of June and because we know that Members of Congress, having labored here since the beginning of the session, are weary and are anxious to have a little respite—the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] interjects here that many of us were working a long time before the first of the year, and that is quite true—but if, for those reasons, we now abandon a position which is intended to maintain the integrity of the States, I think we shall be making a very great mistake.

I should very much like to see this matter presented once more to the House of Representatives; and I know no reason why this body, which was designed by the Constitution to represent the States as States, should not now, by its vote, send to the House of Representatives a message saying, in effect, "We disagree with the position you have taken because we feel that, even though it may cost one or two or three hundred thousand dollars more, it is important to maintain local State sovereignty in the administration even of these Federal activities."

I hope the Senator will not abandon his position.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I do not wish to call for a quorum. If I can have a yea-and-nay vote upon a motion that I shall make, I shall not call for a quorum.

I now move that the Senate reject the conference report, and that the Senate conferees be instructed to insist upon the Senate's position on the amendments just stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion as stated by the Senator from Oklahoma is not in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I realize that. The first vote will come upon a motion to concur?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I can put the matter in shape for the Senator by moving that the Senate recede from its amendments. That will present the issue, if I may be permitted to make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order for the Senate to insist upon its amendments and ask for another conference.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, all I want is a vote. I shall not take any unnecessary time, but I think the people in the respective States are entitled to know how this matter is settled. It is an issue in every State; to what extent I cannot say, but I know it is an issue; and all I want is a vote, so that the people may understand where and when and by whom the action is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Chair to understand the Senator to ask for the appointment of conferees to consider this matter further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No: I desire the Senate to pass upon the matter. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate insist on its amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, before the question is put, I desire to be heard.

If this were an ordinary situation, I should be glad to go along and continue to battle to maintain the Senate's position; but what we are now voting on is whether, in order to give 350 men jobs, we shall put a million men out on the street tomorrow. That is the issue, because if this report is rejected the chances are that that will be the result.

In order to present the matter, I move—I think it is a preferential motion—that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Colorado is, of course, a preferential motion, and takes precedence over that which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] sought to make.

I think the issue is not, as the Senator from Colorado has stated, whether 350 persons shall have jobs or whether a certain number of persons on relief shall be without an appropriation. The issue is whether we shall proceed with the program of regionalization, undermining the separate entity of the States.

Because I feel very strongly upon that subject I hope the motion of the Senator from Colorado will not be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, further answering the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado, I feel assured that if this motion should be rejected the conferees could have another meeting with the House conferees and yet reach an agreement this day; but, even if that should fail, I am advised that our leader has in his desk or in his pocket a joint resolution which can be presented and passed by which we will continue this organization in force and in effect exactly as if the money should be made available tonight.

Upon that theory I say there will be no delay, and if there is delay in passing the bill, there will be no inconvenience and no difficulty in any W. P. A. worker getting a job and being paid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On that motion I ask for a record vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Eastland	Murdock
Aiken	Ellender	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Guffey	Overton
Bone	Gurney	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bridges	Herring	Reynolds
Brown	Hill	Russell
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrnes	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	White
Connally	McNary	Wiley
Danaher	Maloney	
Davis	Mead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their name, a quorum is present.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a number of Senators now in the Chamber were not present when the pending matter was presented, I simply wish to repeat in a few words what was previously said. The situation briefly is that the House, following the recommendation of the administration, fixed the amount which could be expended from the appropriation for accounting services in connection with the W. P. A. In the Senate, upon motion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the amount for these services was increased $485,000. The matter was taken to conference. The Senate conferees declined to yield from the Senate's position. We felt obligated to refuse to make any concessions of any kind, and the House conferees refused to yield.

They took the amendments back to the House for a separate vote, and the House voted 119 to 1 to stand by the House position and against the position of the Senate.

I am assuming, of course, that the Senate was correct in its position. While I did not vote with the majority in the Senate, as a conferee I accept the judgment of the Senate, and as to the merits of the situation I continue to accept the judgment of the Senate. But we are confronted with a very practical question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I followed the Senator up to the point when he said "but." If the Senate is correct, and the Senator says it is, why should the Senate be coerced by the House? Is not the Senate a coordinate branch of the Congress? I am in favor of letting the House Members find their places. If they wish to tie up the measure on the last day of the fiscal year, with the effect it will have on their hungry constituents, let them take such action.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, of course, that is a position we could take on every item with respect to which we disagree. The Senate adopted a number of amendments. Upon a majority of the amendments the House receded. We cannot take the position that the Senate is entitled in every instance to maintain its position, and that we should never recede and never yield to the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about this one item. I am not saying that the Senate should never recede. Of course, that would be ridiculous and silly. But I am saying that the House has a sort of habit of getting the Senate into a corner and saying, just as we are about to come to the end of the fiscal year, just as the clock is about to strike 12 o'clock midnight, "Now, you will either take this proposal or leave it." I am in favor of leaving it occasionally. I would not have been bold enough to make that suggestion except that the Senator from Colorado said he deferred to the action of the Senate, and he deferred to it because he thought it was right.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. ADAMS. In the Senate I voted against the Thomas amendment. I simply said that the Senate having acted, I acquiesced in the Senate's action, and I, as a conferee, have from that time on followed the Senate's judgment, and I am assuming that that is the correct position to take. I did not venture to intrude my difference of opinion on the Senate, and I, as chairman of the Senate's conferees, have stood by the position of the Senate, as has every other Senate conferee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not criticizing the Senator from Colorado. I think he is a very valuable Senator, and I am sure he represented the views of the Senate in the conference. I wish to apologize if I made an incorrect statement. I thought the Senator said he respected the views of the Senate and would continue to do so.

Mr. ADAMS. It is my fault if I did not make my position clear.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I apologize.

Mr. ADAMS. There is no occasion for it. I simply wanted to make clear that the Senate conferees stood consistently for the position of the Senate, and refused to make the concession of a nickel. The House, on the other hand, refused to agree at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The proposed action of the House changes the existing order, does it not?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; certainly it changes the existing order and the custom heretofore followed. The position of the House in this case is the position of a plaintiff. If we are going to have a hung jury, the plaintitff does not get a verdict. Since the House has taken the affirmative of changing the existing order, I do not think the Senate should say, "We do not want to change it; but if you insist we will do it, anyway."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are all the conferees a unit in reporting in favor of recession?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; so far as I know.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear what is involved in this issue. We are here at half-past 6 on the 30th of June. The fiscal year ends at midnight. If the W. P. A. measure does not pass on this calendar day, there will be no W. P. A., and a large number of persons who would otherwise be on the W. P. A. rolls will be out on the street. The entire W. P. A. organization will be out, and will have no legal authority. It has been stated here that this matter could very easily be corrected by the adoption of a joint resolution, which it is said the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has in his pocket.

Mr. BYRNES Mr. President, I have no such resolution in my pocket.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator heard the statement made, I know.

Mr. BYRNES. A Senator said he was informed that there was a resolution, and I know he was so informed, but I have no such resolution.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the Senator be good enough to inform me what would be the possibility and the prospect of meeting the situation by the passage of a joint resolution?

Mr. BYRNES. If some hour this evening it should develop that the conferees

were unable to agree, there would be no alternative except for the Senate and the House to attempt to pass a continuing joint resolution, and if there were a quorum present it could be done, but if there were not a quorum present, as someone suggested the absence of a quorum, it could not be done. Then the only such thing that could be done would be to move to adjourn until tomorrow, and then see what could be done about a continuing joint resolution.

Mr. ADAMS. And in the meantime this matter which we are now discussing would not be settled. In other words, if Congress passed such a continuing joint resolution, it would merely provide funds in a general way to continue the W. P. A. It seems to me the Senate of the United States cannot very well take the position that it will jeopardize the W. P. A. organization for the sake of a few jobs. I know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] says there is a matter of principle involved. I have been unable to see the great principle involved in the question whether a bookkeeper should transcribe the records of the Wyoming W. P. A. in Cheyenne or in Omaha. A consolidation of offices is involved. There are now approximately 50 offices; the consolidation will result in about 25.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I understand the Senator to say "Cheyenne or Omaha"?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator heard correctly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what the Senator meant?

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator heard what I said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, I will accept the Senator's statement.

Mr. ADAMS. We all like to have our own home organization. There is $485,000 involved. The House is trying to save that amount in accordance with the administration's recommendation. The Senate took the different viewpoint. So the issue is whether a bill which carries $900,000,000, all of which, with few exceptions, goes to the relief of needy people, shall be defeated or even deferred in order that there shall be maintained certain offices in perhaps 20 States which otherwise would not be maintained.

There is no compulsion in the bill for consolidation. Consolidation merely comes because of a necessity arising from the reduction in the appropriation. I wanted to make clear what is involved, and I trust that the Senate will not close the W. P. A. offices at midnight.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, just a word before the vote is taken. This is the situation which confronts the Congress tonight: We are advised that in the House of Representatives a vote was had. I do not know what kind of a vote it was. It may have been a show of hands. It may have been a teller vote; but obviously, it was not a record vote. Only 120 Members voted. That is scarcely half of a quorum of the House of Representatives. Under the Constitution, a majority of the Members of the House are required to constitute a quorum.

The membership is 434. Making allowances for those who have passed on, and whose vacancies have not been filled, approximately 218 Members of the House would be required to constitute a quorum. So the vote was not had with a quorum present. Three hundred and fifteen Members were not present a little while ago. I doubt if those who were present understood the issue.

After awhile, some W. P. A. worker who cannot get his check will make inquiry about the delay. The State official will tell him, "Mr. W. P. A. worker, the Congress passed a bill forcing us to send the pay roll from Oklahoma City to Denver, or some other foreign place [laughter], and it requires a week or 10 days for mail to go from Oklahoma City to Denver." Denver is a fine place in which to live. The climate in summer is ideal, and it is not bad in winter. The officials there take their time in writing the checks. Several days are required to analyze the pay roll and write the checks. Then more days are required to get the check back to the State of Oklahoma, and until the pay roll reaches the regional office, and there is time to check the pay roll and write the checks and send them back, the check will be delayed. All the necessary work cannot be done in a day.

A W. P. A. worker can get his check now in a day or half a day in the State capital. Three days pass, a week passes, 2 weeks pass, 3 weeks pass, and the checks are not delivered. Who is responsible for the delay? Three hundred and fifteen Members of the House could hold up their hands and say, "I am not responsible. I did not vote to regionalize the W. P. A. offices." They would be telling the truth. They were not present awhile ago. They did not vote for it, and they could tell their constituents, "I am not responsible for it." We are told that 119 Members voted, but there was no record vote.

At one time I served in the House of Representatives. In the House of Representatives there is a club called the Demagogues' Club. I do not recall being a member of it. It was a long time ago. There are several Senators present who formerly served in the House of Representatives. They may have been Members of the famous organization known as the Demagogues' Club in the House of Representatives. A Member of the House feels no compunction about saying to his constituents, "I am not responsible for the situation." Unless his opponent can point to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and show his name in black and white, he can get away with it. The situation is that there has been no record vote in the House of Representatives on this question; and if the appropriation is reduced and some of the offices are abolished, not a single Member of the House of Representatives can be held accountable. They can all say, "I did not do it. It must have been your Senator."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The Senator has referred to a possible delay in the issuance of checks. Is that conclusion based upon past experience? Upon what does the Senator base his conclusion?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Even in the States delays occur; and if a delay of a day or two occurs in the States, it is natural that several more days' delay should occur if the pay rolls had to be sent from the State capital to some regional office and there be examined before checks could be written and sent back. There is bound to be greater delay. Complaints now come in from W. P. A. workers that they cannot get their checks. They say, "I should have been paid Saturday. Here it is Sunday, Monday, or Tuesday, and I have not yet received my check."

Should this provision remain in the bill, W. P. A. workers who have checks due them will go hungry because they cannot get their checks. I do not want to hold up this matter. I do not propose to do so. But I do think we should have a record vote. No W. P. A. worker will find me on record in such a way that he can criticize me for a delay of a week, 10 days, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks in receiving his check. All I ask is a vote. I care not how Senators vote. I care, but nobody will tell them how to vote—I hope. It would not be safe for anyone to do so. All I ask is a record vote, and I shall be satisfied.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what I have said on numerous other occasions when the joint resolution making appropriations for the W. P. A. has been under consideration. I wish to be very circumspect in what I say, for I realize that under the rules a Senator may not criticize the conduct of Members of the body at the other end of the Capitol. But I think I am well within the rules when I say that it cannot be any coincidence that each year the joint resolution carrying appropriations for 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 people who depend upon the money thus appropriated for their very existence comes to the Senate so close to the dead line of the end of the fiscal year that the Senate conferees find themselves in such a position that they are forced either to accept the point of view of the House conferees or accept the responsibility for delay in the continuation of the program upon which millions of people in this country are dependent for their very bread and butter.

I realize that it does not do much good to protest that situation, since under the Constitution the body at this end of the Capitol does not have control over the period of time during which it shall have an opportunity to consider appropriation bills. But I do say, Mr. President, that the manner in which such measures are handled has the effect of depriving the Senate of its coordinate position with the branch at the other end of the Capitol.

I wish that this issue had arisen on a question which I considered more vital than the amendment now under consideration, although I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma in the Senate. I voted for it after I had read all the testimony before the House committee and before the Senate committee.

With all due deference, I do not agree that the issue is the amount of money involved in maintaining the offices. I think any person reading the testimony of all the agencies involved in this matter before the House and Senate committees cannot escape the conclusion that it is not a question of mere dollars and cents, and abolishing a few jobs for those on the pay roll.

I think one cannot escape the conclusion that the efficiency of the W. P. A. operation will be impaired if regional offices are created for accounting and fiscal purposes. As the Senator from Oklahoma has suggested, every Senator who is familiar with the operation of the W. P. A. in his own State knows that there are bound to be delays. Do not forget, Mr. President, that delays in the issuance of checks to the people on W. P. A. mean the difference between the family having a subsistence diet and going hungry. When we appropriate $875,000,000, are we to quibble over the amount necessary in order that the checks may go quickly to those who are dependent upon them for food and shelter for their families?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that several years ago we had the same fight.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. The Senator led the fight.

Mr. McKELLAR. We won that fight. I wish we could win it again. I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, but it looks as though it is a question whether we shall get the W. P. A. bill, which is so necessary to so many people, or whether we are to continue to fight beyond the end of the fiscal year. For that reason, I think there should be a record vote on the question, in the interest of what is best for all our people. If we were not at the close of the fiscal year, I should certainly join the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators who have made the fight in again making the fight. However, I think such action would only mean delay because we shall probably abolish the regional offices before we are through.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not happen to agree with the Senator in his conclusion, but I recognize that in making that statement the Senator has stated what he believes to be the best thing to do. I say again that I am sorry the issue has arisen on this particular item because I know it is easy to say, "The Senate was interested in maintaining a few jobs on the pay roll." I say again, as I have said each year for the past 5 years, that unless the Senate is prepared to make a last-ditch fight for its position it might as well abandon its legislative functions, insofar as the W. P. A. is concerned.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is sound from the standpoint of theory and of administrative practice. Believing that it would help to maintain efficiency in getting checks to the people who are involved, and for the additional reason that I want to register my protest against the Senate being put "behind the eight-ball," so to speak, every time with respect to W. P. A., I intend to vote to reject the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 9, and 10.

On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not being able to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. GLASS], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS];

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. SHAWVER];

Mr. O'Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HAYDEN].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—27

Adams	Danaher	Overton
Aiken	Ellender	Pepper
Barbour	Green	Radcliffe
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Burton	McKellar	Tunnell
Butler	McNary	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Maloney	White
Capper	Nye	Wiley

NAYS—24

Andrews	Guffey	McFarland
Bone	Gurney	Mead
Brown	Hatch	Murdock
Bunker	Herring	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Hill	Reynolds
Clark, Mo.	Kilgore	Schwartz
Connally	La Follette	Stewart
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.

NOT VOTING—44

Austin	Gerry	Smathers
Bailey	Gillette	Smith
Ball	Glass	Spencer
Bankhead	Hayden	Taft
Barkley	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Hughes	Tobey
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bulow	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	Lee	Vandenberg
Caraway	McCarran	Wagner
Chandler	Murray	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Norris	Walsh
Davis	Reed	Wheeler
Downey	Rosier	Willis
George	Shipstead	

So the motion of Mr. ADAMS to recede from Senate amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 was agreed to.

LIFE AND RESOURCES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I submit the present conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 4. (a) Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any non-basic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use

the funds made available under section 3 of this Act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 per centum of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed to be non-basic commodities.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a)) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of non-basic commodities not covered by any such public announcement to a fair parity relationship with other commodities to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the basic commodities and the commodities listed in any such public announcement and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
CLYDE L. HERRING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that we passed this bill on Saturday. In the bill as it came from the House there were two provisions which were the subject of controversy in the Senate. On the larger issue of the continuance of the Corporation there was no particular difference of opinion except as to the expiration date.

As to the additional amount of money, there was no difference between the Senate and the House.

It will be recalled that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] moved to amend the bill by having the Corporation's existence limited to 2 years, that is, to 1943 instead of 1946. Upon that proposition the House conferees receded, and acceded to the desires expressed by the passage of the bill in the Senate.

The other issue was contained in what was known as section 4. It was felt by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that while there was much merit in the provisions of section 4, it was not well drafted, and that possibly it was not necessary to the carrying out of the provisions of the act by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture; and the Senate committee struck section 4 from the bill.

We found upon conference with the conferees upon the part of the House that they were very much interested in having section 4 remain in the bill as a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture. After I had ascertained the attitude of the Members of the House, I discussed the matter with several Members of the Senate, particularly those from the farm sections, and found that they were very much interested in having a proper substitute for section 4 retained if it were possible to do so.

I also found that the representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture were anxious that something along the line of section 4 be retained. That was true also of the farm organizations. Therefore, when we went into conference we decided to try to rewrite section 4, and that is what we have done.

Briefly, section 4 directs the Secretary to encourage the production of such agricultural commodities as he deems to be necessary in the present emergency, having reference, of course, to the defense program. It requires the Secretary to support the prices of such commodities so that they shall not fall below 85 percent of parity.

There was considerable discussion among us as to whether that should be an authorization or a direction. At first the Senate conferees tried to persuade the House Members to accept language which would leave the situation so that the Secretary would be authorized to do these things, but would not necessarily be required to do them. We submitted such a proposition to the House conferees. After considerable deliberation upon their part, they rejected that proposal. We then—particularly the majority Members of the Senate conferees—decided that inasmuch as the time when action was necessary was near at hand, and in view of the fact that we did not think the issue particularly important, we would accede to the wishes of the House conferees in that respect, in order to pass this bill today, if possible.

I think there is little difference between the two bills. The president of the Commodity Credit Corporation intimated that it was much more than likely—in fact, entirely probable—that loans would be made and operations carried on to support the price; but all except the Senate conferees seemed to agree that there should be an explicit statutory direction to the Secretary, and I may say that the Secretary in a letter he wrote to the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, requested that that direction be given to him. We acceded to the wishes of the House conferees in that respect, and section 4, as rewritten, contains a direction to the Secretary to support these prices by loans, purchases, and otherwise.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there a print of the section as it has been rewritten?

Mr. BROWN. I have here a typewritten copy which I can let the Senator have.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator explain to me, and for the benefit of other Members of the Senate, wherein the new provisions differ from section 4 as stricken out by the Senate?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that there is no essential difference in principle between the provisions of section 4 as originally contained in the House bill and section 4 as rewritten. We think we have done a better job. We think we have made the intent and meaning of Congress more clear by rewriting section 4. There was some doubt in the minds of counsel for the Secretary, who were present, and among lawyers on the committee, as to the meaning of the language in lines 20 to 25 of page 2, and lines 1 to 4 of page 3. It was felt that we had clarified that language—if the Senator is familiar with the bill he will, I think, get my point—so that there could be no confusion regarding the priority of aid that is to be given.

I mean by that statement that the first aid to be given is, under existing law, to basic commodities. The second aid to be given is to the commodities the production of which, as announced in a proclamation of the Secretary, is necessary in this emergency. The third class is other nonbasic agricultural commodities which do not come into the picture and receive aid from the Secretary of Agriculture unless the funds, for the other two purposes, have not been exhausted. That was not entirely clear in section 4 as it passed the House and as it was rejected by the Senate. We think we have made that proposition entirely clear in section 4 as it came out of conference.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the language as it is now being considered by the Senate, it is the Senator's contention that the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to say what are essential but nonbasic commodities in category No. 2.

Mr. BROWN. Commodities essential to the defense program.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the basic commodities are already taken care of by existing law, wherein the Congress has said that we shall give 85 percent of parity in the nature of a loan on certain basic commodities.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The next category deals with nonbasic commodities, as I understand; and such nonbasic commodities, whatever they are, may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BROWN. They may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and brought into the general scheme of price maintenance if the funds for the other two classifications have not been exhausted.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am trying to determine in my own mind is, What is included in the second classification? I understand what is included in the basic

law at the present time so far as basic commodities are concerned.

Mr. BROWN. There are five basic commodities.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. What is included in the second classification?

Mr. BROWN. In the second classification are the agricultural products the expansion of whose production the Secretary deems it necessary to encourage. That is the second class.

Mr. LUCAS. That is discretionary with him.

Mr. BROWN. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I am trying to make. In other words, we leave it to him to say what are the nonbasic commodities to which he will apply the money after the 85-percent parity is applied to the basic commodities.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct. I may say that there is no doubt that sufficient funds are provided to take care of the commodities the production of which the Secretary may desire to encourage.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, after the second class is exhausted—in other words, if he has a sufficient amount of money to bring the second class of nonbasic commodities up to 85 percent of parity—if there is any money left he may apply it upon further nonbasic commodities?

Mr. BROWN. If the situation of the other commodities is such that he finds it necessary to start his operations by way of purchases and credits to bring them up to 85 percent of parity, or comparative prices—there are no parity prices on those particular commodities—he may do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I will frankly say to the Senator that I cannot see why the distinction is made between the last two classes. They are all nonbasic commodities, and I cannot see the reason for the distinction.

Mr. BROWN. I think it is entirely conceivable that the Secretary would find that, say, 10 particular commodities were not being produced in sufficient amounts to take care of our needs. Then if, through a fortunate declaration of peace, the price should decline, it seems that there should be some sort of a Government guaranty that the producers will not lose; and as to the class of commodities which the Secretary has encouraged by his announcement there is for their protection a greater moral obligation, which we recognize by this proposed statute, as a legal obligation. We do not feel that the commodities which he has not encouraged are in the same category, or entitled to the same protection; but if there are funds left after the other two classes have been taken care of, it was felt that they ought to be used for the purpose of maintaining parity in that classification.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his last explanation. I thoroughly appreciate the force of his argument, and can see the reason for the change, and I am for it.

It seems to me that if we are to encourage the production of certain nonbasic commodities, the producers of such nonbasic commodities ought to have some assurance by the Government that they will be taken care of in this emergency, the same as the man who is getting 85 percent of parity under the basic law at the present time. If I may say one thing further—I do not know whether the Senator will agree with me on this point—I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time, without this legislation, perhaps would have power to do the thing we are giving him authority to do; but he would like to have a declaration of policy, and to have the law laid down in this way, so that the producers of such nonbasic commodities will have some assurance that they are to be taken care of in the event they produce a larger crop. Am I correct on that point?

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator very well expresses the thought that is set forth in the letter from the Secretary to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of our committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I mentioned it is that in passing over this matter the other day, as the result of the slight consideration given by the committee to the bill because of lack of time, I obtained a notion from the debates that we were delegating to the Secretary of Agriculture a power which a number of Senators did not believe was necessary; in other words, that we were giving him more power. The truth of the matter is that he has the power at the present time without this measure, but he desires to have a declaration of policy as laid down in the pending legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there anything in the last draft of section 4 as reported by the conference committee which makes it mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to sustain commodities at 85 percent of parity, other than commodities embraced in the original parity law the five basic commodities, and those which are deemed to be essential by the Secretary of Agriculture, which he proclaims in order to encourage production?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. In subsection (b) language essentially similar to the language in lines 4 to 10 on page 3 is found. I will read it. The Senator will understand that we are talking, now, not about basic commodities——

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. BROWN. Not about commodities which are in the Secretary's proclamation, commodities which he desires to encourage, but other commodities. I read:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a))—

Subsection (a) relates to the announced commodities. Under the bill as it passed the House there was no provision for a proclamation by the Secretary along that line. We wrote into the bill a provision requiring that he proclaim the particular commodities which he desired to encourage.

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a)) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of nonbasic commodities not covered by any such public announcement—

There are two classes, those not covered by public announcement, and basic commodities, which are provided for under existing law—

> to a fair parity relationship with other commodities to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the basic commodities and the commodities listed in any such public announcement and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Is that clear to the Senator?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure that it is entirely clear. If I understand the Senator, the only limitation in the direction to the Secretary to maintain commodities at 85 percent of parity is the amount of money that is made available by this bill.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill establishes an order of priority, first, in five basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and rice—which have been recognized in all the agricultural acts. Second, those commodities which the Secretary encourages on the ground that their production is in the public interest.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, if any funds are left over, it is made mandatory on him to support the price of any other commodity that is produced.

Mr. BROWN. If it is within the ability of producers to bring supply into line with demand.

I take it to mean that he will survey the general situation. If he should find that there is such a tremendous surplus of nonbasic commodities and nonproclaimed commodities that it would be impossible, within reasonable limits, to bring their prices in line with parity, he should not attempt to do it. That limitation is written in.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had hoped that was what the amendment provided.

Mr. BROWN. If the ability of the producer to bring supply closer to demand exists, then it will be the Secretary's duty to assist, by his lending and purchasing operations, to bring prices into line.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is well aware of the fact that before the producers of the basic commodities are permitted any advantage under the 85-percent-loan provision, they are required to make drastic reductions in their production of such commodities.

Mr. BROWN. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. For instance, if a wheat farmer produces any wheat on lands which are in excess of his allotment, he must pay a penalty of 49 cents a bushel before he can market it. It would seem that the producers of nonbasic commodities would be given an advantage over the producers of other commodities, in that there is no limit in this language on the amount they could produce, as the Secretary is charged with the responsibility of payment, within the limits of the

funds made available in the act, to bring their income up to 85 percent of parity.

Mr. BROWN. Looking at the bill from the standpoint of really conservative financing, we felt that basic commodities were No. 1, that the proclaimed commodities were No. 2, and that then, if funds were available, or it was possible, giving general consideration to supply and demand, to bring other agricultural products close to parity, it was the duty of the Secretary to do so. It is made clear in the declaration of policy that it is the policy of Congress and the intent of Congress that he shall endeavor to do this. With respect to basic commodities, he shall do it. With respect to the proclaimed commodities, he shall do it. Then we go on with subsection (b), and say that it is the hope and the policy of the Congress that he shall do the same for the third class of commodities, if funds are available, and if general economic conditions are such that it is reasonably possible to do so. That is my interpretation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary certainly should have some discretion with respect to commodities in the third category, because otherwise farmers might produce without restraint, and accumulate huge surpluses, and have available tremendous quantities of products which had not been encouraged, or which had not been catalogued as basic commodities.

Mr. BROWN. That is the exact limitation which I believe in, and as the Senator in charg of the bill, I say as a matter of interpretation that it is the view I have as to the intent and meaning of the last clause in the section, that is, that a general survey of economic conditions should be made, and if it is reasonably possible, within the limits of funds available, to bring about this parity arrangement, it should be done; otherwise, not.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I favor full parity for the producers of every agricultural commodity, but I realize that it is impossible to obtain parity without some power being vested in the Secretary of Agriculture or some other administrative agency to balance in some wise production with consumption.

Mr. BROWN. Does not the Senator agree that we have written that limitation into the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. With the construction which the Senator from Michigan places on the language, I am content.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me one more question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Following the thought suggested by the Senator from Georgia, does the Senator say that as to proclaimed commodities, or commodities in category number 2, it is mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to see that such commodities reach 85 percent of parity after the basic commodities under existing law are taken care of?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, if any funds are left, they automatically go into the third category, providing demand is sufficient for the money to be spent in that category?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; the Senator is correct in that respect.

Mr. President, on Saturday the minority leader asked me to obtain certain statistics as to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which I have obtained. The Senator from Illinois also asked me to secure figures as to the losses which have occurred in respect of particular commodities. Such a letter has been prepared by the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Hutson, and I ask that the letter be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 27, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: A question has been raised as to the views of this Department on section 4 of H. R. 4972, which is now before your committee.

The Department of Agriculture is in complete accord with the necessity for taking steps that are designed to protect farmers who have, as a result of encouragement by the Department, increased their production of those agricultural commodities that are necessary to meet the present emergency situation. I feel quite strongly that protection should be provided not only for the emergency period but for the period of subsequent adjustment as well.

As you know, programs have been put into effect in the Department of Agriculture to secure greater supplies of several commodities, since the indicated production was not sufficient to fill domestic requirements and to meet the needs of Great Britain and other countries resisting aggression. At the same time that farmers were encouraged to increase their production of such commodities, an announcement was made that the Department would make sufficient purchases of those commodities to support prices in line with the objectives of the proposed legislation. As you know, the funds currently available have been sufficient to maintain prices of those commodities at 85 percent of parity or better, ever since the program was undertaken.

For the present, the funds now available and those under consideration by Congress for the coming fiscal year seem adequate to enable the Department to continue this price policy which is now proposed to be written into legislation. If the international situation should change materially, however, additional funds would, of course, be required in order to maintain this price policy for the nonbasic crops, the production of which is being expanded at the instance of the Government, just as the additional funds to be made available by this bill to the Commodity Credit Corporation are now required to support farm prices for the basic crops at 85 percent of parity.

It is my understanding that section 4 does not require each individual purchase or other operation to be made at not less than 85 percent of parity price, but that operations shall be so conducted as to support prices for farmers at averages of not less than 85 percent of parity.

I endorse the proposed legislation and I am in hearty agreement with this legislative expression of the principle of protecting the interests of the American farmer.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington.

Hon. PRENTISS BROWN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: Pursuant to your verbal request, losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation from its organization October 17, 1933, to the time of the latest annual appraisal, March 31, 1941, aggregated approximately $172,000,000 on loans and purchases made approximating $2,100,000,000.

These losses are estimated by crops roughly as follows:

Corn	$82,400,000
Cotton	57,000,000
Wheat	13,400,000
Tobacco	2,200,000
Turpentine and rosin	7,000,000
Other crops	1,500,000
Operating expenses	8,500,000
Total	172,000,000

The item "Operating expenses" is the net deficit obtained by subtracting from interest and other income of the Corporation, the total amount of payments other than loans, purchases, and carrying charges.

Our studies show that these losses would have been about $20,000,000 less had the appraisal been made April 30, 1941. Since price levels have continued to rise for the commodities owned by and pledged to the Corporation, an even greater decrease in losses would be obtained from an appraisal made as of today according to the existing formula. The appraisal formula proposed in H. R. 4972, however, would have increased the loss as of last March 31 by approximately $70,000,000.

The Corporation does not anticipate a need for issuing debentures to the full extent of the authorized borrowing power in conducting its 1941 loan and purchase programs. This borrowing power of $2,650,000,000 which, with its capital of $100,000,000 would give the Corporation total resources of $2,750,000,000, will be used in part to guarantee, to banks and other private lending agencies, loans made by them to farmers cooperating in the farm programs. To the extent that loans are carried by the banks until repayment by farmers, debentures need not be issued by the Corporation. Consequently, the debentures outstanding at any one time will be less than $2,650,000,000. However, it is essential that the Corporation's resources must be large enough to cover the maximum amount of notes outstanding at any one time, including those held by banks.

Very truly yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
President.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] also requested a statement from the Commodity Credit Corporation president, through me, of the policy which the Corporation is following in the handling of cotton loans. I also have that information and ask that it be included in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1941.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: You have requested a statement concerning the changes with respect to the handling of producers' notes contemplated by Commodity Credit Corporation in the 1941 cotton loan program.

Two changes in the procedure for handling cotton producers' notes are planned for the

1941 loan program. First, a more uniform method of providing facilities for completing loan documents for farmers is planned. In the 1940 loan program no specific arrangements were made for completion of loan documents for farmers, although it was expected that lending agencies and warehousemen would perform this service. Even though the charges allowed warehousemen and the interest rate allowed lending agencies were intended to cover the cost of this work, in many instances other parties completed the loan documents and assessed additional charges against farmers. Provision will be made in the 1941 loan program for the county agricultural conservation committees to appoint agencies to complete loan documents for farmers at an agreed fee. The interest rate and warehouse charges will be adjusted so that farmers will not be forced to pay two fees for the same service. Several agencies in each county may be appointed by the county committees to complete loan documents.

Second, provision will be made in the 1941 cotton loan program whereby the producers' notes will come into the possession of Commodity Credit Corporation at the time the loans are made. In past loan programs banks or others lending money to producers have qualified as lending agencies by completing a contract to purchase with the loan agencies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation acting as agents of Commodity Credit Corporation. The notes were negotiable and were transferred among lending agencies by endorsement. The contract to purchase provided for the tender of the notes to Commodity Credit Corporation 30 days prior to the maturity date of the note, and interest was paid to the tendering lending agency to the date of purchase of the note by Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the 1941 cotton-loan program lending agencies may qualify in the same manner as in past loan programs. However, the producers' notes will not be transferable, but will be tendered to Commodity Credit Corporation by the lending agency advancing the funds to the farmer. All notes will be held in a pool by the Federal Reserve banks, acting as custodian for Commodity Credit Corporation, and the lending agencies tendering the notes will be given a "certificate of interest" in the pool, bearing interest at an agreed rate. The "certificate of interest" will be transferable between lending agencies. Since the interest in the pool of producers' notes may be transferred, banks or others qualifying as lending agencies will be given the same opportunity for investing funds in cotton producers' notes as in past loan programs. This change in handling cotton producers' notes will enable Commodity Credit Corporation to give prompt service in releasing collateral to cotton merchants who purchase the equity of producers. This will eliminate the serious confusion of delays which occurred under the old plan.

A committee of bankers, appointed by the American Bankers' Association, in a conference with representatives of Commodity Credit Corporation, gave unanimous approval to this plan.

Although the plan outlined above has received the approval of the groups indicated, it is still in the discussion stage and no definite decision has been reached at this time.

Very truly yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
President.

Mr. BROWN. Unless some Senator desires to ask me something further about the matter, I have said all I desire to say.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as the minority conferee in attendance most of the time in the conference on the pending bill, I have a few thoughts which I feel should be expressed even to the 15 Senators who are now present.

On Saturday last, for the first time, the pending bill came before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Unlike the situation which exists in respect to certain other measures which expire as of June 30, 1941, and thus terminate agencies and the operations thereof, the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be impaired by reason of delay on this particular bill. It is true that there could not be new commitments, nor could there be new offerings of loans under the existing law were the Corporation to die tonight, but so far as all other operations are concerned they could and would continue even though we postponed action on this bill.

A fundamental question of policy was raised by this section 4. It marks so complete a departure from anything that the Congress has ever heretofore assented to in reference to nonbasic commodities that it is fundamental.

Mr. President, we are undertaking in this particular measure to extend a policy beyond that type of crop which is susceptible to control and susceptible to supervision by the Department of Agriculture. The bill was reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which only vicariously has any knowledge of the intricacies of the farm problem. Far from the basic question of policy even being determined by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is familiar, so far as any committee can familiarize itself, with questions of this nature, the question comes to the Senate from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

What did we do? When we saw what the House had done by adding section 4 we struck section 4 from the bill. The Senate did not get this new policy from its committee. We struck it out, but none the less were willing to extend the authorized borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the amount of $1,250,000,000. Under section 3 of the pending bill its authority is now extended to $2,650,000,000.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said a while ago as to the status of the Senate on these last-day measures is certainly apropos in this instance. Why should the Senate on the very last day constantly have to take something the House has chosen to write into legislation on the ground that it is June 30 and we must act; we must do it by a quarter after 6 in the afternoon or the heavens will fall?

We are confronted now, Mr. President, with a basic change in the attitude of the Congress and an opening up of public funds to the maintenance of a price structure, and we are asked to do it on 30 or 40 minutes of testimony by Mr. Hutson, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, before the Committee on Banking and Currency on Saturday last, and that is all. We have had no records presented to us, we have had no representations as to the facts, we have had no idea given us of the extent of the commitments. We do not know what it means to "bring prices into line," as is said. We do not know how controls, if any, are to be expanded. We do not know what supervision, if any, is to be exacted.

Mr. President, when we went into conference this morning, the House conferees told us that in their view of the matter there may well be situations when the Secretary of Agriculture might find, under our defense needs, that an expansion of production in a given crop should be had. They pointed out that were such a demand made by our Government upon the farmer it would be inequitable to leave him with an expanded production ratio and not support the price which would yield him a fair return, for the bottom would obviously drop out of the market were it not to be supported.

That seemed to me to be so perfectly ethical and perfectly fair, although we of the conferees knew very little about the intricacies and the complexities of this farm legislation, that in an effort to get what the House conferees said they wanted, I drafted and submitted a proposed amendment, and I might say that the Senate conferees at one time were in favor of it. I will read it so that Senators will see to what extent we tried fairly to meet what the House conferees said they were trying to do:

Whenever during the emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary in order to secure adequate supplies for the purposes of national defense to encourage the expansion of production of any agricultural commodity he shall make public announcement of such finding and shall specify the commodities so affected, whereupon the Secretary shall be authorized to use the funds made available to him under this act or otherwise to support a price for the producers of any such commodity of not less than 85 percent of the parity price or, as to nonbasic commodities, the equivalent of such price computed upon a basis that such price shall be comparable to not less than 85 percent of parity prices for other commodities. Such price shall be continued as to any such commodity over the period for which the Secretary shall specify such expanded production shall be required. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed nonbasic commodities.

Mr. President, had that particular amendment prevailed we would have been able to meet the situation which the House conferees said was the basis for their program. But that was not what they really wanted at all. When we entered upon a discussion of the matter, there was not even a question of subsection (a) of the pending section 4. What they really wanted was subsection (b). There were pronouncements to the effect that they would be willing to lose all the rest of the bill if they could only retain subsection (b). It, then, is important, it seems to me, that we discuss the matter at greater length, and I hope with a greater understanding than we have been able to have of the subject up to now. Subsection (b) is as follows:

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a)) shall be carried out so as to

bring the price and income of the producers of nonbasic commodities not covered by any such public announcement to a fair parity relationship with other commodities, to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the basic commodities and the commodities listed in any such public announcement, and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Mr. President, immediately we are going to increase the prices to all consumers, whoever they may be, wherever they buy, of all nonbasis commodities, not specified in subsection (a). Even when we passed the mandatory parity act extending for 1 year the parity provisions on basic commodities, prices lifted 15, 16, and 17 percent inside of 2 weeks.

Now we are going to draw upon the Public Treasury, not in advance, but after a surplus shall have been discovered, perhaps next fall, perhaps a year from next fall. Public funds are to be used to maintain a price to be returned to the producers who have overproduced a nonbasic commodity in any given agricultural line; to maintain whatever price the Secretary determines "shall tend to bring that price into line," whatever that may mean.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator, as well as the Senate, knows I am not an expert on farm problems.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator knows I am not, surely.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator and I agree on that matter with respect to each other. Fate seems to have placed us as representing the majority and minority views on this question. But it is difficult for me to complain, coming as I do from an industrial State, as well as an agricultural State, about the arrangements which the bill seeks to set up to assure a reasonable price to farmers. Because I am a member of the Commerce Committee which authorized the building of many ships by the Maritime Commission, and because I know, through my general knowledge of military and naval expenditures, that we are pretty largely on a cost-plus basis with respect to almost everything the Government buys, it is difficult for me to resist this particular proposal, which is a long way from cost-plus to the farmer, but is merely some assurance of 85 percent of parity. So, upon the general proposition, it seems to me it is no more than fair that the Government should go at least as far as this bill goes, when we are going so much further for industry, particularly with reference to contracts between the Government of the United States itself and builders of ships, makers of munitions, and so on, and so forth.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan a question. Is labor on a cost-plus basis?

Mr. BROWN. The general situation with respect to labor, of course, is affected by the cost-plus contracts which are made between the Government and the producers of goods for the Government. It is supplementary to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we have heard discussion here only within the last 10 or 15 minutes about the efficacy of the stamp plan. It is perfectly apparent that whatever number of millions of dollars we apportion to the stamp plan are going to be depreciated at once by reason of the rise in the price of the commodities the users of the stamps under the stamp plan will be called upon to buy under subsection (b). For instance, this morning a representative of the farm agencies appeared before the committee and pointed out that something like 70 percent of the prune market of the prune producers of the United States has been destroyed as the result of the war overseas. Now out of public funds are we going to be called upon to maintain the prune market for the prune producers?

I submit that we have gone the full length we should go in maintaining a parity program for the basic commodities. Those commodities are supported. They are possessed of a claim upon the Public Treasury and the public funds.

When Mr. Milo Perkins—who, as I recall, is president of the Surplus Commodities Corporation—appeared before the House committee, it seems to me he pointed out the question which is involved in the nonbasic commodity guaranteed-price arrangement.

I read from page 101 of the House hearings. Mr. Perkins said:

More important than this, however, is the principle involved in dealing with perishable and semiperishable crops as opposed to dealing with nonperishable crops which can be stored under Government loans for long periods of time. The loan approach in the latter case gives a guaranteed kind of support to farm income. The only way to get similar results in the case of nonbasic crops is to have adequate money available for moving perishable and semiperishable crops into consumption before they spoil.

On that point, every dollar available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, every cent that is available under section 12 as to the operations so far connected as to the soil-erosion program, and other similar payments—the parity payments have been by direct appropriation—not to mention the Surplus Commodity Corporation money, will all be available under section (b) as well as under section (a).

Let me continue:

In order to do this in a way to get the maximum effect upon farm income, Government purchasing power can be used to "lead" a market upward from any given level, but limited purchases—much above the level of commercial prices—would not improve total farm income as much as moving a larger quantity even at a somewhat lesser price in the event that increased purchasing funds were not available in an amount adequate to achieve full parity.

The greater the amount of money available for moving perishable or semiperishable crops into consumption, of course, the higher the level of prices it is possible to achieve. The sky is virtually the limit, although Government would tend to become the farmer's chief customer if such a program were pushed to extremes.

Of fundamental importance in this connection is the problem of providing for the long-range protection of farm income through the continuance of both the purchase and loan programs. Any such programs could, of course, be swamped in the absence of adequate production adjustment by the greatly excessive supplies that would be called forth by parity prices for several crops.

Under the proposed language there is no program. The whole thing operates after the fact. If there be found to be overproduction, then it applies. There is no supervision either planned for, outlined, or testified to; and the record is barren of fact or incident to give us a basis for any such action as is contemplated by section (b).

Mr. Perkins continues:

It should be emphasized that adequate production adjustment is difficult to obtain in the case of certain specialty crops, such as fresh fruits and vegetables and nuts and even poultry products which are widely produced by a large number of small farmers.

Producers of nonbasic crops have, for the most part, several factors now operating in the direction of better income.

These factors are:

A. A sharp rise in consumer purchasing power due to increased pay rolls. This particularly affects the price level of the nonbasic crops of which there are acute nutritional deficiencies among low-income families. When a man gets off of relief the first foods he buys are meats, fruits, vegetables, and dairy products.

Those are the commodities the prices of which we are going to raise, Mr. President. We are to make the Treasury of the United States and the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation cause the United States Government to become the chief customer for such products. Meanwhile we raise the prices to all the little people everywhere.

Those are commodities he did not get on relief. So the increase pay rolls are offering the producers of these crops a very much broader market than they had before.

B. A broader total market occasioned by Government purchases for—

1. Britain and other democracies resisting aggression.
2. The Red Cross.
3. Domestic distribution to relief families.
4. School lunches.
5. Army and Navy requirements.

The Department of Agriculture is using, and intends to continue using, whatever purchase funds are available to it in such a fashion as to get the maximum possible effect upon total farm income.

This proposed act will make available for these purposes not only all the funds made available under section 3 of this act, but all funds otherwise made available to the Secretary, without limit and without appropriation. We do not know what they are; we cannot calculate them, because there was not an item of evidence as to what the cost of the program would be.

It cannot achieve a greater effect without a greater appropriation for this purpose, however, any more than it could maintain 83 percent of parity prices for the five basic crops without increased loan funds.

Summerizing the content of my remarks, we have in the Department of Agriculture a combination of triple A, with production control; Commodity Credit, with loan mechanisms; and S. M. A. and with purchases for export or domestic distribution. The combination of those three things, given adequate funds fairly distributed through the

crops, will give us the machinery through which we can get any price level Congress determines to be wise.

You cannot, however, approach the buying of cabbage and tomatoes in the same fashion as you approach the buying of cotton. We cannot, of course, store tomatoes. And the same thing goes for practically all of 40 or 50 specialty crops with which we will deal in a year.

Mr. President, this program would apply to castor beans, turpentine, cottonseed oil, walnuts, pecans, and prunes, as we heard this morning. Where are we to stop? To what point shall we say the Public Treasury shall be utilized to maintain a floor under the prices of nonbasic commodities? That is the question which is involved here; and at a quarter to 8 on June 30, without a bit of record, without any testimony upon which to justify our action, we are being asked to accept this proposal because the House passed it, although the Senate unanimously struck it out, and every member of the Banking and Currency Committee felt that it should be stricken from the bill. That is the predicament in which we find ourselves. We are asked to vote the bill up or down on the basis of the House version of it, without analysis and without exploration of the principle underlying the whole action.

To come back to section A, I do not object to section A, insofar as it applies to that type of crop whose expansion is called for by the Secretary of Agriculture after he finds that such crop is needed; but this language does not say that the program shall continue while the emergency exists under the President's proclamation. It says whenever, during the existing emergency, the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary, and so forth. There is no definition of what the existing emergency is. Whatever definition we could have had was rejected when the amendment which I offered in the committee was defeated.

Mr. President, it seems to me that another feature about section A should be mentioned, and that is that the action under it becomes mandatory.

Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity.

Once we accept this theory, we are committed to a continuation of the program so long as the Secretary of Agriculture decides that it shall be continued.

Mr. President, I have given my reasons in outline. Were the hour not so late, they could be supplemented by many more. I feel that the conference report should be rejected. I believe that we should insist upon the Senate amendments to the bill, and let the whole matter of the policy involved in section (b) be referred to the proper committee, there to be carefully scrutinized and brought back as a basis of new legislation. The program initiates a brand-new policy. It is one that ought not to be added to a bill which merely continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. President, for those reasons, I feel that the conference report should be rejected. For my part, I refuse to sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the report was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I am advised that the House is in recess until 8 o'clock, at which time it will consider the conference report on the deficiency bill.

Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., when it reassembled.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert H. Jackson, of New York, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in place of Harlan F. Stone, nominated to be Chief Justice of the United States.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clyde O. Eastus, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD—JOHN H. FAHEY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John H. Fahey to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Fahey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY—CLYDE O. EASTUS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the nomination of Clyde O. Eastus to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas was reported from the Judiciary Committee. It has not been printed on the calendar, but legally it is on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clyde O. Eastus to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1707 (by request). A bill to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1708 (by request). A bill for the relief of Susannah Sanchez; and

S. 1709. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims against the United States of I. M. Cook, J. J. Allen, Radiator Specialty Co., and the R. & W. Motor Lines, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1710. A bill for the relief of Norris I. Perry; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1711. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, so as to include certain persons disabled while in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMERICA'S DANGER IS AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject America's Danger Is America's Opportunity, delivered by him on June 28, 1941, under the auspices of the Committee to Defend America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the only business which I expect the Senate to transact tonight is the consideration of the conference report on the deficiency bill. I am advised that the House has not yet acted upon that bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the able Senator if he has a plan for Thursday. What is expected to be the program?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it is my thought, based upon the tentative agreement which I have heretofore had with the Senator from Oregon, that we should take a recess until Thursday, that no legislative business should be transacted on Thursday, and that we should then take a recess until next Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator contemplate the consideration of any action by the Judiciary Committee with respect to the Jackson nomination to the Supreme Court?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no plan at this time. I should prefer not to make a statement at this moment. In a few minutes I hope to confer with the Senator from Oregon and tell him of the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is expected to be present on Thursday.

I move that the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the

Chair. At 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the Senate reconvened, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 30, 42, 43, and 57 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 28 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4972. An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 39, 41, 44, and 51.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$205.000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out, amended to read as follows:

"INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

"Construction and machinery: On account of objects heretofore authorized (and appropriated for in part), for the acquisition, conversion, or construction of five hundred and fifty thousand tons of auxiliary vessels authorized by the Act approved May 24, 1941 (Public Law 72, Seventy-seventh Congress), and for the acquisition and the conversion of merchant vessels for use by the War Department as transports to replace vessels transferred by the War Department to the Navy Department, $100,000,000, to be available for the foregoing purposes (including obligations heretofore incurred) and for obligations heretofore incurred under the head "Replacement of Naval Vessels, Construction and Machinery", and to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two additional employees (one special attorney in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy and one a special assistant in the Office of Budget and Reports)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$864,191"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and, (3), the amount which may be expended for recreation, amusement, comfort, contentment, and health of enlisted men is hereby increased from $46,720 to $51,621"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 28, 30, 42, 43, and 57.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5166, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 30, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 42, 43, and 57 to the bill (H. R. 5166) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the matter inserted by such amendment, strike out the following: "1941, to remain available until June 30,".

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to the amendment adopted by the Senate this afternoon, submitted by me, and amended on motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. What happened to that amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. By reason of the necessity of my being on the floor of the Senate in connection with the relief bill, I was not present during the conference. The papers disclose that the Senate conferees receded on the amendment. I merely have the result as disclosed in the papers. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] presided as the acting chairman of the conference during the time when I was compelled to be in the Senate Chamber due to the activities of some of my good friends.

Mr. MURDOCK. I assume, then, that had the distinguished Senator from Colorado been able to attend the conference at the time the amendment was considered, in all probability he would have insisted upon it?

Mr. ADAMS. Had I been present I would have insisted on it, and I am very sanguine that I might have been able to make some headway. However, I could not be positive, because frequently conferees have failed to listen to the gospel.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is difficult for me to understand, of course, how any conferees could disagree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I have the same difficulty. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I realize, however, that the amendment submitted by me this afternoon, although it had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, had no hearing before the House, and I serve notice now that, of course, I shall renew my effort in behalf of the amendment in the future, and I hope that when I do renew my effort I may have the support of the Senator from Colorado and the Senate conferees.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Utah that he

does not need to serve notice on us, because, as one member of the Appropriations Committee I can assure him that if I am a member of the conference committee, and the matter is taken to conference, everything will be done to sustain the Senate's position. If the Senator were to start earlier during the House hearings I think the prospects would be infinitely better, if, indeed, he would not be reasonably sure of success.

Mr. MURDOCK. With that assurance, Mr. President, I am quite satisfied, and hope that when the matter is presented again it will be acted upon favorably.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is on his feet, and was going to make an explanation. I should like to hear what he has to say about the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to tell the Senate what I know about it. We had this matter and some other matters before the conference to which the House conferees objected because they said they knew absolutely nothing about it. This was a matter which was submitted to the Senate by a Budget estimate after the bill had passed the House, and there had been no opportunity for the House committee to hold hearings on it. We did get a promise from the House conferees that the matter would receive attention upon a deficiency bill which it is expected will come to the Senate within 30 days. They were sure there would be another bill. They promised to give a hearing to representatives of the Bureau of Mines or anyone else interested in the matter. The Budget estimate is still alive and can be considered by the House committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, that means then that the merits of the amendment were not gone into by the conferees?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. They simply said they knew nothing about it, and said they would not agree to anything they had had no opportunity to study.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But there was really no judgment passed upon this amendment on its merits?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not upon its merits at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no desire whatever to hold up the consideration of this particular report. I wish to interject another matter at the present time, because I am afraid that the moment action on the report is concluded——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report has been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, what is the parliamentary situation, if I may ask the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report having been disposed of, there is nothing before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, how was the report disposed of? The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Utah have been speaking about what?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was simply a request for information.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to speak on that motion. I have no desire to delay the Senate about that matter. As I began to say when the Chair interrupted me [laughter]——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was stating the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that the matter might have been expedited had it not been for the interruption of the Chair. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was really stating the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Chair was mistaken as to the parliamentary situation, if I may say so.

THE LATE BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. MITCHELL

Mr. President, earlier in the day the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. Richard L. Stokes on the subject of Gen. William Mitchell. I do not think he introduced the whole article. The entire article appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of Sunday, June 29, under the name of Mr. Stokes, and contained some things which are not contained in the article published yesterday in the Washington Star. As to that I have no desire to quibble. In a box in the Sunday's edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is contained certain matter which I think should be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I should say that I introduced into the last Congress a bill to do justice to the memory of Gen. William Mitchell, who sacrificed himself, sacrificed his rank in the Army, and died of a broken heart because of his opposition to "brass hats" of the Army and the Navy.

The Senator from Wisconsin introduced the article dealing with General Mitchell into the RECORD earlier today, but as I said, there was not included in the article which he introduced matter contained in a box to be found in the original article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 29, 1941, which I desire now to read into the RECORD.

The headline at the top of the box is as follows:

A Prophet is Not Without Honor, Save in His Own Country, and in His Own House.

I shall now proceed to read what is contained under that headline in the box:

Throughout his career in the Army, terminated by court martial in 1925—16 years ago—Gen. William Mitchell, a veteran officer of the A. E. F. in World War I, preached all the lessons of air power that World War II is bringing home. Following is a concise summary of what he preached then in striking parallel with what is now the practice.

Then there are to be found two headings, one "Preaching" and the other "Practice." Under each heading is to be found a statement. Under the heading "Preaching" appears the following:

Mitchell advocated a Cabinet Department of National Defense, with Army, Navy, and Air as separate and equal components.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to say that the bill which I introduced in the last Congress contained such a provision. I introduced a similar bill in the present Congress. I may say that I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], that he will give us a hearing on that measure at a very early date.

I will now read the matter contained under the two headings, "Preaching" and "Practice":

PREACHING

Mitchell advocated a Cabinet Department of National Defense, with Army, Navy, and Air as separate and equal components.

He urged building a great air arm to defend the United States from attack on land and sea, by supplementing ground troops and warships.

He asked development of bombing planes, which would make sea power obsolete and replace artillery in land fighting. Target practice on a large scale was held necessary to perfect this weapon.

PRACTICE

Germany has a separate air force. The United States War Department has just set up the Army air forces on a semi-independent basis. The Navy is fighting to retain control of its aviation.

Little was accomplished here until the German victories of May 1940. Unlimited program of expansion is now authorized, but it remains largely on paper. The Army Air Forces will be unable to wage war for another year.

Mr. President, the last statement under Preaching is precisely the recommendation for making which General Mitchell was tried and broken.

The matter in the opposite column, under the heading "Practice," is:

Bombs from the sky have mastered cruisers and destroyers, and the battleship *Bismarck* was crippled fatally by aerial torpedoes. Beginning late, this country new leads the world in evolution of heavy bombers. Not until a few years ago were funds available for target practice on an adequate scale.

Then the matter in the box continues under the two headings, as follows:

PREACHING

He demanded improvement of pursuit planes in speed, fire power, and number. (He declared in 1925 that the Army had not a single pursuit plane fit for war.)

Mitchell complained in 1925 that the air service had only two competent bombardment crews.

He testified that the Army at the time of the court martial had only four or five modern bomb sights, and urged development of this instrument in numbers and accuracy.

No accurate meteorological observations were then available, he protested, for Army and Navy flyers.

Aeronautics, he predicted in 1930, would in the lifetime of his own children become the greatest and principal means of warfare.

PRACTICE

The United States Navy claims the fastest pursuit plane in the world. Deliveries are only now beginning of Army interceptors with all equipment necessary for modern warfare in the skies.

The Air Corps has today no more than two or three fully trained bombardment squadrons. (A squadron is equivalent to an infantry battalion.)

Early pilots used a wing edge as a rude bomb sight. The first instruments were based on the pendulum. Optical bomb sights were proposed in 1920, and 2 or 3 years later emerged the first Sperry gyro-stabilized instrument. This grew into a highly efficient device. It was succeeded in the Army 3 or 4 years ago by the Norden instrument, to top all others for precision bombing.

This condition persisted till 1936, when weather-map analysis was perfected. The commercial airways first developed systematic meteorological reports.

Only 10 years later, a blitzkrieg of planes and tanks laid France prostrate in 20 days. France, England, and his own country ignored Mitchell's warning. The Royal Air Force is credited with saving England till now from invasion.

Mr. President, I have pending before the Military Affairs Committee a bill designed to do belated justice to the memory of that very great man and very great American soldier, Gen. William Mitchell. I have been assured by the chairman of that committee that I may have a hearing on it. I introduced such a bill in the last Congress, and was unable even to obtain a hearing on it because of the opposition of the "brass hats" in the War Department, who had hounded General Mitchell to his death. I think that if such a bill can be brought to the Senate a belated tribute can be paid to the memory of Gen. William Mitchell.

Far more important than that, Mr. President, I think, is that the thing for which he fought, for which he suffered practical "cashierment" from the Army, the thing for which he died, and in which he has been proved so right, should be considered. I do not think it makes very much difference whether we set up a separate division or department of military aviation, with a Cabinet officer present at the President's Cabinet table, or whether we adopt such a plan as General Mitchell himself visioned, provision for which is contained in a bill which I have introduced. Such a plan would include a general department of national defense, with coordinate branches under the Department of National Defense for the Army, the Navy, and the air force. I do not think the precise method is important at all. However, I do think that it is of the utmost importance to this country that we establish the independence of the air force, either as an equal and subordinate branch of the Department of National Defense, or as an independent department. Unless we do so, Mr. President, the record of the trial of General Mitchell, which was put into the RECORD earlier in the day by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] stares us in the face. We know that many of the men who hounded General Mitchell to his death are still in very high positions in the Army or Navy of the United States. We know that every prediction of General Mitchell has proved to be true to a very melancholy extent.

Mr. President, I think that at this time the Congress of the United States cannot afford to adjourn without at least very carefully considering the issue involved in the development of air power. The bill which I have introduced, for the establishment of a Department of National Defense with coordinate under secretaries—one in charge of the Army, one in charge of the Navy, and one in charge of the air force—is now pending in the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], has assured me that he will be glad to give us a hearing on that subject.

I think we cannot accord the competence we should accord, and do accord, to General Mitchell without giving very careful consideration to the very essential advice which he gave us at the risk and sacrifice of his professional career.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri made a pro forma motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I made a pro forma motion to reconsider. I withdraw the motion.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] asked me as to the program for the remainder of the week. I desire to say now that it is my intention to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday; that on Thursday no effort will be made to transact business on the Legislative or Executive Calendar; and that on Thursday we shall adjourn until Monday. However, on Monday of next week certainly executive business will be transacted, and the nomination of Attorney General Jackson to be a member of the Supreme Court will be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House, that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills, and that committees be authorized to submit reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BYRNES. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, July 3, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of June 26), 1941:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

John H. Fahey to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Clyde O. Eastus to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom the world has received its greatest Light and without whom there is neither peace for today nor hope for tomorrow, Thou hast said: "If ye abide in Me and My words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will and it shall be done unto you." We would that our country would lay aside its materialistic world and learn more of the abiding realities of a nation's life. There is no power known to human experience comparable to the living, breathing divinity in its own soul. O Father in heaven, come down from above that we may partake more fully of the bread and water of life; that drinking from the fountain of all good, and thereby ennobled and refreshed, we may measure up to the highest standards of manhood. O God, so many in our own land are without knowledge and understanding, carrying wounds and scars which have never been healed. May we, as Good Samaritans, bring comfort to the comfortless and strength to the strengthless and thereby magnify Thy holy name through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 28, 1941, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the policy announced by the President to give military aid to Communist Russia strengthens powerfully the forces of communism in our own country. If left unchallenged, all the protective means which have been developed to combat this cult will be virtually paralyzed. The good that has been accomplished by recent legislation to check it will have been in vain.

If the announced policy of the President is permitted to stand, the Dies committee had better be discontinued and an apology offered by Congress to the people of the country for having created it in the first place.

That there has been for some time a growing threat to our country of communism from within is common knowledge. This act of the administration seriously increases that threat. It forces us into a struggle right here at home for

the very existence of our own Government and way of life.

America must promptly and effectively answer this challenge and steel itself against this threat.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein additional information on automobiles in our defense effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address Charles Lindbergh delivered in the Rose Bowl at Hollywood on the 20th.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

WIRE TAPPING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in orde. to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 4228, a bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing certain crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, when specifically authorized by the Attorney General of the United States, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admissible evidence; and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4228, known as the wire-tapping bill. It provides for 2 hours of general debate, the bill then to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

I feel it to be my duty to inform the House that there is a great deal of opposition to this measure. All the labor organizations, including the railroad organizations and many others, are opposed to the bill because of their fear that it goes too far.

I presume that it is generally known that I have been and I shall continue to be a friend of labor. I will go as far as any man in aiding the cause of labor. At this time, however, I believe these labor organizations have not understood the intent of this proposed legislation. This bill will not affect any honest laboring man or any man who has the interest of our country at heart. It will affect only those who may be guilty of subversive and un-American activities detrimental to our Nation.

The bill before us is different than the original bill, H. R. 2266, introduced on this subject. Certain objectionable features are not found in the present bill, and it was upon the elimination of those objectionable provisions to which I was opposed, together with the conclusion that I made after a careful study of the bill that it would not be detrimental to the interests of labor, and also understanding that the President is in favor of the bill in its modified form, that I decided that the House should have the opportunity to vote on it.

The bill is restrictive and applies only to crimes involving espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, or extortion, and I quote from the bill itself:

Whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable ground for believing that a felony cognizable under any law of the United States relating to espionage, the transportation of kidnaped persons in interstate or foreign commerce, or the transmission of threatening or extortion communications through the mails or in interstate commerce, may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, and he so certifies, and in so certifying states specifically the facts forming the basis of his belief that such felony may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice may, in connection with investigation, detection, or prevention of such felony or the apprehension of the perpetrators thereof, intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and if in such event such interception, listening in, or recording is to be carried on in an area within the jurisdiction of the Department of War or Department of the Navy, then it may be carried on by the Division of Military Intelligence or the Office of Naval Intelligence.

Such evidence as may be obtained, however, can be used only for the purpose of offering it as evidence in court. A very strong provision safeguards the use of any evidence that may be obtained by the Department of Justice or the Division of Military Intelligence or the Office of Naval Intelligence. This provision shows that those who drafted the bill desire to protect the Government as well as those whose messages may be perhaps erroneously intercepted. It reads as follows:

Any person who divulges, publishes, or uses the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this act otherwise than in connection with the investigation, detection, or prevention of any offense hereinbefore enumerated, or the apprehension or prosecution of the perpetrators thereof, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Anyone who is interested in being a good American citizen, as I understand from this report, does not need to worry about getting into trouble. Only if the Attorney General decides that such a person is doing something against this Government can he issue orders to have his telephone conversations intercepted. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman stated that no innocent person need have any fear if this bill is enacted into law. What is the gentleman's opinion of this? A couple of years ago, as a lawyer in Cleveland, I defended a conspiracy case in the United States district court in Cleveland, and in that case the Government had resorted to wire tapping. The Government's witness who perpetrated the wire tapping testified that in many instances it was necessary for him to intercept from 200 to 300 private conversations before he finally secured the right wire to tap. Does the gentleman understand that it will be necessary, if this bill is enacted into law, for Government witnesses to intercept messages of absolutely innocent people and perhaps cause embarrassment to a great many innocent people in order to convict perhaps one guilty man?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio I may say that there is no law today against doing the very thing he objects to. That can be done now, and if there is anything that will stop it, it is the bill that is now before the House, as I will show when I get the floor if I have the time.

Mr. YOUNG. In answer to that statement, if the gentleman will yield just a moment further to me, my client was con-

victed in the United States district court, but the United States Court of Appeals reversed that conviction and freed my client because wires were tapped, and such evidence used.

Mr. SABATH. That client of yours had a mighty fine and able lawyer, and perhaps it was somewhat due to the ability of the lawyer that the circuit court of appeals finally reversed the finding of the court of original jurisdiction. Personally, I feel this bill is so drafted that the rights of the people are protected.

I do not wish now to take the time to read all the restrictions in the bill, but you have the bill before you and I know that each and every one of you will be satisfied that the measure is about as fairly drawn to protect the rights and interests of the people as it can be.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Just to clear up the point made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], I want to point out to the House that within the last few days, by an indictment and prosecution instituted by the Department of Justice, one Jacob Gruver, in New York, has been convicted of the crime of wire tapping, and the idea that it is perfectly lawful today to tap wires, I submit, is a mistaken one.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether in the case the gentleman mentions it was a private individual or a man connected with the Government, but under this measure there can be no wire tapping unless the Attorney General has obtained sufficient evidence to justify the authorization of such wire tapping, and it is to be used only in a court of law as evidence against guilty persons.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we put such a law into effect, what good will it do when we know that we have in this country today several hundred people who ought to be deported? The records show they ought to be deported, but the Department does nothing to deport such people. Why should not the Department execute the laws it already has in getting rid of these men who have advocated the overthrow of this Government, and get them out of here, and send them over to Russia and let them fight over there?

Mr. SABATH. In answer to the point that the gentleman has made, I wish to inform the House that there is a bill, H. R. 3, that is pending now. It has been reported by the Judiciary Committee, and awaits the action of the Rules Committee. I have been endeavoring to obtain that rule ever since the original bill, H. R. 3, was before our committee, but, unfortunately, due to certain objections on the part of people who should be in favor of it, the bill was withdrawn and has been rereported. I have been waiting until the gentleman from Alabama could return so we could have a hearing on the rereported bill. The bill will provide for the deportation of about 2,000 aliens that are now being held by the Department, but the Department cannot deport them because of provisions of law now in existence, but under H. R. 3 it will be possible to deport all those guilty of any felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude.

I am hopeful that shortly that bill will be before us, notwithstanding that certain gentlemen, especially from the Dies committee, oppose the rule.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has referred to the Dies committee.

Mr. SABATH. I did not mention anyone's name.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman made a statement that certain gentlemen on the committee opposed this resolution. I do not understand that to be the fact.

Mr. SABATH. I was referring then to H. R. 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. COX. Is this the wire-tapping bill the gentleman is speaking about now?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order. The gentleman is referring to a committee and to the members of that committee. I understand that under the rule he cannot do that.

Mr. COX. He simply refers to it.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to explain to the gentleman from Georgia that a question was raised about the deportation of criminals that are now in the United States.

Mr. COX. I understand the gentleman was discussing the wire-tapping bill.

Mr. SABATH. I am.

Mr. COX. Then will the gentleman permit this statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. These two gentlemen are talking at once, and I cannot tell which one to listen to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and he criticized the Department of Justice for not deporting certain criminals. I stated that such a bill has been reported.

Mr. COX. I hope I misunderstood the gentleman in understanding him to say that somebody on the Dies committee opposes the wire-tapping bill.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no; no.

Mr. COX. Because if I remember correctly, the people opposing the wire-tapping bill are the people that the Dies committee have been after.

Mr. SABATH. I explained that. Unfortunately the gentleman was not in his seat when I stated that the membership should know that the labor organizations are against this bill.

Mr. COX. The gentleman will remember that every "red" organization had its representative before the Dies committee, even the Lawyers Guild, and I remember particularly a representative of the Lawyers Guild was the gentleman that I wanted to get after on cross-examination and take for a ride, but on the morning on which he was to appear he did not show up.

Mr. SABATH. I made that clear before the gentleman came into the Chamber, that all labor organizations opposed the granting of the rule.

Mr. RICH. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois to state that we do not have any laws on our statute books today whereby these people who have committed crimes against the United States can be deported?

Mr. SABATH. We have the law, but unfortunately the countries to which these men should be deported refuse to accept them because of war conditions and existing treaties. The Judiciary Committee is trying to correct this by H. R. 3, as I have explained.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the bill under consideration, as I have stated, it appears to me that labor organizations are unnecessarily alarmed as to the effect of this bill, because they have been opposed to the granting of a rule. However, I know that there are organizations apart from labor organizations which are also opposed to this bill that have not directly shown their hands or gone on record. These organizations are comprised of gentlemen who represent the various monopolistic groups who cannot put their private agreements to set prices in writing and who resort to the use of the telephone to do so. Between these two groups on the one hand and the interest of the Government as represented by the Attorney General, who strongly urges the passage of the bill, and others, I feel it is my duty to be on the side of the representatives of our Government and country. I cannot see how this proposed law could in any possible way be harmful to the interests of labor.

All of us are aware of the un-American, subversive, and treasonable activities that are occurring today. Only yesterday 29 Nazi sympathizers were indicted for conspiracy, it being charged that they sought to obtain secret information and data from our Government. Aside from the 29 persons who have been indicted, we have hundreds of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist agents and other persons whose activities are inimical to the interests of the United States, who should be found and prosecuted without delay. Within the last few weeks there has been a wide circulation of letters and pamphlets, and I have received many of them, which carry propaganda that attempts to create discord and dissension in our country. I believe that if this bill is enacted into law it will enable the F. B. I. to run down and apprehend these subversive agitators in our midst whose activities are the same as those employed by the Nazi and Fascist agents in dividing the people in those countries which have been weakened and fallen a prey to Hitlerism. Many persons of these subversive elements cannot be deported because they are American-born, but under this proposed law they could be apprehended and prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that some people are more interested in certain interests in the United States than they are in the welfare of our country. They can only see, and daily point out,

the danger from communism, refusing to see the real danger to America, namely, that from the Nazis and Fascists. They refuse to recognize that Russia at this time, regardless of what its policies have been and what it has done heretofore, is now fighting alongside of Great Britain against the Nazis, thereby aiding us to help Great Britain. Every practical person realizes that we can help to save Great Britain by assisting all the people fighting Hitler, including the Russian people, and the Russians are not as atheistic and are far more democratic than the Nazis. The fact is very clear to every reasonable person that Hitler is far more dangerous to Britain, the United States, and all the democracies than is Stalin, and we must be practical enough to concentrate all of our efforts on the defeat of the greatest of all enemies to democratic institutions, which is Hitlerism. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me urge that we should not remain blind to the subversive dangerous activities in our own country and, I repeat, there is far greater danger from Hitlerism and fascism than from communism.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that until I make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House is about to recess today, because of no further business, and before the recess is granted, I be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. There are already two special orders that have been agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. After those special orders.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman think he should hold up a recess?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It seems a shame to waste all of that time in recess when I might be talking.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York withhold the point of order until I make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project and include an editorial from the Duluth newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. I insist upon my point of order.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 81]

Andrews	Hall,	Patrick
Angell	Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin	Hall,	Pierce
Barry	Leonard W.	Plauché
Bates, Mass.	Harrington	Plumley
Beam	Hart	Rees, Kans.
Bloom	Harter	Rivers
Bolles	Hartley	Rockefeller
Bradley, Pa.	Healey	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Hébert	Sacks
Buckley, N. Y.	Heidinger	Sasscer
Burgin	Hess	Satterfield
Cannon, Mo.	Hinshaw	Scanlon
Carter	Holbrook	Schaefer, Ill.
Cartwright	Hook	Schulte
Celler	Houston	Scott
Clark	Jacobsen	Scrugham
Claypool	Jenks, N. H.	Secrest
Coffee, Wash.	Johns	Shannon
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Sheridan
Colmer	Johnson,	Sikes
Cooley	Lyndon B.	Smith, Conn.
Copeland	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Pa.
Culkin	Jones	Smith, Va.
Cullen	Kee	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Kelly, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Dickstein	Kirwan	Stearns, N. H.
Dies	Kleberg	Stratton
Dirksen	Kopplemann	Sweeney
Domengeaux	McArdle	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McGehee	Tinkham
Drewry	McGranery	Tolan
Edmiston	Maas	Traynor
Elston	Maciora	Vincent, Ky.
Engel	Magnuson	Vinson, Ga.
Englebright	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Flaherty	Merritt	Walter
Flannagan	Mitchell	Wasielewski
Flannery	Myers, Pa.	White
Ford, Leland M.	Nelson	Whittington
Gearhart	Nichols	Wilson
Geyer, Calif.	Norton	Wright
Gore	O'Day	Zimmerman
Green	O'Leary	
Haines	Pace	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 302 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by Hon. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, on the subject Home Defense and National Defense, delivered last night over radio station WWDC on a program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an article from the Boston Globe, which is a reprint from the Pilot, official Catholic organ for the archdiocese of Boston.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio speech to be delivered by myself this evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SAUTHOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an exchange of correspondence with Dr. Gallup, of the Institute of Public Opinion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WIRE TAPPING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are now living in a very changing world. It does not seem so long ago that we were taught that to be right was to be virtuous and to be thrifty was to be virtuous. Now we are told that we should spend ourselves into prosperity.

It does not seem so long ago that candidates for Congress campaigned on the slogan of economy. Now many Members of Congress campaign on the slogan to bring as much boondoggling back to their districts as possible.

It does not seem so long ago that we told business, those people who meet the pay rolls, that we would give them a breathing spell. But now we are continually hitting them from behind.

It does not seem so long ago that the idea was that the people should keep this Government, but now most people throughout the United States feel that it is the duty of the Government to keep the people.

It does not seem so long ago that we here in the House applauded little Finland, about the only European country that has been honorable to this country. We applauded them in their struggle against gigantic Russia. But now, today, we are faced with what we might call a cartoon, watching Stalin, with hands dripping in blood, with the many nations which he himself had ruined, with the many priests and nuns lying in front of him murdered, with a dagger in the back of Poland, with little Finland overrun; and as Stalin looked down upon the horde of communistic saboteurs who are leaving for this country, receiving his blessings, to be met in this country with the words "My friends."

It does not seem so long ago that we looked with horror as Hitler purged many people in Germany, while during the past few years we have had purgings in this country.

It does not seem so long ago that Hitler appointed Goebbels to suppress the press over in Europe. It does not seem so long ago in this country that we confiscated personal telegrams of the people, and today we are here to follow out that which we looked at in horror when we learned not so many years ago that Mr. Hitler wire tapped over in that country.

So I am saying to you today we are now continuing to go along the lines of those people in Europe, about which we have talked so freely and condemned for their activities.

I have put in considerable study in regard to this wire-tapping bill. I feel that the chances of its abuses are great. I believe it is an un-American principle to bring into this country at the present time. There are several who appeared before the Rules Committee and agreed with the contention which I have just stated. For instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] stated before the Rules Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the commitee, I am opposed to this proposed measure because I feel that its enactment would mean passing over to the administrative branch of the Government something that would be the strongest means of setting up the worst system of espionage known in the world.

And, continuing, he said:

When Mr. A, an investigator, desires to tap a wire in accordance with this bill he simply telegraphed the Attorney General. Do you think he would call the Attorney General? No. In the middle of the night he would get the janitor in the Department of Justice and tell the janitor he wanted to tap a wire and the janitor would tell him to go ahead, and the following morning the Attorney General, or somebody for him, would sign a paper authorizing that which had been done the night before.

Mr. Walter also said:

During the World War we did just the opposite from that which is sought to be done by this bill, namely, we made it a crime to tap any wires. It seems to me that the reason that caused the enactment of that legislation applies with equal force today. If we do not enact legislation of that sort, we at least ought not to do the opposite to what we did then with respect to espionage.

Another witness who came before our committee was Paul Scharrenberg, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor. He stated, among other things:

We appeared before the committee and opposed H. R. 4228, and will continue to do so, because it is violative of the very precepts of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. It would open the door to snoopers of all kinds.

George Lueherson, executive secretary of the Twenty Standard Railroad Labor Organizations, was asked this question:

Mr. FISH. Have you given serious thought to this proposal, Mr. Lueherson?

He replied:

Yes; very serious. We feel that it is destructive of the entire moral courage of the citizenship to exercise its own judgment.

Mr. FISH. Your organizations have nothing particularly to do with the subject, and you simply are looking at it from an American angle, I believe.

Mr. LUEHERSON. Yes. We have 90,000,000 miles of wire in the United States—telephone and telegraphic. We use approximately 700,000 miles of wire for handling trains by telephone and we have 500,000 miles of wire operated by the Morse code. Many things could happen under a system of wire tapping. If a wire is tapped, if it is crossed or interfered with, anybody could go to it and draw any isolated remark from it and cause great damage. The potentialities of danger are far-flung. I can speak about the railroad man's attitude in connection with this matter.

Certainly we want to apprehend these criminals, but if we want to catch them we do not have to use wire tapping because we can get them by the exercise of good judgment. These special agents have a good record, I know. Why do we continue to talk about kidnaping when we claim that 99 percent of the kidnapers have been caught? How many of those cases have been solved by wire tapping? In the Lindbergh case, the case out in Chicago, and some cases on the west coast wire tapping was not resorted to. Why ask for something that unnecessarily destroys the liberties conferred by the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

We are opposed to this bill from the standpoint of principle. We do not think it is sound and we do not think it is needed.

The committee also heard Miss Josephine T. Adams, of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Descendants of the American Revolution. She said:

Much of the testimony was heard by only one member of the subcommittee.

The bill was taken away from the subcommittee before it could reach a vote or prepare a report.

The full committee heard two witnesses in secret sessions, one being Attorney General Jackson, favoring the bill, and the other Chairman Fly of the Federal Communications Commission, who opposed the bill. Then the bill was adopted by the full Committee on the Judiciary, with about one-third of the members voting against it.

This action was taken before the record was printed and necessarily in ignorance of testimony against the bill by all branches of organized labor, civic rights groups, Congressmen, bankers, and so forth.

Miss Adams further stated:

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, himself has best stated the case against any wire tapping when he said it was inefficient, it leads to corruption, is a handicap to sound law enforcement, unethical, and so forth.

She also said:

Nobody likes kidnapers, spies, extortioners, or saboteurs, but there are other proper means of apprehending them. If wire tapping is used, why not the whipping post, the third degree, torture?

Further in her testimony she said:

Just one example of the confusion that still envelops the wire-tapping bill—repeated statements in the press, and in public documents show that Director Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has, without qualification, been opposed to wire tapping.

A number of these statements were placed in the record, some of them by myself. None has been denied, retracted, or disavowed. Instead, Mr. Hoover sent by proxy, a four-paragraph statement expressing qualified opposition to the Hobbs bill.

As a result, the record contains absolutely conflicting and inconsistent statements. It is hard to see how Members of the Congress can safely vote on this bill without knowing at first hand definitely what is in the mind of the man who is to use the tapping power, if granted. How can Congress act prudently unless Mr. Hoover is given a chance to appear before the committee and requested to deny or explain the many statements he has made referring to wire tapping as a source of corruption and as a handicap and barrier to law enforcement?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I believe that to pass this bill would be to take many dangerous chances. I hope the bill does not pass.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman use some more of his time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is possibly as much misunderstanding about this bill as any that ever came before Congress. You must understand the proceedings before the Judiciary Committee before you can consistently and intelligently consider the bill now before the House.

The bill H. R. 2226 and the bill H. R. 3099 are two bills dealing with wire tapping, were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and extensive hearings held on them, a copy of which I hold in my hand. One of these bills, H. R. 2226, was sponsored by the Department of Justice and was a department bill. After those hearings the committee gave further consideration in executive session. For instance, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] was one of those who felt—as shown by the hearings—that the Department and the administration did not understand what this bill was or they would not be for it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] therefore took it upon himself as an individual member of the committee to write to the President of the United States for his opinion in reference to this legislation. Remember, hearings were held on the first two bills in the month of February last. The bill now before the House was introduced on the 31st day of March 1941 and reported on April 1, 1941. You will find on page 266 of the hearings the letter addressed to the President by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT], and on page 257 you will find the President's reply to that letter setting forth the President's position in reference to this bill. After some discussion he makes it clear that he is opposed to the general philosophy of indiscriminate wire tapping, but then he makes a statement as follows:

You may rightfully ask, then, where I would draw the line where wire tapping by the Government should end. I do not believe it should be used to prevent domestic crimes, with possibly one exception—kidnaping and extortion in the Federal sense.

There is, however, one field in which, given the conditions in the world today, wire tapping is very much in the public interest. This Nation is arming for national defense. It is the duty of our people to take every single step to protect themselves. I have no compunction in saying that wire tapping should be used against those persons not

citizens of the United States and those few citizens who are traitors to their country who today are engaged in espionage or sabotage against the United States.

This power may, of course, be abused; abuse is inherent in any governmental grant of power. But to prevent that abuse as far as it is humanly possible to do so I would confine such legislation to the Department of Justice and to no other department. I would also require that the Attorney General be acquainted with the necessity for wire tapping in every single case, and that he himself sign a certificate indicating such necessity.

There is only one domestic crime which ought possibly to be included; that is kidnaping. It is a heinous crime for which never is there any justification. Further, wire tapping is a peculiarly effective instrument in the detection of such offenders because of the nature of the crime and the subsequent negotiations surrounding it. This includes extortion.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman also read the third paragraph of that letter beginning "the use of wire tapping"?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I am sorry, because time will not permit. You all have it before you. It is on page 257 of the hearings. The President deplores the general use of wire tapping, as I do, but the President says conditions are such today that we should authorize wire tapping in these four instances, and I agree with the President, even though the gentleman from Massachusetts does not.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman a Roosevelt rubber stamp?

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I only have a short time. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] says, "You are a Roosevelt rubber stamp," because I agree with the President in this matter. I can hardly qualify along with some Members as New Deal rubber stamps. I support the President when I think he is right.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I am sorry I cannot. Anyone on the Republican side who can see anything good in what may be recommended by Mr. Roosevelt is called a Roosevelt rubber stamp by a New Deal Democrat. Strange, is it not? Well, now, I have never accused anybody here of being a Roosevelt rubber stamp, although I have a lot of thoughts along that line many times.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider this bill which the rule makes in order. Extensive hearings by the committee have been had on these two bills. When we started considering these bills I was not for them. I was not for the original bills, but after I got into it, after I considered the conditions as they are, after I heard the Attorney General of the United States, after I heard from the President by letter to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT], I began to realize that possibly there was something we should do about this matter. So a new bill was drafted complying with the President's suggestion. It was accepted by the Department of Justice. The President and his Attorney General are today sponsoring this bill. I say to my Democratic friends simply because it has Democratic sponsors is no reason why I should oppose it. The bill is right, the bill is needed in the present emergency. I am going to support an amendment to the bill to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] placing a 2-year limit on the life of the law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to the bill. Just what does it do? That is the thing we want to know here.

This bill provides that whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable grounds for believing that a felony punishable under the laws of the United States has been committed relating to what?—first, espionage; second, sabotage; third, kidnaping; fourth extortion. When the Attorney General of the United States has reason to believe that any one of those specific offenses has been committed he may authorize wire tapping in those particular cases.

Mr. MASON. But in no other instances?

Mr. MICHENER. In the four specific cases of espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion only.

If this bill becomes a law, it will work like this: When the Federal Bureau of Investigation feels that it is necessary to tap wires, as in this bill provided, the Bureau will notify the Attorney General. The Attorney General will then grant permission, provided he finds that there is reasonable cause to believe that one of these four felonies is about to be, is being, or has been, committed. The Attorney General must file a certificate in the Attorney General's office giving his reason and authorizing the wire tapping. This certificate becomes a public record in the Attorney General's office. Before any of the information obtained through this authorized wire tapping is presented in court, this Attorney General's certificate, or a duly authenticated copy thereof, must be presented to the court, and the right to offer as proof the evidence obtained by this wire tapping stems from the Attorney General's certificate filed with the court.

Be it remembered that this law will authorize no one to tap wires, as in the bill provided, except the Federal Bureau of Investigation; that is, the organization under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover. Even the F. B. I. cannot function under this bill without the certificate of the Attorney General of the United States. I repeat this because this is vital and shows the precautions taken in the proposed law to safeguard the general interests of our people.

The bill further provides that where it is necessary to obtain the evidence sought by this wire tapping in an area with the jurisdiction of the Department of War or Department of the Navy, then it may be carried on by the Division of Military Intelligence or the Office of Naval Intelligence.

I have already called attention to the President's letter, found on page 257 of the hearings, urging the enactment of this bill. Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, in a letter to the Judiciary Committee dated March 19, 1941, and found at page 18 of the hearings, discussed this matter at length and urged the enactment of this legislation. Mr. Jackson said, in part:

It would make the discussion of the proposed wire-tapping legislation more clear if those who fear that the proposed legislation would deprive them of their "right of privacy" would first learn just what "right of privacy" they now have.

There is no Federal statute that prohibits or punishes wire tapping alone. The only offense under the present law is to intercept any communication and divulge or publish the same. Any person, with no risk of penalty, may tap telephone wires and eavesdrop on his competitor, employer, workman, or others, and act upon what he hears or make any use of it that does not involve divulging or publication.

To use evidence obtained by wire tapping for the protection of society against criminals often requires that it be divulged in open court. It is this divulging in law enforcement that court decisions hold to violate the statutes. The courts do not stop people from tapping wires—no one has ever been or under present law could be convicted of that by itself. What has been stopped is the use of evidence to enforce the laws against criminals.

Many uninformed persons, and some who ought to know better, are thinking that these decisions protect their telephone privacy. They do nothing of the sort. They only protect those who engage in incriminating conversation from having them reproduced in court. These decisions lay down rules of evidence. But since our use of this method would have as its chief purpose the proof of a case against criminals, the practical effect of these decisions is to make wire tapping unavailing to law-enforcement officers, although still useful to those who make private use of it. For this reason it was discontinued by the Department of Justice.

Let me give you an actual example of the way the present law works in practice: A short time ago a small child was kidnaped in California. There was reason to expect that demands would be made upon the parents by telephone. If the voice making such a call were recorded, preserving its accents, its peculiarities of speech, and its exact words, it would be a scientific means of identification not subject to the faults of hearing or of memory which so often make identification weak. It might be decisive in saving the life of the child or in convicting the kidnaper, and it might be equally decisive in clearing an innocent person unfortunate enough to be under suspicion.

At that point Mr. Hoover came to me for instructions. In June 1940 the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit had held that the Communications Act prohibits use as evidence of a telephone conversation mechanically recorded with the consent of one party but without the knowledge and consent to the other (*United States* v. *Polakoff*, 112 F. (2d) 888).

So neither the distracted parents nor the United States Government could obtain valid evidence by recording a criminal telephone conversation unless the kidnaper consented. That is the state of the law at this moment.

Of course, I directed Mr. Hoover to put a recording device on that line. The child was recovered before the criminal reached the place from which he expected to operate. But even if he had called and we had obtained scientific identification of him, we could not have used it in court under that decision.

I am well aware of the dangers of unrestricted wire tapping. I have always maintained, and I so stated in my annual report, that unrestrained and uncontrolled wire tapping, even on the part of law-enforcement officers, would be intolerable. I have always felt that a bill to permit wire tapping by properly authorized Government officers should be balanced by carefully drawn safeguards to prohibit the indiscriminate tapping of wires and the indiscriminate use of information obtained in that way.

On the other hand, my present concern is with the very practical work of protecting decent citizens, and, indeed, the Nation itself, against criminals, spies, and saboteurs. Such persons, under existing law, have one great method of communication which they may use without fear of leaving incriminating trails—the telephone and telegraph. If a criminal writes a letter he runs the risk that it will fall into the hands of the law. If he transacts his illegal business in person, he may be overheard by an eavesdropper. If he sends a confederate to act for him, the confederate may betray him. All such evidence is good in court against him. But so long as he uses the telephone or telegraph he is sheltered against law-enforcement officers.

Criminals today have the free run of our communications systems, but the law-enforcement officers are denied even a carefully restricted power to confront the criminal with his telephonic and telegraphic footprints. Unless we can use modern, scientific means to protect society against the organized criminal movements of the underworld, the public cannot look to its law-enforcement agencies for the protection it has a right to expect.

Legislation should not only make clear the rights of law-enforcement officers and their limitations as well but might very wisely put an end to private or public wire tapping which, unless accompanied by divulging, is now permitted. I would suggest—

1. That the Department of Justice be authorized to obtain and use in court evidence obtained by wire tapping in connection with four offenses—viz, espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion. These are the offenses which are accomplished or accompanied by extensive use of the telephone.

2. That such wire tapping be done only on the written authorization of the Attorney General. His authorization will then have to be proven as a foundation for admission of any such evidence. He should also be required to keep a permanent record of each such authorization. I am confident no Attorney General would make abusive use of this power under such circumstances. I do not favor the search-warrant procedure, which would authorize some 200 judges and 500 United States commissioners to authorize wire tapping. Such procedure means loss of precious time, probable publicity, and filing of charges against persons as a basis for wire tapping before investigation is complete, which might easily result in great injury to such persons. A centralized responsibility can easily be called in question by the Congress, but you cannot interrogate the whole judiciary.

3. Except as so authorized for law-enforcement purposes, it should be made a crime for any person, whether or not divulging the communication, to tap any wire or install any recording or listening device thereon. This would be a real protection of the right of privacy which is not now protected at all.

I have already called your attention to the fact that hearings were held on H. R. 2266. Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., sent a statement to the Judiciary Committee giving his views as to the advisability of this type of legislation at this particular time. Much will be said here about Mr. Hoover's general views on wire tapping in bygone days. Suffice it to say that Mr. Hoover concluded his statement as follows:

I am informed that at the hearings before subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in regard to H. R. 2266 a number of statements made by me on the subject of wire tapping have been quoted by witnesses opposed to the bill. These short quotations, detached from their context, purport to condemn such a proposal as is represented by the pending bill. These statements must, however, be construed in the light of the circumstances under which they were made.

I have always been, and am now, opposed to uncontrolled and unrestrained wire tapping by law-enforcement officers. Moreover, I have always been and am now opposed to the use of wire tapping as an investigative function except in connection with investigations of crimes of the most serious character, such, for example, as offenses endangering the safety of the Nation or the lives of human beings. I also feel that world developments of the past year or more, and the changed conditions resulting therefrom, have increased the gravity from the standpoint of national safety of such offenses as espionage and sabotage.

In other words, my view is that wire tapping should not be permitted except as to such crimes as I have described, and even then in such limited group of cases only under strict supervision of higher authority exercised separately in respect to each specific instance. In the group of cases I have in mind, such as espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion, wire tapping as an investigative function is of considerable importance.

I have examined the pending bill on the subject, H. R. 2266. I feel that it could be improved if its scope were to be limited to a few crimes specifically enumerated, such as those I have mentioned above. If so limited, I favor its enactment.

This statement will be found on page 112 of the hearings.

In short, Mr. Hoover agrees with the President and with the Attorney General that indiscriminate wire tapping should not be authorized by law. We are all in agreement, however, that the bill, H. R. 4228, which this rule makes in order is not only desirable but necessary at this particular time.

As I have heretofore stated, the hearings were held on H. R. 2266 and H. R. 3099. It is interesting to note who appeared in opposition to this legislation. There was considerable opposition. Representatives of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. and representatives of the railroad brotherhoods opposed the enactment of either H. R. 2266 or H. R. 3099. Then, in addition, I think every so-called liberal organization in the country, ranging all the way from the chairman of the American Labor Party in New York County to the American Civil Liberties Union, strenuously opposed any kind of wire-tapping legislation. These groups huddled under the Bill of Rights of the Constitution and insisted that any kind of an effort on the part of the Federal Government to prevent sabotage and espionage at this particular time by means of wire tapping was unorthodox, totalitarian, oppressive, and un-American. The emergency made no difference to these groups.

I was especially interested in the position of the railroad brotherhoods. I have great respect for the considered judgment of the brotherhoods, and personally I have not heard the representatives of the brotherhoods discuss H. R. 4228. Knowing this group as I do, I cannot conceive of the railroad brotherhoods opposing any emergency legislation that will make it possible to carry on our national-defense program and prevent espionage and sabotage in this the hour of the Nation's peril. To me, the past conduct of these great organizations is the best evidence that even though the brotherhoods did oppose the original bills granting broad wire-tapping power they will insist on, rather than interfere with, the efforts of the Government to carry out our national-defense program at this particular time.

For my part, it would be very difficult for me to vote against a bill that the Department of Justice insists is necessary if kidnapers and extortionists are to be prevented from carrying on their nefarious activities at this time.

After all, just what is wrong with the objectives sought in this bill? Who is going to be hurt? Are your liberties and my liberties going to be taken away because the law-enforcing authorities are permitted to listen in if and when it has been determined that we are committing or preparing to commit one of these four felonies?

In my judgment, this bill would pass almost unanimously were it not for the fact that certain labor leaders opposed the original bills. The membership of the House is not advised as to the details of this bill. I am wondering how many have read the printed hearings and how many know the facts. I am also wondering how many of the labor unions who have registered opposition to their Representatives in Congress realize that the bill now before Congress is not the bill which they had in mind when they notified their Representatives of their position.

No one will accuse me of being overenthusiastic about most of the New Deal philosophy. I abhor concentration of power in the departments in Washington. I realize, however, that the exigencies of the occasion are such as to require bold, fearless, and comprehensive legislation. It is in this spirit that I shall support the legislation before us.

Mr. BENDER. Will the industrious gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENDER. They have all the information they need on Harry Bridges. Why does the administration continue its policy of vacillation?

Mr. MICHENER. I am just as much opposed to Harry Bridges as anybody, and I have done everything I can to have him deported. I helped write the law which makes it possible for him to be deported. I am in no way justifying the vacillation to which the gentleman refers, but I do think that the question of the hour is the preservation of our own country. I do think the thing in which

we should be vitally interested is what is before us and the task at hand right now.

I have a number of quotations here from the hearings that I wanted to use, but time will not permit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman refers to extortion. It occurs to me that sometimes extortion is practiced in other crimes than in kidnaping cases alone. I should like to see the bill broad enough to cover extortion in connection with any crime.

Mr. MICHENER. The bill will be debated under the 5-minute rule and the gentleman will have an opportunity to offer his amendment. He will have an opportunity to present the merits of his amendment to the House. If the House agrees with the gentleman, then the House can accept the amendment.

I believe this rule should be adopted. I believe this matter should be brought before the House. Personally, I am going to support the bill wholeheartedly and 100 percent, but I do want to place a limitation, for instance a 2-year limitation, on the life of the bill. If it is a good bill during that trial period, I am sure we shall all be back here asking that it be made permanent law. If it is not a good bill, that 2 years will be the test.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] my remaining time.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, to oppose a measure of this sort is almost like defending crime. I can very well see the possibilities of waving the flag and talking about the enforcement of our laws. But bear this in mind—and I trust you will vote down this rule—there has not been offered one scintilla of evidence in the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary to indicate the need for this legislation. Not one single bit of evidence has been adduced.

Under this measure some agent of the Department of Justice must merely call upon his chief for authorization to invade the privacy of our homes. Who is there naive enough to believe that if it is necessary to tap a telephone wire in order to detect a crime it is not being done today? We all know it is being done. I even believe that some of the Government officials tap each other's wires just to keep in practice.

This is what the bill does: It permits one member of the executive branch to secure permission from another member of the executive branch of the Government to do something that is a wide departure from anything we have ever considered to be democratic. It is the beginning of the construction of the worst espionage system any government in the world has ever seen. All this agent from the Department of Justice has to do if he wants to find out something about somebody whom he suspects of being unfriendly to the administration, let us assume, is to tap a wire, and out of the Department of Justice will come a stereotyped, mimeographed consent.

I recognize that there are cases when it might be quite helpful in the detection of the perpetrators of the heinous offenses enumerated in this bill to tap wires. I have introduced a bill that meets that situation. It provides for the securing of permission such as you now must secure in order to search the home of an individual. It seems to me that if it is ever necessary to tap a wire we ought to compel the agent who intends to invade the privacy of our lives to go before a representative of the courts and make out a case of probable cause, demonstrating to the court the necessity for invading the privacy of our lives. Then, after having demonstrated the need for the use of this unusual and undemocratic power, have the court say that probable cause has been shown and issue a certificate of authority.

I do not know what your contacts have been with the agents of this Government, but mine have been such that I do not have sufficient confidence in them.

I sincerely trust that this rule will be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the sole question now pending before the House is not whether we will approve the provisions of this bill but whether or not it will take under consideration the request of the President and the request of the Attorney General to give the power to tap wires in these particular, specific cases. That is all.

This is our situation. I do not like wire tapping, either. I do not suppose anybody in this House likes wire tapping. But here we are dealing with a specific, definite, concrete situation where the responsible administrative agencies of this country, to which we have given the power to put in uniform the young men of this country, and we have voted them billions and billions of money to make sure the defense of this country. They tell us—and we know it is true—that there are people in this country whose designs are against this country. They want to detect and frustrate their plans.

You have hired a man to be President and Commander in Chief. You have hired another to be Attorney General, the chief law-enforcing officer of the country. Your Commander in Chief and the chief law-enforcing officer of the country come to the Congress now, which is their copartner in attempting to deal with this situation, and they say, "We need this power proposed by this bill to protect the interests of this country." The majority of your committee in first responsibility agrees to a favorable report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS—

Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes; my darling daughter.
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water.

Congress passes and has, from time immemorial, passed criminal laws. The Chief Executive of this Nation and the Attorney General are the prime officials of this Government, the prime agency, if you please, of this Congress charged with the responsibility and duty of enforcing the laws that we pass. Now, do we mean for them to enforce them or do we not? They come to their Congress, a coordinate branch of the Government, and say, "In four cases we need that power which a mistake of the Congress has deprived us of." Passing the act creating the Federal Communications Commission we were talking about the employees of the public-utility companies and the officials and employees of the Federal Communications Commission and, possibly other private persons, when we said that no person shall intercept any communication and divulge the contents. The Supreme Court, in the first Nardone case, said that that language was broad enough to include officials of the law of all kinds and degrees. Mr. Justice Sutherland, in his dissenting opinion, disagreed heartily, and very cogently. For 150 years prior to 1937, every law enforcement officer, high and low, was free to exercise this power. Under the narrow interpretation, as it seems to many of us, given by the Supreme Court in the first Nardone case, it now has become generally recognized as being unlawful to tap wires.

I want to read you what the Attorney General says in his letter to Chairman SABATH of the Rules Committee of the House:

> I understand that your committee is considering a rule in reference to the bill to authorize this Department to intercept wire communications in connection with the investigation of kidnaping, extortion, sabotage, and espionage.
>
> You may be interested to know that since the hearings before the Judiciary Committee the sabotage of Axis ships in American harbors was ordered by telegraph. Several of the ships' masters have themselves asserted the receipt of telegrams from the Italian naval attaché to that effect.
>
> That demonstrates our problem. We have sabotage by telegraph, and the Government is powerless to intercept the messages and use them as evidence.
>
> I do not know how I can demonstrate the situation better than this incident does. Unless we can have legislation of the type I have recommended, our wire systems will continue to be the safest and most effective methods of communication that foreign agents can employ against our Government.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ROBERT H. JACKSON,
> *Attorney General.*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman point out what crime these Italian seamen committed that would be covered by this bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Sabotage.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, of course not.

Mr. HOBBS. You may not call sabotage sabotage. I do. I believe that sabotage is a crime. I believe that sabotage should be stopped. I believe that other vessels and property of aliens in this country ought to be protected for the use of Uncle Sam and for the aid of our British allies.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman know that those Italians were indicted for violating a criminal statute with respect to the hindrance of navigation, and that is not sabotage?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know under what law the indictments were drawn, and I care less. I am not interested in whether the men on the sabotaged ships are eventually punished a couple of years hence when all the courts have ground; what we seek by this bill is to prevent the destruction of ships our Nation now so sorely needs. The sabotage of these ships would have been prevented had this bill been the law and our F. B. I. could have been authorized by the Attorney General to intercept the wires ordering the sabotage.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 63.

Mr. WALTER and Mr. ALLEN of Illinois objected to the vote on the ground there was not a qorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 124, not voting 135, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—173

Allen, La.	Culkin	Johnson, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	D'Alesandro	Johnson, Luther A.
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Davis, Tenn.	Kean
Andresen, August H.	Dingell	Kefauver
Arnold	Dondero	Kerr
Barnes	Doughton	Kilburn
Beckworth	Doxey	Kilday
Bell	Drewry	Kinzer
Blackney	Duncan	Knutson
Bland	Durham	Kocialkowski
Boggs	Elliott, Calif.	Kramer
Bonner	Ellis	Kunkel
Boren	Faddis	Lambertson
Bradley, Mich.	Folger	Lanham
Brooks	Fulmer	Larrabee
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	Lea
Bryson	Gathings	Leavy
Buck	Gibson	LeCompte
Buckler, Minn.	Gilchrist	Lewis
Bulwinkle	Gossett	McCormack
Burdick	Graham	McLaughlin
Byrne	Grant, Ala.	Maciejewski
Camp	Gregory	Mahon
Cannon, Fla.	Gwynne	Mansfield
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Martin, Iowa
Carlson	Hare	May
Carter	Harris, Ark.	Meyer, Md.
Chapman	Harris, Va.	Michener
Clason	Hartley	Mills, Ark.
Cluett	Hébert	Moser
Coffee, Nebr.	Heidinger	Mott
Cole, Md.	Hill, Wash.	Mundt
Collins	Hobbs	Murdock
Cooper	Hope	Norrell
Costello	Hunter	O'Hara
Courtney	Izac	Oliver
Cox	Jarman	O'Neal
Creal	Jennings	Patman
	Jensen	Patton
	Johnson, Calif.	Pearson
Peterson, Fla.	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Peterson, Ga.	Sanders	Thomason
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sasscer	Traynor
Pierce	Satterfield	Vorys, Ohio
Poage	Schuetz	Ward
Priest	Shafer, Mich.	Weaver
Ramspeck	Sheppard	Wene
Randolph	Simpson	West
Rankin, Miss.	Smith, Conn.	Whelchel
Reed, Ill.	South	White
Rich	Sparkman	Wickersham
Richards	Starnes, Ala.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Robertson, N. Dak.	Sumner, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Robertson, Va.	Sumners, Tex.	Woodruff, Mich.
Rogers, Okla.	Sutphin	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Talle	Worley
	Tarver	Wright
	Terry	

NAYS—124

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Ploeser
Arends	Geyer, Calif.	Powers
Baumhart	Gillie	Rabaut
Beiter	Granger	Ramsay
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Rankin, Mont.
Bennett	Guyer, Kans.	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Haines	Reed, N. Y.
Boehne	Halleck	Rizley
Boland	Harness	Robsion, Ky.
Bolton	Hill, Colo.	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Rolph
Butler	Howell	Rutherford
Canfield	Hull	Sauthoff
Case, S. Dak.	Imhoff	Schulte
Casey, Mass.	Jackson	Shanley
Chiperfield	Jarrett	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Cochran	Johnson, W. Va.	Snyder
Coffee, Wash.	Jonkman	Springer
Connery	Kee	Stefan
Copeland	Keefe	Stevenson
Cravens	Kelley, Pa.	Sullivan
Cunningham	Landis	Taber
Curtis	Lesinski	Tenerowicz
Day	Ludlow	Thill
Dewey	McGregor	Thom
Disney	McIntyre	Tibbott
Ditter	McKeough	Treadway
Downs	McLean	Van Zandt
Dworshak	McMillan	Voorhis, Calif.
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Walter
Eberharter	Mason	Weiss
Eliot, Mass.	Mills, La.	Welch
Englebright	Mitchell	Wheat
Fellows	Murray	Wigglesworth
Fenton	O'Brien, Mich.	Winter
Fish	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young
Fitzgerald	Osmers	Youngdahl
Fitzpatrick	Paddock	
Fogarty	Pheiffer, William T.	
Gale	Pittenger	
Gehrmann		

NOT VOTING—135

Andrews	Forand	McArdle
Angell	Ford, Leland M.	McGehee
Baldwin	Ford, Thomas F.	McGranery
Barden	Gavagan	Maas
Barry	Gearhart	Maciora
Bates, Ky.	Gifford	Magnuson
Bates, Mass.	Gore	Marcantonio
Beam	Green	Merritt
Bloom	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Monroney
Bolles	Hall, Leonard W.	Myers, Pa.
Boykin	Harrington	Nelson
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	Nichols
Burch	Harter	Norton
Burgin	Healey	O'Connor
Byron	Heffernan	O'Day
Capozzoli	Hendricks	O'Leary
Cartwright	Hess	O'Toole
Celler	Hinshaw	Pace
Chenoweth	Holbrock	Patrick
Clark	Hook	Plauché
Claypool	Houston	Plumley
Cole, N. Y.	Jacobsen	Rees, Kans.
Colmer	Jenks, N. H.	Rivers
Cooley	Johns	Robinson, Utah
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller
Crosser	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Romjue
Crowther	Jones	Sacks
Cullen	Kelly, Ill.	Scanlon
Delaney	Kennedy, Martin J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Dickstein	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scott
Dies	Keogh	Scrugham
Dirksen	Kirwan	Secrest
Domengeaux	Kleberg	Shannon
Douglas	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Edmiston	Lynch	Short
Elston	McAndrews	Sikes
Engel	McArdle	Smith, Pa.
Flaherty	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Flannagan	McGranery	Smith, Wash.
Flannery	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Somers, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	Wasielewski
Spence	Tinkham	Whittington
Steagall	Tolan	Williams
Stearns, N. H.	Vincent, Ky.	Wilson
Stratton	Vinson, Ga.	Wolcott
Sweeney	Vreeland	Zimmerman
Taylor	Wadsworth	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Byron for, with Mr. Jones against.

General pairs:

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Dirksen.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Elston.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Short.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Green with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Barry.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Williams.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Scanlon.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Leary.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3857. An act authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 5049, entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136 to said bill;

That the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 52 and 53 to said bill; and

That the Senate ask a further conference with the House on the amendments in disagreement.

The message also announced that Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN had been appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 4926, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 10, and 11 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill H. R. 2097, entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, by striking therefrom subsection (k) of section 4 and substituting therefor a new subsection (k)," disagreed to by the House; and agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. BULOW, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 4756, entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

WIRE TAPPING

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4228) to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section authorizing, for the purpose of detecting or preventing certain crimes, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, when specifically authorized by the Attorney General of the United States, to intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications; and making such authorizations and communications, and testimony concerning same, admissible evidence; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4228, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning, I call attention to the fact that wire tapping under this bill is asked for only in four particular cases—violation of our national laws against espionage; second, sabotage; third, kidnaping; and fourth, its kindred crime, extortion. The President of the United States has approved this bill and has asked for its passage. The Attorney General, the chief law enforcement officer of the country, has asked for the passage of this bill. Mr. Hoover, the head of the Government's principal investigating bureau, has stated that this bill is needed if he is to ferret out these crimes. If we have confidence in the administration, if we have confidence in the officers on which we must rely in this great emergency for the administration of our laws and for the protection of this great defense program, then tell me why we should not give this power that they ask.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. No; I will not yield. I do not have the time.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the opposition to this bill, as reported in the hearings, on page 187. I refer particularly to the opposition of Mr. Edward Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio. Mr. Lamb's appearance before our committee was arranged for in a letter written by Mrs. Carroll King. Mrs. King is the attorney for Harry Bridges, and I refer you to the press reports and to reports of the Dies committee, which show that she appeared in defense of Bridges, according to a copy of the Washington Star of April 1, 1941. Who is Mr. Lamb? Lamb is himself an attorney and who went before the Dies committee, representing Alex Balint. The acting chairman of the Dies committee, Mr. STARNES, noted the parallel between the strike at the aircraft plant and at the aluminum plant. Edward Balint was defended before that committee by this same Lamb. I call attention also to a petition which was mailed to every Member of this House bringing to the attention of Congress a protest made about our Government's attitude toward the Communist Party, and signed as one of the Communist leaders on that petition is this same Edward T. Lamb, of Toledo, Ohio. I call attention further to the hearings, to various people who appeared as representing these same organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes more.

Mr. CAMP. But, Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the opposition on the ground that it violates civil rights or any other inherent right of our persons, I say that wire-tapping is widespread in this country at the present time. Two of the largest manufacturers of electrical appliances boldly picture wire-tapping apparatus and offer and sell it to the public. Do you tell me that we are going to sit idly by and let spies and saboteurs tap into the wires of this Government, tap into the wires of our administrative departments, and refuse to give our law-enforcement officers the same privilege to check it? I do not believe that we will.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever risen in this House in the 3 years I have been here to speak on a controversial question. I come as a former United States attorney. As far as I know, there are less than three or four men in this House who have served as assistant United States attorneys. I have gone all through this wire-tapping experience. I have personal knowledge of it. I served as United States attorney at Pittsburgh in the western judicial district of Pennsylvania. Therefore when I speak to you it may not be as one having authority, but at least as one who has had great practical experience.

You will pardon the personal allusion. In my time I have handled 38,000 criminal cases. I have tried 299 people for murder in my time. I have actually tried in court something between ten and twelve thousand cases. So when I speak to you I speak to you in soberness and with the knowledge of what is back of this bill.

First of all, may I say to you it is my honest thought, making all due allowance for the opposition, that there is a great deal of misapprehension and misunderstanding about this bill. The very number of the bill connotes that. If you will look at the hearings and examine the testimony of witnesses who appeared before the Judiciary Committee you will find their opposition was directed to two other bills, and that the present bill was introduced after the hearings had been concluded on those two bills. So much for that.

The second thing is the abnormal time in which we find ourselves. As you know, I am a member of the Republican minority. If you will examine my votes, you will find very few votes cast for the New

Deal. I am one of the best "no-ers" in Congress on questions of the New Deal. Therefore I am not swayed by any partisan thought in this matter, but I am swayed by the fact that in this crucial time in which we find ourselves, in this time in which we may be at war any minute, if we are not already in war, we need every resource at our command; we need every protection. This country is infested with saboteurs, those who are guilty of espionage, those who would wreak destruction on our Government. The time has come now to submerge all party lines; the time has come to get away from the thought of whether we are just striking at the President of the United States. So long as I think he is wrong I will vote against him. So long as I think he is right I will vote with him. This is the thought I bring to you today. The Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcing officer of this country, has asked for this bill. What did he ask for? Only four things. Let us see what they are. First of all, he says, "I need, in the performance of my work, this bill for the purpose of determining who is guilty of espionage." Does anybody in the United States say, "I am against espionage, prying upon the secret things of our Government"? The second thing is, "I need this to suppress those who are guilty of sabotage, the saboteurs who would destroy our Government." Can any man honestly stand up and say he is opposed to that?

The third thing he says is, "I need this in the matter of kidnaping." Is there any man in the country who will say today, "I favor kidnaping"?

The last thing he says is, "I need it in the matter of extortion." Why does he need it? Because frequently, after the telephonic communication is made in a kidnaping case, the demand comes through by letter for the money. What man can honestly say he opposes this thing on that ground? Where can labor object to this? No man speaks for labor in the sense that he is against his country and its needs. I hold in my hand a record of the proceedings where the subregional director of the C. I. O. in my district wrote me that 25,000 men in my district were opposed to this, and asked me to vote against it. His reasons are set forth in the hearings, but I told him that the interests of the whole American people rose over and above any subordinate group in this Nation.

My friends, where are we in this matter? We are facing a situation where any of you who read this morning's paper should realize that this is a spy-infested country; where the officer who executes the law needs every mechanical device and resource. What those men want this for is this: Very, very frequently the evidence and testimony is not brought into court at all, but it gives leads by which they can follow through. Following through, then, they are able to buttress this by corroborating testimony, substantiating what they have already discovered. If that is the case, here we are in the city of Washington today in a crime wave of sex perverts and maniacs. Do you mean to tell me that that ought to be included? Of course, you do. Yet you examine this bill and you find that is not in the bill. There are only four things. I repeat those four things—espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion. As much as you would like to see the city of Washington protected, it is not included in this bill. No better limitation can be thrown around than has been thrown around. What about the Member of this House who says "I do not want to grant unlimited power"? Think on this for a minute. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Judiciary, has said that an amendment would be offered limiting the use of this power to 2 years.

Because of the need for this bill at this time, because of the character of the crimes covered, and because a request will be made to limit the life of the bill, no one who thinks in terms of the safety of the country, in terms of the safety of its people, in terms of its defense, in terms of its boys in the camps, will oppose legislation of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, wire tapping to the people of my district is about as repulsive a word as anyone can pronounce.

I find it very, very difficult today to decide just how I am going to vote on this bill. I believe, however, that, in view of existing circumstances, I shall vote for it. The reason I find it so difficult is because of my knowledge of some things that were done in my district in 1939, and evidence that is to be found in hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on wire tapping.

I believe most of the people, not only of my own State, but of the entire country, are familiar with the case that was engineered in 1939 by the then Republican Governor of Rhode Island, William H. Vanderbilt, in his attempt to entrap certain Democrats who had perhaps caused him a little embarrassment at the polls. I am not going into the details or the merits of that case because I believe I should restrict myself to the scope of the bill; but I do want to say that if you will read these hearings you will find that as a result of this dirty business, as it was referred to by one of the most outstanding jurists of our time, an innocent man, Edward Freeman, was made to stand trial for practically 4 weeks. He was not only embarrassed, himself, but his reputation was temporarily damaged, his family was subjected to all sorts of embarrassment and humiliation, his wife was made ill—and the man responsible for that trial and for the wire tapping that brought it about was none other than the then Governor of the State. Out of his own pocket he paid $15,500 to an agency in New York to send its agents up to my district. Not only was this man embarrassed, but the wires of the mayor of the city of Pawtucket, Mayor McCoy, were tapped. The wires of the attorney general of the State, a Republican, were tapped, although he was a man the Governor had sponsored and campaigned for in the last election. The wires of his law office and his home were tapped, and also in the office of the attorney general, and by none other than a special assistant that the Governor had prevailed upon the attorney general to appoint to assist him. They had crossed the wires of the attorney general so that this special assistant would get the information supposed to go to the attorney general.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Was not the man who conducted that wire tapping in Rhode Island a former employee of the Department of Justice?

Mr. FORAND. The man who did the actual listening was a man by the name of Barton, Lee Edward Barton, a former F. B. I. man. One reason why I feel so skeptical about going along with this bill is from fear that F. B. I. agents who learn to do this for the Government may retire from their Government service and resort to the same thing in private life.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman realize that there is no law against wire tapping, that it is indulged in right along, and that the only effect this bill will have upon the whole matter is to make the evidence in the certain four instances available and usable as evidence in court. If the gentleman will read my remarks in tomorrow's RECORD he will find included the opinion of the Attorney General on which I rely; and if he will read the hearings he will find evidence to support my stand.

Mr. FORAND. I have read the hearings. As I said, my only purpose in voting for this bill today, and I am doing it only because it is limited in scope and also because an amendment will be added limiting the time of the operation of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. On page 18 of the hearings the gentleman will find the opinion of the Attorney General stating what I have just stated.

Mr. FORAND. Regardless of that, Mr. Chairman, and regardless of whether or not there is a law on the books today making wire tapping or the use of dictographs or other similar devices illegal, I hope eventually we shall have a bill dealing with this subject that will enable the law-enforcement agencies of the Government to put a finger on the criminal and protect the rights of the public generally.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I imagine many Members of this House would be opposed to a law which established a general policy of wire tapping; but this is not such a bill. This bill is limited to the actual necessities of the situation,

and the procedure is very carefully safeguarded.

The history of wire-tapping legislation in this country is substantially this: At common law, as you know, evidence which was otherwise competent, was not made inadmissible because it was obtained illegally. The Constitution made some limitation to that rule. For example, the fourth amendment to the Constitution does carry some limitation in its provision against unreasonable search and seizure.

In the case of *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438), decided in 1928, the Supreme Court of the United States held that evidence obtained by wire tapping was admissible and did not violate the constitutional provisions. Thereafter, in 1934, this Congress passed the Federal Communications Act.

In the case of *Nardone* v. *U. S.* (302 U. S. 379), that question was again presented to the Supreme Court, and that Court held that section 605 of title XLVII of the present code prohibited the use in court of evidence obtained by wire tapping. I wish that every Member, before he votes on this bill, would look at section 605, title XLVII and observe to whom the protection of that law is extended.

If you will examine that section, you will find it prohibits four different kinds of activities. It does not prohibit the tapping of a wire or the listening in on a conversation as such. What it prohibits is simply the use of or the divulging of the evidence that you have acquired. In other words the practical effect is that if the agents of the Government listen in on the wire of an honest citizen he has no protection against that violation of his right of privacy, and the officers have committed no crime by listening in on the conversation. If he is an honest citizen they will have no occasion to introduce this evidence in court. On the other hand, if they listen in on the conversation of a criminal and get evidence that he is about to commit a crime and attempt to offer that in court, section 605 steps in and protects the criminal. A better law for the protection of the criminal could hardly be written.

It cannot be said that we are departing from any well-established policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why could we not repeal that section and fix it up that way?

Mr. GWYNNE. Repeal section 605?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one that extends protection to the criminal.

Mr. GWYNNE. If we repeal section 605 we would then have no regulation of wire tapping. We are not sponsoring unlimited wire tapping.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentleman to say that the trouble was that the court excluded that evidence in certain cases. Why could we not fix it up by changing that law?

Mr. GWYNNE. We are doing that here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are also giving them permission to listen in.

Mr. GWYNNE. How can they get it if they do not listen in?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said they could do it that way anyway.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not take care of that by changing that part which forbids the judge from accepting it?

Mr. GWYNNE. That might be one way of doing it, except you would be allowing them to use evidence of that kind in every character of crime.

Mr. Chairman, we are not doing as some people state, departing from the well-established policy of this Congress and of this country. Up until 1934 there never had been any Federal law prohibiting general wire tapping. During the last war when the Congress turned over the telephones and telegraph to the Government, we passed a statute which prohibited anyone tapping wires. That was done, as I understand it, to protect the military secrets then going over these wires. In 1933 an amendment was attached to an appropriation bill which prohibited the use of wire-tapping evidence in prohibition cases.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, in 1933 an amendment was attached to an appropriation bill which prohibited the use of wire tapping in prohibition cases. It is my understanding that the reason for the action of the Congress at that time grew out of the growing resentment against prohibition.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I rise simply to ask the distinguished gentleman to make it clear that in the act to which he refers, when the control of the wires was under the Post Office Department or under whatever department it was, it was not the wire tapping which was interdicted, but unauthorized wire tapping.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is right, and it was done, as I understand it, for the purpose of protecting military knowledge and secrets going over the wires.

Let me call attention also to the fact that for many years we have had in the Postal Department a statute similar to this one. That is to say, if you make a showing to the Postmaster General that letters of certain individuals are going through the mail and are being used for the purpose of committing a crime, the Postmaster General will file a certificate in his office substantially as provided in this bill; thereafter, the proper officials of his Department are authorized to examine those letters. So we are departing now on nothing new and untried. On the other hand, we are getting back to the common sense that we had prior to the ill-advised Act of 1934 when, as I understand it, in a general bill to regulate communications there was inserted this section 605, which I believe did not get much consideration at that time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the House after extended hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary and after careful consideration by that committee. I should not presume to speak on the bill, had it not been for the fact I sat on the subcommittee last year that had this subject under consideration. I attended these hearings, and I have followed the hearings during the present session of Congress. I believe I have a contribution to make to the debate on the subject.

This is not a subject which should be approached in a state of emotion or hysteria. It is a subject which deserves, and I sure will receive, the most serious consideration by the Members of the House. In my opinion the membership of the House will pass upon the bill intelligently, and after the most earnest consideration of the bill, of its effects, and of its provisions.

We all start with the proposition, I believe, that unlimited and unrestricted wire tapping is reprehensible. Certainly I should not for one moment sponsor any bill which would permit private conversations to be generally and unrestrictedly tapped and listend to by anyone who might see fit to do so. Such a thing would invade the privacy of the lives of the people of this country.

However, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not do anything of that sort. It is well for us to consider the provisions of this bill. In the first place, this bill authorizes the Attorney General to make possible what is called wire tapping or listening-in in four instances only. First, espionage; second, sabotage; third, kidnaping; and, fourth, extortion.

The bill provides that where the Attorney General certifies that he has reason to believe that one of these crimes is being committe ', has been committed, or is about to be committed, he may authorize wire tapping in connection with that case.

In my opinion, even that would not safeguard the public because of the very fact that has been brought out in the debate up to this time that there is a danger of abuse through the casual use of that power by the Attorney General.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for whom I have a high regard, spoke on the rule on this bill and made what I consider to be a rather loose use of some words when he said that this bill would permit this authorization to be granted by the Attorney General merely by signing a stereotyped or mimeographed certificate. If that were possible, I should not be standing in the well of this House supporting this bill at this time. It fell to my lot, however, to propose an amendment which is incorporated in this bill and which, in my humble opinion, corrects that situation. On page 2 of the bill, in lines 14 to 17, inclusive, there is a restrictive provision with regard to the certificate. After the provision that the Attorney General shall certify as a condition precedent that he has reasonable ground to believe that these acts are being committed or are about to be committed, there is this provision:

and in so certifying states specifically the facts forming the basis of his belief that such

felony may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed.

Therefore, the situation is that before the wire tapping can be engaged in the Attorney General must certify that he has reasonable ground to believe that these four specific crimes—and only these four are affected—have been committed, are being committed, or are about to be committed, and in so certifying he must make a specific statement of the facts forming the basis of his belief that such situation exists. In my opinion, this surrounds the bill with safeguards which make it impossible for it to be abused.

If I thought that this bill were going to be abused I should not support it. If I thought it were going to be used as an unreasonable weapon against any segment of our population, I should not support it. If I thought this bill were inimical to the interests of organized labor, I should not support it.

I cannot view this bill with the same alarm as it is viewed by those who have opposed it. I respect the views of those men but I say that at this time, when it is so important that these particular crimes be checked, with this limitation upon this bill it is only fair and reasonable that this bill should be passed and that those who are engaging in subversive activities should be checked.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN].

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DAILY SAVING

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning in the public press there appeared a statement that the Federal Power Commission is very much concerned about the supply of electric power in the Southeast. I have offered at least a partial solution of that problem by suggesting that our clocks be advanced and that we have daylight saving throughout the country during this war emergency. This will save for the manufacture of defense material 1 hour of electric energy which otherwise would go to municipal and domestic uses. Early in March, realizing that an emergency was threatened as to the amount of electric power or energy available, I introduced a bill suggesting the conservation of electric energy by saving daylight. So much time has elapsed that the provisions of that bill would be ineffective, so I am introducing today a new bill, which provides that immediately on its enactment daylight saving shall become effective.

I do not understand why it is that those in charge of the national-defense program, those who must realize the strain there is on the supply of electric current throughout the country, do not see the possibility of conserving our electric energy by diverting that which would be used for domestic purposes for as much as an hour a day to our national-defense program. By adoption of the idea of daylight saving a considerable amount of electric energy which is now consumed for domestic purposes could be diverted to our national-defense program.

There would seem to be some merit in the proposition because in a semi-official way, by public pronouncements, the Office of Production Management and the Secretary of the Interior have endorsed it. Commercial bodies throughout the country have endorsed it, and in many parts of the country it is now in operation. At this time when conservation is urged upon us in every direction, we might better be taking advantage of our natural resources of which sunlight is one of the most available rather than attempting to provide at considerable cost additional facilities for generating electricity which will not be available for some months to come. Additional electric energy is immediately available by the conservation of daylight. All we need to do to conserve the equivalent of 1 hour of electric energy is to borrow 60 minutes of the afternoon and add it to the morning hours. That will result immediately if the bill I am introducing is adopted.

There are many other reasons why we should conform our habits to the great national resource of sunlight, but the need for the conservation of electric energy and the possibility of diverting a considerable amount of it to the demands of the defense program is argument enough for immediate action. Early enactment of the bill I have introduced will add immeasurably to the solution of an important phase of our national defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Apostle Paul, after having persecuted the church and early Christions, changed his course and became one of the greatest advocates of the church and Christianity. It was said of him he was an apostle born out of season.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress, with very limited information before our committee and the Congress, with much misgiving I voted in favor of a wire-tapping bill; but since that time our Committee on the Judiciary has held very extensive and careful hearings. The information developed at these hearings has definitely changed my viewpoint on this important issue, and I am very glad today to have an opportunity to speak and vote in opposition to this bill.

Our committee heard many witnesses, but the only witness who appeared before our committee in favor of this bill, as I recall, was Mr. Holtzoff, special assistant to the Attorney General. All the other witnesses expressed strong opposition to it. Every businessman who appeared before our committee testified against the bill.

To me, the clearest, strongest, and most convincing testimony of the witnesses is not printed in the hearings and is not available to you. I refer to Hon. James L. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. He in my opinion knows more about this subject than any other man who appeared before our committee. He testified in executive session. I would not mention his evidence but for the fact that his testimony has appeared in the press and others have spoken of it in debate here today. He analyzed this bill most carefully. He was very positive in his statements that this measure is not necessary, it is not feasible, and while it would infringe upon the rights of the American people as set forth in article IV of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, it would not accomplish the purposes for which it is intended. He further stated most positively that this invasion of the rights of the American people could not be justified on any ground.

He pointed out that while this bill provides for tapping of the radio, the telegraph, and the telephone, it could serve no purpose whatsoever so far as the radio and the telegraph are concerned, and the benefits from tapping the telephone wires would be negligible compared to the harm done to the American people. He very well said it certainly would not be necessary to tap the radio because radio could be received everywhere by anyone who had radio instruments and equipment. Radio broadcasts cannot be concealed.

This bill provides that someone must make a statement to the Attorney General, and then the Attorney General would issue a certificate authorizing the wires of a certain person or persons to be tapped. This would be unnecessary so far as the telegraph is concerned, because if any Federal agent had sufficient information to advise the Attorney General that a certain person was about to send a telegram, the agent could apprehend the criminal, if he was a criminal, on the spot at the time he sent the wire, and then the authorities could apprehend the man or woman on the other end to whom the wire was being sent.

Representatives of patriotic groups and many individuals appeared and testified against the bill. The representatives of all of the railroad brotherhoods strongly urged the defeat of this measure. They pointed out that railroad communications were handled to a large extent over the telephones, and the tapping of these telephone wires would endanger the operation of the trains, the crews, and passengers; and furthermore they felt that this measure was an attack upon the working people of this country.

The representatives of the American Federation of Labor gave most convincing and pertinent testimony in opposition to the bill. Representatives of the mine workers, the C. I. O., and other labor groups strongly urged the defeat of this bill. Some able lawyers showed most conclusively that this measure was violative of our Bill of Rights, the fourth amendment to the Constitution. No one pointed out any real need of this legislation.

It is most interesting to note that in all the history of this Government, in peacetime and in all of its wars, no such measure has ever been enacted into law. If we could fight our other wars successfully without such legislation, why pass this bill when we are not at war?

It is insisted that we pass this bill in order to enable the Department of Justice to investigate and apprehend those guilty

of sabotage, espionage, kidnaping, and extortion. Some years ago we had an epidemic of kidnaping. The F. B. I. and other law-enforcement agencies apprehended the guilty parties, but without wire tapping, except in perhaps a single important case. The Lindbergh and other great kidnaping cases were solved without resorting to wire tapping. Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hillman, cochairmen of our defense program, sometime ago testified before our committee that sabotage in this country was negligible and that there was no real danger from this source. The papers today disclosed that the F. B. I. had rounded up a spy ring and a number of them have already pleaded guilty. They did not resort to wire tapping.

The witnesses who appeared before our committee, with the exception of Mr. Holtzoff, the Assistant Attorney General, uniformly condemned wire tapping as violative of some of the great fundamental rights of American citizens. Let us see what the Supreme Court and other great agencies, including Mr. Hoover, the very able and splendid Director of the F. B. I., had to say about wire tapping.

JUSTICES STONE, BUTLER, HOLMES, AND BRANDEIS OPPOSE

In the celebrated case of *Olmstead* v. *United States*, reported in Two Hundred and Seventy-seven United States Reports, pages 438, 478, and 479, Justice Stone, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and former Justices Brandeis, Butler, and Holmes had this to say about wire tapping:

> The evil incident to invasion of privacy of the telephone is far greater than that involved in tampering with the mails. Whenever a telephone line is tapped, the privacy of the persons at both ends of the line is invaded and all conversations between them upon any subject, and although proper, confidential, and privileged, may be overheard. Moreover, the tapping of one man's telephone line involves the tapping of the telephone of every other person whom he may call, or who may call him. As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping (277 U. S. 438, 478–479).

You will observe that they say that—

> The evil incident to invasion of privacy of the telephone is far greater than that involved in tampering with the mails. * * * Moreover, the tapping of one man's telephone line involves the tapping of the telephone of every other person whom he may call, or who may call him.

It was testified that in efforts to tap wires, thousands of conversations were heard that yielded no information about the purpose for which the wires were being tapped. This would disclose the most intimate relations—family, social, business, and political.

In trying to describe the evil of wire tapping these great men of our Supreme Court use this most significant language:

> As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping.

They have wire tapping in Russia and Germany and other nations ruled by dictators and autocrats. This espionage upon the lives of the people has created fear and has caused a greater part of their population to discontinue the use of telephones.

Before the Revolution the British Government tyrannized the American Colonies with writs of assistance and general warrants. They invaded the privacy and searched the homes of the Colonists. This was the real cause of the Revolution. The Colonists claimed that as Englishmen the privacy of their homes could not be invaded. The Revolution was fought, the Constitution was established by the Revolutionary patriots, and they wrote into the Constitution, in the Bill of Rights, article IV, a provision that would forever protect from invasion the homes of the citizens of this country.

Wire tapping violates not only article IV but, likewise, article V of the Bill of Rights. Wire tapping must be bad when these great judges say that espionage, writs of assistance, and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping. Our forefathers fought to get rid of espionage, writs of assistance, and general warrants, but here we are today trying to fasten upon our people a much greater instrument of tyranny and oppression than they were.

Justice Holmes, that grand old man of the Supreme Court, referred to wire tapping as—

> Such dirty business * * * such iniquities.

Wire tapping was also denounced by the New York Supreme Court and many other high courts in the various States of the Union.

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER CONDEMNS WIRE TAPPING

I have always been a great admirer of Mr. Hoover and his organization. I think he has and is rendering wonderful services to our country. Mr. Hoover said in 1939:

> While I concede that the telephone tap is from time to time of limited value in the criminal investigative field, I frankly and sincerely believe that if a statute of this kind were enacted the abuses arising therefrom would far outweigh the value which might accrue to law enforcement as a whole.

On March 29, 1939, Mr. Hoover wrote a confidential memorandum opposing a bill then in Congress at the instance of the Treasury Department, giving Government agencies the right to tap wires. He stated in that memorandum that he had men who were expert at tapping wires, but if he let them practice it to any extent they would turn crooks in no time. In a departmental notice of Attorney General Jackson in 1940 it was stated:

> It is believed by the Attorney General and the Director of the Bureau of Investigation that the discredit and suspicion of the law-enforcing branch which arises from the occasional use of wire tapping more than offsets the good which is likely to come of it. We have, therefore, completely abandoned the practice as to the Department of Justice.

THE SENATE COMMITTEE CONDEMNS

Certain persons in high authority, including a Senator, tapped wires, seized thousands of telegrams and used dictographs. This whole matter was investigated by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate and they made their report in the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, Report No. 1304, in which they strongly condemned wire tapping in the following language:

> Wire tapping and other unethical devices may lead to a variety of oppressions that may never reach the ears of the courts. That some agencies of law enforcement are not likely, in regard to the problem of wire tapping and dictographing, to be guided by the fine sense of ethical decency which has been expounded by the Supreme Court and embodied in the Bill of Rights is unfortunately clear from a long history of unauthorized and unlawful police activity. * * * Some people have argued from time to time that wire tapping, dictographing, and similar devices should be permitted, else society will suffer and criminals prosper. This argument has even been urged in defense of the "third degree." * * * Whether it be the use of wire tapping or dictographs by those seeking to detect crime, or their use by those seeking to commit crime, the effect on our judicial and social system is far reaching.

The able and distinguished Senator Ashurst, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, denounced wire tapping and praised the House for having condemned the practice. He stated:

> It is refreshing, it is like a breath of pure air in a fetid atmosphere, to find that another body of Congress—the body which holds the purse strings and sends to us the appropriation bills, has set its seal of condemnation upon the use of Federal funds to induce men to violate the law—has condemned wire tapping and purchase of evidence.

Of course, those of us who oppose this measure do not favor espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, or extortion. We desire to see criminals apprehended and punished, but, as pointed out by Mr. Fly, members of the Supreme Court, Mr. Hoover, Attorney General Jackson, and others, the evils that would follow this violation of the fourth and fifth amendments to our Constitution would greatly outweigh any benefits that might accrue. It has been urged in debate today that an honest man should not fear wire tapping and that only criminals need fear wire tapping. When the Colonists, before the Revolution, complained of the searches of their homes by British officials, these British officials told these Colonists that every honest man should be willing for any official to enter his home at any time and violate his privacy, but these honest, God-fearing Colonists did not agree, and one of the great purposes in fighting the Revolution was to make their homes safe and private from intrusion. They were so deeply interested about this matter that they insured this protection by adopting in the Bill of Rights the fourth amendment to the Constitution.

The Congress, for some time, at the behest of the administration, has been infringing upon the rights and liberties of the American people. We have been aping the laws and policies of the dictator nations of the world. We have been regimenting agriculture, labor, and industry. This bureaucratic control of the American people has grown by leaps and bounds in the past few years. On Friday of this week we shall celebrate

the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the birth of this great, free country. I hope that this House will not on today pass this bill and further undo the great work of our founding fathers and take away some of the great liberties of the American people. It has not been found necessary in 165 years, in peace or in war, to tap the wires and invade the privacy of the homes and the offices of the people of this Nation.

DEPORT ENEMY ALIENS

It is urged that we have enemy aliens in this country, subversive groups, the largest of which is the Communists. Who has given more encouragement, aid, and comfort to the radicals in this Nation of whom we now complain than the present administration? Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover refused to recognize communistic Russia. One of the first acts of the present administration was to recognize that country and admit Russian nationals to come to the United States. They have created more discord, stirred up more trouble, and done more harm than any other group of aliens that has come to our land.

One of the chief purposes of investigating committees of Congress has been the investigation of the subversive activities of the Communists. They have been considered such a menace to this country that Congress passed a law making membership in the Communist Party a deportable offense. There are now about 1,300 of these enemy aliens, Communists, who have been convicted and ordered deported, and there are about 500 Italian Fascists in the same category; but none of them have been deported. The administration gives the excuse that these persons cannot be deported until their countries grant them passports. Russia has all along refused to grant passports to its Communist citizens in this country. They have come here to bore into our labor organizations, our churches, our schools, and even into farm organizations, in order to create discord and terrorism.

These 1,300 Russian Communists and 500 Italian Fascists are considered enemy aliens and dangerous to this country, yet nearly all of them are at liberty. They cannot be deported, they say, because their countries will not receive them.

Last year the House passed a bill giving authority to restrain these aliens until they could be deported, but this bill failed in the Senate. We are now months in the new Seventy-seventh Congress, yet no measure has been passed to detain these enemy aliens, each and every one of whom has been ordered deported to protect our country. The administration has a big majority in the House and Senate. Why do not the President and his leaders get behind these bills and put them through? What would wire tapping benefit to capture more enemy aliens if we do not do any more about it than we have with the aliens who have already been captured, convicted, and ordered deported?

The House passed a special bill by almost unanimous vote ordering the deportation of Harry Bridges. He is admittedly an alien. The Attorney General says it has been established that he is a Communist. The Senate failed to act on that bill, and Harry Bridges is still in the United States. It required no wire tapping to get all the proof necessary on Harry Bridges.

The man who led the strike in the North American Aeronautic plant in which 12,000 men were on a strike in one of our great defense plants defied the national leaders of his own organization, defied the Mediation Board and defied the President. This man is not only a Communist but he has been convicted twice of felonies such as stealing automobiles. He is still in the United States. What effort has been made to deport him?

If this administration had put into effect our immigration laws and deported alien criminal Communists like this man, it would not have been necessary to have called out the Army. It required no wire tapping to secure the evidence against this man and hundreds of other criminal aliens who could have been long ago deported under our laws.

I have been and I shall continue to urge this administration to no longer coddle these enemy aliens and subversive groups. The administration, however, is now on the spot. The President has announced all-out aid to Russia. We now recognize her as one of the great leaders, our ally, in the fight for democracy in Europe, Asia, and Africa—God save the mark.

Russia is gorged with the loot of many nations. Her hands are red with the blood of millions of innocent and defenseless men, women, and children. It was a sad day when this administration recognized Russia and opened our gates to her hordes of Communists who are determined to overthrow every government that refuses to accept Communism.

I am not pro-Hitler, pro-Mussolini, or pro-Stalin. I shall continue to be pro-American. No good can come of this unholy alliance with God-hating, liberty-hating, and America-hating Russia.

May we again urge the administration to deport or get behind measures that will detain these enemy aliens who are within our gates? It does not require any wire-tapping bill to accomplish these most laudable purposes. When such action is taken, I then shall have more faith in the good intentions of the administration to rid our country of enemy aliens and subversive groups.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I believe a good deal of the opposition to this bill is based on objections to H. R. 2266, which was discarded by the Judiciary Committee. All the sound arguments that were made against that bill were weighed by the committee and an entirely new bill was drafted containing most of the suggestions that were made by the President, the Attorney General, and members of the committee, to limit its scope to reasonable bounds. The bill before us is not H. R. 2266, although we are hearing arguments against it; we are considering H. R. 4228.

The point was raised by the last speaker, and I think it is a very inconsequential one, that more witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill H. R. 2266 than appeared in favor of it. I cannot go quite as far as my friend from Georgia in agreeing that it was largely communistic influence that opposed this bill, but I do say that those groups of people who call themselves liberals and adopt high-sounding names for their organizations, and who are always extremely active when legislation aimed at subversive influences is before the House, appeared in large numbers. Of course, there were also some fine and sincere men and women who appeared in opposition to wire tapping on general principles.

I have observed that there is a type of liberal who is very, very glib when it comes to discussing the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and when it best serves his purpose. I venture to say if there had been any organized effort to produce a battery of witnesses in favor of this bill we could have filled the Capitol. I myself have talked to dozens of lawyers and judges of repute and standing and I have yet to find one, when he knows what this bill is, who does not favor it. So I say the argument used by our friend from Kentucky, much as we all love him, has no substance whatever. You cannot pass on the merits of a bill by counting the noses of volunteer witnesses.

It might be well to quote the leading supporter of this bill just briefly, a man whose position demands respect and whose testimony in my mind outweighs that of the many who cannot speak with authority or experience—the Attorney General, the chief law officer of the United States:

> My present concern is with the very practical work of protecting decent citizens, and indeed the Nation itself, against criminals, spies, and saboteurs. Such persons, under existing law, have one great method of communication which they may use without fear of leaving incriminating trails—the telephone and telegraph. If a criminal writes a letter he runs the risk that it will fall into the hands of the law. If he transacts his illegal business in person, he may be overheard by an eavesdropper. If he sends a confederate to act for him the confederate may betray him. All such evidence is good in court against him. But so long as he uses the telephone or telegraph he is sheltered against law-enforcement officers.

There is this principal argument for the bill, and you cannot treat it lightly. The limitations in this bill have been fully described. Intercepted messages on the telephone, telegraph, and radio can only be used as evidence in connection with the investigation, prevention, and prosecution of the four most heinous crimes known to the Federal law, and then only when the Attorney General certifies he has reasonable grounds for believing that one of these crimes has been committed, is being committed, or is about to be committed, and further certifies the facts on which he bases his reason to believe that one of these crimes has been or is about to be committed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Is it not true that in most of the States where the common law obtains eavesdropping is prohibited? Does

this statute do anything except provide that in four cases a man can eavesdrop and his evidence will be competent in court?

Mr. HANCOCK. I do not quite understand it that way. Eavesdropping is legal in most States for purposes of evidence. The common law permitted the use of incriminating evidence in criminal cases, even though illegally obtained, and that is still the law in many States. Listening in on the telegraph, radio, and telephone has been legal and testimony thus obtained has been admissible in criminal actions since these things were invented. That would be the law now except for the questionable decision of the Supreme Court in the *Nordom case* (302 U. S. —).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. HANCOCK. Of course we all despise the Paul Prys, the spies, the peeping Toms and snoopers in ordinary everyday life, but how can peace officers do their jobs if they do not resort to undercover practices? If we leave the law as it is it will make it impossible for law enforcing officers to use incriminating evidence against the worst and most dangerous crooks. Mind you, there is no law against cutting in on a telephone conversation, none whatever, but if peace officers get incriminating evidence thereby, there is a legal bar against using it. Under the law as it now stands you cannot use such evidence. The present law is a cloak and a shield for the most desperate and dangerous thugs in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think it can be safely said that we are all strongly against sabotage, espionage, kidnaping, and extortion, and I think it may be said that all or almost all of us deplore the idea of wire tapping, because we realize that it is, as the President recently said, one of the worst possible methods of oppression against a free people. The question is whether in spite of its evil it is something we should legalize and use as a weapon against dangerous criminals in this Republic. As has been pointed out before, there was virtually no evidence given to the committee that the practice of wire tapping is an effective instrument in the detection of crime. Some mention was made of some leads being given, but, of course, a skillful criminal does not communicate his secrets to a confederate over the telephone wire. That I assume is particularly true of foreign agents. It has been said here today through a letter from the Attorney General, read by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], that this bill would have helped prevent the attempted sabotage on Italian ships now in American ports. I submit that that argument is about as fallacious as any argument could be, and is typical of the argument made in favor of this practice. Consider what would be the case if the Department of Justice had attempted wire tapping in those cases of telegrams being sent to the ship captains. They would have had to intercept thousands upon thousands of telegrams coming into the various telegraph offices in the cities on the east coast where the ships lay in port. It would have been a tremendous waste of time and effort when they had a very simple remedy right at hand. All they had to do, if they knew, or thought they knew that some of those telegrams were going to these ship captains, was to issue a subpena against the local telegraph office, subpenaing any telegram that came in addressed to Captain So-and-So of such-and-such a ship. That is a practice that has been upheld by the courts, including the Supreme Court. It is a short and simple method and does not require the passage of any general legislation of this sort.

Furthermore, in line with what I said about foreign agents not using the phone, let us remember that in France wire tapping has for many years been a police practice. Did it stop sabotage and espionage? I suppose there is no greater evidence in the world of successful sabotage and espionage than the experience of France a little more than a year ago. We have an example in our own history about how to deal with wire tapping in the time of a national emergency. In the last war, in September 1918, we outlawed wire tapping. I heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] say a few minutes ago that we merely outlawed unauthorized wire tapping. You can call it what you will, but wire tapping was outlawed unless the people at both ends of the telephone agreed to have a third person listen in. If necessary, I can read the statute itself to prove that point.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Was not that law passed for the purpose of protecting the Government against any leak in secret information?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The law was passed for a number of reasons, according to the debates. It was passed in part to protect the Government from a leak in secret information, a leak which could be caused by talk not only by private citizens or foreign agents but by unwise and loose-talking Government agents. If wire tapping is such a tremendous weapon against sabotage and espionage, why did the administration of President Wilson, at the very peak of the war effort, throw this supposedly valuable weapon away?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Why do you think that President Roosevelt in his letter to you asked for this bill? He said he could not enforce the law without it.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The President was commenting on the original Hobbs bill, which went way beyond this bill, and indicated he thought it should be limited and did say he thought wire tapping was valuable in connection with sabotage and espionage and possibly kidnaping.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Just to call attention to the fact that this bill now before the House was drafted and drawn after the letter to you from President Roosevelt.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And in compliance with the President's letter.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That leads me to the other point that I wanted to stress. The President believed it was possible to limit this bill to those four specific crimes; that somehow wire tapping can be controlled and limited, but I submit that the very nature of the thing is such that it cannot be limited.

I would cite two cases. In the first case, in the case of a sale of drugs, a Government agent tapped literally thousands of conversations coming into the Hotel Astor. Only a few of those conversations had anything to do with the crime, but the nature of wire tapping is such that he got a great deal of illicit information, so-called, of rather a private and domestic nature by listening to these thousands of irrelevant conversations.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. In that hotel case did they tap the entire hotel?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. They were tapping three of four of the booths.

In the second case, the Tristan kidnaping case, we understand that in that case the F. B. I. investigated 22,000 suspects, all of whom proved to be innocent. Were this bill in effect, presumably the F. B. I. men would have listened in on the private conversations of at least 22,000 innocent Americans, let alone all the people who were telephoning them on private business.

It seems to me that there is so little to be gained by the passage of this bill—so little that in the last time of national crisis they threw away the weapon. There is so much to be lost by this bill, in investigative technique, the confidence of our people in our Government, our own faith in the idea of personal freedom. Against writs of assistance, against unwarranted search and seizure our forefathers stood and fought. Against foreign tyranny which maintains much of its power through the secret police weapon, of which wire tapping is a part, we stand united today. Should we seem now to start down that same secret police road to fearful despotism and tyranny, our faith would flame less brightly. I think that is the basic question to be decided at this time on this bill. The bill does not appear to be of substantial assistance in catching criminals, but does contain within itself the seeds of incalculable harm.

I hope the measure will be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I presume the debate upon this bill is as divided as it possibly can be as far as party lines are concerned. For example, we have the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT], a very devoted follower of the President, opposing this legislation, whereas I, supposed to be on the other side of the political fence, am speaking in favor of the legislation. I think perhaps it is a fair example of the division in our Judiciary Committee upon this very important proposed legislation.

I confess I approached this bill at the start with some suspicion. I think that all of us approach it with a serious sense of responsibility, a serious sense of responsibility of the times and conditions that exist in this country and in the world. I do not question at all the good faith of those who are speaking in opposition to this bill. I recognize, as they do, that we have a very disturbed public opinion, but I think we also must safeguard the Government property and lives of the people of the United States, and which would be safeguarded by this legislation.

I intend at the proper time to offer an amendment limiting the operation of this bill to 2 years, not because I am suspicious of the Attorney General's office, not that I am suspicious of the President, but because I believe that with the present disturbed state of public opinion this legislation should be for the emergency, and for the emergency only.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] made a most telling argument. I wonder if those who are so concerned about the use of telephones and the possibility of someone tapping their telephone ever realized that they do not have anything to say about the employees the telephone company hires who may necessarily choose to listen in on their confidential messages? I wonder if the gentlemen who are so solicitous about labor do not realize that if this legislation resulted in the saving of the lives of perhaps thousands of laborers engaged in munitions factories their voting for the passage of this bill would be rendering labor a tremendous service?

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] has introduced a bill, H. R. 2, providing the death penalty for saboteurs. I was particularly interested in the testimony given in connection with that bill by Mr. John J. McCloy, one of the Assistant Secretarys of War. I believe Mr. McCloy knows more about the sabotage committed in the last war than any other living person, because he spent 10 years investigating the Black Tom disaster in which millions and millions of rounds of ammunition were blown up and some laborers lost their lives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I think one of the most significant things to note in connection with that Black Tom explosion, which occurred in 1917, was that the first cable sent in reference to it was way back in 1915.

These people who act as spies and saboteurs in this country will be much more concerned if this type of wire tapping is permitted. For example, according to Mr. McCloy's testimony, the evidence which fixed the blame for many of the acts of sabotage during the last war were not discovered until long after the war, and were then discovered through the effective use of wire tapping, and discovered only because of wire tapping by the British Government.

It is fantastic for us to believe or even suppose that our Government can catch spies and saboteurs without using wire tapping to the limited extent provided in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4228) to permit the limited use of wire tapping, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5166. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5166) to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5049) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment 52: Page 35, strike out all of lines 14 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur in the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot be a party to receding and concurring to the Senate on this item because of the principle involved. At this time I want the House to know what it is confronted with. Last week this House sustained your committee, and now you are asked to bow and surrender to the other body.

For the information of the House, you recently voted that children of people living in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and other States for that matter, cannot secure free tuition in the schools of the District of Columbia. Now you are asked to forget what you did and surrender to the Senate, which has decided that students of these other States may come here and get their tuition free of charge. It so happens that most of these students come from Maryland and Virginia because they live so close to the District. What it amounts to is about $280,000 a year free tuition for these students. It means that you are relieving the taxpayers in these two neighboring States of so much taxation each year and putting that burden on the backs of the taxpayers of not only the District but on the shoulders of the taxpayers in my State of Nebraska and the taxpayers of other States. It is just not fair, and I cannot be a party to receding and concurring, and demand a vote in spite of the fact that my chairman moves that we recede and concur. This fight represents one of many years' standing. The Maryland and Virginia Representatives are very powerful and have been successful in this sectional legislation. Because it represents the money of my own taxpayers as well as the money of District taxpayers, I feel I must represent them as honestly and fairly as I can. The taxpayers of this District do not have a vote. They pay taxes and have no representation. Here they are called upon to use their tax money as well as the money of my own people and just hand it over to relieve the tax burden of the people in Maryland and Virginia. The people of this District are silenced because they cannot vote, and they have no voice in the affairs of their city or Federal governments. But I insist on raising my voice in their behalf and will fight this issue out. If this House does not sustain me, I serve notice now that I shall come back soon with a bill upon which I shall demand full and complete hearings. I urge now a negative vote on this motion.

Mr. SASSCER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Does the gentleman realize that this is not sectional, that probably 60 to 75 percent of these people to whom the gentleman refers as Maryland citizens are, as a matter of fact, from his State and the State of every Member, who have retained their residence in the State from which they came for voting purposes?

Mr. STEFAN. There are people here from every district in the United States.

In reply to the gentleman from Maryland, I merely wish to say that he represents a district which borders this city. His district is the beneficiary of much of this legislation. I cannot blame him for fighting for his taxpayers. I am doing the same for mine, plus trying to give the silenced people here some representation. To him and his colleagues I wish to pay a compliment. They are always on the alert to take care of their districts. He and his colleagues should be congratulated.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, after all, the matter in disagreement between the House and the Senate is a legislative matter on an appropriation bill. I think the position of the House was correct in the matter of people who live outside the District being required to pay tuition. I concede, however, that there is some merit in the argument to the contrary. In view of the fact that this is a legislative provision, that the law is rather complicated, and it is highly difficult to deal with this thing on an appropriation bill, and in view of the further fact that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who has been so diligent in pursuing his convictions on the subject, is introducing a bill to cover the situation, I think the best thing for us to do is to break the deadlock with the Senate and recede and concur.

I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—yeas 28, noes 41.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 141, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—147

Allen, La.	Brooks	Cannon, Fla.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Brown, Ga.	Cannon, Mo.
Beckworth	Bryson	Casey, Mass.
Beiter	Buck	Chapman
Boehne	Buckler, Minn.	Cochran
Boggs	Bulwinkle	Coffee, Wash.
Boland	Burch	Cole, Md.
Bonner	Burdick	Collins
Bradley, Pa.	Byrne	Connery
Byron	Cooper	Costello
Cravens	Creal	Crosser
D'Alesandro	Davis, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.
Dingell	Doughton	Downs
Doxey	Duncan	Durham
Eberharter	Elliot, Mass.	Elliott, Calif.
Faddis	Fitzgerald	Fitzpatrick
Folger	Ford, Miss.	Fulmer
Gathings	Geyer, Calif.	Gibson
Granger	Grant, Ala.	Gregory
Haines	Hare	Harris, Va.
Hébert	Hill, Wash.	Hobbs
Hull	Hunter	Imhoff
Izac	Jackson	Jarman
Johnson, Luther A.	Kee	Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.	Kilday	Kocialkowski
Lanham	Larrabee	Lea
Leavy	Lesinski	Lewis
McCormack	McIntyre	McMillan
Maciejewski	Mahon	Mansfield
Marcantonio	May	Meyer, Md.
Mills, Ark.	Mills, La.	Mitchell
Monroney	Murdock	Norrell
O'Brien, Mich.	O'Connor	Patman
Patton	Pearson	Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Pierce
Priest	Rabaut	Ramsay
Ramspeck	Randolph	Rankin, Miss.
Richards	Robertson, Va.	Robinson, Utah
Russell	Sabath	Sanders
Sasscer	Satterfield	Scanlon
Schuetz	Schulte	Shanley
Smith, Conn.	Smith, Wash.	South
Sparkman	Spence	Starnes, Ala.
Sullivan	Tarver	Tenerowicz
Terry	Thom	Thomason
Traynor	Voorhis, Calif.	Ware
Weaver	Weiss	Wene
West	Whelchel	Wickersham
Williams	Worley	Youngdahl

NAYS—141

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Paddock
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Pheiffer, William T.
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Pittenger
Arends	Guyer, Kans.	Ploeser
Arnold	Gwynne	Poage
Barnes	Hall, Leonard W.	Powers
Baumhart	Halleck	Rankin, Mont.
Bell	Hancock	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Harness	Reed, Ill.
Bennett	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hill, Colo.	Rich
Blackney	Hoffman	Rizley
Bolton	Holmes	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Jarrett	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Rolph
Carlson	Jennings	Rutherford
Carter	Jensen	Sauthoff
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Calif.	Sheppard
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Simpson
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Maine
Clason	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Kean	Springer
Cluett	Keefe	Stefan
Coffee, Nebr.	Kilburn	Stevenson
Copeland	Kinzer	Stratton
Crawford	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Crowther	Kunkel	Sutphin
Culkin	Lambertson	Talle
Cunningham	Landis	Thill
Curtis	LeCompte	Tibbott
Day	McGregor	Tinkham
Dewey	McKeough	Treadway
Disney	McLaughlin	Van Zandt
Dondero	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Walter
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Englebright	Mason	Wheat
Fellows	Michener	Wolcott
Fenton	Moser	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fogarty	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Forand	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Gal	Murray	Wright
Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young
Gehrmann	O'Hara	
Gerlach	Oliver	
Gilchrist	Osmers	

NOT VOTING—144

Andresen, August H.	Bolles	Colmer
Andrews	Boren	Cooley
Angell	Boykin	Courtney
Baldwin	Buckley, N. Y.	Cox
Barden	Burgin	Cullen
Barry	Camp	Delaney
Bates, Ky.	Capozzoli	Dickstein
Bates, Mass.	Cartwright	Dies
Beam	Celler	Dirksen
Bland	Clark	Ditter
Bloom	Claypool	Domengeaux
Cole, N. Y.	Douglas	Drewry
Edmiston	Ellis	Elston
Engel	Fish	Flaherty
Flannagan	Flannery	Ford, Leland M.
Ford, Thomas F.	Gavagan	Gearhart
Gifford	Gore	Gossett
Green	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Harrington
Harris, Ark.	Hart	Harter
Healey	Heffernan	Heidinger
Hendricks	Hess	Hinshaw
Holbrock	Hook	Houston
Jacobsen	Jenks, N. H.	Johns
Johnson, Ind.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Johnson, W. Va.
Jones	Kelly, Ill.	Kennedy, Martin J.
Kennedy, Michael J.	Keogh	Kerr
Kirwan	Kleberg	Kopplemann
Kramer	Ludlow	Lynch
McArdle	McGehee	McGranery
Maas	Macior	Magnuson
Merritt	Myers, Pa.	Nelson
Nichols	Norton	O'Day
O'Leary	O'Neal	O'Toole
Pace	Patrick	Plauché
Plumley	Rees, Kans.	Rivers
Rockefeller	Rogers, Okla.	Romjue
Sacks	Schaefer, Ill.	Scott
Scrugham	Secrest	Shafer, Mich.
Shannon	Sheridan	Short
Sikes	Smith, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.	Snyder	Somers, N. Y.
Steagall	Stearns, N. H.	Sumners, Tex.
Sweeney	Taber	Taylor
Thomas, N. J.	Thomas, Tex.	Tolan
Vincent, Ky.	Vinson, Ga.	Vreeland
Wadsworth	Wasielewski	White
Whittington	Wigglesworth	Wilson
Winter	Woodrum, Va.	Zimmerman

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Elston against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia for, with Mr. Jones against.

Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Bolles against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Mr. Secrest for, with Mr. Johnson of Indiana against.

General pairs:

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Dirksen.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Claypool with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Short.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Johns.

Mr. Keough with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Andrews

Mr. Clark with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Green with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Whittington with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Maciora with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Barry.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gore.

Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Myers of Pensylvania with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Zimmerman.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Boren.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Sachs.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Sumners of Texas.

Mr. YOUNG changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SCANLON and Mr. HUNTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 35, after line 19, insert "The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia, shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

WIRE TAPPING

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4228.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4228, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the debate on this measure and, despite my great respect for the opinion of those who oppose its enactment, I cannot see the validity of the objections to its passage. It is not aimed at the constitutional rights and liberties of the law-abiding people of this country. It is aimed at the activities of those who at this time seek to commit espionage; that is, to play the role of a spy in a manner inimicable to the interests and safety of the American people. It is further aimed at those who seek to or may have been committed the offense of sabotage; that is, those who are undertaking to destroy our defense industries.

To be brief, these first two offenses are aimed at the security of the Nation and the people as a whole. The other two offenses which this bill seeks to prevent and, in the event they have been committed, to aid in the apprehension of the criminal, are offenses against the persons of our citizens, that is, kidnaping and extortion.

Before this act can be put into effect, an officer of the United States whose business it is to prevent these four offenses from being committed or to apprehend the criminals who have committed them must make application to the Attorney General of the United States, and then the Attorney General shall give permission for the so-called tapping of the wires for the interception of a telephone message or of a telegram or any other method of communication between the criminal and his accomplices. The Attorney General shall embody in such certificate a statement of the facts on which he acted, and this certificate is made a permanent part of the records of the Department of Justice.

A complete answer to the argument of those who say that this measure is an invasion of the rights of the people is contained in the last provision of the bill, which denounces as a felony punishable by imprisonment of not more than 2 years and a fine of $10,000 the attempt by anyone to use the information thus obtained in any way except for the prosecution of the offenses against which the bill is aimed.

In addition, the bill simply makes this certificate of the Attorney General the foundation upon which the evidence obtained can be introduced in the court. It does not strip a defendant, even a spy, even a saboteur, even a kidnaper, even an extortionist, of any one of the constitutional safeguards that are thrown around a person accused of crime.

Is there any extenuation for the offense of kidnaping, extortion, sabotage, or spying against the safety of this country? In other words, this bill simply permits the law enforcement officers of this country to avail themselves of the use of the varied instrumentalities sought to be used and now used with impunity by the criminals of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am not so much concerned about these fellows who want to commit a crime of this kind. I rather subscribe to the doctrine that the apprehension and punishment of the criminal is justice to him and mercy to the great body of the law-abiding people of this country. We have had just a little bit too much coddling of the criminal over here, as expressed by the person who said—

When an enterprising burglar is not burgling
And the cutthroat is not busy with his crimes,
He loves to listen to the little brook agurgling
And to hear the merry village chimes.

There is nothing in this bill that threatens the security or the liberty of a single law-abiding citizen of this country and, in my opinion, the bill should become a law and I expect to vote for it. I agree with Bobby Burns that the fear of hell and the hangman's noose is what keeps the wretch in order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been a change of attitude on this legislation, not only on the part of the author of the bill but also Government officials. The original bill was so worded that its defeat was certain. So we find a revised or compromised bill presented to us today.

Are we to forget article 4 of the Bill of Rights? Those who have time and again appeared in defense of the Constitution should again read the provisions of article 4 which says in part:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.

The original bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama gave to any enforcement officer of the Government the right to tap wires. The revised bill limits the authority to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Included in the bill that would enable wires to be tapped are the kidnaping and extortion acts. Not violations alone but, and I quote, "may about to be committed," meaning someone is suspected as about to commit a crime. Even if they suspect one they can tap wires.

Now it so happens that I am coauthor of the kidnaping act and author of the extortion act. I want to see those laws and all other laws enforced but I say they can be enforced as they have been in the past without resorting, and I use the language of Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in his dissenting opinion in 1928, "dirty business." And what did another famous Justice of the Supreme Court, Justice Brandeis, say? Again I quote:

Writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping.

Congress outlawed wire tapping in 1934 and here you in part restore that "dirty business."

No evidence has been presented or made public that would warrant me to say this legislation is necessary from the standpoint of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we have not had a major kidnaping case in this country in several years. Every hour of the day extortionists are at work. There were only three kidnaping cases in this country where wire tapping was used, according to Department of Justice officials.

Does that warrant any such legislation as this?

I am sorry that we do not have here the testimony of the Chairman of the Communications Commission, Mr. Fly. I understand he assailed this legislation. Where is it?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman doubtless knows that the reason we do not have his testimony is that he himself requested that it not be put on record.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not think the committee should have kept the testimony from the Members of this body. We should have had the benefit of his information. He is an expert witness.

You talk about kidnaping. I stood on the floor one whole afternoon fighting to pass the Kidnaping Act, and I had lots of trouble. Before I was able to get it passed by this House I had to amend the bill to make it life imprisonment rather than capital punishment, but the very ones who fought that law then came back at the next session of the Congress and were responsible for putting the capital-punishment provision in the law just as it is today.

Let me recall that it has only been a short time ago that Attorney General Jackson and J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F. B. I., referred to wire tapping as unethical as well as illegal. What made them change their opinion?

We can enforce these laws without violating article IV of the Bill of Rights, and we should read that article over again before we vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago, like many Members of the House, I was thrilled at the magnificent presentation made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], and I know we were all thrilled when he talked about the success in breaking up the spy ring, as he describes it, in this Nation. Then he pointed out the need at this particular time to exert every power we possibly can to the end that these spies may be incarcerated. In this connection I want to read to you a headline that appears in this morning's Philadelphia Enquirer, one of the great newspapers of the country:

F. B. I. ARRESTS 29 IN GERMAN SPY RING

In the biggest spy suspect round-up in the history of the United States, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, announced today 29 persons had been arrested on charges of conspiracy to engage in espionage activities in the United States.

Did he have to tap wires to break up that ring? Was it necessary for the Congress to give this competent public servant additional powers in order to bring about the detection of a group that was undermining our Nation? Oh, no. Mr. Hoover found the means of crime detection in his power adequate to meet the very situation that we say we are trying to meet today, and it seems to me this particular case offers proof conclusive that additional legislation is not necessary.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I think the announcement of the arrest of 29 of these spies the night before the bill comes before the Congress, after having been pending for 2 years, shows a great sense of timing on the part of the Department of Justice.

Mr. WALTER. I do not think the Department deliberately waited, although I do know that Mr. Hoover has always felt that wire tapping is unnecessary.

Who is it that wants this legislation? Who is it that says it is necessary in order to detect crime? Well, one representative of the Department of Justice, one man, appears before the Judiciary Committee and he apparently made out a case, or at least he satisfied some people; but bear in mind that the enactment of this legislation opens the door for more abuses than we have ever seen coming from an administrative branch of the Government. Justice Holmes refers to wire tapping as "dirty business," and it has always been regarded as dirty business not because all of us want to assist criminals in carrying on their nefarious processes; some of us are interested in seeing that they are not permitted to go too far, but when a wire is tapped, how does anybody know that the wire that is being tapped is not that of some innocent person, thereby placing in the hands of unscrupulous people the power of extortion, if you please, way beyond anything we are trying to meet today?

Oh, I am afraid of this great bureaucracy we have built up. I will say so frankly before anyone. We have day by day surrendered one after another of our powers to the point where we cannot very successfully resist any request that comes from the executive branch of our Government. It seems to me we ought to stop now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks who advocates this bill. He is not a member of the subcommittee, but he is a member of the Judiciary Committee and should know who advocates the bill. To refresh his memory I call his attention to page 18 of the hearings, the statement of Mr. Robert Jackson, the Attorney General of the United States, in substance saying that if he is expected to enforce the law he must have this legislation.

I also call his attention to page 112 of the hearings, the statement of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the man whom he just discussed, who says:

I have examined the pending bill on the subject (H. R. 2266). I feel that it could be improved. If its scope were to be limited to a few crimes specifically enumerated, such as those I have mentioned here—

the four crimes mentioned in the bill. Continuing, he says:

If so limited, I favor its enactment.

Then I call his attention to page 257 of the hearings, where the President of the United States specifically wrote a letter and asked that this bill be enacted in the form it is now before the Congress, and I want to call attention to the fact that these hearings were held on two bills which are not now before the Congress, and that after the hearings and after these people spoke the objections raised were met by the committee and are covered in the pending bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I direct the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that a letter has just been handed me signed by the Secretary of the Navy, in which he says:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to be put upon record as endorsing the passage of H. R. 4228 and also H. R. 3. These deal with the question of espionage and sabotage and their passage in my judgment would be in the public interest.

Yours sincerely, FRANK KNOX.

Mr. MICHENER. Why, of course. I understand the Intelligence Divisions of the War Department and of the Navy Department are for this bill. I was against it in the beginning. I do not want a general wire-tapping bill, but when the President and the Attorney General, and when the military departments of this country, charged with the responsibility of protecting the country against sabotage, say to the Congress that they must have this legislation if they are to do the job, I cannot see my way clear to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, we have listened with much interest to the entire discussion both for and against the pending bill. The fact that there is such wide divergence of opinion among so many sincere, intelligent, and honorable Members of this body is within itself a compliment to the democratic processes of government. I am sure that every Member who has spoken for and against this measure, over which there is considerable controversy, is sincere and honest in the position taken.

Nevertheless, it is significant that practically every speaker for the opposition to this measure has opposed it on the theory that it is a general wire-tapping bill. Frankly, I agree wholeheartedly with many of the statements made against the practice of wire tapping in general, but may I call your attention to the fact that 98 percent of the argument made in opposition to the pending measure does not apply in the slightest degree against this bill. How any person can read the bill before us and come to such a conclusion is beyond my understanding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for whom I have a very high regard, has made two very able arguments against wire tapping in general. I must confess, however, that I do not understand his repeated declarations that the pending measure, if passed, will cause the sacred precincts of our homes to be invaded. Just whose homes would the pending legislation invade?

First, it might cause to be invaded the so-called sacred precinct, the hang-out of some criminal enemy of our Government who might commit or plan to commit espionage against the Government of the United States. What Member of this House will rise in his seat and object to that first provision? What particular sacred rights are such human beings entitled to at any time, and more specially during this grave emergency?

Second, the bill would permit, upon recommendation and specific showing of the Attorney General, the wire tapping of places of those guilty of sabotage against the Government of the United States, as in the case of the case heretofore mentioned of the Italian seamen whose ships were ordered sabotaged by an unfriendly foreign government over American telegraph lines. If this bill had been the law then that crime could and might have been prevented. Just what rights do saboteurs have that our friends of the opposition are so worried about and who would object to that provision of the pending bill?

Third, the bill applies also to the dastardly crime of kidnaping. Is the heartless and murderous kidnaper who holds in contempt the sacred precincts of anyone's home entitled to any special protection of the law? Does any Member of Congress object to the third provision against kidnapers? If so, let him speak up now.

The fourth provision applies to extortion. This heinous crime is the method usually employed by the kidnaper to extort money from the victim and the telegraph and telephone is used to a large extent by this same type of criminal. This old worn-out, and far-fetched cry about entering the sacred precincts of the home certainly does not and should not apply to the kidnaper, the extortioner, the saboteur, or those enemies of our Government who are guilty of espionage. [Applause.]

In a frantic effort to defeat this bill opinions of members of the various courts on the subject of wire tapping have been pointed to by the opposition to this bill. It is pointed out that in one important decision a member of the Supreme Court referred to wire tapping in general as "dirty business," but again let me ask, "What in the world does that argue against the pending bill"? The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked, "Who wants this bill?" and then intimates that only one little petty official has suggested it.

First and foremost, as has been pointed out, the President of the United States, who is, of course, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has urgently requested the passage of this measure. Incidentally, it is passing strange that many who give much lip service to the President have joined the bitter Roosevelt haters in opposition to this bill. The Attorney General of the United States, upon whose shoulders has fallen the responsibility of enforcing the law, has written a strong letter to the chairman of the committee specifically requesting the passage of the pending legislation. J. Edgar Hoover, who is doing a splendid job of rounding up spies and other alien enemies, has specifically stated that there is urgent need of this legislation, and as the opposition does not yet seem to know, the Secretary of War and the Intelligence Division of the Navy feel that it is essential to the enforcement of the law. Yet Members argue here all afternoon and talk long and loud about the possibility of someone wanting to "invade the sacred precincts of 133,000,000 people."

I listened with interest to the statement of another gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], the former district attorney, who has had a wide range of experience in law enforcement. He knows from the great school of experience the need of this legislation and the information the gentleman gave the Members of this body should be sufficient to pass the pending bill by an overwhelming vote. As pointed out by him and others, this bill has every safeguard possible. In the first place, may I remind Members that section specifically stating that the Attorney General of the United States must not only have reasonable ground for believing that a felony under the law of the United States as herein set forth has been or is about to be committed, but he must also certify specifically the facts forming the basis of his belief—that is to say, that such felony may have been committed or is being committed before it would be possible under the law to engage in wire tapping. Then there are other provisions and safeguards that meet any legitimate objections.

The able gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] also made his usual interesting and impassioned speech. But I must confess I found it difficult to follow his logic and reasoning. He, too, talked at some length about the supposed danger of "invading the sacred precincts of the homes of the 133,000,000 people," but if I understood him correctly, he admitted that, not only once but twice, had he voted for a general wire-tapping bill which, it must be admitted is 1,000 times broader than the pending measure. Then he confesses that he was wrong when he voted for a measure with no safeguards and with such sweeping provisions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I voted in the other Congress once for a wire-tapping bill, but since then we have had these hearings, and Mr. Fly of the Commission has testified and proved to me clearly that this measure is not necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not also true that the gentleman voted for a general wire-tapping bill in 1937; in fact that he voted for a general wire-tapping bill on two occasions and yet today makes an impassioned argument against this bill that is nothing like as far reaching as the measure to which he has given his full measure of support on two separate occasions?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Kentucky keeps his mind open for information and when he sees he is wrong he is willing to admit it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Might I not also suggest that if the gentleman was so utterly wrong and clearly mistaken then that he might possibly be wrong now? [Applause.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let us see just what it is that confronts us today. I think all Members of the House are unanimous in their opposition to a general wire-tapping bill. It is understood that an amendment will be offered to reduce the operations of this bill to 2 years. Here is the situation at the present time. The President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Hoover, the Secretary of War, and everybody insofar as I know whose business it is to protect this Nation against sabotage at this time come here and warn us from their experience and what they know that they need this proposed legislation to help them do their job for the Nation, the things that it is their responsibility to do. I ask the Members of the House, irrespective of party, this question: Are you willing to take this responsibility of failing to provide for these officers the powers which they say are necessary for them to do the job which the people of this country want them to do? That is the proposition before us, and I hope we all consider it from that angle.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask my Democratic friends, would they vote for this bill if Harry Daugherty were Attorney General? I know I would not. Who is going to succeed Robert Jackson as Attorney General? I do not know, and I doubt if any other Member knows. I would trust Mr. Jackson, but I might not trust his successor.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Why does not the gentleman ask that question about Harry Daugherty of the Members on the Republican side of the House?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I put it to all those in favor of this bill on both sides of the House. There is no way of knowing who is going to be the next Attorney General. It might be another Harry Daugherty, which I sincerely hope will not be the case. You may have some other grafter in that job who would be willing to sell to the highest bidder these writs of assistance, because that is all they amount to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Pardon me. I wish to finish my statement.

If you will recall a little American history—if that has not gone out of fashion since the lease-lend bill—I would remind you that the first gun that was fired in

the American Revolution in 1761 was against this kind of legislation. The hated writs of assistance were denounced by James Otis; and later on we had exactly the same type of legislation during that noble experiment known as prohibition. And who was it, who was seized in the dragnets when we had this search and seizure under prohibition? A lot of little petty peddlers of pint and quart bottles of moonshine. Al Capone was not seized under that act. He was taken for evading the Income Tax Act. You are going to have exactly the same situation under this business.

Those of you who will remember what took place back in the time of the first World War when we had sabotage and espionage—and I defended several of those cases at that time—will remember that the only ones who were seized were clerks who were getting about $75 or $100 a month. I challenged the Federal district attorney to go out and take a manufacturer who denounced the Government and advised men to shoot their officers. He said:

> We cannot touch him. He is too tough. We need the guns he is making for the Government.

I said:

> You know he is too tough. So you go around and take the little fellows.

Do you know what is going to happen under this act? Any 2 by 4 agent in the Department of Justice, clothed with a bit of brief authority, swelled up and snorting under his powers, is going to come in and sign up one of these things and get ready to listen in on somebody that he wants to put in jail. And he will go through with it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I am sorry. I cannot yield now.

He will go through with it and the end will be that you will have a lot of persecution of harmless, small defenseless individuals, and the big shots that we are supposed to get will, as usual, get off the hook.

I recall that at the time of the first World War, United States agents were constantly harassing those who were opposing our entrance into the war. I recall that the senior Senator from my State, the late Robert M. La Follette was hounded and persecuted, his files rifled and his records gone over with a fine-tooth comb in order that something might be pinned on him because of his views on the war.

Labor leaders were then and will be now hounded, harassed, and persecuted under the semblance of law, because they will not fall into line on this war issue. I predict that before this year is over labor leaders who advocate strikes will be seized for sabotage. Perhaps even Members of this House will have their telephone wires tapped to hang something on them.

Under the guise of espionage and sabotage anything can happen. Charges can be trumped up against labor leaders, public speakers, newspaper editors, preachers, America First Committee, and similar organizations that try to keep us out of war. And you must remember that we are not in war yet. What will happen when we get into war?

You talk about foreign agents. Do you think for 1 minute you will catch any of the German or Russian—pardon me; perhaps I should not refer to our fellow travelers—let us say Italian or Japanese foreign agents under this bill? The chances are that the embassies cannot be touched under the law and you could not serve a warrant on them. Even if you did get the goods on them you could not arrest them and could not prosecute them.

I hope the bill is defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] the balance of the time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this week we are commemorating the birthday of our country In the fourth provision of the Bill of Rights we find the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.

For a long time on the floor of this House and throughout the country political leaders of all parties have condemned the Ogpu of Joe Stalin and the Gestapo of Herr Hitler. It appears to me that here today, in order to apprehend, as they say, one or two or a group of individuals, we are violating this provision of the Bill of Rights for which our American Republic has become famous everywhere throughout the world. I cannot conceive of the need for this additional power. Why create an American Ogpu or Gestapo?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] mentioned a former statesman from my home State. I came up in Ohio politics during that period, and I was not in sympathy with the then famous Ohio gang. But let me say, regarding the present occupant of the great office, he did not need any law to turn over to Great Britain the 50 destroyers. I am not objecting to his having turned them over, but there was a right way to do it. On the floor of this House the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] remarked only last Saturday that he had visited some of the camps and they were training British air pilots in those camps. I am not objecting to the training of those air pilots, but where did they get their authority to train those pilots in the United States of America? Is there not an American Congress? When people will take privileges and rights that they do not have, without any law, what will they do when they have that right and privilege under such a provision as this? You and I know of the tyranny we experienced during the days of prohibition in Ohio. I know what was happening in Ohio when the law was then on our statute books. You remember they would raid homes promiscuously. They would declare Roman holidays and raid whole city blocks and plant evidence so that they might rake in the cash in these justice shops and mayors' courts in the villages.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But they were approved by the Chief Executive of the United States who was in power at that time.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly that was something that the United States Congress had acted upon and that was passed upon by the people of the United States. Because the people of the United States passed that law and the Congress enacted that law, those people in minor official positions took occasion to abuse the right and privilege that they had under the Constitution and laws enacted by the United States Congress.

Only last evening the former Chief Executive to whom the gentleman referred spoke of the four freedoms and said in effect:

> In order to pass on the four freedoms throughout the world do not give up the four freedoms here in the United States of America.

Therein is my objection, the giving up these four freedoms under this questionable measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, rarely do I take the floor of the House to discuss any topic, and in taking it at this time I have no criticism in mind for any of the splendid statements that have been made here today. Twenty-two years ago, however, I had the honor to serve my Government in a confidential capacity not only in this Nation but in four other nations, and I was permitted to enjoy the close cooperation of as fine a bunch of men as ever worked in any department of the Government. I can state to you, based upon those years of experience, that men of that type—and many of those same men are still left in our departments—will not misuse the power entrusted to them. I have no qualms about those gentlemen abusing the privileges accorded to them under this proposal.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. For a brief question.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman states he has no qualms about the character of the men who would enforce this legislation. I call his attention to the fact that Phillip Musica was once an employee of the F. B. I.; so also was Gaston B. Means.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Human nature is human nature, a burglar is a burglar and a thief is a thief, and you cannot make him any better by congressional legislation; but we can throw controls around those people who seek to destroy this country by the most insidious approach known to the science of mankind. If you have any reluctance in your mind or in your heart as to the splendid gentlemen who are going to handle this bill if it is enacted, throw safeguards around the use of this power but do not tie the hands of the men who are spending long hours doing everything they possibly can to bring to justice the enemies of this Nation

who themselves do not hesitate to use far worse than wire tapping to carry out their ends. In wartime this approach to the problem of dealing with spies and saboteurs is not only necessary but I believe absolutely essential. Going back to my record and experience I support the measure wholeheartedly.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, having served on the Judiciary Committee until this year, I will pronounce them ultra conservative when they permit any bill to come out that makes any change in our judicial procedure. I thought while a member of the committee that they were a little too conservative, but when the majority and the minority of the committee endorse this bill, you can rest assured—those of you who are not familiar with such things and with court procedure—that they have done nothing rashly or without full consideration.

The competition between crime and science is an eternal race. When one gets an invention the other must have an invention to meet it. What law can you pass to prevent the four classes of criminals here mentioned from wire tapping upon Government enforcement? None whatsoever; but you who propose to deny this proposition would set the law-enforcement agency one step behind in the race and refuse to put them on a plane of equality with them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have much patience with the argument made by two gentlemen here who talk about prohibition and World War No. 1. This House is united upon that question. Why discuss it? The pendulum always swings to extremes. Had the first wiretapping bill had some exceptions, perhaps it would never have been repealed, but it was repealed in toto. The pendulum swung too far. So common sense and reason come back to the middle point, as it does in all things. I would hate to think that in this day and hour the enforcement agencies could not employ against these four major crimes the same instrumentalities the criminals use to see if they are suspected. Oh, you talk about your Bill of Rights. None of that is lost in this legislation. I have great respect for the grandfathers and the forefathers, but in their day they knew nothing of the telephone, the telegraph, or radio sets. They were at that time thinking of the man who knocks on your door, enters your house, and looks around the place against your will. That protection is still there. We need this legislation for the purposes named in the bill, to be used in cases of sabotage, espionage, kidnaping, and extortion. Any other use is prohibited. I would, of course, oppose any wire-tapping bill for general purposes.

The people who objected to this bill, at least many of them, were under the impression that it would permit tapping for any purpose.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4228) authorizing wire tapping in certain cases had come to no resolution thereon.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia submitted the following conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

(For conference report above referred to, see p. 5745 of the Senate proceedings of today.)

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is not necessary to take very much time in the consideration of this conference report. There are five amendments in disagreement, four of them relating to the same subject, and I am sure none of these amendments in disagreement will be controversial.

In the conference report proper we have reached agreement on all of the matters that are of interest to the House. I will mention one or two briefly and answer any questions that Members wish to ask.

In connection with the 18-month provision, there was inserted a provision which reinstates the 18-month lay-off in a greatly modified form.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the gentleman will read the bill as it passed the House, if we accept the conference report relative to the 18-months provision.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Clerk read it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I did not hear it all, he read it so fast.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia (reading:)

> There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting blind persons, veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans as are unemployable, who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months.

You will observe that excepts from the 18 months' provision these people whom I have named, blind persons, veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans as are unemployable. Veterans are not subject to the 18-month provision.

> and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after the expiration of 20 days.

It was 30 days before—

> after the date of his removal, and recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects:

This provision I am going to read now greatly tempers the old 18 months' provision:

> *Provided*, That such workers shall be removed only in the numbers necessary to provide employment for employable persons with the same or similar job qualifications who have been certified for a period of 3 months or more as in need of Work Projects Administration project employment and who have not in such period been given employment on work projects.

That is, in no case can a person who has been on 18 months be removed at the expiration of 18 months unless, first, there is a person with his same job qualifications available; that is, if a man who has been on 18 months is a bricklayer, you would not take him off and give the job to a piccolo player, if you would give a piccolo player a job at all. That is a wise provision. You would not take him off on account of the 18 months' provision unless there are persons certified who have been waiting for 3 months with the same job qualifications.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. In the event a man has been on for 18 months and he is not qualified to get any work in industry we will say because of industrial discrimination or on account of some other disability, he will not be removed either, will he?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. He will not be removed unless there is a person with his same qualifications who has been certified and waiting for 3 months.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If this gentleman is not able to get anything, does he have to go back on relief, inasmuch as you are able to put somebody else on?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the man has qualifications——

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. He has no qualifications.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Then there cannot be a person waiting with his same qualifications to take his place.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. In certain offices in different cities there are W. P. A. persons employed. These offices are being closed up on account of lack of funds. Will the persons employed in those offices be entitled to employment on some other project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Those are involved in some of the amendments in disagreement. They are not involved in the conference report.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman mentioned widows, then widows of veterans. Did the gentleman repeat "widows"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No. It covers unmarried widows of veterans; that is, veterans and unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans as are unemployable.

Mr. BEITER. It does not take care of the widows? They have to be widows of veterans?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right, or the wife of an unemployable veteran, the wife of a disabled veteran.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I have received correspondence from my district this morning in reference to people who are in the C. C. C. camps. These correspondents also referred to people who were on relief, and stated that the farmers in the district wanted to get help now to take in their crops, but they could not get anyone to do the work. Everybody seems to be busy, yet we have the C. C. C. camps and some few people who are on relief. Do you think they ought to take these jobs? How are you going to handle a situation of that kind?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is a provision in here that any person who is offered private employment and does not accept it shall be dismissed from the relief roll.

Mr. RICH. Then I might say to the farmers in my district, anyone who wants people to do work, "If you know of Tom Jones or Pete Smith or anyone else who is on relief, if you can spot him and go to the proper authorities they will take him off the rolls if you will offer him a job."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman knows they must have a reasonable proposition, and not give a man 1 day's work and expect him to give up a W. P. A. job for it. It must be a reasonable offer of employment.

Mr. RICH. One condition now is that many of them want to stay on relief and will not take any kind of work. What are you going to do with them? A man could get a job from someone or he could secure work if he would try to get employment, but instead of that he thinks he has a snap and he hangs onto relief and does not do anything. What are we going to do to get those fellows off the rolls? We ought to get rid of the leeches that are hanging onto W. P. A. If ever there was a time when this administration or this country ought to get the people back into jobs, it is now while we are spending billions of dollars for national defense. I believe we ought to use every effort we possibly can to see that they are compelled to take jobs wherever jobs are offered today.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman knows we are reducing the rolls on the average of 44 percent under the 1941 average.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. In sections of the country like northern Minnesota, which I represent, no war industries have been established, and there are still plenty of persons available for W. P. A. Unless the Administrator has a chance to even things up so that sections of the country that have war industries get less W. P. A. money and sections like my own that have no war industries get more, this reduction will work a real hardship on a lot of veterans and aged people. As I understand, the conferees did not increase the appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amount for W. P. A. remains just what it was as it passed the House, and the amount of the Budget estimate.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman has just said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that any man on W. P. A. who is offered a job in private employment and does not take it will be dropped from the W. P. A. rolls. That has been the rule that has been carried out most effectively. However, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to leeches, I presume he means men who will not leave W. P. A. to pick a quart of berries.

Mr. RICH. If I may answer the gentleman, I say that the men we want are honest men, men who want to get out and work, who are honest enough not to want to stick to jobs where they can sit down and put their feet up on a chair and smoke cigarettes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment in which I know the House is very much interested is the veterans' preference amendment. The conferees accepted with very slight modification the Senate amendment, which is in substance what the House passed with the exception that it practically gives the veteran an outright preference on W. P. A. employment. It retains the substance of the Edmiston amendment which we inserted in the House, which is to the effect that where a veteran is receiving a small amount of compensation, that may be taken into account and he may be permitted to work on W. P. A. under certain conditions. We believe that is a very good amendment, and workable.

I do not know of anything else in the conference report that needs discussion, Mr. Speaker. Does the gentleman from New York wish any time?

Mr. TABER. I should like to have 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House and everybody else know, I am opposed to the whole W. P. A. set-up, but as far as this conference report goes, I am satisfied with it. I believe we have done as good a job as could be d ne with what there was to operate with to get it straightened out. For that reason, I shall support it.

I believe the situation in the country is terrible when there are thousands and hundreds of thousands on W. P. A. who ought to have jobs in private industry today and who ought to go to work on legitimate jobs that are available to them. I know of many cases myself and I hear of more and more every day where men can actually earn more off the W. P. A., but they will not go off the rolls because they have nice, easy jobs.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Since I made my statement a moment ago to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] I have been informed by a good Jeffersonian Democrat that a certain individual in Michigan on the W. P. A. was offered a job at pay and he asked, "What are the hours?" He was told, "From 7 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, with an hour off for lunch." Then he said, "Oh, I cannot take that job, because I have to carry a banner in an unemployment parade in the afternoon."

Are you going to do something to put those men back to work? They are the ones, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I want to make go to work when they are offered jobs. Do you want that kind of men to have jobs? Able-bodied men should work if offered a job at good pay or the Government should refuse to pay them for loafing.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, why does the gentleman use the pronoun "they"? The gentleman has only one such case in over a million people.

Mr. RICH. I want all such persons to accept jobs when they are offered to them, and I do not care who they are or where they come from. That is what I mean, and that is just an example, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and there are thousands of them in the country and I will venture there are many of the same class in the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want men able to do so that are offered jobs to work to take them or be dropped off of W. P. A. at once.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10, which involve exactly the same question, may be reported and considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 8, line 20, strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 8, line 20, strike out "$2,025,000" and insert "$2,360,000."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 8, line 24, strike out "$6,005,000" and insert "$6,490,000."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 8, line 24, insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to defray the expenses of transferring or maintaining the performance of any of the functions appropriated for in (a), (b), and (e) of subdivision (2) of this section at points other than in the States where any of such functions are now performed."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments, and I ask for recognition, briefly, on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what is involved in these four amendments can be briefly stated. The House put in the bill the amount of the Budget estimates. Mr. Bartelt, of the Treasury Department, stated he could carry on the functions of the disbursing and accounting work which the Treasury Department does for W. P. A. with those funds. Let me emphasize the fact that there is nothing involved here with reference to funds for W. P. A. itself or for work jobs. These are the funds that are appropriated to the Treasury Department for performing the accounting work they do for W. P. A. Mr. Bartelt, who, I think, is one of the most capable and efficient men we have in the service, felt that by making a few consolidations and rearrangements and reorganizations in the field service, due to the fact we have very drastically reduced the W. P. A. program, he could save the $485,000 proposed by the Budget estimates, and he so stated to the committee. The committee held the Budget figures in the bill and the House passed those figures and there was no question raised about it here. I understand now it has been suggested that in a certain State, a certain Senator feels that an office might be moved from city A to town X, and therefore they undertook to put back into the bill an additional $485,000, together with a legislative provision prohibiting the Treasury from transferring any of its functions from one place to another, even though the Treasury Department says that by such reorganization and such change in its procedure it could save the $485,000. This is a virtual declaration of the fact that we do not want the Department to save a dollar, even if they can do it. The House conferees want to insist upon their position in this matter.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. How many offices does this close?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It provides for a rearrangement on account of the fact the program is cut down 44 percent. The Treasury Department has said that this could be done. It does not do away with any W. P. A. offices. The gentleman understands that. This refers to the disbursing and accounting offices of the Treasury Department.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not this provide for the closing of Treasury Procurement Offices in the buying of supplies for the W. P. A. in the States in which the W. P. A. now operates?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No, it does not apply to them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not the purpose to discontinue about 6 or 7 State offices and consolidate all of the employees who are now working in these State offices and put them in another State to carry on these purchasing functions for W. P. A.?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. This does not affect the procurement program in any way whatever.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This does not affect the procurement offices, I would like to say to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have already done that in my State. A year ago they moved all of the disbursing offices to the capital at Jefferson City.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee hopes the House will back the conference committee in this respect and when the time comes I am going to ask for a vote by division and I hope it will be the pleasure of every Member of the House to back the conference committee and give us your moral support in order that we may transmit such solidarity and unanimity of opinion to our colleagues at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. These amendments that are in disagreement do not affect the Procurement Division of the Treasury in any respect.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. TABER. They are in a separate division and the Senate amendments do not touch them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were—ayes 119, noes 0.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 24: Page 34, insert the following:

"SEC. 35. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1942, the sum of $50,000,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, as amended, such sum to be in addition to any funds appropriated by such section 32 and to be subject to all the provisions of law relating to the expenditure of such funds."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 24 with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000", and in line 5, change section "35" to section "34."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came to the House originally from the committee, $50,000,000 of W. P. A. funds were earmarked for the stamp plan. The House, after consideration, struck out of the bill the earmarking, and the bill went to the Senate without any funds in it for the stamp plan. The Senate added this amendment, reinserting $50,000,000. This matter has been in disagreement between the conferees for several days, and the House conferees have felt that a concession of this kind is in the interest of expediting the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This $25,000,000 is not taken out of the W. P. A. funds? The money has been added?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am in favor of the food-stamp plan but I ask the gentleman this question: This does not establish a precedent that the relief fund should take care of the stamp-plan fund?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It certainly should not establish such a precedent, and it is not my idea that it will.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. And next year we will not be confronted with a precedent that the stamp plan should come out of the relief fund?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not at all.

Mr. TABER. This $25,000,000 is in addition to the $100,000,000 now in the agricultural appropriation bill and with the other $100,000,000 it makes $225,000,000 for the stamp plan.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And this $25,000,000 does not earmark an additional amount for the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

Mr. CASEY of Massachussets. As the bill passed the House with the food-stamp plan $50,000,000 eliminated, it therefore added that $50,000,000 to the W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The full amount for the W. P. A. was the same as it is now.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. But the bill is $25,000,000 more now for W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; this is for the Agricultural Department. The W. P. A. is not affected at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. We might as well know what we are doing. We are appropriating $10,000,000 less for the Surplus Commodity Corporation than they had this year if we agree to the $25,000,000. They are short right now $35,000,000, and if you agree on $25,000,000 you take $10,000,000 away from them. I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers a preferential motion which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 24.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is in control now.

Mr. COCHRAN. I just want to explain my position on this situation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia demands a division. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia offers a preferential motion which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves to concur in Senate amendment numbered 24, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000", and change the section number from "35" to "34."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by this parliamentary move the gentleman from Virginia has denied me an opportunity to try to get the amount for the Surplus Commodity Corporation that they had last year.

We from the cities have all through this session voted right down the line for your agricultural bills and when it comes to the big cities being taken care of, it is the last appropriation bill in every session of the Congress—the relief bill comes right at the end—we find ourselves in a very difficult position.

This whole trouble comes out of a squabble between the chairmen of two subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. One of them does not want this item in his bill and the other does not want it in his bill, and it is kicked around from one side to the other. What difference does it make? It all comes out of the same pot in the end. Here you come on the last day, it is absolutely necessary to pass this bill tonight—and I realize it is—and you are asking to agree to $25,000,000 additional, and in doing so you are depriving the Surplus Commodity Corporation of $10,000,000 below this year's appropriation to which it is entitled. In other words, the Corporation gets $100,000,000 from customs receipts. There was $100,000,000 carried in another bill which makes $200,000,000. Last year $35,000,000 was carried in the relief bill. Now you are cutting it down to $225,000,000 instead of $235,000,000 and you have increased the operations of the stamp plan all over the United States. How are they going to operate, and operate properly?

I say the amendment should be voted down and see if we cannot get at least $35,000,000, the same as we had during the present fiscal year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, just in order to keep the record straight on this, very briefly, the Department of Agriculture had for surplus-commodity disposal in this present fiscal year $235,000,000. Of that they have said they would use $125,000,000 for the stamp plan. They have now for surplus-commodity disposal for the fiscal year 1942 $100,000,000 in the permanent appropriation, $100,000,000 in the agricultural bill, and $25,000,000 here, if my motion prevails, which is $225,000,000, or within $10,000,000 of the total amount that they had for surplus disposal this current fiscal year.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is exactly what I said. You are $10,000,000 short.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Why do they have to take $10,000,000 off of the stamp plan?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what I do not want done.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am not taking it anywhere. The Department of Agriculture can still use $125,000,000 on the stamp plan under a total appropriation of $225,000,000. Now, let us see for a moment about the stamp plan. I am for the stamp plan also, but we have reduced the W. P. A. work program 44 percent. We are providing for an average of 700,000 less for 1942 than for 1941. We are reducing their money 35 percent.

Mr. COCHRAN. And that means that you are adding to direct relief, and that is just what you will do in the large cities.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If we do that it just means that some localities are going to have to take up some of their relief burdens that they should be bearing and that the Federal Government has been bearing up to this time. But I want to emphasize that the Department of Agriculture will still have $225,000,000 for surplus crop disposal and there is no reason why they cannot use $125,000,000 of it for the stamp plan if it is important and if it is needed. As a matter of fact, the Budget estimate for 1942 for surplus removal was $200,000,000 and under that amount the allocation to the stamp plan was $125,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman anticipate there will be as much money under section 32 as there has been in the past? In other words, will the customs duties be as substantial as they have been before?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I see no reason why they should not be.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 9, 13, 17, 21, 97, 98, and 100 to said bill; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 80 with an amendment as follows:

Omit the second paragraph of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment and insert in lieu of such paragraph the following:

"If the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate or the average farm price, whichever is higher, for the crop year 1941 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural and conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmer's returns to parity prices; parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3735) making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the Senate amendment numbered 80 with a House amendment thereto.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 80 with an amendment as follows: Omit the second paragraph of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment and insert in lieu of such paragraph the following:

"If the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate or the average farm price, whichever is higher, for the crop year 1941 and the applicable rate of the payments announced under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural and conservation program and the parity payments herein appropriated, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmer's returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Is this or not the same amendatory language which the gentleman took up with his subcommittee the other day?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is.

Mr. TARVER. And the members of the subcommittee or a majority of them advised the gentleman that they did not believe the House should recede and concur with this amendatory language.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Precisely. I regret to say the Senate did not accept our recommendation. I endeavored

everywhere to find the gentleman to again take up the matter with him. I consulted all the members I could find.

Mr. TARVER. I have been here all day I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I made every effort to find the gentleman. As I say, I consulted with those members who were available and they agreed that this motion should be made.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman then means that he has had another conference with somebody on his subcommittee since the conference was held the other day, at which time the membership of the subcommittee, with one exception, advised the gentleman that they thought this amendatory language ought not to be agreed to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. TARVER. I, of course, have no knowledge of the gentleman having consulted other members of the committee, whether he has done so or not; that is within his own knowledge, not mine. I, of course, regret that the gentleman was unable to find me, because I have been very much interested in the subject matter. As I stated, I have been on the floor of the House all day.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the last hours of the session immediately preceding the close of the fiscal year. It is vitally important that this legislation become law before adjournment tonight. We have before us now a minor proposition—the the last item in disagreement between the two Houses.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. There seems to be one item in the bill whereby the Senate has limited soil-conservation payments, so that they shall not be above an amount which would equal the parity price. Is that involved in this amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The item involves parity payments rather than soil-conservation payments. The purpose of the provision, as was fully discussed and explained at the time the bill was under consideration on the floor, is to provide sufficient funds to insure full parity prices for the five basic commodities.

Mr. TABER. But not more.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But it was the sense of the House, as indicated by the debate, that money should not be taken from the Treasury to pay more than parity price on any of the basic commodities; and this amendment was drawn with that in view.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the membership of the House to agree to this proposed amendment upon the theory that it is merely the correction of a typographical error. The matter contained in the amendment is very material.

There was inserted in the parity appropriation language in the bill provisions which included in the income of the farmer, to determine whether or not a parity price is being received for his product, the 85 percent of parity loans on the basic commodities which is provided under recently enacted law, and the soil-conservation benefits in addition to the amount of the parity payments. Many of us who are interested in agriculture did not feel that soil-conservation payments should be included, because they are benefits which are not granted by the Government to the farmer as subsidies or donations, but which are earned by the farmer through the expenditure of a great deal of effort and some money in the carrying on of soil-conservation practices. The subject matter was finally agreed to in an amendment which was in the nature of a compromise and which, as stated, included in the income of the farmer to be considered in determining whether he is receiving parity or not for his products, the 85 percent of parity loan which was provided by recent legislation. This amendment which is offered by the chairman of the subcommittee this afternoon provides that the 85 percent of parity loan or the market price, whichever is higher, shall be considered in determining whether or not he is receiving parity.

In other words, if the amount of the market price is 75 percent of parity, then the amount of the loan, 85 percent of parity, would be used in determining that question. If the market price, however, was 90 percent or 95 percent of parity, then the market price instead would govern in deciding that question; and being more than the 85-percent loan, the parity payment would be decreased to that extent. On the face of it that would appear to be fair, and it would be fair except for the proposition which I mentioned in opening; that is, that there has been included in the farmer's income in determining whether he is receiving parity, soil-conservation payments which ought not to be included therein and which probably some of us were willing to agree to include because of the language which limited to 85 percent parity loan the consideration of what the farmer is actually receiving for his crop when it is not sold but placed in the loan.

This pending proposal takes something very material away from your constituents who are engaged in the production of the five basic commodities. If the language it is proposed to change is favorable to the farmer, it is one of the few instances in which he has gotten a break. So far as I am concerned, I am willing for him to have it.

The subcommittee, of which the gentleman is chairman, met a few days ago at his request and discussed this subject matter, and with the exception of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the entire membership of the subcommittee present indicated their opinion that this amendment should not be adopted.

The gentleman says he has conferred with gentlemen on the subcommittee today. He may have done so. He has not conferred with me, although, as I said before, I have been present on the floor of the House throughout the session today. I feel this is not a matter which should be agreed to out of hand without your being advised that it does materially affect the rights of your farmer constituents, although I realize that under the emergent circumstances existing it will probably be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, differences between the Houses must be composed in conference. In such conferences neither House can expect always to have its own way on every disagreement. We have to give and take. All legislation is by compromise.

The majority of the managers on the part of the House preferred not to agree to this amendment, but this afternoon at this late hour, now 20 minutes of 5, the last day of the fiscal year, this bill, one of the largest of the annual supply bills, carrying hundreds of items, has been agreed to by the two Houses in every detail with the exception of this one remaining amendment.

I diligently endeavored to contact every member of the committee of conference in this Chamber, in the cloakroom, in the anterooms, and in the corridors. I saw every member that I could find and all agreed to recede in order to secure the passage of this legislation before the deadline tonight. It does not affect in the slightest the amount of soil-conservation checks received. It follows in every respect the basic principle of parity prices for the five agricultural commodities. It carries out the understanding on both sides of the aisle in this House, and in the Senate, that appropriations should not be made from the Federal Treasury to provide subsidies above the parity price of any commodity.

Therefore, in order to insure the enactment of the bill before midnight, and by instruction of a majority of the conferees on the part of the House, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes.

(For conference report above referred to, see p. 5750 of the Senate proceedings of today.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4972) to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] be substituted on the conference committee for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who is unavoidably absent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Clerk will notify the Senate to that effect.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is very little difference in the agreement reached by the conferees and the bill as it passed originally by the House. The life of the corporation according to our bill was extended to 1946, a period of 5 years. On that the House conferees receded and accepted the Senate amendment which confines the life of the corporation to July 1, 1943, an extension of 2 years.

The Senate struck out the entire fourth section of the House bill. The conferees restored all the provisions in that section in substance, which I think will clarify the language and make the provisions stronger than they were before.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, most legislation is the result of compromise. This bill was debated at length here on the floor and certain basic principles were agreed upon.

It was intended by the bill to protect the farmer who was given encouragement to expand his crops because of the emergency or otherwise. We felt that where a farmer was given encouragement to expand the production of a crop, he should be given some protection which would guarantee to him at the emergency's end that he would not be left with surplus commodities in his barn, which, if dumped on the market, might so demoralize the market as to make it less economical for him to cooperate with the President and the Department of Agriculture.

The principle of the House bill is included in the amendment, and I believe it is in better language than when it passed the House. It will be recalled that we had some discussion about the interpretation of the word "encourage." We have clarified that, and I think there is no doubt now as to what is meant by the word "encourage."

We adopted also as a matter of policy the principle that on these crops which I have mentioned where encouragement is given for increase in production, and, in fact, all other crops where it is possible, these funds where available will be used to establish 85 percent of parity.

For the first time in the history of American legislation the farmer has been successful in having written into the law a most definite declaration of policy in respect to parity. I am sure that the changes which have been made by the conferees do not change in one iota the benefits which will accrue to the farmers in respect to the principle we enacted here on the floor the other day. They clarify the language so that it will facilitate the administration of the act.

I feel that the House can very well adopt this conference report with assurance that as a matter of governmental policy the farmer from now on, on all crops, basic or otherwise, should receive 85 percent of parity.

At last Congress has officially recognized the disparity between the price of things which the farmer buys and the price of the products which he sells. The enunciation of the policy that farmers should receive at least 85 percent of parity is a decided victory for the many Members of Congress who have been trying for years to solve this problem, not only for basic crops but for all farm commodities.

It is my hope that the President will sign the bill and that it shall be administered so as to effectuate its purpose.

A splendid job has been done by the conferees for the American farmer, and I hope the House will adopt the conference report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The explanation of the conference report indicated that as far as possible 85 percent of parity will be encouraged on other than the five major crops. Do I correctly understand that to be the fact?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. That is the bill we passed and that is the bill that is now under consideration.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have already done quite well by the five major crops. What other crops are contemplated to be included? Will the gentleman be a little more specific in regard to the crops other than the five major crops?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Any crop the increased production on which is encouraged by the Secretary of Agriculture. That field is left entirely open to him. Any crop the increased production of which he encourages, and makes an announcement to that effect, is included. Anyone who enters upon that increased production program will be entitled to have the prices of such commodities protected under this bill. This applies to nonbasic commodities.

Mr. MURDOCK. I compliment the conferees on that improvement. It is a real accomplishment for the farmers. I hoped something further would be done for those products other than the five major crops, so as to make beneficial farm legislation more general.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the diplomatic manner in which he brought the conferees of the House and Senate into agreement. After all, it is a task to get the Senate to agree to put a section back into the bill once they have stricken it out.

In behalf of agriculture, as a Member of the House, and in behalf of our committee, I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri on his fine work on this job and to express to the House my support in retaining section 4 in the bill. I think it a most important addition to the present law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WIRE TAPPING

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4228.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4228, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin to speak on the bill, I cannot find it in my heart to refrain from paying a deserved tribute to our friends of the minority for their splendid support of this measure, not only the members of our Committee on the Judiciary but the Members generally on that side. It is, indeed, heartening to see men rise to the full stature of manhood and statesmanship, as the Republicans have in the consideration of this bill, and in the contributions they have made to the discussions, not only here but in our committee. I, for one, wish to pay that tribute to our distinguished friends of the opposition.

May I echo most heartily the sentiments which have been expressed here today in the debate when I say there is no question of the sincerity of any man who is opposing this bill any more than there is a question of the sincerity of those of us who are supporting it. I believe it is a meed of praise due us all to say that in this hour of our country's crisis we are doing our duty as we see it, following the light as God gives us to see it. Therefore it is a joy to conclude this debate upon the high plane upon which it has been pitched.

Our good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], utterly innocently, of course, made the charge that Donald Musica, alias Donald Coster, was once a member of the F. B. I. That is not true. The gentleman from Massachusetts was misled by the testimony of Mr. Fly before our committee. This simply shows that good men can be mistaken. I believe that Mr. Fly innocently made the charge without proper investigation. I had it investigated, and it is not true.

It is true that Mr. Gaston B. Means was a member of the F. B. I. under the administration of Attorney General Daugherty, from 1921 to 1922, long before Mr. J. Edgar Hoover took charge. And the F. B. I. prosecuted him for his fraud. He was convicted and sentenced to a term in the penitentiary.

Let me answer in the next breath the question flung by the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF], would we support this bill if Mr. Daugherty were now Attorney General.

My answer is, "Yes." I care not who the Attorney General may be. If he is a "rotter," kick him out. If you cannot do that, then impeach him. But as long as he is Attorney General, it makes no difference to me who he is or to what party he belongs, I believe in giving him the aid to which he is entitled from this coordinate branch of the Government. He should be given a fair chance to do his duty and enforce the law.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says that the fact that Mr. Hoover's Bureau arrested 29 spies today shows that this bill is not necessary. In other words, because the members of this great organization, the F. B. I., under that great leader J. Edgar Hoover, who has built a monument to himself in the efficiency of that agency, can do their duty in some instances under the terrific handicaps under which they are laboring, that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, forsooth, proves that they do not need this authority.

I would rather trust J. Edgar Hoover than Mr. FRANCIS WALTER on that issue of whether or not he needs the help this bill would be, although we have the highest regard for our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] further says that Mr. Justice Holmes called wire tapping "dirty business." It makes no difference, but while I am sweeping out of the way some of these cobwebs, I just want to say that if I understand the English language correctly, that is not so. What Mr. Justice Holmes, in his dissenting opinion in the Olmstead case, said was that for State officials in violation of the law of the State condemning wire tapping, to wire tap was "dirty business." In other words, for the prosecution to commit a criminal offense in order to prosecute another for a criminal offense, he said was "dirty business." I will read you the entire dissenting opinion:

> Mr. Justice HOLMES. My brother Brandeis has given this case so exhaustive an examination that I desire to add but a few words. While I do not deny it, I am not prepared to say that the penumbra of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments covers the defendant, although I fully agree that courts are apt to err by sticking too closely to the words of a law where those words import a policy that goes beyond them. *Gooch* v. *Oregon Short Line R. R. Co.*, 258 U. S. 22, 24. But I think, as Mr. Justice Brandeis says, that apart from the Constitution the Government ought not to use evidence obtained and only obtainable by a criminal act. There is no body of precedents by which we are bound, and which confines us to logical deduction from established rules. Therefore we must consider the two objects of desire, both of which we cannot have, and make up our minds which to choose. It is desirable that criminals should be detected, and to that end that all available evidence should be used. It also is desirable that the Government should not itself foster and pay for other crimes, when they are the means by which the evidence is to be obtained. If it pays its officers for having got evidence by crime I do not see why it may not as well pay them for getting it in the same way, and I can attach no importance to protestations of disapproval if it knowingly accepts and pays and announces that in future it will pay for the fruits. We have to choose, and for my part I think it a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part.
>
> For those who agree with me, no distinction can be taken between the Government as prosecutor and the Government as judge. If the existing code does not permit district attorneys to have a hand in such dirty business it does not permit the judge to allow such iniquities to succeed. See *Silverthorne Lumber Co.* v. *United States*, 251 U. S. 385. And if all that I have said so far be accepted it makes no difference that in this case wire tapping is made a crime by the law of the State, not by the law of the United States. It is true that a State cannot make rules of evidence for courts of the United States, but the State has authority over the conduct in question, and I hardly think that the United States would appear to greater advantage when paying for an odious crime against State law than when inciting to the disregard of its own. I am aware of the often repeated statement that in a criminal proceeding the court will not take notice of the manner in which papers offered in evidence have been obtained. But that somewhat rudimentary mode of disposing of the question has been overthrown by *Weeks* v. *United States* (232 U. S. 383) and the cases that have followed it. I have said that we are free to choose between two principles of policy. But if we are to confine ourselves to precedent and logic the reason for excluding evidence obtained by violating the Constitution seems to me logically to lead to excluding evidence obtained by a crime of the officers of the law.

And I want to read you an excerpt—I shall not take the time to read the whole quotation—from Mr. Justice Holmes' letters to Sir Frederick Pollock, in which he said:

> I dissented in the case of tapping telephone wires. Brandeis wrote much more elaborately, but I didn't agree with all that he said.

Now, it is too bad that Mr. BENDER disagrees with the Supreme Court of the United States which, in 1928, before any substantial changes were made in its personnel, held that this particular bill authorizing wire tapping was, in effect, perfectly constitutional and that wire tapping, even when it was denounced by a particular statute in the State of Washington, was all right and that the evidence obtained in that way could be used in court.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Is it not a fact that in the Olmsted case the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Stone, in a dissenting opinion, held that wire tapping was a violation of the Federal Constitution—the fourth and fifth amendments?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not think so. My recollection is that the three other dissenting opinions in that case were by Mr. Justice Butler, Mr. Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Brandeis, discussed the question of constitutionality and that Mr. Justice Stone concurred in theirs. I may be wrong, but I think that is so. The prevailing opinion was to the effect that no constitutional guaranty was impinged.

Now, if I may hurry on, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says to leave it to the courts. Well, you might just as well kill it if you do that. There are only 250 United States judges in the United States. Suppose the one in your particular district was 300 miles from the scene of the telephone conversation that is anticipated on a fishing trip; how are you going to get him to get his court in action? Suppose his district attorney or clerk is out of commission temporarily. You cannot function that way when you need expedition. Take a case where you are tipped off, reliably, that there is going to be a telephone conversation between a kidnaper and one of his stool pigeons, as there was in the de Tristan case: Are you going to wait until you find the judge who, at that time may be on Puget Sound fishing for salmon? Are you going to wait for him to come back? Certainly not. This is a business proposition, and you are either going to remove the handicaps and enforce the law or you are not.

So much for that. Now let us get down to the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]. That is a sweet one—to subpena duces tecum the telegraph company to produce into court the wires. Why, of course, that can be done, but the wires would be delivered to their addressees, and what the companies would do would be to hand you carbon copies under your subpena duces tecum, which has been held to be sufficient compliance. You cannot compel the telegraph company by subpena duces tecum not to deliver a message which comes in due course. They cannot be made to violate the law in that way and lay themselves liable to damages. What good would that do, anyhow? But with this bill on the statute books all that the Attorney General would have to do, all that J. Edgar Hoover would have to do would be to say, "Intercept and stop—do not deliver those messages," and they would not be delivered, and therefore the sabotage would not occur.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Could not the Department of Justice probably get copies of the telegrams by subpena just as soon as they were delivered, or maybe sooner than delivered to the ship captain, and that would be just the same as not having them delivered at all?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not believe that at all. I think it would stop the sabotage. What the gentleman seems to be interested in is to punish the man guilty of committing the sabotage.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. If you get the instructions for sabotaging before the saboteurs do, it would stop the saboteurs.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not think, as fast as the gentleman's mind acts—and he is one of the most brilliant Members of the House—as fast as he would be able to act physically, that he could act faster than dynamite explodes. And that is what we are talking about. We are talking about Black Tom explosions and sabotage of that kind.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. When you intercept a telephone message you do not prevent the message from being delivered.

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, but because you cannot with one of these agencies act as fast as you can with another that does not damn the proposition. What we want to do is to do the best we can.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Then why not authorize the Government agents to cut the telephone wires?

Mr. HOBBS. As far as that is concerned if it would stop sabotage and espionage and stop kidnaping and extortion, I would be willing to go to that length, and I believe the gentleman would. I think he has just gotten off on the wrong foot.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. CREAL. If it be true, according to the Dies committee report and the F. B. I., that those who engage in espionage number by the thousands, as well as kidnapers and extortionists, has the gentleman any idea at all what these thousands would care about how we vote today on this bill?

Mr. HOBBS. No; I do not, but I shall pass that question on to the Members of the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] in the second place said the Wilson administration outlawed wire tapping. I don't think that is an accurate statement. They only outlawed unauthorized wire tapping, according to that bill.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The language pertinent on this point makes it a crime for anyone, without authority and without the knowledge and consent of the other members thereof, to interfere in a telephone conversation.

Mr. HOBBS. I realize that—without authority.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. And without the consent of the other two people on the telephone.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right; and I realize further that under the case of *U. S.* v. *Polakoff* (112 Fed. (2d) 888) the court held you must get the consent of the crook—which is highly probable and easy. That is why we are trying to clarify some of these things and make the law consistent with common sense.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would appreciate if the gentleman would clarify this point. People from the Judiciary Committee have spoken here today, and they say already the F. B. I. has the power to tap wires, and yet there are people on the floor who are members of the Committee on Appropriations who have said that Mr. Hoover said that he did not at present have the power to tap wires.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the gentlewoman's question, and I shall be delighted to clarify that. Mr. Edgar Hoover, fine man that he is, and Mr. Robert Jackson, fine man that he is, do not care to do a futile, useless thing. They have no power to use the evidence where they do intercept. Therefore they do not intercept.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And they have the power?

Mr. HOBBS. They have the absolute legal power to intercept, but they have no right to use evidence so obtained under the interdiction of the law as we wrote it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Not to use it in evidence? Could they use it for other purposes beside that?

Mr. HOBBS. Never. You can use it under my bill, but under no bill in any way whatsoever except in a legal prosecution in court, and you cannot do that now.

Now that we have answered in substance the contentions of the opposition, please allow me in conclusion to say a few words about the merits of this bill. It seems to me that it might well have in its title a statement that it is a bill for the benefit of labor, among other beneficiaries, for if this bill helps to stop sabotage it will save the lives of many laboring men. Honest laboring men who know nothing of the sabotage plot are they who are killed when the sabotage is accomplished. Remember the Black Tom explosion and dozens of similar cases, the new bomber that crashed the other day, our submarine that sank, did not carry to their deaths the saboteurs responsible for these catastrophes, but they did kill loyal Americans doing their duty in Uncle Sam's service.

One of the chief benefits with which this bill is freighted is the potential reduction of crimes because of fear of detection which would be born of its enactment. At present the criminals know that they have guaranteed them by law the free and safe right to use the telephone and telegraph wires to perfect conspiracies and to give orders for the execution of their plots. With the passage of this bill they would not feel safe in the use of these avenues of communication because they would know that the F. B. I. might listen in or intercept such communication. It would have a very wholesome diminishing effect.

Just exactly what wire tapping is proposed to be authorized by this bill?

Not indiscriminate wire tapping by anyone. Not even wire tapping by officers of the law, whenever they see fit. Nor by officers of the law in the investigation of misdemeanor cases. But only in a felony case, and not then unless authorized in writing by the Attorney General.

For example, if a gang of criminals were plotting to kidnap your baby and the F. B. I. had discovered positive and trustworthy evidence of that plot, my bill would enable the Attorney General to authorize wire tapping in an effort to prevent the crime.

When the F. B. I. was trying to rescue the de Tristan child from his kidnapers, the head of the F. B. I., Hon. J. Edgar Hoover came to the Attorney General, Hon. Robert H. Jackson, and told of reliable information he had that at 3 o'clock next afternoon the kidnaper was going to telephone one of his confederates. He suggested that if that call could be monitorized and recorded, it might be helpful in identifying the kidnaper, by enabling a study of his voice, brogue, and peculiarities of speech, and in addition, the subject matter of the conversation would almost certainly be incriminating. Our great Attorney General did not hesitate. He immediately authorized the interception of the call. He assumed full responsibility, saying to Mr. Hoover that while it was a violation of the law to monitorize that call and record that conversation, it must be done, and if anyone had to go to the penitentiary for doing it, he would go with them! Thus, the law as it stands today makes criminals of conscientious and zealous officials like Robert H. Jackson and J. Edgar Hoover. Such a situation is indefensible before any bar of sound thinking. This bill would wipe out that hideosity.

Illustrations might be multiplied for hours. "Fifth columnists" might be plotting to wreck a troop train, telephoning hourly up and down the line, yet no officer of the law could prevent such threatened multiple murder by listening in. A code telegram ordering another "Black Tom" explosion to be set off could not be intercepted, decoded, and such sabotage prevented. A plot to assassinate the President is a sealed secret as long as the plotters use a telephone. Radiograms may be giving orders to raiders preying upon our merchant ships at sea, yet such messages are perfectly private and privileged communications. Mutinies may be thus fomented and insurrections incited, seditious conspiracies perfected, military expeditions organized and outfitted against the United States, and plans to poison the water supply of our Army training camps may be in the making, all with perfect safety from prevention or detection, if the criminals use the highways of communication which are now dedicated by law to their service.

So the question is not only, "Shall we legalize wire tapping?" but also, "Shall we enforce the law?" or, "Shall we continue to guarantee immunity to criminals by assuring them easy and safe means of plotting and committing their crimes?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28) be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after section 274d thereof a new section, to be numbered 274e, reading as follows:

"SEC. 274e. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the Attorney General of the United States has reasonable ground for believing that a felony cognizable under any law of the United States relating to espionage (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 31–42), sabotage (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 381; title 50, secs. 101–103; and the act of November 30, 1940, Public, No. 886, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), the transportation of kidnaped persons in interstate or foreign commerce (U. S C., title 18, secs. 408a–408c), or the transmission of threatening or extortion communications through the mails or in interstate commerce (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 338a, 338b, and 408d), may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, and he so certifies, and in so certifying states specifically the facts forming the basis of his belief that such felony may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice may, in connection with investigation, detection, or prevention of such felony or the apprehension of the perpetrators thereof, intercept, listen in on, or record telephone, telegraph, or radio messages or communications;

and if in such event such interception, listening in, or recording is to be carried on in an area within the jurisdiction of the Department of War or Department of the Navy, then it may be carried on by the Division of Military Intelligence or the Office of Naval Intelligence.

"Any such certificate of a duly authenticated copy thereof shall be admissible in evidence in any court having jurisdiction of any such case only as proof of its execution and filing. Upon and after the admission of such certificate in evidence in any case, any evidence obtained by the interception, hearing, or recording of any telephone, telegraph, or radio message or communication, as well as testimony concerning the same, shall be admissible and admitted in evidence in any prosecution for any offense hereinbefore enumerated, if such evidence is otherwise admissible.

"Certificates made by the Attorney General under the provisions of this section shall be deposited in the files of the Department of Justice and form a part thereof.

"Any person who divulges, publishes, or uses the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this act otherwise than in connection with the investigation, detection, or prevention of any offense hereinbefore enumerated, or the apprehension or prosecution of the perpetrators thereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 1, beginning in line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That chapter 11 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, chapter 10) is amended by inserting after section 274d thereof a new section, to be numbered 274e, as follows:

"'SEC. 274e. (1) Upon application by any person employed in the investigation, detection, or prevention of offenses against the United States, a judge of a United States district court, or of a State or Territorial court of record, or a United States commissioner, shall issue a permit, signed by him with his name of office, authorizing the applicant to intercept, listen in or, on record, in the district, State, or Territory in which such judge or commissioner has jurisdiction, any message or communication which may be transmitted by wire or radio by the use of any specified communication facilities, if such judge or commissioner is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that such communication facilities are being used or are likely to be used in transmitting information which would be useful in investigating, detecting, or preventing the commission of a felony cognizable under any law of the United States relating to the national defense, or useful in the apprehension of the perpetrators of any such offense.

"'(2) The judge or commissioner shall, before issuing such permit, examine on oath the applicant and any witness he may produce, and require their affidavits or take their depositions in writing and cause them to be subscribed by the parties making them. The affidavits or depositions must set forth the facts tending to establish the grounds of the application or probable cause for believing that they exist.

"'(3) Whoever shall knowingly and willfully obstruct, resist, or oppose any person acting under authority of any such permit, or shall assault, beat, or wound any such person, knowing him to be a person acting under such authority, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years.

"'(4) Sections 125 and 126 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 18, secs. 231 and 232) shall apply to and embrace all persons making oath or affirmation or procuring the same under the provisions of this section, and such persons shall be subject to all the pains and penalties of said sections.

"'(5) Any person who maliciously and without probable cause procures a permit under the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year.

"'(6) Any person who, in exercising the authority granted by a permit issued under this section, willfully exceeds his authority thereunder, or exercises it with unnecessary severity, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year.

"'(7) Any permit issued under authority of this section shall be admissible in evidence in any court of competent jurisdiction in a prosecution for the commission of a felony cognizable under any law of the United States relating to national defense, and, upon being offered in evidence in any such case, shall be admitted as a self-proving document. Upon and after the admission of such permit in evidence in any such case, any evidence obtained under authority thereof, as well as testimony concerning such evidence, shall be admissible and admitted in evidence.'"

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the one thing that made our great Republic continue to function as satisfactorily as it has, has been our insistence that the separation of powers be maintained. The amendment I have just offered follows the Judicial Code provisions with respect to the issuance of a search warrant and preserves our philosophy of government. It certainly seems to me that where unusual powers such as are sought under this bill are given there ought to be someone from a branch of the Government other than that which seeks these powers to pass on the question of whether or not they ought to be granted. This amendment does this, briefly, and it differs from the Federal search-warrant law in only one respect; that is, the applicant for the permit may appear before a judge or a court of record of a State court, as well as before a United States commissioner or a district court judge of the United States. The argument has been made that much time will be lost in carrying out this procedure. It certainly seems to me that anybody who feels it is necessary to tap a wire could find a judge or a United States commissioner much easier than they could locate the Attorney General of the United States in Washington. In every section of the United States there is a court of record, easily available. We certainly are not requiring anything unusual when we require that a member of the executive branch of this Government come to a member of the judicial branch in order to secure this authority. Then if a case of probable cause is made out, such as is made out in the securing of a search warrant to search your home, the judge can decide that such case has been made out and issue this unusual authority. I earnestly urge that this amendment be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Not only are kidnapers not as accommodating as they might be, but neither are saboteurs, nor spies, nor extortioners. Sometimes they do not behave exactly as we wish they would, and fail to notify the authorities of the law exactly what they are going to do, far enough in advance of the time of doing it, to make it feasible to hunt up a United States commissioner or a United States judge. Speed is of the essence of crime prevention or detection. The United States Attorney General is already informed as to these cases. You do not have to educate him. In 5 minutes he can be apprised of the situation by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and he can authorize, if satisfied that there is to be a violation of the law, the needed wire tapping, with no chance of a leak, or tip-off, and with no delay.

If, on the other hand, the F. B. I. must go to a judge or commissioner, the chances are a hundred to one that they never heard of the case with which the Attorney General is perfectly familiar. They must be given the education he already has with respect of each individual case. Then again, there are only 250 Federal judges and fewer than 500 United States commissioners in the whole United States, where there are 982 cities of over 10,000 inhabitants and 2,387 cities with between 2,500 and 10,000 inhabitants. In many cases the F. B. I. agent who had the "hot tip," after getting authority from his superiors in the F. B. I. and possibly from the Attorney General, would then have the burden upon him of traveling sometimes hundreds of miles to find a judge or commissioner. Then, after finding one, he would have to go over the case again in detail with him. If the officer were a commissioner, he would have to reduce to writing all the evidence before he could act, which would mean an additional delay.

If we mean business about law enforcement, let us not remove the handicaps under which our law-enforcement officers now labor, in such a way that the delay entailed will thwart the purpose. In law enforcement, unnecessary red tape and delay is fatal.

Another important consideration is that when a case is filed in court it is always a matter of public record. There is no privacy worthy of the name. Such things have a way of getting spread abroad. There may be just suspicion founded upon probable cause and adequate evidence, and yet the suspicion be utterly unwarranted when all the facts are known. Under such circumstances a G-man would be perfectly right in applying through his superior officer to the Attorney General for the right to tap wires in aid of that suspicion. If he does so and later finds that the one whose wires were tapped was innocent, the fact of the tap would be kept secret for all time, and there never would be the slightest whisper that the citizen had had his wire tapped by the F. B. I. because of suspicion that he was a criminal. But take such a case to court and the fact will be gossip forever.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. With great pleasure.

Mr. BARNES. Does not this amendment offered by the gentleman considerably broaden the scope and give permission not only to every district judge but to every State court judge of record

in the United States the power and authority to give an investigator the right to tap wires; and it is not limited to four crimes, but it is limited to the entire field?

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is probably correct.

Mr. WALTER. May I correct the gentleman?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is not correct.

Mr. HOBBS. I thought it was correct, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania says it is not, so I will say I do not know.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Gladly.

Mr. HANCOCK. Wire tapping or intercepting messages is not regarded as either a search or seizure, but a mere form of eavesdropping, and eavesdropping is a recognized practice of police forces the world around.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Ever since the day of Deerslayer and Daniel Boone when they crawled silently through the leaves of the forest and listened to the Indians eavesdropping has been prevalent. By virtue of the telephone science has virtually taken the ear out of its socket and stretched it so as to reach the ends of the earth. There is nothing new about eavesdropping in any of its forms.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Under the proposition suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania it would be almost impossible to give any tip-off to a department investigator.

Mr. HOBBS. There always has been and always will be "leaks" in many matters that should not be made public.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] branded wire-tapping as a form of eavesdropping. That leads me to make the comment that there is another contemptible form of eavesdropping practiced by none other than by "gent room" journalists such as Walter Winchell.

Mr. HOBBS. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I know nothing of the practices of Mr. Walter Winchell. He certainly seems to get a great deal of information. Whether he employs it or not, eavesdropping is not and has never been denounced by Federal statute. Eavesdropping is a perfectly proper practice among officers of the law.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Necessarily in the interest of the public we have to sanction certain practices among police that we frown upon in polite society.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished and legally learned gentleman from Pennsylvania. It seems to me we should be meticulously careful in endeavoring to enshroud the American citizen with constitutional rights in this period of great crisis in America.

It should be recalled that the President of the United States until last December had frequently condemned the use of wire-tapping procedure in the apprehension of crime; that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover year after year used rather pointed language in expressing his enthusiasm for those who were opposed to the use of wire tapping in the apprehension of criminals; that more than 20 States of the Union have passed statutes denying the use of wire tapping technique to law enforcement officials; and that no State in the Union up to the present moment has passed any statute enabling the use of wire tapping practices or according the testimony thus gathered competency as admissible evidence. The United States Government as represented in this Congress up to this hour has not seen fit to pass any legislation validating the use of the wire-tapping procedure but, a fortiori, on the other hand has, whenever it has spoken, condemned or limited the use of wire tapping.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes. If I had more time I would.

The newspapers of the Nation have repeatedly condemned the wire-tapping procedure, and all of the leading newspapers in America in one form or another have condemned it from the Baltimore Sun to the New York Times.

All of the labor organizations in the United States including the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the 21 railroad brotherhoods unanimously have opposed this bill throughout its consideration by this Congress. Hence, when proponents assert there is a small minority of the American people opposed to the instant bill they are reflecting upon all of organized labor in the United States. Certainly labor has reason to be apprehensive of the indiscriminate and promiscuous use of the wire-tapping procedure by so-called law-enforcement officials. Labor has reason to cherish unhappy memories concerning a certain Attorney General under a past administration; namely, one A. Mitchell Palmer, who used rather extreme methods in prosecuting and persecuting labor unions in the United States on the charge that they were engaging in subversive activities when they picketed plants in the hectic years following the end of the first World War.

Something was said by the distinguished and erudite gentleman from Alabama about Justice Holmes' statement anent wire tapping. Let me read what Justice O. W. Holmes said in the Olmstead case in 1928:

> It is desirable that criminals should be detected and to that end all available evidence should be used. It also is desirable that the Government should not itself foster and pay for other crimes when they are the means by which the evidence is to be obtained. We have to choose, and for my part I think it is less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part.

The use of wire tapping is emphatically illustrated in the example set by all totalitarian governments. It was employed by the Nazis in Germany and by the Fascists in Italy. It is the invariable sine qua non of all authoritarian governments. Wire tapping is the inseparable handmaiden of authoritarianism. It was the very means by which dictators put themselves into power and remain in power.

Joseph A. Padway, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor, paid his respects to this wire-tapping legislation:

> This bill retains all of the objectionable features of preceding bills. It vests inordinate powers in Government officials, without providing for any effective checks against abuse of those powers.
>
> As a matter of fact, because of the very nature of this kind of legislation, it is impossible adequately to protect against that kind of abuse.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I can think of no amendment, no matter how carefully drawn, that would in any manner minimize this danger. It would, for example, be impossible to write an effective amendment that would impose severe penalties on Government officials who would ignore and violate the true purpose and spirit of the bill. This is so because, no matter what you write, you would be unable to prove in a court of law on the regular rules of evidence that any given individual has abused the power given by this bill.

Yes; we condemn totalitarianism; but I hesitate—in fact, I blush when I think the Congress of the United States is contemplating the adoption of methods which are the stimulus and bulwark of totalitarianism, its very bone and its sinew. Who did criticize wire tapping? Justice Roberts, in the first Nordone case, denounced wire tapping. Justice Butler has reviled it. Justice Brandeis, in one of the most vitriolic attacks ever made by a Supreme Court Justice, condemned the whole idea of wire tapping in no uncertain terms. He wrote:

> Every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment. And the use, as evidence in a criminal proceeding, of facts obtained by such intrusion must be deemed a violation of the fifth.

The same eminent jurist also opined:

> The evil incident to invasion of privacy of the telephone is far greater than that involved in tampering with the mails. Whenever a telephone line is tapped the privacy of the persons at both ends of the line is invaded, and all conversations between them upon any subject, and although proper, confidential, and privileged, may be overheard. Moreover, the tapping of one man's telephone line involves the tapping of the telephone of every other person whom he may call or who may call him. As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny

instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wire tapping (277 U. S. 438, 478–479).

An editorial in the Baltimore Sun, March 19, 1940, stated that:

There has never been any doubt that the country agreed with Mr. Justice Holmes about wire tapping. Mr. Justice Holmes held wire tapping to be a "dirty business * * *."

The Minneapolis Tribune of March 19, 1940, stated editorially:

While it is difficult to sympathize with kidnapers, racketeers, and other criminals whose wires are tapped, the fact remains that the practice is repugnant to the American sense of decency. Because it may easily be misused and lead to an inexcusable intrusion on the privacy of law-abiding individuals, it is far better to abandon it entirely than to temporize with it, even aside from the question of legality.

On January 8, 1941, the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant, which often prints items of especial interest to the important life-insurance community in which it is published, stated in the course of an editorial that—

Public sentiment has long been strongly arrayed against this police practice. In 1928 the late Justice Holmes called the Government's violation of the anti-wire-tapping statute of the State of Washington "dirty business," and in the same case, the late Justice Brandeis ventured the opinion that "when the Government becomes a lawbreaker * * * it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

* * * * * * *

* * * Congress would be handing to one person a weapon which has been emphatically condemned by the courts. Present wire-tapping bans are aimed not at sparing vicious criminals from detection but at protecting innocent persons from unwarranted search and seizure.

I think that speaks rather well for the legal luminaries of the United States and some journalists in giving expression to what they believe to be the true situation.

This measure is a threat to our Bill of Rights. It contravenes the civil liberties of our people. It menaces and even undermines the democratic process. Let us defeat it and revivify the spirit of our founding fathers. None appeared before the committee to advocate wire tapping except representatives of our Justice Department. No authority on constitutional law favors this bill. It is opposed by every liberal organization in America. Vote it down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the arguments made by the gentleman who has just left the floor and the gentleman who offered the amendment. The gentleman from Washington said he is for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes a great deal further and permits a great deal more wire tapping on more kinds of subjects, and with more ease to get permission to do so, than does the pending bill; yet the gentleman from Washington prefers the Walter amendment to this one.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman probably was not listening when my amendment was read.

Mr. CREAL. I listened very closely.

Mr. WALTER. It certainly does not go further at all. It only covers one type of crime, a felony involving the national defense, that is all.

Mr. CREAL. But you permit it to be obtained with ease.

Mr. Chairman, under the old constitutional system that there must be reasonable ground and probable cause to search your house for stolen meat, there may be reasonable ground and probable cause, but the meat may not be found; nevertheless, the fact your house was searched is a besmirching mark that you can never outlive, meat or no meat.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. No; because the gentleman would not yield to me.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I did not refer to the gentleman in my speech.

Mr. CREAL. I am referring to the gentleman now, and I am not yielding. You go on down to the little crossroads United States commissioner, and permit an F. B. I. man to go in there and make that record. There are no strings on it. Why, it would be gossip in that town within a few minutes that your telephone was being tapped by the Government. Whereas, under the other system nobody in my town or yours would ever know that that party was ever suspected. If nothing was found, although he was suspected, that would be the end of it and nobody would know anything about it. If he was suspected and there was proof, then your man would be in the penitentiary.

Yet, that great class of citizens you want to protect, you make it easier to besmirch by making it easy for these people to place it on record in your community. There are no strings on that court to hide the record that the F. B. I. got permission to tap your telephone wire and that you were a suspicious character.

Now, then, to the gentlemen who say they want to protect the little people and have a fear that this might be abused, can you conceive of a method whereby innocent people may be greatly abused than by this substitute? If they listen and hear nothing, the community is never the wiser under the present bill. If the community knows you are under suspicion, there is a black mark, you cannot live it down, and I am opposed to the amendment for that reason.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman stated there would be a black mark against the citizen in his community if a permit was secured; but the gentleman overlooks the fact, when he makes that statement, that in order to meet that situation there is a section in this amendment which makes it a crime to secure without reasonable cause and there is a penalty carried with it.

Mr. CREAL. As a prosecuting attorney of 18 years' experience I have issued hundreds of warrants on cause and good affidavits, and I found no meat, but the citizen was never able to outlive the smear. If the neighbors learn that the officers regard their neighbor as a suspicious character, he cannot outlive that. There is the danger.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 4 words.

Mr. Chairman, I am becoming increasingly alarmed at the way national defense is being invoked to take away all our rights and privileges as American citizens. All you have to do is to put the stamp of national defense on a bill and the liberties of the American people go out the window.

In this bill you repeal Article IV of the Constitution, the rights given us under that article. I suppose the next step will be to take away the Fifth Article of the Constitution, which provides that a person shall not be compelled to testify against himself.

I am becoming alarmed at the temper of this House. A little while ago we took a fellow named David Lasser off the rolls, not because he was a criminal, not because he was a Communist—the Dies committee had absolved him of any charge of that kind—not because he was inefficient, but merely because his views were different from ours. Shortly before that we tied on to another appropriation bill a proviso that Anna Gruber should not get any money under that bill because she went to Russia on a visit. The Senate found out that mistake and later rectified it.

I am getting scared of the temper of this House. I am becoming a little bit wary of the results of this emotionalism, all under the guise of national defense.

There are quite a few men in this House who voted against H. R. 1776. A noted columnist wrote that the men who voted against H. R. 1776 were "little traitors." I have read in another column written by a very famous woman writer, that you Congressmen who voted against H. R. 1776 were subversive and ought to be prosecuted and investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Who is going to determine these things? You are going to have a lot of men from the Federal Bureau of Investigation working on these cases. This talk about the Attorney General issuing the certificates personally is nonsense. He will not be there personally to issue them. They will be like a lot of forms, like a lot of questionnaires, like a lot of legal forms you and I have in closets in our law offices, and they will just be pulled out and given willy-nilly to whoever wants them. That is what will happen. You will not have any protection.

You cannot do this sort of thing to the American people. You cannot have us losing our individual liberties. If this Government is great, it is great because it offers to the individual more freedom under God's sun than any other government ever offered or ever gave. I do not want to see us encroach upon that piece by piece day after day.

As a practical consideration, what are you going to accomplish by this? Someone on that side, I believe it was, said

that it does not go against any law-abiding citizen—that this bill will not hurt anyone who is not subversive. I take exception to that statement.

This bill provides for the interception of telegraph messages. Copies of all telegraph messages are in the hands of the telegraph companies and are immediately obtainable, subject to proper process. The notion of tapping telegraph wires raises a problem like that involved in the tapping of a radio circuit. Thousands of messages from thousands of people are flowing continuously over all these wires. Anyone tapping the wires for any substantial length of time will find himself in an avalanche of messages. It would be like looking for a needle in a haystack to find any particular message. The one feasible way to get the messages of any particular party is to get the written copies of the messages from the telegraph company.

As to telephone conversations, do you believe wire tapping will be directed against an individual? You do not limit the tapping of wires to any particular wire. A multiplicity of wires runs into every large office, apartment house, or hotel. The cooperation of the manager must be secured. For example, 80 trunk lines run into the Mayflower Hotel, and it has more than 1,000 rooms. Tapping the wires of a suspect thought to be in residence there would result in intercepting several thousand messages involving several thousand people.

This is an invasion of the rights of the citizens. It will accomplish nothing. You cannot write a good wire-tapping bill, but of these two bills the Walter bill is less harmful, in my opinion.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Is not the mudsill upon which the Walter amendment is built national defense, and does not his amendment come under exactly the same condemnation the gentleman has meted out against my bill?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Yes; I agree to that. I am against both bills, but I believe his is much less harmful.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 60, noes 64.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WALTER and Mr. HOBBS as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4228, the wire-tapping bill, pursuant to House Resolution 222, reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 84, noes 78.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 169, answered "present" 2, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—123

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Osmers
Andersen, H. Carl	Gehrmann	Paddock
Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	Peterson, Ga.
Arends	Geyer, Calif.	Pheiffer, William T.
Baldwin	Granger	Pittenger
Baumhart	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Beiter	Guyer, Kans.	Powers
Bender	Haines	Rankin, Mont.
Bennett	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Harness	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Hess	Rizley
Boehne	Hill, Colo.	Robsion, Ky.
Boland	Hill, Wash.	Rodgers, Pa.
Bolton	Hoffman	Rogers, Mass.
Bradley, Pa.	Holmes	Rolph
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Sauthoff
Burdick	Hull	Schulte
Canfield	Hunter	Shafer, Mich.
Carlson	Jackson	Smith, Conn.
Carter	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Maine
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio.
Chiperfield	Johnson, W. Va.	Springer
Clevenger	Jonkman	Stefan
Coffee, Wash.	Kean	Stevenson
Connery	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Copeland	Knutson	Talle
Cravens	Kunkel	Thill
Cunningham	Landis	Thom
Curtis	McGregor	Tibbott
Day	McIntyre	Tinkham
Dewey	McKeough	Van Zandt
Disney	McLean	Walter
Dworshak	Marcantonio	Welch
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Wheat
Elliot, Mass.	Mason	Winter
Englebright	Meyer, Md.	Wolcott
Fellows	Mitchell	Wolverton, N. J.
Fenton	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Fish	Murray	Wright
Ford, Miss.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Young
	Oliver	Youngdahl

NAYS—169

Allen, La.	Cole, Md.	Folger
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Forand
Anderson, N. Mex.	Collins	Ford, Thomas F.
Arnold	Cooley	Gamble
Barnes	Cooper	Gathings
Bates, Ky.	Costello	Gibson
Beckworth	Courtney	Gilchrist
Bland	Crawford	Gossett
Boggs	Creal	Graham
Bonner	Crowther	Grant, Ala.
Bradley, Mich.	D'Alesandro	Gregory
Brooks	Davis, Ohio	Gwynne
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.	Hall, Leonard W.
Bryson	Dingell	Hancock
Bulwinkle	Dondero	Hare
Burch	Doughton	Harris, Ark.
Butler	Downs	Harris, Va.
Byrne	Doxey	Hébert
Byron	Duncan	Hendricks
Camp	Durham	Hobbs
Cannon, Fla.	Eaton	Hope
Case, S. Dak.	Elliott, Calif.	Izac
Chapman	Ellis	Jarman
Clason	Faddis	Jarrett
Cochran	Fitzgerald	Jennings
Coffee, Nebr.	Flaherty	Jensen
	Fogarty	
Johnson, Calif.	Mott	Scanlon
Johnson, Luther A.	Murdock	Schuetz
Johnson, Okla.	Norrell	Shanley
Kee	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson
Kefauver	O'Connor	South
Kelley, Pa.	O'Hara	Sparkman
Kerr	Patman	Spence
Kilburn	Patton	Starnes, Ala.
Kilday	Pearson	Sullivan
Kinzer	Peterson, Fla.	Sumners, Tex.
Kocialkowski	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sutphin
Kramer	Pierce	Tarver
Lanham	Poage	Tenerowicz
Larrabee	Priest	Terry
Lea	Rabaut	Thomas, Tex.
Leavy	Ramsay	Thomason
LeCompte	Ramspeck	Traynor
Lesinski	Randolph	Treadway
Lewis	Reed, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
McCormack	Rich	Vorys, Ohio
McLaughlin	Robertson, N. Dak.	Ward
McMillan	Robertson, Va.	Weaver
Maciejewski	Robinson, Utah	Weiss
Mahon	Russell	Wene
Martin, Iowa	Rutherford	West
Michener	Sabath	Whelchel
Mills, Ark.	Sanders	White
Mills, La.	Sasscer	Wickersham
Monroney	Satterfield	Williams
Moser		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Worley

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Casey, Mass.	Fitzpatrick

NOT VOTING—138

Andrews	Harrington	Patrick
Angell	Hart	Plauché
Barden	Harter	Plumley
Barry	Hartley	Rankin, Miss.
Bates, Mass.	Healey	Rees, Kans.
Beam	Heffernan	Richards
Bell	Heidinger	Rivers
Bloom	Hinshaw	Rockefeller
Bolles	Holbrock	Rogers, Okla.
Boren	Hook	Romjue
Boykin	Houston	Sacks
Buck	Imhoff	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Jacobsen	Scott
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Scrugham
Burgin	Johns	Secrest
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Shannon
Capozzoli	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Cartwright	Jones	Sheridan
Celler	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Clark	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sikes
Claypool	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Pa.
Cluett	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kirwan	Smith, Wash.
Cox	Kleberg	Smith, W. Va.
Crosser	Kopplemann	Snyder
Culkin	Lambertson	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Ludlow	Steagall
Delaney	Lynch	Stearns, N. H.
Dickstein	McArdle	Stratton
Dies	McGehee	Sweeney
Dirksen	McGranery	Taber
Ditter	Maas	Taylor
Domengeaux	Maciora	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Magnuson	Tolan
Drewry	Mansfield	Vincent, Ky.
Edmiston	May	Vinson, Ga.
Elston	Merritt	Vreeland
Engel	Myers, Pa.	Wadsworth
Flannagan	Nelson	Wasielewski
Flannery	Nichols	Whittington
Ford, Leland M.	Norton	Wigglesworth
Fulmer	O'Day	Wilson
Gavagan	O'Leary	Woodrum, Va.
Gearhart	O'Neal	Zimmerman
Gifford	O'Toole	
Gore	Pace	
Green		
Hall, Edwin Arthur		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Dirksen.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Short.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Green with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. May with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Rankin of Mississippi with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Barry.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Harter.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Boren.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Maciora.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Smith of Washington.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies and the Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'HARA moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 2, after the words "United States" insert "without delegating his authority except to the Acting Attorney General in his absence," and on page 3, after line 23, insert: "This section shall remain in force and effect for a period of two years after its passage."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, we are in favor of both of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered on the bill to final passage and the question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in obedience to the instruction of the House we report the bill back as amended in accordance with the order of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the words "United States" insert "without delegating his authority except to the Acting Attorney General in his absence," and on page 3, after line 23, insert: "This section shall remain in force and effect for a period of two years after its passage."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 129, noes 104.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 154, answered "present" 1, not voting 130, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—147

Allen, La.	Gathings	Michener
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gibson	Mills, Ark.
Arnold	Gilchrist	Monroney
Barnes	Gossett	Moser
Bates, Ky.	Graham	Mott
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Murdock
Bell	Gregory	Norrell
Bland	Gwynne	O'Hara
Boggs	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Neal
Bonner	Hancock	Patman
Boren	Hare	Patton
Bradley, Mich	Harris, Ark.	Pearson
Brooks	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Peterson, Ga.
Bryson	Hendricks	Pierce
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Poage
Burch	Hope	Powers
Byrne	Izac	Priest
Byron	Jarman	Ramspeck
Camp	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Rich
Carlson	Jensen	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, Va.
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Rutherford
Collins	Kefauver	Sanders
Cooley	Kerr	Sasscer
Cooper	Kilburn	Satterfield
Costello	Kilday	Schuetz
Courtney	Kinzer	Simpson
Creal	Knutson	South
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	Kramer	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Dondero	Larrabee	Sumners, Tex.
Doughton	Lea	Sutphin
Doxey	Leavy	Tarver
Duncan	LeCompte	Terry
Durham	Lewis	Thill
Elliott, Calif.	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Ellis	McLaughlin	Thomason
Faddis	McMillan	Vorys, Ohio
Folger	Maciejewski	Ward
Forand	Mahon	Weaver
Ford, Miss.	Martin, Iowa	Wene
Gamble	Mason	West
Whelchel	Wolfenden, Pa.	Woodrum, Va.
Wickersham	Woodruff, Mich.	Worley
Williams		

NAYS—154

Allen, Ill.	Flaherty	Ploeser
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Rabaut
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Thomas F.	Ramsay
Andresen, August H.	Gale	Randolph
Arends	Gehrmann	Rankin, Mont.
Baldwin	Gerlach	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Geyer, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Beiter	Gillie	Rizley
Bender	Granger	Robinson, Utah
Bennett	Grant, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Guyer, Kans.	Rodgers, Pa.
Blackney	Halleck	Rogers, Mass.
Boehne	Harness	Rolph
Boland	Hess	Sauthoff
Bolton	Hill, Colo.	Scanlon
Bradley, Pa.	Hill, Wash.	Schulte
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Shafer, Mich.
Burdick	Holmes	Shanley
Butler	Howell	Smith, Conn.
Canfield	Hull	Smith, Maine
Carter	Hunter	Smith, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Springer
Casey, Mass.	Jenkins, Ohio	Stefan
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Stevenson
Chiperfield	Johnson, W. Va.	Sullivan
Cluson	Jonkman	Sumner, Ill.
Clevenger	Kee	Taber
Cluett	Keefe	Talle
Cochran	Kelley, Pa.	Tenerowicz
Coffee, Wash.	Kunkel	Thom
Connery	Lambertson	Tibbott
Copeland	Landis	Tinkham
Cravens	Lesinski	Traynor
Crawford	Ludlow	Treadway
Crosser	McGregor	Van Zandt
Crowther	McIntyre	Voorhis, Calif.
Cunningham	McKeough	Walter
Curtis	McLean	Weiss
Davis, Ohio	Marcantonio	Welch
Day	Martin, Mass.	Wheat
Dewey	Meyer, Md.	White
Dingell	Mills, La.	Wigglesworth
Disney	Mitchell	Winter
Ditter	Mundt	Wolcott
Downs	Murray	Wolverton, N. J.
Dworshak	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Eaton	O'Connor	Young
Eberharter	Oliver	Youngdahl
Eliot, Mass.	Osmers	
Englebright	Paddock	
Fellows	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Fenton	Pheiffer, William T.	
Fitzgerald	Pittenger	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fitzpatrick

NOT VOTING—130

Andrews	Gifford	Maciora
Angell	Gore	Magnuson
Barden	Green	Mansfield
Barry	Haines	Mason
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	May
Beam	Harrington	Merritt
Bloom	Hart	Myers, Pa.
Bolles	Harter	Nelson
Boykin	Hartley	Nichols
Buck	Healey	Norton
Buckler, Minn.	Heffernan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley, N. Y.	Heidinger	O'Day
Burgin	Hinshaw	O'Leary
Cannon, Mo.	Holbrock	O'Toole
Capozzoli	Hook	Pace
Cartwright	Houston	Patrick
Celler	Imhoff	Plauché
Clark	Jacobsen	Plumley
Claypool	Jenks, N. H.	Rankin, Miss.
Colmer	Johns	Rees, Kans.
Cox	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Cullen	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rockefeller
Delaney	Jones	Rogers, Okla.
Dickstein	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Dies	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sabath
Dirksen	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sacks
Domengeaux	Keogh	Schaefer, Ill.
Douglas	Kirwan	Scott
Drewry	Kleberg	Scrugham
Edmiston	Kopplemann	Secrest
Elston	Lynch	Shannon
Engel	McArdle	Sheppard
Fish	McGehee	Sheridan
Flannagan	McGranery	Short
Flannery	Maas	Sikes
Ford, Leland M.	Marcantonio	Smith, Pa.
Fulmer	Mason	Smith, Va.
Gavagan	May	Smith, Wash.
Gearhart	Merritt	Smith, W. Va.

Snyder	Taylor	Wadsworth
Somers, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	Wasielewski
Steagall	Tolan	Whittington
Stearns, N. H.	Vincent, Ky.	Wilson
Stratton	Vinson, Ga.	Zimmerman
Sweeney	Vreeland	

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.

Mr. Buckler of Minnesota for, with Mr. Imhoff against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Short against.

General pairs:

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Dirksen.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Claypool with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Andrews.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Green with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Rankin of Mississippi with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Barden with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Barry.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Flannery.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Hook with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Maciora.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Smith of Washington.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. May with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Harter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HARTLEY. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected was laid on the table.

GUTZON BORGLUM

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3857) authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon Borglum, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 7, after "Gutzon", insert "and Mary."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing the construction of a crypt for the remains of Gutzon and Mary Borglum."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS BIG SANDY RIVER NEAR NOLAN, W. VA.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1304) granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River near Nolan, Mingo County, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is this the bill that the gentleman from West Virginia was interested in?

Mr. KEE. Yes. It is the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia, and authorized to do business in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation near Nolan, W. Va., where the said Tug Fork forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consert that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 4228.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement on the late Senator Borah.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address by William Tyler Page, and the introduction thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I made today and include some excerpts from the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Secretary Ickes stressing the importance of daylight savings, especially so far as power is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by former President Hoover delivered last night. I have an estimate from the Printing Office and from the Joint Committee on Printing which shows that it takes four pages at a cost of $180.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and include quotations from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief report outlining the progress of the Southern Forest Experiment Station by its director, marking the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DITTER, and Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Nathan Straus, Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO PRINT COMPILATION CONCERNING MONETARY AND OTHER BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO SOLDIERS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably with amendments (Rept. No. 893) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 238), authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the pamphlet containing information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition up to and including July 1, 1941, of the compilation containing information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States and their dependents pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies, including the War Department and the Civil Service Commission, prepared by Hon. Wright Patman, Representative from Texas, be printed as a House document; and that 20,000 additional copies thereof be printed for the use of the House document room.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifteen"; and in line 11, after the word "room", strike out the period, insert a comma, and add: "and 5,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement which I issued to the press this morning, and a dispatch from London appearing in the Times-Herald this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a protest made by 120 Members of this House against cutting the duties on competitive farm products in connection with the trade agreements with Argentina and Uruguay.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by William Lindsay Young, of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon in respect to the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4972).

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON]. This extension somewhat exceeds the limit but I have an estimate from the Committee on Printing as to the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Mr. Breckinridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from General Hershey, head of the Selective Service System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Jack Kyle, national educational director of the Regular Veteran's Association, relative to the late Senator Harrison.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until Thursday next midnight, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive any messages from the Senate; and that the Speaker of the House be authorized to sign any enrolled bills passed by the two Houses and found duly engrossed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], and appearing in the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that we will not reconvene before 8 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That means the bells will be rung 15 minutes before convening?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m., pursuant to the taking of the recess.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Jones, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193), entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942";

That the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 to said bill; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 24, to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4972) entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes."

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 5166), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942,

and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

(For conference report above referred to, see p. 5757 of the Senate proceedings of today.)

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 5166, the second deficiency appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the second deficiency bill as it passed the House was $879,321,270.80. The Senate increased that by reporting out of the Senate Appropriations Committee amendments aggregating $162,918,381.95. Some other amendments were added on the floor of the Senate. The bill having just been considered this afternoon, we do not have the total of those amendments now. Most of them, or practically all of those amendments added on the floor of the Senate, were stricken out in conference and do not appear here. A few smaller amendments added on the floor of the Senate, for which there were Budget estimates, remain in the bill.

Of the $162,918,381.95 added by the Senate, $150,000,000 is accounted for by the amount included for the so-called Lanham bill for community facilities—access roads, additional school facilities, sewers, and utilities around heavy defense-industry concentrations, as provided in the authorization recently passed in the House in the so-called Lanham bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that the amount passed in the Lanham bill has been added to this bill by way of an amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. And that bill, H. R. 4545, was just eliminated?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no. The Lanham bill was the authorization. That was passed and signed by the President. This $150,000,000 is appropriation of the funds which implement the Lanham bill.

Of the remaining twelve or thirteen million dollars added by the Senate committee, approximately six and one-half million is accounted for by an item on account of the moving of the Army air field to replace Moffett Field, which is a Navy transfer, and that amount of money was put in.

The other amounts are odds and ends which were represented in each case by Budget estimates.

The committee has filed the report. The conference report of the House conferees, in the stress and strain of the closing hours of the fiscal year, represents the action of the House. The Case and Pace amendments relating to strikes were stricken out of this bill, to conform to the action which had been completed in both Houses on the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment.

There are five amendments in disagreement. At least four of them had to be brought back to the House because of the parliamentary necessity for separate action in the House and are noncontroversial. The other amendment, amendment No. 30, which has to do with the civil-service status of the employees of the Farm Security Administration, will be taken up, and there will be something said about it when we come to the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to inquire with regard to the appropriation for the Consumers' Counsel. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that at least I am very much disappointed. I think the members of my committee are quite generally united on the idea that the Consumers' Counsel should have been provided with at least $250,000, and the sentiment went as high as $300,000. I took the matter up with the White House and the Budget Director and it was agreed this agency should have at least $290,000. I appeared before the committee and presented the case as best I could in a very short time, not desiring to impose on the time of the committee. I find that the committee has generously allowed them about $165,000, $175,000, or $185,000; then the Senate added some $30,000. The appropriation is now $205,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. It seems to me as if the committee is not very solicitous about the interests of the consumer. If the Bituminous Coal Commission administrative cost to the Government amounts to, say, $3,000,000, it seems to me that the Consumers' Counsel, to protect the consumers' interest, ought to be worth $300,000, or else the entire act is not worth being on the books.

I am not going to interpose any opposition here and now, because it is rather late, but I do want the House to know—I want the gentleman from Virginia to know—that I am disappointed, and I think I bespeak the sentiment of the members of the Ways and Means Committee on that particular point.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. Not having the printed conference report, may I ask the gentleman what was done with the amendment that was added in the Senate on the division of power in the office of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Thirty-five thousand dollars was allowed. The Senate put in $50,000 and the conference agreed to $35,000.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to ask about three little items. There are three items for compensation of attorneys, one for the Menominee Indians, one for the Klamath Indians, $12,000, and the third for the Kootenai Indians in Montana.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In each of those cases funds were paid out of the tribal funds belonging to the Indians. They asked that authority be granted to use their own funds for that purpose. There was a Budget estimate for each of those and they were allowed.

Mr. LEAVY. Each of those items came before the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations in the regular supply bill. They were denied there. None of them were in the nature of a deficiency, because they all deal with the supply bill for next year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. At least one of them did not have the action of the Indians when it came to the Interior Committee and I am not advised as to the other.

Mr. LEAVY. The allowance of these items in a deficiency bill is virtually to nullify the action of the committee handling the matter.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That should be avoided if possible. Of course, the gentleman realizes the extreme unsatisfactory situation we are dealing with when you have to bring in a bill during the last hours of a fiscal year.

Mr. LEAVY. Our committee felt there were abuses growing up in the matter of attorneys fees.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia about the item of 131,000 added by the conference report for the grading of tobacco. Am I correct in understanding this is the amount which was estimated by the Agricultural Department as the amount necessary to grade the remaining ungraded 27 burley markets?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Kentucky, as well as several other Members of the House, were very diligent in presenting this matter when the bill was before the House for consideration. At that time the Budget had not acted on it and the parliamentary situation was such that the committee had to reluctantly request the gentleman to permit the matter to pass until the Budget did act on it.

The Budget sent a Budget estimate to the Senate; it was put in by the Senate and it has stayed in.

Mr. VOOHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman explain what the situation is with regard to the Senate amendment which denies civil service to the Farm Security Administration employees?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is amendment 30 and will come up directly.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Do I correctly understand that the conferees have stricken from this bill the appropriation for the Maritime Labor Board?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman that I personally have felt that the Maritime Labor Board perhaps should have been discontinued. However, we went into that very thoroughly in the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and may I say to the gentleman that it is penny wise and pound foolish to discontinue the Maritime Labor Board at this time because the relations in the maritime industry between labor and the operators is the finest that has existed for many, many years, due to this Board.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is aware of the splendid work of the Maritime Board in years past?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sorry, but I am not.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I inform the gentleman, in a most friendly manner, that in my estimation they have done a very commendable job.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I concur in the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. I believe it is a great mistake at this time not to have continued the National Maritime Labor Board.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank my colleague for his observation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the committee has agreed to the conference report. There are some items in it like the item for the Consumers' Council in the Bituminous Coal Commission, where the committee of conference allowed $205,000 as against an expenditure of $175,000 for the current year, when half of that amount would be a great plenty if we had competent lawyers and personnel to run the agency. One hundred thousand dollars would be a large figure if the agency were only managed right.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I am familiar with that situation. The trouble is that there is no management to it. They are paying wages way out of sight. I have made that statement, and I would be glad to have the gentleman get some time to defend the Consumers' Counsel if he cares to. The work they have to do would not keep three good lawyers busy steadily. A couple of stenographers apiece would be liberal. That is the picture of that situation. I am not going to yield on that subject.

Mr. DINGELL. It is all right with me.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman can get his own time if he wants to go into it.

There are many other items where the Senate was altogether too liberal, but we had to take the conference report in order to get the matter cleaned up.

May I make this general comment on the appropriation situation:

Notwithstanding the enormous increases for national defense, enough sense of patriotism and enough courage has not come to the House of Representatives to reduce the nondefense items in the appropriation bills at all.

When we got down to the W. P. A. bill, after we had passed the second deficiency bill, and taking only the nondefense items, the net increase for 1942 over 1941 totaled $545,534,709.68. The decrease in the W. P. A. amounted to only $457,156,357. This leaves a net increase in nondefense items of $88,378,352.68.

I venture to predict that when the tax bill, calling for from three to four billion dollars, comes in, the people of this country will rise and smite those who have been responsible for increasing these appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: On page 19, after line 19 insert the following:

"FOREST SERVICE

"Forest-fire control (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, independently or in cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies or individuals, to intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures in critical areas on Federal, State, county, municipal, or private lands, including the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed $12,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1941, to remain available until June 30, 1942, $1,100,000: *Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 3 of the 'Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year endng June 30, 1942, and for other purposes' shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days by the Department for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by said section 3."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 28 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "1941, to remain available until June 30,"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: On page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"No part of the appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, under the heading 'Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation,' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, this is the only amendment in disagreement about which there will be any discussion or difference of opinion. Several gentlemen have brief observations they wish to make, and I ask the indulgence of the House while we dispose of the matter as expeditiously as possible.

When the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration was transferred to the Department of Agriculture from the relief bill, all employees of the Farm Security Administration automatically on July 1, when that appropriation becomes effective, would become regular employees of the Department of Agriculture and would automatically go under civil service. Am I correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is the correct situation.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Had these temporary employees of the Farm Security Administration been covered into the civil service under the provisions of the Ramspeck bill, instead of being automatically covered under as these employees would be except for this amendment, they would have had to have taken a noncompetitive civil-service examination.

The Senate amendment about which we are in disagreement provides that none of the funds in this bill shall be used to pay these employees if they are taken under the civil service, the effect of which is to keep these employees of the Farm Security Administration outside of the civil service.

The motion I have made on behalf of the conferees is to concur in the Senate amendment. I want to be perfectly frank to say that there is a difference of opinion about the matter. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] want to present their views on the matter to the House and I want to ask them to be as brief as they can reasonably be and let the House act upon it. I might say, however, without wishing to put on any pressure, if my motion

is not agreed to then the bill has to go back to the Senate for further action and come back to the House for further action and we might as well settle down for a nice comfortable evening. So I would hope that if it does meet with the pleasure of the House, the recommendation of the conferees may be agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, my genial friend from Virginia did not want to put on any pressure, but that was a very potent suggestion he made and I realize what I am up against.

There is just one correction I want to make in what the gentleman from Virginia said, and that is this. If this language is stricken out of the bill, these employees would automatically go under civil service tomorrow, but they would have to qualify by a noncompetitive examination. The difference between the procedure in this case and under the Ramspeck Act is that tomorrow the jobs that are covered under the Ramspeck Act come under civil service, but the employees do not come under until January 1, and then only after they have passed a noncompetitive examination. This provision not only violates the legislative rights of the Congress and the committees who have jurisdiction of civil service, but it violates the right of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that deals with this Department.

There is nothing in this bill about the Farm Security Administration and the ludicrous part of it, if it were not so tragic, to me is that they sold this idea to some Senators over there by telling them that 85 percent of these employees are Republicans. That is what they told them in order to get them to vote for this provision. I do not think that statement is true.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sorry I cannot yield as I have only 5 minutes.

I think most of them are Democrats, to tell you the truth about it, but I think this is the situation. I think certain State chairmen of the Democratic Party out in some of the Middle Western States have got into an argument with the head of the Farm Security Administration about appointments, and they have decided to punish the Farm Security Administration, so they sent a man up here and he sold this bill of goods to some of the Senators on the Appropriations Committee.

Congress voted last year to put these employees under civil service, and I am going to give you another chance tonight to see whether you meant that or not, because I am going to ask for a roll call on this matter and let the boys stand up and be counted. This is not the way to legislate and it ought not to be done in this way.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman feel from all his discussion with reference to Government employees, that he is desirous of freezing everybody into the Government service that has been appointed or has been in these various organizations? The gentleman wants to put everybody on the Government pay roll.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, the gentleman is in error and does not understand my philosophy at all. I do not want to freeze anybody in the Government service. I want to see that those who are in the Government service are qualified and that when they do a good job they can stay there and not be replaced by some political hack, whether he comes out of my party or out of yours. That is what I want to do, and if the gentleman was as interested in good government and in economy as he makes out he is on the floor of the House, he would be trying to help me instead of trying to help spoilsmen as he does every time he sits on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, I do not yield.

This is all I have to say about it. Somebody is just trying to do a piece of political jugglery on the Farm Security Administration. I have no particular interest in them, but so far as I know they are doing a good job with respect to the things they have to attend to, and these people have been selected, they are there, and if you let them come under the Ramspeck Act they will have to qualify, they will have to show they are capable, and they will be handled just like the other employees, and there is no reason why we should make fish of one and fowl of another. So I am going to ask you to stand up here tonight and be counted and see whether you meant what you told your constituents in the election last November and what you said when you voted for H. R. 960, which is now Public, 880, and which goes into effect tomorrow morning.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is exactly right about this proposition. I want now to read to the House rather slowly and deliberately the language which the Senate has inserted—not in the agriculture appropriation bill but in this deficiency appropriation bill. Here is what they say:

> No part of the appropriations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1942 under the heading "Loans, grants, and rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person in accordance with the civil-service laws."

If anybody wants to agree to language like that, then his conception of orderly legislation is a very different one from mine. It seems to me that not only is this a case of doing a very unjust thing to a group of earnest workers, but it is a case where the position of the House of Representatives itself is involved. This amendment nullifies legislation deliberately considered and passed by the House.

In the first place, these employees that we are asked here to discriminate against are people who work with a group of farm people who are the most in need of any group of farm people in this country. The Farm Security Administration people went into California when we had thousands of people who had come to our State destitute, who were seeking a place to find new roots. They are the men who went out and organized medical cooperatives, so that the health of these people could be taken care of, and although at first they met with opposition they are now in the favor of a very substantial element in our State. These are the people who have done a constructive job with rehabilitation loans and other programs with that group of our farmers who have been hit the hardest, and I cannot see any reason or sense or justice in singling out this one agency just because, as the gentleman from Georgia said, somebody may be sore in some way about appointments. I do not think the House ought to come down to the level of standing for things like that. I realize what the gentleman from Virginia said that we are under some pressure, but for my part I shall vote with the gentleman from Georgia because I think he is right about this, as I believe he is right about his position on the civil service in general, and certainly we do not want to take a backward step like this just because it is late at night.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think we really ought to pass on this situation on its merits. Regardless of whether or not the provisions of the Ramspeck classification bill, which is pending in the Senate, are ready to operate, I believe that we should face this situation just as it is. If all of the provisions of the present classification should take effect and the President should order it to take effect, it would increase the amount of compensation that was paid to these particular people $8,000,000. That would not apply unless the order was made. As I understand it, the object of this language is to prevent that from happening. If that bill which is now pending in the Senate becomes a law, we could then take such action as is necessary and go ahead and let the provisions of that Classification Act which passed the Senate the other day apply, but the way the thing stands now, if the President should order the Classification Act to take effect, then that increase would go on, and these people are pretty well taken care of the way things stand now, and are pretty well paid.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the time the President signed the Ramspeck bill he stated that he did not

intend to use the power contained in title II, which gives him the right to extend the Classification Act at this time; and therefore the argument that putting these employees under civil service is going to cost any more money is not correct.

Mr. TABER. I do not know why these people came down from the White House to the Senate committee and said that.

I think it is up to us to support the gentleman from Virginia and pass this so that that thing will not happen. If there is anything that needs correction later on, after the Ramspeck bill becomes a law, it can be taken care of at that time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 115, noes 54.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 91, answered "present" 1, not voting 188, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—152

Anderson, Calif.	Faddis	Martin, Iowa
Barnes	Fenton	Martin, Mass.
Bates, Ky.	Folger	Michener
Bell	Ford, Miss.	Mills, Ark.
Bennett	Fulmer	Moser
Bishop	Gamble	Mott
Blackney	Gathings	Murray
Bland	Gerlach	O'Brien, Mich.
Boehne	Gibson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boland	Gillie	O'Hara
Bolton	Gossett	O'Neal
Bonner	Graham	Osmers
Bradley, Mich.	Granger	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Grant, Ind.	Patton
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Burch	Leonard W	Joseph L.
Burdick	Halleck	Pheiffer,
Butler	Hare	William T.
Cannon, Mo.	Harness	Ploeser
Chapman	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Chenoweth	Harris, Va.	Powers
Chiperfield	Hendricks	Rabaut
Claypool	Hess	Ramsay
Clevenger	Hoffman	Rankin, Miss.
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Cooley	Howell	Rich
Copeland	Jenkins, Ohio	Richards
Costello	Jennings	Rizley
Courtney	Jensen	Robertson,
Cox	Johnson, Ill.	N. Dak.
Crawford	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Creal	Luther A.	Robsion, Ky.
Crosser	Kee	Rodgers, Pa.
Crowther	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	Kinzer	Rolph
Davis, Ohio	Kocialkowski	Russell
Davis, Tenn.	Kramer	Sasscer
Day	Landis	Scanlon
Dewey	Lanham	Simpson
Ditter	Larrabee	South
Dondero	Lea	Springer
Doughton	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Duncan	McCormack	Sumners, Tex.
Durham	McGregor	Sutphin
Dworshak	McIntyre	Taber
Elliott, Calif.	McLean	Talle
Englebright	Maciejewski	Tarver
Thill	Ward	Woodruff, Mich.
Thomas, Tex.	Wene	Woodrum, Va.
Tibbott	Wheat	Worley
Van Zandt	Wickersham	
Vorys, Ohio	Wolcott	

NAYS—91

Allen, La.	Fogarty	Murdock
Andersen,	Forand	Oliver
H. Carl	Gehrmann	Pearson
Andresen,	Gilchrist	Pittenger
August H.	Grant, Ala.	Priest
Angell	Guyer, Kans.	Ramspeck
Arnold	Gwynne	Randolph
Baldwin	Hill, Colo.	Rankin, Mont
Beckworth	Hill, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Beiter	Hobbs	Robinson, Utah
Boggs	Hull	Rogers, Okla.
Boren	Hunter	Sanders
Bryson	Izac	Sauthoff
Byrne	Jarman	Schuetz
Byron	Jonkman	Schulte
Canfield	Kean	Shanley
Cannon, Fla.	Kefauver	Smith, Conn.
Carlson	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Maine
Casey, Mass.	Kilday	Sparkman
Cochran	Knutson	Stevenson
Coffee, Nebr.	Kunkel	Sullivan
Coffee, Wash.	Leavy	Tenerowicz
Cooper	Lesinski	Terry
Cunningham	Lewis	Thom
Dingell	McKeough	Voorhis, Calif.
Downs	McLaughlin	Wasielewski
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Weiss
Ellis	Meyer, Md.	Whelchel
Fellows	Mills, La.	Wolverton, N. J.
Fitzgerald	Monroney	Wright
Flaherty	Mundt	Youngdahl

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lambertson

NOT VOTING—188

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Merritt
Anderson,	Geyer, Calif.	Mitchell
N. Mex.	Gifford	Myers, Pa.
Andrews	Gore	Nelson
Arends	Green	Nichols
Barden	Haines	Norrell
Barry	Hall,	Norton
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	O'Connor
Baumhart	Hancock	O'Day
Beam	Harrington	O'Leary
Bender	Hart	O'Toole
Bloom	Harter	Pace
Bolles	Hartley	Paddock
Boykin	Healey	Patrick
Brooks	Hébert	Peterson, Ga.
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Pierce
Buck	Heidinger	Plauché
Buckler, Minn.	Hinshaw	Plumley
Buckley, N. Y.	Holbrock	Reed, Ill.
Burgin	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Hook	Rivers
Capozzoli	Houston	Rockefeller
Carter	Imhoff	Romjue
Cartwright	Jackson	Rutherford
Case, S. Dak.	Jacobsen	Sabath
Celler	Jarrett	Sacks
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Satterfield
Clason	Johns	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Collins	Johnson,	Secrest
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Shafer, Mich.
Connery	Johnson, Okla.	Shannon
Cravens	Johnson, W. Va.	Sheppard
Culkin	Jones	Sheridan
Cullen	Keefe	Short
D'Alesandro	Kelly, Ill.	Sikes
Delaney	Kennedy,	Smith, Ohio
Dickstein	Martin J.	Smith, Pa.
Dies	Kennedy,	Smith, Va.
Dirksen	Michael J.	Smith, Wash.
Disney	Keogh	Smith, V. Va.
Domengeaux	Kerr	Snyder
Douglas	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Doxey	Kleberg	Spence
Drewry	Kopplemann	Starnes, Ala.
Eaton	Ludlow	Steagall
Edmiston	Lynch	Stearns, N. H.
Eliot, Mass.	McArdle	Stefan
Elston	McGehee	Stratton
Engel	McGranery	Sweeney
Fish	McMillan	Taylor
Fitzpatrick	Maas	Thomas, N. J.
Flannagan	Maciora	Thomason
Flannery	Magnuson	Tinkham
Ford, Leland M.	Mahon	Tolan
Ford, Thomas F.	Mansfield	Traynor
Gale	Mason	Treadway
Gavagan	May	Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.	West	Winter
Vreeland	White	Wolfenden, Pa.
Wadsworth	Whittington	Young
Walter	Wigglesworth	Zimmerman
Weaver	Williams	
Welch	Wilson	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wigglesworth for, with Mr. Lambertson against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr Ludlow against.

General pairs:

Mr. Doxey with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr Barden with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Short.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Merritt with Mr Rockefeller.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Green with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Traynor with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Fish.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Welch.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Johns.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Rutherford.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Mahon with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. West.
Mr. May with Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. McGehee.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Kopplemann.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Sacks.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Young.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Plauché.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Geyer of California.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LESINSKI changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SPARKMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. REECE of Tennessee, changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BRYSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I voted "no." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 42: On page 43, after line 16, insert:

"Helium plants and investigations: Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to expenditures from the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines for helium plants and investigations in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, approved April 1, 1941; for helium plants and investigations and helium production and investigations in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942; and for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164), authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 25, after line 15, insert:

"Government of the Virgin Islands, survey of public-works needs: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and the employment by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an engineer or firm of engineers if necessary, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive and complete survey of the need for the replacement of hospitals, schools, and other institutional buildings, and the need for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of sewer, water, power, and other utility services, and other public works necessary for the welfare of the Virgin Islands of the United States, fiscal year 1942, $5,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be transmitted to the Congress covering the results of such survey, together with estimates of costs of all projects, not later than June 30, 1942."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to that amendment. Is this for the purpose of making an investigation in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct; a survey. There was a budget estimate for $30,000 and we cut it down to $5,000.

Mr. RICH. They are going to make the survey, are they?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They are.

Mr. RICH. It needs it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57: On page 52, after line 13, insert:

"QUARTERMASTER CORPS

"Military posts

"Construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts: For an additional amount for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances at military posts, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified therein, fiscal year 1942, $6,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure unless and until the bill H. R. 3537, Seventy-seventh Congress, is enacted into law."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which the motions were agreed to will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

THE LATE IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, all humanity was shocked when radio commentators announced the passing of Ignace Jan Paderewski. It was late Sunday night, June 29, when the great heart of the artist, statesman, humanitarian, and patriot known to countless millions throughout the world ceased to beat, and one of the world's greatest characters passed peacefully into the Great Beyond and to a well-deserved rest. Tragically, he was denied the privilege of departing this earthly sphere from the land of his forefathers, his beloved Poland, for which he labored ceaselessly throughout his entire life. The great heart of this noble and cosmopolitan character was grieved and pained as he followed the progress of the war which desecrated the sacred soil of his people. As the plundering, blasphemous, and bloodstained hoofs of the Nazi German Huns advanced through the fair Polish countryside, he prayed that God might sustain the heroic citizens of his homeland until deliverance. More than that, despite his age, the virile octogenarian labored actively, energetically, and unfalteringly to the end to aid the cause of Polish freedom and to hasten her complete restoration.

Poland, his beloved Poland, was his first and his greatest love. For her he sacrificed everything—health, wealth, and friendships, and now even his very life.

In accordance with an ancient custom of his people, the great heart of the first Premier of reconstituted Poland will abandon its earthly habitation of four score years to become enshrined at the bosom of his fatherland.

The people of America, with whom he considered himself closely related, bow their heads in reverent silence as they sigh a fervent prayer for the everlasting rest of his noble, weary soul.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

ISOLATIONISTS AND THE DEFENSE OF AMERICA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I read a little book dedicated to Franklin D. Roosevelt in these words:

To the only great democratic chief of state who comprehended the inherent menace of Hitlerism from the beginning.

This is indeed a fitting and truthful tribute to one of the greatest and most farsighted of American Presidents. I thank God such a man stands at the helm of our ship of state during the gravest crisis that has ever confronted this country. Never has our need been greater for that strong hand at the helm, for never before have we seen the foundations of our Nation being deliberately undermined from within by the direct agents of dictators whose openly avowed purpose it is to destroy this Republic and wipe democracy from the face of the earth.

Does any Member of this House doubt that the embassies and the consulates of the Axis Powers are the dynamos of a vast and amply financed "fifth column" dedicated to espionage, sabotage, and propaganda for the purpose of obstruct-

ing the production of war materials in the United States? God knows this efficiently organized undeclared war which is now being waged against us is difficult to cope with, for these enemies within our gates claim and receive diplomatic immunity.

I am thankful our great President had the courage to ignore our appeasers and defeatists and to cut off the consular branches of this organization designed to destroy our American way of life. But do we not all know that the only way to kill an evil weed is to tear it up by the roots? For the sake of self-preservation, therefore, let us finish the job and tell the "gauleiters" of this Axis "fifth column" to close up their embassies and get out along with their small fry.

Yet this recognized and immunized "fifth column" in our midst is not by any means the gravest menace to the security of America, for in my opinion it is the "made in America" dupes and mouthpieces of these "fifth columnists," our isolationists, who represent the real and fundamental menace to our safety.

Now just what constitutes an isolationist? I culled from the Washington Post the following accurate definition offered by Mr. Mathew, of Alexandria. I quote:

> An isolationist is a person born with a fear complex; an imperfect maturity of one of the natural senses; a mental condition that overbalances the ability to judge by sound reasoning matters where physical conflict is involved or imminent.
>
> Many isolationists are brilliant speakers, with the ability to impress many persons with their views.
>
> Isolationists are obstructionists, and are a definite detriment to any nation involved in war or about to become involved.
>
> These persons may be found in all nations of the world. In Germany they are immediately shot or placed in concentration camps for the duration of the war. In fact, any nation at war would be compelled to isolate, destroy, or remove these persons from public contact in the interest of the nation.

Yes; it is the isolationists, feeding the American people the soothing sirup of false security, who are the real menace to our national security. It is the isolationists who tell us that Hitler will leave us alone if we leave him alone, it is the isolationists who oppose every effort of our chosen and informed leaders to arouse this Nation to the ever-increasing and fast-approaching peril. In short, my friends, it is the isolationists who have brought America to the brink of the abyss.

Let us take warning from the appalling lessons of current history before we, too, find ourselves on the road trod by France. Was it not by precisely the same kind of methods, using the same kind of soothing sirup, that the cowardly leaders of France doped the unsuspecting and heroic French people into a dream world of false security? A dream world from which they were awakened by Hitler's panzer divisions and Stuka bombers to find themselves the prisoners—yes; the slaves—of their ancient and ruthless enemy.

France, the great Republic, so long the leader of European culture and liberalism, is no more. Today France lies prostrate in the dust, ravished and dishonored in the eyes of the world. Disgraced and betrayed, she was sold into slavery by the same traitorous leadership which seeks to plunge a dagger into the heart of England, her friend and ally. Forced by Darlan and Laval to join forces with Hitler, she is to play the part of a despised jackal for her conqueror and oppressor; that is the unfortunate and tearful role of the France of today.

And who, gentlemen, encompassed the downfall and the ruin of France? Who are those who sold their birthright for a mess of pottage? Who are those that bartered the honor and the freedom of their countrymen to keep themselves in office? Who are those that have condemned to death DeGaulle and his gallant followers, the escaped few who are the hope and pride of the great mass of liberty-loving French people? Why, the same, I say, the same cowardly vendors of an opiate who first doped the people of France into false security and then betrayed them to the enemy. But France, a greater and a rejuvenated France, please God, will rise again with a British victory over godless, barbarous nazi-ism.

Are we going to watch history repeat itself in these United States? Do you realize that our demagogues, soothsayers, and the isolationists are trying to do to us today exactly what the French demagogues and soothsayers of France actually did to that great democracy only yesterday? Do you realize they are trying to sell our people the same bill of appeasement and false security that their French counterpart sold to the people of France?

Our soothsayers are trying to sell us the idea that we are perfectly safe behind the Atlantic Ocean, just exactly as the soothsayers of France sold the French people the idea that they were perfectly safe behind the Maginot line. Yes, our soothsayers and the isolationists have tried for 20 years and are still trying today to sell the American people the perfidious notion that, thanks to the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, we live in a world apart. A safe, secure world, a dream world, protected from attack and invasion and delivered from evil and from the dangers and the suffering that afflict our less fortunately situated neighbors and fellow men.

Thus our soothsayers are calling to the mothers of America, "follow us and your sons will be safe. Fathers of America heed not the words of the interventionists and the warmongers, follow us and not one drop of American blood shall be spilt on foreign soil." "Come," cry the soothsayers, "let the foreigners stew in their own juice, this is not our war, so let us have no part of it. Join the Levites and pass by on the other side—our two great oceans render us immune from the woes and wounds of a warring world. Let Hitler murder, ravage, and rob to his heart's content—we shall arm to the teeth and live in peace and safety behind our ocean barriers." That is what they tell us.

My friends, no more deadly lies than those have ever been uttered. For mark you, just as certainly as loss of the Maginot line to Hitler encompassed the destruction of the French Republic, just so certainly will the loss of the Atlantic Ocean to Hitler encompass the destruction of the American Republic.

And yet today, thanks to the false counsel and the weasel words of the isolationists, our Nation is shrouded in a fog of uncertainty and misinformation. Great America sits complacently by and views without alarm the losing battle which Britain, with her back to her crumbling walls, fights alone for Christianity, freedom, and civilization against overpowering odds and numbers. A battle, my friends, that will determine who will command the seas, who will control the Atlantic Ocean, the Maginot Line of America.

Yes, thanks to our appeasers and defeatists and isolationists, the American Navy, the finest in the world, designed and built to protect our commerce, our way of life and the honor of this Nation even if needs be by taking the offensive, strains at its anchors, while the British fight the battle whose outcome will determine our future security and our way of life. The French, despite their copperheads, fought bravely to defend their Maginot Line, but we, thanks to our copperheads, refuse to lift a finger to defend our Maginot Line, the Atlantic Ocean. What an appalling, what an incredible situation.

And who is to blame? I accuse the isolationists. They and they alone will be to blame if Britain falls and America alone faces a totalitarian world. Nor will I, for one, allow them to shirk their responsibility unrebuked should that evil day befall us.

Now, this little book I mentioned previously as being dedicated to Franklin D. Roosevelt, is called Pax Americana, written by the Honorable James H. R. Cromwell, formerly our Minister to Canada. It is a concise and serious work which commands attention. It tells you in plain and understandable language just what would happen to America, isolated in a totalitarian world, and why. Let me quote Professor Elliott, of Harvard, who wrote a brilliant introduction to the book:

> In a time of great confusion when the American people must make a decision that will determine the future, not only of their own way of life but of world civilization, clear and resolute speech is imperative; it must also be simple speech, capable of being understood by the people of this country to whom it is addressed. Further, it must be speech spoken calmly and without ill temper or any spirit of fear and hate. Yet it must be speech that meets the desperate urgency for action that the times demand.
>
> Because this book, Pax Americana, fulfills these requirements, I believe Mr. Cromwell has rendered a valuable and lasting service to his country. He has defined the issues clearly and tersely and has set forth the only real alternatives. That is exactly what is

needed to enable the American people to decide.

I, too, believe Mr. Cromwell has rendered a valuable and lasting service to his country and I want to remind the Members of this House that this is not the first time he has done so.

A year ago on March 19, 1940, Mr. Cromwell made a speech in Toronto that not only aroused Congress but literally was heard around the world. Why? Because he was the first and only American official with the courage to risk his post in order to warn his countrymen that Hitlerism threatened the safety of America. In that speech Mr. Cromwell said, I quote:

> The Allies are fighting for the perpetuation of individual liberty and freedom.

But, he went on to say, such a frank expression of the simple truth will be resented by, I quote:

> Some of my very distinguished countrymen, who, it would seem, believe the fulfillment of the handwriting on the wall can be avoided by pretending the handwriting is not there.

The gist of Mr. Cromwell's famous Toronto speech, however, was in the following words:

> I am at a loss to understand how any intelligent citizen of any of the world's neutral democracies can state with conviction that he has no interest in the outcome of this war, or that there are no issues at stake which can affect him. To me, it is only too apparent that the life, the liberty, the livelihood, and the very safety of this same neutral citizen may be dependent upon the outcome of the present war. Whether he recognizes it or not, his future, and the future of his children's children, are, in all probability, now at stake.

Were more prophetic words ever spoken? Will even the isolationists, 15 months later, deny the truth of these words in the face of defense appropriations now approaching a goal of fifty billions? But in March 1940 they held sway, they were in full control. What a storm of ridicule and abuse was visited upon our courageous young Minister to Canada. From coast to coast the isolationist press, which at that time was practically all the press, "raged furiously." Editors, columnists, and cartoonists joined in a front-page chorus of criticism and demands for his immediate recall. For Mr. Cromwell had committed the sin that is unforgivable to the dictators and to their dupes and mouthpieces, the isolationists—he dared to tell the truth. So he was called a warmonger, he was accused of treason, he was told to get out of the country for which he and his forefathers had fought for seven generations, and told never again to cross its borders.

At that time I did not personally know Mr. Cromwell; I knew him only because of his appearance before the Ways and Means Committee; but the idea that it had become treason in the United States to tell the people the truth was too much for me to take while prone and in silence. And so on March 20, in the face of a vicious pro-Nazi isolation barrage, I sent Mr. Cromwell the following telegram. I quote:

> Stand your ground; pay no attention to puttyheads and potbellies. You are in harmony with American foreign policy, and 95 percent of our people are in agreement with you. Shed your kid gloves; do some boxing, and don't pull your punches. Truth has a terrific wallop, and there is nothing diplomatic about it. I, too, want a copy of your speech to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an inspiration to American posterity. You can cross the border as many times as you please and do so with impunity. Personal congratulations.

I am on this floor to repeat these words, for truth has a terrific wallop, and will always prevail.

Today who do we find was telling the truth, Mr. Cromwell or the isolationists who accused him of treason? I am not one to pull my punches when I think my country is in danger. I realize the words I used in my telegram 15 months ago were neither soft nor euphemistic. They were not meant to be. They were aimed at a blatant and brazen group of pro-Nazi spokesmen who would throttle free speech—and, by the way, not one of these at whom I directed my attack resides in my district. It was the language of the frontier and was intended to encourage Mr. Cromwell to keep on trying to arouse our people to the danger that threatens them.

I am peased to note that Mr. Cromwell is keeping up the fight and I shall continue to do my utmost to help him. For there is only one way the American people may be spared the horrors of modern warfare, and that is to tell them the truth, no matter how much it may hurt. And the truth is that there is only one way to keep this war out of America, and that is to confine it where it is now—across the Atlantic Ocean.

You cannot keep the burglar out by the isolationist expedient of pulling the bedclothes over your head and pretending he is not there. I am not certain whether that may or may not be good politics, but I am positive it is bad patriotism. The people must know the truth, and, so far as I am concerned, I told the truth 15 months ago. I am repeating it here and now.

I want to say that the new book just written by Mr. Cromwell is timely, accurate, and tells the truth. I am here to congratulate the author and to say "I am all for you, Jimmy Cromwell, for you warned the American people 15 months ago and foretold what was going to happen and now in your book you warn them again." This prophet shall not be without honor in his own country while I am here to fling the truth in the teeth of the isolationists and challenge them to answer cold, hard facts with cold, hard facts. I have read to the isolationists a few of the truths in Mr. Cromwell's little book which are unanswerable. I demand that they stop assassinating characters, calling names, and appealing to emotions just long enough to admit or refute a few of the cold, hard facts to which I referred.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may be allowed to extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three newspaper editorials in regard to Mr. Wickard and the cheese situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIMITATION OF ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views to accompany the bill (H. R. 4873) to promote the national defense by limiting the entry of certain aliens into the United States. These minority views are signed by Messrs. LESINSKI, RAMSAY, SCHULTE, WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER, MASON, MACIEJEWSKI, and DICKSTEIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain newspaper comments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES SHOULD BE DEPORTED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, June 13, 1940, this House by a vote of 330 to 42 passed H. R. 9766, a bill to deport Harry Bridges. Since that action more than a year has passed.

Four days ago in Detroit, Harry Bridges denounced the Federal Bureau of Investigation in vehement language. I shall ask the indulgence of my colleagues as I read the following news dispatch:

> BRIDGES DENOUNCES F. B. I. TO NEWSPAPER GUILD—IS ENDORSED BY ORGANIZATION; "RED" CHARGE REJECTED
>
> DETROIT, June 27.—Harry Bridges, C. I. O. labor leader whom the Government is seeking to deport on the grounds that he has been a member of the Communist Party, told the American Newspaper Guild (C. I. O.) last night that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was a "super labor spy organization."
>
> He spoke just after the Guild approved a resolution pledging support to Bridges

and asserted that it "resented his continued persecution as an attack on labor."

Bridges, addressing the Guild convention here, said the F. B. I. was not just looking for subversive activities, "they are out to bring down organized labor."

In the last 36 hours the Federal Bureau of Investigation has corralled 32 spies, 7 of whom have already pleaded guilty of espionage against this country. Americans applaud the courageous work of J. Edgar Hoover and his coworkers.

This is the same Harry Bridges who within the past week postponed action on a motion made before the Longshoremen's Union of San Francisco which would have had that group contribute $500 to the United Service Organization because this noncitizen wanted to look into the validity of the drive.

In this connection I call your attention to a well-written editorial, which says:

BRIDGES AND THE U. S. O.

It is hard to imagine a public appeal for funds less open to legitimate criticism than the United Service Organizations drive. Its purpose is to raise money with which to operate clubhouses for men in the service.

The Government will supply the buildings, and the staffs will be drawn from the Y. M. C. A., the National Catholic Community Service, the Jewish Welfare Board, the Salvation Army, the Y. W. C. A., and the Travelers Aid. The public is asked to assume running expenses only.

At a meeting of the Longshoremen's Union in San Francisco a motion was made to contribute $500 to the U. S. O. campaign. Like everyone else, the members have relatives in the Army or Navy. Some of them are veterans, and know the desperate dullness of a week-end leave at an isolated post. Nevertheless, the proposal was held over for 2 weeks, because Harry Bridges thinks the drive ought to be investigated.

Everybody, of course, is out of step but Harry, the sour radical with a private revelation on Americanism. The six most experienced social organizations in the United States are not good enough for an alien agitator who has long since lost everything but a nuisance value. Presumably when Bridges puts his personal O. K. on the idea—if he does—the longshoremen will contribute. By that time, let's hope the drive will be over the top.

Mr. Speaker, hasten the day when the action of this House over a year ago is concurred in and this man and others of his stripe are banished from our shores.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a few paragraphs from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Gazette.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement I have received from the Arizona Small Mine Operators' Association, Nogales council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which recently appeared in the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our distinguished majority leader could tell the House at this time what his plans are for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the present conference report is accepted by the Senate, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet on Thursday next, and that when it adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday. If this consent is obtained, then, of course, there will be no business between now and next Monday.

On next Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and no controversial legislation will be considered.

If there are any bills other than those on the Consent Calendar that can be passed by unanimous consent, where the membership of the committee is in complete agreement and the leadership on both sides agree on it, they may be considered. I know of no such noncontroversial legislation at this time, but I make this statement because I believe no one would object to that procedure. No legislation will come up on Monday except the Consent Calendar and noncontroversial bills of the nature I have referred to.

I have just been informed that the Senate has concurred in the conference report.

On Tuesday the May bill will come up for consideration. There will be general debate on that bill on Tuesday, and I assume that the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Can we have the assurance that if the general debate is finished on Tuesday the bill will not be read for amendment until Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe that is a fair request to make. If general debate is closed on Tuesday as majority leader I will make the statement now that I shall undertake to have the bill read under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday. This, of course, will enable Members to make adjustments which they could not otherwise make if there were any uncertainty about the bill coming up under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday. Time on Tuesday will be consumed by general debate, and if general debate is exhausted during Tuesday it is my intention to have the House start debate under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the first controversial vote, then, will be on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and I now ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet on Thursday, and when it meets on Thursday there is to be an agreement that there will be no business transacted, and when it adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I think it is unfortunate it has been announced and the Members have been told that the May bill will not be called until the 8th of July, because that delays not merely action on the question of work stoppage in defense plants but also the question of the deferment of men between the ages of 28 and 35. Tomorrow is registration day. The Members of the House are being relieved of uncertainty as to what the legislative program is for the week, but there are millions of young men in the country over 28 who are going to continue in an uncertain status on their liability to call and millions of younger men will be uncertain of their position in the order of call. I hold in my hand an editorial written, it so happens, by the chairman of a local selection board, which states the proposition very clearly which I have already asked to place in the RECORD. I think it is extremely unfortunate that the membership of the House, fearing to face the issue that is

involved in the labor sections of the so-called May bill, is postponing action on the bill with relation to the selection of men 28 years of age or over. I recognize, of course, that there is no way under the rules of the House to force consideration of the bill before July 8 even if we were to hold daily sessions, and, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, there are legislative circumstances which bring about this situation. There is an awful lot in what the gentleman has said and I know that I speak the sentiment of the entire membership of the House when I say that it is regrettable that the provision with respect to the change in the age of selectees was tied up with other controversial matters, because that matter, if considered by itself, would have gone through the House, in my opinion, unanimously, and I think I speak the unanimous sentiment of the House in expressing the desire of this House that General Hershey and the local selective boards may defer the drafting into the service of any men who would otherwise be excluded if the May bill were enacted into law, because in my opinion that particular portion of the bill will be enacted into law in the very near future. I think the gentleman has made a contribution by his statement to the House, and I hope that none within those age limits will be inducted into the service.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, do I understand that Thursday we will be deprived of making 1-minute speeches or being given the right to extend our own remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I said that no legislation will be brought up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JACOBSON, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. GREGORY), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 3 days, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4972. An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint Resolution making appropriations for work and work relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3735. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4756. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4926. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4965. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4972. An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5049. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5052. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to regulate the use of administration expenses, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work and work relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Thursday, July 3, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The House Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing Tuesday, July 1, 1941, at 10 a. m., in the committee room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 5081 (SABATH), a bill authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the United States any offer of patent rights for national-defense purposes. Anyone interested in this hearing should communicate with the clerk of the committee in advance of the date of the hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings at 10 a. m., on the following dates, on the bills named:

Tuesday, July 1, 1941:

H. R. 5111. Authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

Wednesday, July 2, 1941:

H. R. 4446. Relating to the manning of vessels.

Tuesday, July 8, 1941:

H. R. 84. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5051. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5130. To extend the benefits of the United States Public Health Service to fishermen, and for other purposes.

Tuesday, July 15, 1941:

H. R. 3361. To provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold public hearings on H. R. 2472, entitled "A bill to provide pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who became disabled by reason of their service therein, equivalent to 90 percent of the compensation payable to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities, and for other purposes," and H. R. 3257, entitled "A bill to increase and equalize the pensions of those persons disabled as the result of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard." The hearings will be held Thursday, July 10, 1941, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

692. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act reorganizing the administration of Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

693. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a building for Federal courts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

694. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting statement of loan and other authorizations of the Corporation made during the month of April 1941 (H. Doc. No. 298); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

695. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement showing expenditures authorized under the several appropriations therein consolidated and the expenditures made thereunder as of June 15, 1941; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

696. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, by the War Department, recommended for disposition; to the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 4873. A bill to promote the national defense by limiting the entry of certain aliens into the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads. H. R. 5110. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, for the immediate construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 891). Referred to the Committee of Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4972. A bill to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 238. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the pamphlet containing information concerning monetary and other benefits available to persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5166. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5215. A bill to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

H. R. 5216. A bill to provide for certain priorities on oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5217. A bill relating to price fixing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5218. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 5219. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5220. A bill for the completion of the construction of the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal across Florida; to the Committee on River and Harbors.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 5221. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 5222. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 5228. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain aid to Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by suspending section 24b of the National Defense Act and authorizing a more expeditious procedure to vitalize the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to extend the life and the time for reporting of the Joint Committee Under Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress and extended in Senate Joint Resolution 182, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution to hold a national advisory referendum election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to hold a national advisory referendum election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. Res. 256. Resolution directing an investigation of the foreign policy of the United States in relation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, extent to which the domestic and foreign policies of the United States are being influenced by communistic thought and philosophy, and the extent of the employment of Communists in the Federal service and the responsibility therefor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 257. Resolution creating a committee to investigate the feasibility of transferring certain bureaus and agencies of the Government from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5223. A bill for the relief of Reginal H. Carter, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 5224. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Gabellieri, Bruno Gabellieri, Celestino Gabellieri, and Ilia Gabellieri; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5225. A bill for the relief of Susannah Sanchez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5226. A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Walker, alias George R. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5227. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maria Wren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of ule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1562. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Congress, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning pending sugar legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1563. Also, petition of the Civil Service Forum, New York City, favoring the Mead-Flannery bill for longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1564. Also, petition of the United Marine Division, Local 333, New York City, favoring the Flannery bill, H. R. 1057, and the Mead bill, S. 220, longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1565. Also, petition of the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, concerning Senate Resolution 124 and House Resolution 245, for feeding starving nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1566. Also, petition of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, concerning Senate Resolution 124 and House Resolution 245, for feeding starving nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1567. Also, petition of the Catholic members of the committee on food for the small democracies as proposed in House Resolution 245; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1568. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by H. C. Christensen and 16 other citizens of the State of Oregon, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 or House bill 3852; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1569. Also, resolution of the Oregon State Board of Control in support of Senate bill 1201, a bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1570. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State of California, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 33, relative to the extension of flood-control works in the Los Angeles River and the construction of such works in the San Fernando Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1571. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Newspaper Guild (the eighth annual convention) Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with

reference to fundamental rights of labor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1572. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club, Elks Club, Lions Club, of Roswell, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to internal friction and national preparedness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1573. Also, petition of the Oahu Citizens' Committee for Home Defense in Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to loyalty to the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1574. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of sundry residents of Pullman, Wash., and various other cities, protesting the passage of House bill 3852, which authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Barber Examiners to establish opening and closing hours, and a day on which barber shops shall remain closed after an investigation as to the preference of a majority of the licensed barbers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.